

**Diplomatic Language and Translation**  
**Case study: President Donald Trump's Rhetoric**

Irina Tsvetkova-Hegedus

A dissertation presented to the Faculty of Arts in the University of Malta for the degree of  
Master in Contemporary Diplomacy

July 2017

## **ABSTRACT**

This thesis explores the importance of diplomatic language, persuasive rhetoric and translation in international diplomacy. The hypothesis here is that diplomatic language is changing and that this change affects both our understanding and use of language and linguistic devices. In order to exemplify this trend, a case study analyses President Donald Trump's controversial rhetoric and its translatability. The thesis provides, first, a close reading of texts that illustrate the pervasive power of a politician's style, rhetoric and persuasiveness. Second, it considers the translation challenges raised by President Trump's novel communication style. Accordingly, examples of diplomats and heads of state and government increasingly using social media, demonstrate the emergence of a new linguistic style in international diplomacy.

## Table of Contents

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION .....	5
Aim .....	5
Chapter outline .....	5
Methodology .....	6
CHAPTER II DIPLOMATISTS, SMALL 'D'-DIPLOMATS AND RHETORIC .....	8
Introduction. What do we call a diplomatic language? .....	8
The prototypical diplomatic language .....	8
Diplomatic language by non-diplomats .....	10
Undiplomatic language by diplomats and politicians .....	10
Diplomatic language and rhetoric.....	11
CHAPTER III <b>TRADUTTORE, TRADITORE!?</b> .....	14
Introduction .....	14
I. What is translation and what does it mean? .....	14
II. Translation and interpretation.....	16
III. Difficulties and techniques to overcome them .....	17
IV. Emotions, incoherence and the unsaid .....	21
CHAPTER IV CASE STUDY .....	23
I. Prepared speech – the President’s inaugural speech.....	23
II. 1 Media conference speeches with speaking points and no teleprompter .....	31
II. 2 Translatability.....	40
III. Tweets .....	44
IV. The <i>unsaid</i> .....	50
CHAPTER V A NEW DIPLOMATIC LANGUAGE? .....	53
Diplomatic language – old and new.....	53
Social media .....	53

Where does translation fit? .....	57
CHAPTER VI CONCLUSIONS.....	58
Further research .....	59
Food thought.....	59
REFERENCE LIST .....	60

## CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

**The aim of this thesis** is to pose and attempt to answer the question: ‘Has a new diplomatic language emerged?’ Two themes run through this discussion of the importance of language in international diplomacy – (1) the persuasive power of rhetoric and (2) translation. The hypothesis here is that diplomatic language is changing and that this change affects both our understanding and use of language and linguistic devices. At the same time, equally important but perhaps less conspicuous, translation takes a prominent place in key aspects of life – personal, interpersonal or international. It is an integral part of language and diplomacy. In order to exemplify this rapidly evolving trend of using a new style of diplomatic language, a case study has been compiled. The subject of the analysis is President Donald Trump’s controversial rhetoric and its translatability. Accordingly, this thesis provides, first, a close reading of texts that illustrate the pervasive power of a politician’s style, rhetoric and persuasiveness. Second, it considers the translation challenges raised by President Trump’s novel communication style. By means of this dual approach, the emergence of a new diplomatic language can be measured both theoretically, through rhetorical analysis, and practically, through the strategies adopted by translators.

### ***Chapter outline***

Below is an outline of the subsequent chapters of this thesis.

**Chapter II** looks into the concept of *diplomatic language* both in its diplomatic and non-diplomatic settings as well as the use of undiplomatic language by diplomats and politicians. The continuously increasing role of heads of state and government in diplomacy is also addressed. The chapter concludes with a concise summary of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* which defines persuasion as the ultimate purpose of any kind of speech. The principal qualities that are bound to make a speaker and writer (whether a diplomat or a non-diplomat) sound persuasive are outlined so as to be used as assessment criteria in the subsequent case study of Chapter IV.

**Chapter III** deals with translation – both oral and written, and its importance in interpersonal and in international diplomacy. It starts by defining both types of translation; it then outlines some of the most common difficulties and challenges translators face as well as the techniques and strategies used to overcome them. Attempts have been made to provide some pertinent examples. Emotions, incoherence and the *unsaid* are also addressed at the end of the chapter.

**Chapter IV** presents the case study of this thesis – the language and style of President Trump. In order to illustrate the distinctive characteristics of President Trump’s style and its impact on the international scene, the chapter addresses his rhetoric and its translatability as found in – (1) a prepared speech – his inaugural speech; (2) an impromptu speech without the use of teleprompter –

the presidential announcement speech along with some other impromptu comments; (3) tweets; (4) body language and the *unsaid*. Drawing on what has been discussed in the previous two chapters, the questions of translatability and rhetorical effect are addressed throughout the discussion and where deemed necessary in more detail.

**Chapter V** draws on the perhaps slightly pessimistic conclusion reached in the case study; it poses and attempts to answer an important question, namely – has a new diplomatic language emerged and what are its repercussions?

The thesis ends with conclusions based on all chapters.

### ***Methodology***

The methodology adopted in this thesis is limited to the use of primary and secondary sources. The main sources used are outlined below.

The primary sources used in Chapter IV were chosen in order to illustrate President Trump's rhetoric as found in three different genres, namely the prepared speech, impromptu speech and tweets. As indicated above, the main texts chosen to provide a close reading are - President Trump's inaugural of January 2017; his presidential announcement speech delivered in New York in June 2015; various tweets posted during and after his presidential campaign. The photographs used aim at illustrating the speaker's distinctive body language.

In terms of secondary sources - Chapter II which addresses the concept of diplomatic language has relied on: Diplo's Language and Diplomacy (2001); Diplo's lecture texts from Language & Diplomacy by Biljana Scott (2016); Diplomacy by Sir Harold Nicolson (1939); 21<sup>st</sup> Century Ambassador by Kishan Rana (2011); Diplomacy: Theory and Practice by G.R. Berridge (2015); Aristotle, Rhetoric translated by W. Rhys Roberts.

Chapter III on translation draws extensively on the works of David Bellos *Is That a Fish in Your Ear?* (2012), and Mona Baker's *In Other Words* (2008); Tessicini's *Introduction to Translators, Interpreters, and Cultural Negotiators* (2014) has also been referred to; Horace's *Ars Poetica*.

The following has been used for the purposes of Chapter IV - *Do They Think You're Stupid?* on logical fallacies by Julian Baggini (2010); Joe Navarro's *What Every BODY is Saying* (2009) on body language. J.L. Austin's *How to Do Things with Words* and George Lakoff's blog have also been used for reference.

Various articles have been consulted to provide transcripts for the above speeches as well as interviews with the translators' accounts referred to in Chapter IV - [www.washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com),

[www.cnn.com](http://www.cnn.com), [www.time.com](http://www.time.com), [www.qz.com](http://www.qz.com), [www.politico.com](http://www.politico.com), the NPR – National Public Radio [www.npr.org](http://www.npr.org), [www.sbs.com](http://www.sbs.com), [www.slate.com](http://www.slate.com), [www.bbc.com](http://www.bbc.com), Twitter.

Chapter V has relied on the 2016 and 2017 Twiplomacy study reports by Matthias Lüfkens; Wichowski's Social Diplomacy published in Foreign Affairs; examples from Sky News, Project Syndicate, Twitter, Spiegel Online.

The following dictionaries were used: Liddell & Scott's Greek-English Lexicon; Cassell's Latin Dictionary; Collins English Dictionary; [www.merriam-webster.com](http://www.merriam-webster.com) ; Berridge & James' Dictionary of Diplomacy; [www.thefreedictionary.com](http://www.thefreedictionary.com); [www.britannica.com](http://www.britannica.com) .

## CHAPTER II – *Diplomatists, Small 'd'-Diplomats and Rhetoric*

### ***Introduction***

Diplomacy – both international and interpersonal – implies subtlety, tact and balance. It is truly an art – the art of being gracefully purposeful, persuasive and efficient without being rudely confrontational, rash or intemperate. This art thrives on the use of a special type of language – balanced, unthreatening but firm and reassuring, respectful – often called diplomatic language.

The purpose of this chapter is to look into the concept of *diplomatic language*, both in its diplomatic and non-diplomatic setting, as well as into oratory, that is rhetoric as an indispensable part of the art of diplomacy. Furthermore, the ever increasing role of politicians and heads of state and government in diplomacy is emphasized. Drawing on Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, the chapter also attempts to identify what qualities a good speaker should possess in order to be both persuasive and diplomatic. It establishes the analytical criteria that will be used in the subsequent case study.

### ***What do we call a diplomatic language?***

When we speak of diplomatic language, do we refer to diplomacy only or does the phrase apply to any other aspect of life? What is the purpose of diplomatic language – does it befriend and lend a helping hand, or does it frustrate and impede?

We begin from the 'roots' – the etymology of the word *diplomacy*: both in Ancient Greek<sup>1</sup> and in Latin<sup>2</sup> the noun meant *a doubled or folded paper, a letter of recommendation*. In the works of Cicero and Tacitus, the meaning of the word *diploma* was *a letter of introduction given to travellers by the government to facilitate their journey*; in Suetonius' works it stood for *a government document conferring privileges on the person(s) addressed*. In modern English, *diplomatic* means *skilled in negotiating, especially between states or people; tactful in dealing with people* (Collins English Dictionary, 2014); or *exactly reproducing the original* (Merriam Webster, 2017).

### ***The prototypical diplomatic language***

Although there are numerous definitions of *diplomacy*, the following one which covers all key angles shall be adopted for the purpose of this thesis - 'Diplomacy is the principal means by which states communicate with each other, enabling them to have regular and complex relations. It is the communications system of the international society.' (Berridge & James, 2001). Its major functions are negotiation, gathering information, mediation, clarifying intentions, generating goodwill, propaganda, lobbying. All forms and functions of diplomacy require communication which is

---

<sup>1</sup> δῖπλωμα, δῖπλώματος, n. - Greek – English Lexicon, Liddell & Scott. Oxford

<sup>2</sup> diploma, atis, n. - Cassell's Latin Dictionary



achieved primarily through the use of language. And language is what defines us as it is the means through which we express our thoughts - it is the gate to our minds; that gate might be left just slightly or wide open. Flexible and ever-evolving language is the reflexion of what we think and what we mean when we speak both individually and collectively; it's also the medium of understanding. Being a means of communication and a policy instrument at the same time, diplomacy in turn is dependent on language, on the particular form of it used in diplomatic settings. We depend on it to achieve and maintain a level of 'shared understanding', which as Sharp (Language and Diplomacy, 2001, p.95) points out is always achievable 'for if it were not, there would be no point in having diplomacy trying to find what it was.'

In order to represent, promote and defend their country's national interests; to prevent, subdue or eliminate tension and conflicts; to camouflage or declare intentions; to buy time or absolve actors of responsibility, diplomats use the so-called *diplomatic* language. It is particularly formal, at times excessively so; courteous hence respectful and more acceptable, often ambiguous and verbose, it might be bewitching or deceptive. As explained by Sir H. Nicolson, 'it is used to describe that guarded under-statement which enables diplomatists and ministers to say sharp things to each other without becoming provocative or impolite.' (1939, p.226). Nicolson also prescribes the seven virtues the ideal diplomat should possess - '(1) Truthfulness—(2) Precision—(3) Calm—(4) Good temper—(5) Patience—(6) Modesty—(7) Loyalty' (1939, p.104). Attributed as the ideal diplomat's qualities as early as 1939, these seven traits are pertinent today as well.

The purpose of **formality and courteousness** is 'to acknowledge the other party' and 'secure face-space' (Scott, 2016) particularly when the negative impact of disagreement or rejection needs to be softened and minimised so as to protect the personal integrity of the interlocutor, both individually and collectively. Formal register also helps to add importance to the speaker's message.

**Ambiguity** in turn helps as its recognition, interpretation and further monitoring make it a lot harder to concentrate on the issue at hand, thus leaving space for manoeuvring – naturally, it all depends on the context and on the objective. Ambiguity creates the opportunity to retreat from one's previous position and to provide other interpretations of one's initial stand, thus gaining time when time is of the essence. Ambiguity obscures intentions and reduces responsibility thus even absolving of the latter. **Precision** on the other hand, does the exact opposite thing - it leaves no space for manoeuvring.

Formal language is also often more verbose – as Stanko Nick points out (Language and Diplomacy, 2001, p.45), digressions and complex sentences can leave the impression the speaker/ writer is losing his train of thought thus appearing inconsistent, while in reality the purpose of it all might be to

withhold the answer. In some cases, as Rana puts it, **verbosity** ‘becomes a substitute for action’ – acutely visible for instance in the UNGA and its lengthy resolutions (Language and Diplomacy, 2001, p. 112).

Ultimately, whether it is an international treaty or conference, negotiations or unofficial communication, whichever technique one uses, any particular choice of wording in diplomacy is considered deliberate. This is why diplomats need to have a common tongue and to adhere to it in order to secure face-space and to transcend intercultural boundaries.

### ***Diplomatic language by non-diplomats***

The diplomatic language as defined at the beginning of this chapter is used by non-diplomats as well, that is, by all of us on a daily basis – it is simply part of life. We employ it so as not to cause offence, in stressful situations, in negotiations – privately or in our professional lives. And not surprisingly, we use the same techniques as diplomats – be it ambiguity, verbosity, precision, or politeness. To secure an agreement, to save face, to win or lose gracefully, to say ‘no’ politely – we all resort to tactfulness and *diplomacy*.

### ***Undiplomatic language by diplomats and politicians***

Since the end of the Cold War, the past almost three decades now have been marked by the growth of outsourcing, decentralization and networking. With the advance of globalization, interdependence has increased thus highlighting the need for intensified consultations in search of mutually beneficial solutions and at the same time blurring the lines between international and domestic policy-making and increasing the interaction between national and international actors. Globalization has provided a complex setting for diplomacy where a continuously increasing number of actors and issues are involved – both sub- and non-state actors (Rana, 2011, p.22). The ‘entry of multiple state entities into the diplomatic process’ has rendered the Foreign Ministry no longer exclusive (Language and Diplomacy, 2001, p.111).

More actors in the process have in turn meant the slow but consistent erosion of the old style which in terms of language manifests in a less subtle and more direct style. Sharp calls these new actors ‘professional cosmopolitans’ and ‘culture-bound, small’d’ diplomats’ (Language and Diplomacy, 2001, p. 94). Kappeler has rightly warned that the ‘attention to good use of language tends to lapse’ (Language and Diplomacy, 2001, p. 205). Rana at the same time points out that even though there might be one dominant international language at present, the levels of competence in it vary greatly which provides less or no guarantee at all that direct language would be comprehended as intended, let alone a softer, subtler approach. ‘This demands greater care over how one uses language, and

greater sensitivity on how one is perceived by the other side.' (Language and Diplomacy, 2001, p.111).

Furthermore, heads of government and state now play an indispensable role in foreign affairs, overtaking and appropriating the functions of the foreign ministry. The result of this change is an increased role of politicians in diplomacy as well as the infiltration of a more political style into the diplomatic language of old. At the same time, the revolutionary rapid advancement in information and communications technology (ICT) has led to new means of communication – instant, constant, less formal. *Twittering* is just one example, amusingly referred to by Berridge as a social medium which 'unlike birdsong in this respect, as also in its lack of harmony – has not got into the habit of diminishing as dawn passes into morning.' (2015, Loc. 5373). An excellent example of a politician, head of state of a super-power, who relentlessly and infamously exploits the possibilities and advantages of tweeting for example, is the President of the United States, Donald Trump. His social media style - unpredictable, impetuous, disoriented, accusatory, street-smart, has attracted an unprecedented attention and interest. Chapter IV of this thesis will attempt to analyse President Trump's style and rhetoric in order to show the simplicity and specificity of the linguistic techniques he uses and their impact on the international scene.

### ***Diplomatic language and rhetoric***

Based on the above observations, one may conclude that *diplomatic language* is the art of conveying a message effectively, that is, tactfully and persuasively, without resorting to (unnecessary) confrontation. From this it follows that persuasion is at the core of it, and whether a diplomat, a politician, head of state - an individual who seeks to persuade his opponents or supporters of an idea or concept, this person has to be skilled in rhetoric.

Aristotle<sup>3</sup> set out the principles of rhetoric in clear, unembellished language. And although he did so many centuries ago - 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC, these principles apply to our modern times unmistakably. The rules laid out below shall be the criteria used to measure persuasiveness in Chapter IV which analyzes President Trump's rhetoric.

He defines rhetoric as the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion (Book I, Part 2). The author distinguishes the following 3 traits an orator should possess – the ability '(1) to reason logically, (2) to understand human character and goodness in their various forms, and (3) to understand the emotions-that is, to name them and describe them, to know their causes and the way in which they are excited' (Book I, Part 2).

---

<sup>3</sup> Aristotle, Rhetoric. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts - <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/rhetoric.mb.txt>

The speech's object and objective are determined by the listener, hence the **three divisions of oratory** - (1) political which is concerned with the future and urges us either to do or not to do something, (2) forensic which is concerned with the past and attacks or defends, and (3) the ceremonial oratory of display which is concerned with the present, either praises or censures; it also makes references to the past and predictions about the future. (Book I, Part 3)

**'The main matters on which all men deliberate and on which political speakers make speeches are some five in number:** ways and means, war and peace, national defence, imports and exports, and legislation.' (Book I, Part 4) – hundreds of centuries later, with all the innovations of ICT, with all the experience we might think we've accumulated, this statement perfectly characterizes our world.

To effect persuasion which leads to decisions, the orator should make his/her argument worthy of belief by rendering their 'character look right' and by putting the 'hearers, who are to decide, into the right frame of mind' (Book II, Part 1). That, the author counters, is of particular importance in political speaking. So is the style of expression as it produces 'the right impression of a speech. 'The point is not just how persuasion is derived from facts, but also how to express these facts and deliver the speech properly as 'the way in which a thing is said does affect its intelligibility' (Book III, Part 1).

Style should be clear, he maintains, whereas ambiguity is useful to those who aim to mislead (Book III, Part 2). But 'the foundation of good style is correctness of language' (Book III, Part 5). Language is 'appropriate if it expresses emotion and character, and if it corresponds to its subject.' (Book III, Part 7). Good style and delivery 'come through natural talent or long practice' (Book III, Part 10).

Essentially, a speech has 2 parts – the statement of the case and the argument where one proves what they have stated using 'demonstrative proofs'. It requires an introduction, statement, argument and epilogue (Book III, Part 13).

Finally, we should be able to achieve the following – **(1)** 'make the audience well-disposed' towards us and ill-disposed towards our opponent **'(2)** magnify or minimize the leading facts, **(3)** excite the required state of emotion' in our listeners - pity, indignation, anger, hatred, envy, emulation, pugnacity, and **(4)** refresh their memories. (Book III, Part 19).

The above are the principal rules that are bound to make a speaker – a diplomat or a non-diplomat – persuasive. Set out in 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC they are relevant today as well. Used by ordinary people, politicians, heads of states, or diplomats, broken or adhered to, they are the foundation of effective modern rhetoric, the essential skill a speaker should strive to attain and perfect. To what extent and how that is achieved in reality will be addressed in more detail in the subsequent case study.

**In conclusion**, this chapter has attempted to explain the term *diplomatic language* in its diplomatic and non-diplomatic setting; it has outlined the changes in diplomacy that have affected the use of 'old style' language; it has also provided a concise summary of Aristotle's principles of rhetoric since to effect persuasion, oratory is what both diplomats and non-diplomats use.

## CHAPTER III - *Traduttore, traditore!*?<sup>4</sup>

### **Introduction**

‘It’s an almost mystical feeling that you are bringing people together, people who otherwise would never be able to communicate.’ Viktor Sukhodrev, Russian interpreter (Schudel, 2014)

The purpose of this chapter is to look into the concepts of translation and interpretation, and to emphasise their importance in diplomacy. It is also an attempt to identify the difficulties translators encounter and the techniques that may be used to overcome them. Additionally, the chapter addresses the issue of translating emotions and the unsaid. Reference is derived mostly from the works of David Bellos ‘Is That a Fish in Your Ear?’ (2012), and Mona Baker’s ‘In Other Words’ (2008).

Diplomacy is often about decoding messages. As outlined in the previous chapter, the complexity of the diplomatic language involves a rather formal register often characterised by ambiguity, vagueness and verbosity which requires decoding of the message and intentions behind it. Translation aims to help in decoding the message from the source language into the target language. Starting with the Aramaic whisper translation of 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC<sup>5</sup>, we could say that translation is a trade as old as history and languages exist and it is unavoidable if we wish to understand each other when we speak different languages. In today’s modern interconnected, interdependent world, it is everywhere – in the EU, the UN, and various other international organisations, on product packaging, in business negotiations, in our libraries (or rather Kindles nowadays), on our mobile phones. For centuries now, as ancient history sources indicate, translators have been used as informants, consultants and intercultural mediators in commercial, diplomatic and military negotiations and their key fields have always stretched between language and politics (Tessicini, 2014, Loc. 231-258). Generally, all spheres of work require translators to be trusted and in any sort of human relationship trust is the last thing you win and the first thing you lose. So if one doesn’t speak the language of their interlocutor, one needs a translator in whose skills and abilities the former invests a considerable amount of trust. If confrontation and violence arise, diplomacy is essential, hence translation is also essential.

### **1. What is translation and what does it mean?**

Once again we resort to etymology - derived from the Latin verb *transfero*<sup>6</sup>, which means *to carry over or across; to transfer, to transport, to convey*, the Latin noun *translatio*<sup>7</sup> means a transferring, a handling over. In Cicero’s works the verb also meant *to copy in writing, to translate into another*

<sup>4</sup> *Translators are traitors!* – the phrase dates back to Ottoman times; it refers to the Phanariot translators who were often thought to ‘make deals for themselves’ by mistranslating their commissioners (Bellos, 2012, p.127).

<sup>5</sup> Nowadays called *chuchotage*, whisper translations were performed in Palestine when biblical Hebrew was no longer spoken. While a rabbi spoke, Aramaic interpreters used to translate the service in a lower voice. (Bellos, 2012, p.139)

<sup>6</sup> Cassell’s Latin Dictionary – *trans-fero, tulli, latum, ferre*

<sup>7</sup> Cassell’s Latin Dictionary – *translatio, onis, f.*

*language and to use a word figuratively or metaphorically.* Hence, for both Cicero and Quintilian the noun stands for *a translation*, and *a metaphor, trope, figure*. (Cassell's Latin Dictionary)

Both, Hofstadter and Bellos maintain that 'any utterance of more than trivial length has no one translation; all utterances have innumerably many acceptable translations' (Bellos, p.8). Translation is always approximate and it is the substitute for the original. Communication is about understanding what is said as well as the meaning of what is said, that is, why it is said. From this it follows, the purpose of translation is to represent the meaning of a foreign utterance, speech, culture or philosophy. It should not sound clumsy, awkward or incomplete, but quite the opposite – energized, lively and natural-flowing, giving you a taste of the foreign original. But, as we shall see later, *meaning* is a complex term which does not relate solely to the meaning of individual words. 'What you can say by means of translation is what the word means in the context in which it occurs. Translation *is* meaning.' (Bellos, p. 86). **The main skill of the translator is to preserve and express the force of the utterance into the receiving language.** At the same time, it should be noted a controversial issue in the field of translation has always been the *literal* versus the *literary* translation – or word-for-word versus sense-for-sense. Horace's verses from *Ars Poetica* (133-4) are often considered the foundation in favour of the pragmatists' approach whereby translation is all about meaning – 'As a true translator you will take care not to translate word for word.'<sup>8</sup> (Tessicini, 2014, Loc. 231-258) This point will be addressed in more detail in the subsequent case study.

In short, it is the meaning and force of an utterance that translators reproduce by finding the 'perfect' match in the receiving language (the notion of *perfect* being always subjective). The skilled translator should – know and understand not just the meaning, but also the context of both - the source and target languages. S/he should also know how to think *outside the box*. The meaning of the utterance within a certain context helps us understand why it is used, that is, to delve into what has been said and the intention behind it. If the translator does not understand the context, s/he cannot convey the meaning of the message accurately.

## **II. Translation and interpretation**

Interpretation is translation in double quick time; it is language gymnastics which requires great mental agility. It also predates written translation.

Oral translation had a strong tradition in the Ottoman Empire, where writing was at times avoided for fear of forgery. Young boy slaves from various provinces of the Empire were educated in Ottoman Turkish in Istanbul and thus trained to be translators. The late 15th century marks the appearance of

---

<sup>8</sup> Horace, *Ars poetica* 133-4 – 'nec uerbo uerbum curabis reddere fidus / interpres'; [http://www.latin-dictionary.org/Nec\\_verbum\\_verbo\\_curabis\\_reddere\\_fidus\\_interpres](http://www.latin-dictionary.org/Nec_verbum_verbo_curabis_reddere_fidus_interpres)

*bailos* – Venetian diplomats whose job was to maintain good relationship with the Sultan and thus to protect the Venetian interests. Part of their job was the special translators' school which trained the so called dragomans – they were taught to translate Ottoman Turkish into Italian. Their job in turn was of great importance as it involved diplomacy, spying, administrative work – all in the language required. Even though they were known for their subservience and loyalty to their masters, they were often accused of making deals for themselves by misinterpreting. Hence, the phrase - *Translators are traitors*.

As Bellos points out (p.121), fear of misinterpreting by oral translators exists today as well which has had an effect on the translation protocol for private meetings between heads of state. The respective parties bring their own translators. For instance, at confidential meetings between the British Prime Minister and the French President, the British translator speaks the Prime Minister's words in French, whilst the French translator repeats the president's words in English. Such instances relate to the issue of trust mentioned earlier. The UN Documentation Division produces the so called Verbatim – the official records of the meetings of the General Assembly, Security Council and other bodies. Verbatim reporters ensure the accuracy of statements; they transcribe, translate and edit statements.

Oral translation leaves no physical trace unless recorded. An oral translator needs to be a good listener, fast talker, alert, tolerant to boredom and quick to get the gist. A simultaneous interpreter needs to learn not to listen (to him-/herself) when talking and not to talk when listening. Dramatic delivery of a translation makes him/her an actor of sorts, too. The latter would apply to any interpreter translating Mr Trump's speeches for example. Interpretation also requires reformulation in a very short time. It has one version only. Unlike it, the written translation can be polished and adapted continuously – that is until the deadline is due. After that, as words remain, no revision is allowed, and a translator's mistake stays there forever – obvious and embarrassing. From that point of view, interpretation allows more room for mistakes – as once spoken, a word, phrase, entire sentence or paragraph can be easily forgotten if its meaning is not vital to the context. Were it not so, taken out of its context, Khrushchev's short sentence 'We will bury you.' would not have survived since 1956<sup>9</sup>. What Khrushchev had actually said was: 'Whether you like it or not, we are on the right side of history. We will bury you.' What the Western media collectively selected to highlight though was just the second short but controversial sentence. However, as his interpreter, Viktor Sukhodrev tried to explain in the aftermath, 'He meant historical evolution. If one society dies off, somebody's got to be there to bury it' (RT, 2014).

---

<sup>9</sup> Nov. 18 1956, addressing Western ambassadors at the Polish embassy in Moscow.



### **III. Difficulties and techniques to overcome them**

To translate an utterance, a translator first needs to understand its meaning; that includes the context and the genre as 'no sentence contains all the information you need to translate it.' (Bellos, p.79). Genres for example have recognisable styles in each language – be it a court proceeding, a kitchen recipe, sports rules, greeting people. The linguistic form on its own is never enough and to be able to convey the message adequately we need to have both - the utterance and the context. This is something machine translation does not have (yet) – the ability to recognise context and the relative size of things. The following example illustrates this point well - *The pen is in the box.* AND *The box is in the pen.* Typed in Google Translate, the translation of the latter sentence makes no sense at all. (Bellos, p.251) Another good example is provided by Peter Serracino-Inglott in the form of a joke - Somebody says: "Time flies"—to which somebody else replies: "I can't. They're too fast." (Language and Diplomacy, 2001, p.21).

A lot might be changed in the original when looking for the perfect match to reproduce the right meaning in the target language. An additional thing to bear in mind is style - appropriate existing style should be used to match the style of the original. And as we saw in the previous chapter, the style of expression produces the (right) impression of a speech. Style, however, is not easily imitable, and that's exactly its purpose and what constitutes difficulties – another point which will be addressed more concretely in the following case study.

What common problems of non-equivalence both at word and above word level do translators encounter? What strategies and technique can help to overcome these problems? How to translate a word that does not exist in the target language? To begin with, languages are flexible – they often create or borrow and appropriate new words. Let us take the Bible translation for example – 'from Hebrew into Greek, from Greek into Latin, from Syriac into Arabic...when the receiving language didn't have a word for some item, it got a new one – the word of the source language, adapted to its new linguistic setting.' (Bellos, p. 174). So what can translators do? Both Bellos and Baker identify the problems and techniques outlined below.

When the source word expresses a concept familiar in the target culture but there is **no target language word** for it, that is - it is not lexicalized – e.g. *standard, outsourcing, disintermediation* - translation may be rendered by using a less expressive word or a superordinate (hypernym, or more general word). The same applies to **different distinctions in meaning in the source and target languages** – e.g. the word *translation* in Japanese has different terms which relate to: a completed translation, a first translation, a retranslation and the new version, the old version, a translation of

translation, a co-translation, a draft translation, a direct translation, a word-for-word translation, a sense translation, 'a translation presented with the original text on facing pages' (Bellos, p.25-26).

The above techniques are also used when there is **no superordinate (hypernym) in the target language** – that is, there are 'specific words (hyponyms) but no general word (superordinate or hypernym) to head the semantic field' (Baker, p. 22) – as in the above example – Japanese has the hyponyms, but lacks the superordinate, the hypernym for the English word *translation*; the word *facilities* for instance as in 'A building, room, array of equipment, or a number of such things, designed to serve a particular function' (The Free Dictionary, 2017) – has no ready, single equivalent in Russian, Bulgarian, Croatian.

In terms of **culture-specific concepts** when 'the source language word may express a concept that is totally unknown in the target culture.', e.g.: *privacy*, *Speaker of the House of Commons*, (Baker, p.21) translators often use a technique called **cultural substitution**. The latter is 'a naming and translation device that is suited exclusively to things that aren't there.' (Bellos, p.175). Baker explains it as replacing a specific source culture term with a term which does not have the same propositional meaning in the receiving language, but which would achieve the same required impact on the audience. Cultural substitution might help in cases when the readers can't relate to any bits of the foreign culture they read or listen about, and they don't wish to be drowned in arcane information about a culture they are not particularly keen on learning about. At the same time, 'domestic markers' might help the audience relate to and identify with something familiar and appealing coming from an unfamiliar setting. The point is that language cannot be isolated from the social context at the expense of easy comprehension. For example, in his 17c.-translation of the Gospel of Mathew from Dutch into Malay (a regional language on Sumatra), Albert Cornelius Ruyl translated *fig tree* with a word which means a *banana tree* in Malay, simply because there were no fig trees on Sumatra (Bellos, p.174). Similarly, *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* – the 'process of coming to terms with the past' in post-war Germany, with the aftermath of the Holocaust in particular – cannot be translated by a single word or phrase with no explanation (Collins German-English Dictionary, 2014).

At times, translators borrow the word as it is, modify its form so as to make it function in a sentence and perhaps add an explanation – this is called **foreignism**. E.g. – *Zeitgeist*, *Wanderlust* from German; *attaché*, *chargé d'affaires*, *démarche*, *communiqué*, *aide-memoire*, *detente* from French; *casus belli*, *modus vivendi*, *ad hoc* from Latin; Gorbachev's famous *glasnost*<sup>10</sup> i *perestroika*<sup>11</sup>. The use of loan

---

<sup>10</sup> 'A Soviet policy permitting open discussion of political and social issues and freer dissemination of news and information' <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/glasnost>;

<sup>11</sup> 'The policy of economic and governmental reform instituted by Mikhail Gorbachev in the Soviet Union during the mid-1980s' <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/perestroika>

words in the source text in English has a prestige-value as they are meant to make the speaker sound more elegant. That elegance is often lost in translation as finding a loan word with a similar meaning and force in the receiving language might not always be possible. (Baker, p.25)

**Calque** is another technique translators use - making a loan translation which means translating the expression word-for-word, e.g. – the phrases *soft power*, *hard power*, *the sinews of peace*, *Cold War*, *Iron Curtain* are calqued in many languages.

Above word level, differences in the **expressive meaning** may also constitute problems. The *propositional meaning* of an utterance is what it refers to or describes in a certain language – e.g. *a president*; whereas the *expressive meaning* does just that – it expresses the speaker's attitude, not what a particular word describes, e.g. – it is one thing to *complain*, but quite another to *whinge*; similarly, the negative evaluative meaning and connotation of *unkind*, *unfriendly* and *rude* are not the same. The expressive meaning of an utterance is its force(fulness). While it is not so difficult to translate by paraphrasing the propositional meaning of an utterance, it is a lot more challenging to reproduce the expressive meaning of an utterance. Who can claim to be able to define with absolute certainty the expressive meaning of an utterance? Let us take the following example – asked by journalists whether the fact that the FBI Director James Comey was fired would cast a shadow over further Russian-American talks, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov responded - 'Was he fired? You're kidding... You're kidding!' (CNN, 2017<sup>12</sup>) The propositional meaning of Lavrov's words is clear and simple, but is their expressive meaning the same – is it loaded with sarcasm or with surprise? Would it be clear to a person who is not familiar with the context what Lavrov meant? Another example that illustrates the differences between the propositional and expressive meaning of an utterance is President Trump's rhetorical question when referring to former President Bush in his presidential announcement speech analyzed in the case study (Time, 2015). Mr Trump simply said - 'Is he intelligent?' Again, the propositional meaning of his words is clear, but the expressive meaning aims at a whole lot more than just asking a simple question.

**Collocations** represent another challenge in translation – they refer to the presupposed meaning of words, that is – what other words we expect to see/ hear in combination with a particular word. E.g. – laws are *broken* in English, but *contradicted* in Arabic (Baker, p.15). What is problematic is that collocational patterns in languages and across them are 'independent and arbitrary' (Baker, p.48) – we *bend rules* in English but we do not refer to them as *unbendable*, we would rather describe them as inflexible. The propositional meaning of a word often depends on its 'role' within a given collocation – a *dry country*, *dry humour*, *dry book* – is the meaning of the word *dry* the same in all

---

<sup>12</sup> Short video available at <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/05/10/politics/sergey-lavrov-james-comey-meeting/>

three collocations and how do we reproduce that meaning in the target language? Other examples include - *soft power*, *hard power*, an *unfriendly act*, the foreignism *acquis communautaire*; the various types of diplomacy-related collocations – *gun-boat* / *shuttle*/ *guerrilla*/ *ping-pong*/ *track-two diplomacy*; metaphors such as *a roadmap to peace*.

**Idioms and fixed expressions**, in turn both give flavour to any language. However, both cause difficulties and uncertainty in translation. This has to do with the evoked meaning of an utterance, that is - dialect and register. When it comes to this category, lack of flexibility of patterning and of transparency of meaning is what creates pitfalls for translators. Idioms are formulae, still patterns of language which do not allow alteration of form and whose meaning often cannot be inferred from the individual words that compose them. One cannot – change the word order in an idiom, remove a word from it, add or replace a word in it, or change its form. All three - collocations, idioms and fixed expressions reflect the cultural reality of a language. The difference between them is that fixed expressions and proverbs are often transparent in meaning. A more amusing example is perhaps an expression which belongs to the era of Cold War diplomacy – ‘to show Kuzka's mother to someone’ which means ‘to teach someone a lesson, to punish someone in a brutal way’. Its ‘father’ is once again Nikita Khrushchev. Subsequently, the Tsar Bomb, AH602, developed in the late 50s in the USSR was nicknamed Kuzka’s mother (Techniput, 2015).

**Paraphrasing** is a technique that can be used in almost all cases. It consists of using either a related or an unrelated word – that means unpacking, ‘undressing’ the propositional meaning of an utterance into the target language. To avoid repetition, we also rephrase. The main advantage of this technique is that it specifies the propositional meaning of an utterance. On a more negative note, it can clutter the text unnecessarily and it cannot reproduce the expressive or evoked (register and dialect) meaning of the source term.

Translating **jokes and humorous remarks** can also be difficult. It requires quick wit, creativity and it can never be a word-for-word translation because then it would simply make no sense. Khrushchev is told to have often used ‘impenetrable Russian proverbs and jokes’ at the UN in the 1950s and 1960s, invariably confusing interpreters who would then often say ‘the general secretary of the CPSU just made a joke.’ (Bellos, p.197)

The use of **low register** by a speaker almost always constitutes significant problems for translators as they are in most cases reluctant to resort to uncouth language and it is them who would be blamed for the faulty and poor translation. So naturally, as Bellos points out (p.195), translators tend to adhere to a higher standard of language, thus unnoticeably turning into the guardians of the standard form of language. Many examples which illustrate this point can be taken from President

Trump's now notorious use of low register and coarse language. Namely - his comment 'nasty woman' was softened by a Spanish interpreter who reproduced it for the National Spanish Television audience as 'What an unpleasant woman!' (MacLellan, 2016). Further on, the leaked *Access Hollywood* video, which features Trump's lewd *locker talk* included (among other similar in nature comments) – 'I moved on her like a bitch, and I could not get there, and she was married.' Back-translated, its Chinese version on people.cn, reads: 'I pursued her like a whore / prostitute / harlot / strumpet, but I couldn't succeed.' The same comment was subtly translated for News.sina.com as 'I made a strong attack on her.'<sup>13</sup>(MacLellan, 2016)

The above illustrative example provides a bouquet of challenges for any translator into any target language – obscene language, a tasteless idiom, the moral duty to be ethical and to convey the message to the audience understandably conscious of the notion that a language distinguishes in meanings which are relevant to its environment. At the same time, intentional alterations of the target language as well as omissions such as in the above example paint a handsome portrait of a meritless speaker. Translating his tasteless obscene remarks into subtle and soft diplomatic language makes us blind to his vulgarity which in turn is part of his character. What is of greater significance then – to be polite and culturally sensitive or to portray the speaker as he is? Wouldn't Horace agree with the literalists' approach here rather than condemn the word-for-word method? This complex issue will be addressed in the subsequent chapter as well since given the topic of diplomatic language and translation in the context of analyzing Mr Trump's speeches, it is indispensable.

In short, searching for their own *perfect* match, translators encounter many challenges when trying to convey the meaning of an utterance with the right degree of forcefulness. Some degree of loss or expansion of meaning and force is inevitable, particularly when facing an ethical dilemma of translating uncouth language when what we usually aim at is a diplomatic, that is tactful and non-confrontational style. But, what translation teaches us is that everything is describable, therefore translatable.

#### ***IV. Emotions, incoherence and the unsaid.***

Having outlined some of the common difficulties in translation as well as techniques to overcome them, one should not disregard the pitfalls that arise from style and manner of speaking either. When a speaker rushes through their speech, speaks with an accent, makes (inappropriate) jokes, uses vulgar language, speaks incoherently, breaks his own train of thought deliberately or unintentionally – how does a translator handle a situation of that kind? And what to do with a sentence structure and style which release the most important bit of information at the very end?

---

<sup>13</sup> The article provides many examples of Trump's vulgar language.

After all, what the audience listens to is the translator - were it not that way s/he wouldn't be needed at all. Unfortunately, in cases like that, all of the above techniques are redundant. An important question we've touched upon is – is it better to censor, and try to convey the sense of what is being said rather than translate word-for-word, vulgarities and all? The former is what translation is all about – reproducing the meaning of an utterance, of a text, but in a situation like that the message loses its force and the speaker's status is quite undeservedly elevated, all to the credit of the translator. The latter method, on the other hand presents the speaker in his/her true light – incoherent, confused, inconsistent, incomprehensible; it reproduces the reality of which then the audience makes no sense as they haven't grasped the meaning. Did we not say that the style of expression produces the (right) impression of a speech? And aren't translators doing a favour to an incoherent and boorish speaker by consciously refusing to adopt lower register?

Ultimately, whether we choose to convey the authentic, original meaning or the overall meaning, we seek to get the message across – and both ways seek to pay respect.

And last but not least, the *unsaid* – emotions, vocal noises, body language - gestures, mimics. If something is lost in translation, that is it – the *unsaid*. It consists of tiny signals which represent pieces of information. Combined, they produce a message with a meaning perhaps even stronger, deeper, more forceful than a spoken message. But what is translatable is only what is expressed in words.

**In conclusion**, translation is not mathematics and it cannot be correct or incorrect in the way a test or an equation can. It often bounces between what is typical and what is accurate. The line between translating and improving a text is quite blurred. We look for likeness not sameness as no two things in life are the same. To preserve likeness - register, tone, rhythm, style and wit should be taken into account.

Translation is interpretation – interpretation of the meaning. The same as diplomacy. It is the child of communication – we are all different but we have the same wishes, aspirations, heartaches, which we express in different languages – this is why we need translation. Before reproducing the meaning – the task of the translator is to understand **all** the meanings of an utterance within a given context – propositional, expressive, presupposed and evoked.

## CHAPTER IV *Case Study*

*Qualis autem homo ipse esset, talem eius esse orationem.*<sup>14</sup>

*As the man himself is, so is his manner of speech.*<sup>15</sup>

*Cicero (Tusc. V 47)*

Controversial, shockingly and sometimes childishly direct, unceremoniously insulting, but at the same time unquestionably persuasive, President Trump has been in the spotlight of world politics for many months now, and is likely to remain so. Some support him, others detest him, and we are yet to see whether he is here to stay. In this case study, we are not interested in his political moves and ideas and their consequences, but in his language and style. Why are they important, unique even? Because they are the exact opposite of what diplomacy and diplomatic language represent and aim at; they are the growing foetus of something new – dangerous, seemingly shapeless, selfish and threatening to obliterate the well-oiled machine of conventional old diplomatic style and language. To some his ability to persuade gives hope back; others it robs of hope.

This chapter looks into President Trump's language and attempts to identify and analyse the linguistic resources used in his rhetoric in terms of:

- I. Prepared speech – the President's inaugural speech
- II. Media conference speeches – impromptu street-smart style with speaking points and no teleprompter
- III. Tweets – a new powerful weapon of mass disruption which in the case of Trump brags, attacks, insults and degrades with an unpredictable rocket speed and frequency
- IV. The unsaid – body language and intentionally refusing to respond to a direct question
- V. Translatability – the challenges each of the above constitutes in translation

### ***I. Prepared speech – the President's inaugural speech***<sup>16</sup>

In Aristotle's terms discussed earlier, an inaugural is a combination of political and ceremonial oratory of display.

As we shall see, Trump's speech is characterised primarily by simplicity, lack of flowery language, lack of sequence of thoughts, the use of value-speak, polarising and emphasizing divisiveness, the use of logical fallacies. Beginning with logical fallacies, a favourite of Mr Trump's techniques, the analysis below aims to address each in turn.

<sup>14</sup> M.T. Ciceronis *Tusculanarum Disputationum*, V 47 <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/cicero/tusc5.shtml#47>

<sup>15</sup> Cicero *Tusculan Disputations*, Book V. 47. Translated by Peabody AP.

<sup>16</sup> Transcript available from <http://edition.cnn.com/interactive/2017/01/politics/words-from-the-past/>

### ***Logical fallacies***

Logical fallacies are seemingly reasonable statements which are, however, flawed or even entirely untrue. They are loaded with emotional force thus rendering an excellent propagandist tool. Not always easy to detect precisely because they sound logical, they are worth analysing in order to show their persuasive power in rhetoric.

Argument to the people (*Argumentum ad populum*) is the patriotic approach Trump uses in order to appeal to the multitude, thus asserting his stance is correct as 'What truly matters is not which party controls our government, but whether our government is controlled by the people.' It does not matter what party you belong to, what matters is that you serve your people as allegiance and loyalty to the US 'open your heart to patriotism', which in turn eradicates prejudice. If you are prejudiced, you are no patriot, therefore no true American. This is also an example of the *No True Scotsman fallacy*, a sort of reasoning, by which anyone who can serve as an example that contradicts his assertion is automatically dismissed as unpatriotic. Trump resorts to the *snob approach* as well: 'we seek ...to let [our way of life] shine as an example for everyone to follow'.

In a *hasty generalisation*, it is implied that *all* 'politicians prospered', *only* 'Washington flourished', *all* the citizens are unprotected, but now – 'everyone is listening to you.' Who is everyone, who is speaking?! The objective here is once again to win the popular consent provoking prejudice at the same time, or as Aristotle would describe it – to put the hearers into the right frame of mind.

A characteristic of Trump's speech(es) is the *non sequitur* defined as 'an argument that does not follow from the previous statement' (Wheeler, 2016) which refers to a lack of sequence of thoughts and arguments. Non-sequitur can be found in the quick-tack from rebuilding and restoring the country, to the ceremony of transferring power in a peaceful and orderly manner, then more belligerently attacking the establishment and the politicians who have prospered under it, then painting a picture of true patriotism and immediately after that of a 'carnage' that should stop, right after that - 'we are one nation – and their pain is our pain. Their dreams are our dreams...' – who are they? – one needs to go back to the part before 'carnage' to realise the speaker refers to the 'mothers and children trapped in poverty' and to the 'young and beautiful students deprived of knowledge.' Further on, he paints a grim picture of American reality where industry, military and infrastructure along with the middle class are all placed in the same basket, only to jump onto the ceremonious day in question the very next moment. What follows are promises – promises of wealth and prosperity, of eradication of evil, solidarity and patriotism once again, protection. All of a sudden, *thinking* and *dreaming big* emerge, a striving America, an hour of action, and a metaphor – an untypical one for the style of the speech – a long sentence that breaks the sequence of short,



simple ones, an unusual attempt at a poetic description of the country's 'urban sprawl's and 'windswept plains', then back again to the familiar short sentences and repetitions of 'we' and 'you' all along with the never-ending promises for a brilliant future.

Trump's use of non-sequiturs is a typical technique of propaganda - it overloads the listener so that there is no time to process information, resulting in a reaction that can only be emotional, not rational. Exciting the required state of emotion is another skill an orator should have according to Aristotle. As we shall see in the subsequent analysis, the speaker resorts to this device quite often.

A further example of a logical fallacy is the *either/or* fallacy or *false dichotomy* where it is assumed there are only two choices in a given situation, when in reality this is seldom the case. For instance, Trump asserts America 'will seek friendship and goodwill with the nations of the world', but America's friendship is a gift only to those who will accept that its 'own interests' come 'first', therefore it is either the American way, or no way at all. Similarly, 'We do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone', but if you want us to be your friend, you must accept us the way we are. So, you either do as we say, or you are not our friend – there is no space for compromise here.

We also find two examples of the *not x but y* structure as part of an *either/or fallacy* – 1. 'today we are **not merely** transferring power from one administration to another, or from one party to another -- **but** we are transferring power from Washington, D.C. and giving it back to you, the American People.' 2. 'What truly matters is **not** which party controls our government, **but** whether our government is controlled by the people.' Both statements say essentially the same thing. The counterbalanced sentences acknowledge and prevent existing opposing arguments, at the same time paving the way to Trump's value-speak. Furthermore, the structural symmetry of the chiasmus used aims to convince the listener there are only two sides to his argument while making it clear which side should be favoured. This also creates the impression all sides of the argument have been evaluated.

The *undistributed middle term* is another example of the use of logical fallacies in Trump's speech. He claims America 'will unite the civilized world against radical Islamic terrorism, which we will eradicate completely from the face of the Earth.' The three-word phrase 'radical Islamic terrorism' implies: 1. Islam is radical. 2. Islam equals terrorism. 3. All Muslims are radical. 4. All Muslims are terrorists. Consider the meaning of the above sentence without the middle term *Islamic*. While there are radical Islamist terrorists, it does not follow that all Islam is radical and breeds terrorists. The constant repetition of this collocation may well suggest to people that the constituent terms create a natural category, and from that premise they may come to believe, in a lazy-thinking way, that Islam, terrorism and radicalism are all connected. And some may even come to the above conclusions. One

might argue here these are not implications but rather associations. The rhetorical effect on those who use the term to confirm their bias is the same, but the process that gets them to that conclusion is different.

Even though these fallacies are detectable, generalising and attacking while seeking to appeal to the popular multitude, they do sound reasonable and convincing. And this is precisely what empowers the speaker – his ability to appeal to hearts, not minds – something which admittedly Trump is seemingly brilliant at.

### **‘Stories in a capsule’<sup>17</sup>**

*Stories in a capsule* are particularly persuasive – they carry a message, a moral that is aimed to appeal to the pathos of the listener. They paint a picture through words, thus awakening our imagination, targeting our emotions, creating a link between reality and the story told, aiming at epiphany. Trump’s speech contains several encapsulated stories loaded with metaphors – indirect comparisons, hyperbolae - the use of exaggeration, similes – directly comparing one thing to another. These figures of speech seemingly add clarity and vividness to the picture of the story he narrates.

Thus for example, the ceremony of transferring power and its importance is a picture easy to visualize even when not watching the act itself, and as the repetition slams, ‘This is your day. ... This is your celebration’.

Further on, the ‘small group’, that is the ‘establishment’ which has protected itself, almost mafia-style one imagines, prospered while we envision - people remaining jobless; the ‘shuttered’ ‘rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of [the] nation’ (*hyperbole and simile*), the silence of the machinery in them; ‘mothers and children trapped in poverty’ - a metaphor that reminds of trapped animals (notice the absence of men for a bigger impact); only rich and poor as there is no middle class it seems, ‘crime and gangs and drugs’ in the streets; ‘roads, and highways, and bridges, and airports, and tunnels, and railways... fallen into disrepair and decay (*hyperbole*). Another hyperbole which is a metaphor at the same time is the personification of America *ravaged by other countries* that *steal* its *companies*, and *destroy* its *jobs*. One can almost see the winged Hope disappearing ‘over the horizon’, carrying away wealth, strength and confidence. The entire picture summed up in one powerful word and its connotation – ‘carnage’.

The very next picture we are to envision is of Hope flying back to us – vibrant and generous, she brings the precious gifts of ‘prosperity and strength’, restoring the hum of machinery in the now

---

<sup>17</sup> Scott B (2016) *Soft Persuasion. Lecture 5.*

rebuilt factories; a picture of happy ordinary people living their ordinary lives and enjoying the benefits of the 'new roads, and highways, and bridges, and airports, and tunnels, and railways' – a happy picture – 'an example for everyone to follow' and dream of.

At the same time, we are to see America as if it is the almighty Zeus, strong, wealthy, proud and safe – defeating all who do not put his interests first, sweeping away, eradicating those who disobey.

We are also to imagine the scene of patriotic soldiers, of all skin colours, saluting the flag; and right next to it, the picture of dreamy children taking a stroll along the vibrant streets of a city or the peaceful plains of the countryside, 'looking up at the same night sky' – feeling hopeful, happy and protected.

All of the above stories packed with hyperbolic descriptions and metaphors help depict and visualize reality the way the speaker does. Their purpose is to reify the abstract and frame it into something concrete, to convince of the ceremoniousness of the occasion, of the magnitude of the moment we witness, of the gravity of the reality and the prospects of the future under the able leadership of the speaker. What do we infer from the stories Trump tells us? He is the only one who can and will erase the grim picture of the past, painting the rosy picture of the future. Again a combination of a political and ceremonial oratory of display – it censures the past, praises the present and magnifies the future.

### ***Value-speak & shared aspiration***

What this entire speech represents is a never-ending rhetoric of value-speak and shared aspirations. What does Trump's value-speak technique involve? He begins by establishing a personal connection with the listeners by acknowledging their importance at this ceremony, at this very special moment – he points out at common ground and shared goals. The ancient Greek concept of *kairos* is relevant here; defined as 'the right point of time, the exact or critical time'<sup>18</sup> it signifies the occurrence of a significant event (The Free Dictionary, 2017). Here the right point of time is the crossing of the bridge – from the darkness of the past to the brightness of the future. Trump appeals to *kairos* in order to expand his circle of inclusion – 'We, the citizens of America, are now joined... together...' as 'one nation' with 'one heart, one home, and one glorious future.' – as if to say *We are one family*. The shared aspirations of this family are 'great schools for ... children, safe neighborhoods ..., and good jobs' – 'the just and reasonable demands of a righteous public.' The wish for a better future for our children is what we all have in common and this is how we overcome divisiveness. Our shared values and aspirations bring us together and move us forward to a better place – 'to great prosperity and strength', to 'a way of life' that will 'shine as an example' to all the rest, to solidarity, unity and the

---

<sup>18</sup> [καῖρός](#) III. - Greek English Lexicon, Liddell & Scott, Oxford.

desirable feeling of being protected. The entire time we are to see Trump as the man of the moment who is the only one able to deliver to his people, so that their salvation depends on his election and the transition of power now under way.

What does Trump's value-speak achieve? It achieves a change of scenes – from the grim picture of 'carnage' he painted - the picture of the past, through the glorious momentum of today's inaugural ceremony and the aspirational future of 'prosperity and strength'. His message gains strength through the constant simple repetitions which aim at persuasiveness.

### **Consecutive repetition**

Once again appealing to *kairos* through phrases such as 'from this day forward', 'from this moment on', 'we are protected, and we will always be protected', consecutive repetitions introduce shared aspirations and the desired change for the future. The frequent use of the modal verb *will* which expresses certainty in predictions – 'we will start winning again', promises – 'I will fight for you with every breath in my body', decisions – 'We will follow two simple rules', warning and threats – 'we will eradicate [radical Islamic terrorism] completely from the face of the Earth'. In one instance, *will* is used in 13 consecutive sentences:

1. 'Protection **will** lead to great prosperity and strength.'
2. 'I **will** fight' and 'I **will** never, ever let you down.'
3. 'America **will** start winning again'
4. 'We **will** bring back our jobs.' – an *anaphora*.
5. 'We **will** bring back our borders.'
6. 'We **will** bring back our wealth.'
7. 'And we **will** bring back our dreams.'
8. 'We **will** build new roads...'
9. 'We **will** get our people off welfare...'
10. 'We **will** follow two simple rules...'
11. 'We **will** seek friendship and goodwill...' Here the spell is broken by the use of the Present Simple tense – 'We **do not seek** to impose our way of life on anyone...' – simply stating a universal and permanent truth. And right after the modal **will** again:
12. 'We **will** reinforce old alliances ... we **will** eradicate completely...'
13. 'At the bedrock of our politics **will** be a total allegiance to the United States...'

A second example of the repetition of *will* is the end of the speech where it is used in 8 successive sentences, 5 of which contain another *anaphora* – '**we will make**'. The repetition of the personal pronoun *we* – 'We are one nation', 'We share one heart', and in the sentences quoted above achieve

a significant impact. The consecutive repetitions lay and reinforce the foundations of the speaker's promises for a better future, demonstrate determination and strength, and thus excite the required state of emotion putting the audience into the right frame of mind.

### ***Divisiveness***

An additional rhetorical technique Trump uses in his speech is divisiveness – or the ***us vs. them*** formula. By dividing people into in-groups and out-groups, he instantly categorises the in-group as the superior one, while the out-group is the inferior one. Who are they, who forms the out-group? These are the establishment and the politicians that belong to it – ‘all talk and no action’, the other countries that ravage America and steal from it, radical Islamic terrorists – they all go into the same basket of the out-group. By degrading that out-group, by rendering it imperfect he reinforces the sense of superiority, safety, stability, perfection and worthiness within the in-group. Through passionate, open and even belligerent alterity he dismisses his ‘constantly complaining’ predecessors and their ‘empty talk’-achievements thus aiming to win the approval and allegiance of his listeners - ‘The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer’ as ‘You will never be ignored again.’ This othering is meant to draw a sharp line between the unworthiness of the old and the worthiness of the new. It is also meant to stir our emotions, to make us feel he is one of us, to convince us of his genuine ‘oath of allegiance to all Americans’. Once again, the required state of emotion has been reached - while demarcating and demonising the out-group, Trump also expands the in-group by bringing all the neglected, forgotten and invisible people into his caring embrace. A very effective response to those alienated by his opponent's ill-judged comments about “deplorables” and “undesirables”. His appeal to the forgotten signals his intention to represent ALL Americans, not the privileged few he claims have hitherto been the only ones to benefit.

### ***Quotes***

To persuade others of our worthiness we often appeal to authority by quoting great men thus identifying ourselves with their greatness and supporting our beliefs, authority and credibility. There aren't any quotes in Trump's speech except for one – ‘The Bible tells us, "How good and pleasant it is when God's people live together in unity."' This is ironic given Trump's notorious divisiveness! It is only the Bible he obviously considers worth of his mention, worth of exemplifying his own unreachable wisdom. In two more occasions he refers to God – ‘we are protected by God’, he claims and ‘the same almighty Creator’ infuses each child's dreams with his ‘breath of life’. Here, he doesn't waver from the American oratorical tradition where God is omnipresent.

As we have seen so far, another convention this speech adheres to is Aristotle's claim that the main matters on which politicians make speeches are: 'ways and means, war and peace, national defence, imports and exports, and legislation' (Book I, Part 4).

### ***Translatability***

In terms of translatability, the speech would not constitute a problem – the inexperienced or tired translator might take delight in the short and plain sentences, whilst the translator who loves the challenge of rendering the true meaning of a speech in another language, might simply consider this particular exercise a bore.

***In summary***, Trump's style is pompous, belligerent, accusing and sympathetic at the same time. Brevity and simplicity are what is likely to appeal to the (ordinary) listener, as the sentences are short, uncomplicated, and easy to comprehend. He asserts and imposes his beliefs by using logical fallacies, moral-packed stories through exaggerations and metaphors, value-speak and othering as well as appeal to one single authority – the Bible.

And if we refer back to Aristotle's principal rules of rhetoric laid out in Chapter II of this paper, we can recognise that the speech: 1) makes the listener well-disposed towards the speaker and ill-disposed towards his opponents/ predecessors; 2) magnifies and minimizes facts; 3) excites the required emotions; 4) refreshes memories (Book III, Part 19). The speaker has the ability: 1) to reason logically, albeit through logical fallacies; 2) to understand human character and thus appeal to its target audience; 3) to understand emotions (Book I, Part 2).

### ***Other Prepared Speeches***

In order to not rest the entire argument on one single speech, the following prepared speeches were considered and analyzed in the above manner: campaign speech in Wisconsin of 17 August 2016<sup>19</sup>; campaign speech in Michigan of 19 August 2016<sup>20</sup>; Alumnisource speech in Pennsylvania of 28 June 2016<sup>21</sup>; a speech delivered in Florida<sup>22</sup> in response to assault accusations – 13 October 2016 – a mixture of prepared speech where the speaker often goes off script. The reason for choosing these particular speeches is Wisconsin, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Florida had been Democratic states until this last election in November 2016. They were all won by Obama in 2012. Pennsylvania and Michigan had last voted for a republican president in 1988; Wisconsin – in 1984 (Meko, Lu & Gamio,

---

<sup>19</sup> Transcript at <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/full-text-donald-trumps-speech-on-227095>

<sup>20</sup> Transcript at <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/donald-trump-michigan-speech-transcript-227221>

<sup>21</sup> Transcript at <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/06/full-transcript-trump-job-plan-speech-224891>

<sup>22</sup> Transcript at <http://www.npr.org/2016/10/13/497857068/transcript-donald-trumps-speech-responding-to-assault-accusations>

2016). These states account for 46 electoral votes and if Trump had lost there, he wouldn't be the President of the United States today.

Having analyzed the speeches, the following has been concluded:

- The same issues were addressed in all speeches – trade deals, illegal immigration and insecure borders, unemployment and closed factories, Obamacare, China and Mexico stealing America's jobs, infrastructure - bridges, railways, skyscrapers, roads, Common Core and education, the Second Amendment, crime and law enforcement, lower taxes, radical Islamic terrorism, ISIS, Iraq, Iran, the corrupt political establishment, NAFTA, the Transpacific Partnership.
- The situation – past and present - is a disaster.
- The promise for a better future is always made to the American people.
- Trump is consistent in naming the same 'enemies' in all his speeches.
- The following phrases are omnipresent: We will make America great again! – all speeches end with this phrase; *What (the hell) do you have to lose?!*, *radical Islamic terrorism*, *crooked Hilary*, *closed/ shut factories*, *the corrupt political establishment*, *our system is rigged*; I'll bring back our jobs!

**To sum up**, the speaker has been very consistent in addressing the same issues, in using the same phrases, always appealing and promising to the American people, painting various pictures of the disastrous past and present and of the promising future when he will govern competently and justly. Through constant repetitions, brevity and simplicity the speaker aims at stirring the emotions of his target audience, reasoning seemingly logically and persuasively.

## ***II. 1. Media conference speeches with speaking points and no teleprompter***

This section analyses Donald Trump's impromptu speeches, or at least those given without using a teleprompter. The speech that will be closely analysed is his Presidential Announcement Speech<sup>23</sup> of June 16 2015. The reason for choosing this speech in particular is that it represents a starting point in what led to his inaugural speech, discussed above. Were it not for the fact that it is the beginning of a successful end, Trump's announcement speech could be regarded as quite an amusing piece of reading material. It shows the true style of the speaker, unembellished, simple, meant to address a child-like audience, incoherent. But is it persuasive?

It should be noted in advance, part of the following is to a certain extent a mock running-commentary of the roller-coaster this announcement speech is.

---

<sup>23</sup> Transcript at <http://time.com/3923128/donald-trump-announcement-speech/>

Once again a combination of *political and ceremonial oratory of display*, just as any other of his speeches, the presidential announcement speech begins with extensive **flattery** of the audience – ‘There’s been no crowd like this.’ – No matter how empty, flattery is meant to give the audience a feeling of importance (Baggini, 2010, p.91); and sadly, it almost always gets applause during election campaigns (Baggini, p.93). The flattery abruptly stops and gives way to a short remark about out of order-air-conditioner and candidates that ‘sweated like dogs’. And there follows an abusive attack which is at the same time a false analogy – the *sweating like dogs candidates* are incapable to fill up a room, therefore ‘how are they going to beat ISIS?’ – an irrational comment which aims to diminish the opponents’ merits. Immediately after this follows the assertion that ‘the country is in serious trouble’ and that there are no victories anymore – against what or who, one might ask. The major antagonists are swiftly introduced, in order of appearance – China, Japan, Mexico – and they are beating America ‘all the time’. For emphasis of the gravity of the situation in which America ‘has become the dumping ground for everybody else’s problems’, the verb *to beat* is used eight times – ‘How are they going to beat ISIS?’, ‘When was the last time anybody saw us beating, let’s say, China?’, ‘When did we beat Japan at anything?’, ‘When do we beat Mexico at the border?’ And then: ‘Thank you. It’s true, and these are the best and the finest.’ – who are we talking about? Next to *the best and finest* come the people that Mexico, Trump’s eternal foe sends – ‘rapists’, who bring drugs and crime; but let’s not make hasty generalisations – some ‘are good people’ after all – he assumes! And it’s just ‘common sense’ – the border guards have told the nominee so, they have conveyed their wisdom to him, therefore it must be true. But as Baggini muses, ‘common sense is a poor indicator of what is true’; it is unreliable, hazy and ill-defined; a misleading strategy that ‘implies a kind of universal standard of rationality. It is more than just what ordinary people happen to think, but requires less specialized knowledge’ (p.257-8).

Having just explained and named who the culprits for America’s miserable state are, Trump says: ‘But we don’t know...we don’t know what’s happening. And it’s got to stop and it’s got to stop fast.’ If we don’t know what’s happening, what is it exactly then that we, that is the audience, need to stop?! Next he bemoans the Middle East, being *eaten up by Islamic terrorism* and claims: ‘They’ve become rich.’ It isn’t very clear, though, who has become rich – the party that is being eaten up, or terrorism; and how can terrorism become rich?! Right after that he informs us that ‘They built a hotel in Syria.’, but again, it isn’t clear who built it – the terrorism, the Middle East, the Syrians? Further down, we are granted the following clarification – ISIS has the oil, Mr Trump was rightly against hitting Iraq years ago and Iran is now taking over Iraq, which has the oil, from this it follows that ISIS and Iran are more or less the same thing. There comes a challenge, among countless other ones, an intriguing challenge for the poor translator – should he translate the meaning of the following disjointed sentence or should he render it word-for-word: ‘And in 19— and I will tell you this, and I said it very



strongly, years ago, I said— and I love the military, and I want to have the strongest military that we've ever had, and we need it more now than ever.' Would any of the theorizing on translation techniques laid out earlier help here? We deal with translation in a lot more detail at this end of this analysis.

We move on – to the wounded soldiers in Iraq and 'all over the place.' Also some up-to-date statistics are provided - 2300 sophisticated Humvees had apparently been left behind for the enemy the week before – but we don't know to which enemy, and we don't know where. Nevertheless, we can move onto the GDP, now that we have exhaustively covered so many important points. Tragic, the situation is tragic. The same applies to 'labor participation rate' – no data, but we should *believe him* as Mr Trump encourages us. Unemployment is caused by China and Mexico who have the American jobs. Next point – from unemployment we swiftly move onto nuclear arsenal, which 'doesn't work'. And Mr Putin somehow fits in the equation here, because he is also mentioned in the context of the nuclear arsenal. No time to waste though - the next disaster on the agenda is Obamacare, and, the \$5 billion website. And the mantra – 'politicians are all talk, no action'. Somehow the phrase 'as an example' sneaks in – an example to what? Anyway, let's talk about the Republicans a bit, and me, me, me! But we can't not mention China again, can we?!

Patience please – we are getting to the moment of epiphany! While Mr Trump gets to the point of this speech, he leads us once more through the disasters of the present and the past, the incompetence of the current president. We even *receive* the wisdom of his doctor friend at one point – all to the purpose of persuading the audience what a disaster Obamacare, among other things, is.

And now, having painted this grim, unbearable picture of the present, he tells the audience there is a way out of this seemingly impossible situation. At this moment of epiphany, at this critical point, the listener is told a leader is needed, a leader who will *bring back the jobs, bring back the manufacturing, the military*, and the vets – let's not forget the vets, he somehow forgot to mention them earlier, but there is plenty of time until the end of this torture of speech. A bit more about what qualities the true leader should possess and the big announcement – 'So ladies and gentlemen...I am officially running... for president of the United States, and we are going to make our country great again.' – and this is his *kairos*.

To go through the rest of the speech in as much detail as we did during the introduction would be of no particular use other than to point at repetitiveness and incomprehensibility, but it would be useful to summarise the main points addressed further, along with the linguistic devices applied.

The style does not change, the incoherence does not waver, there is no evident sign of sequence in the speech until its end – at least some consistency, and in the words of Faulkner<sup>24</sup>, the speaker uses no words that might send the reader/ listener to the dictionary. Conversely, the opposite argument can be used – big emotions do not really come from big words<sup>25</sup>.

**What do we learn from this speech?** We learn a lot about Mr Trump himself. In his own words - He is happy to be in his own Trump Tower. He beats China 'all the time'; he is 'in competition' but with whom exactly it is not very clear - 'Islamic terrorism is eating up large portions of the Middle East. They've become rich. I'm in competition with them.' When he has to build a hotel, he pays interest; he also has 'many websites' and he has them 'all over the place'; he hires people, 'they do a website - it costs' him \$3. All Republicans, 'wonderful people', want him to support them. He also has 'the best (golf) courses in the world', has one right next to the White House and would generously let Obama play there. Mr Trump has watched the politicians and dealt with them all his life. 'Hey, I have lobbyists.' he explains. He wants the audience to know: 'I love my life. I have a wonderful family.' But what he is implying is 'I am ready to sacrifice this wonderful life for you, the American people!' In the course of his speech we also find out he sold a \$15m-worth apartment to a Chinese person; he owns 'a big chunk of the Bank of America at 1290 Av of the Americas' that he 'got from China in a war'.

He has and he knows 'the smartest negotiators in the world.' Beware - not some of the smartest, but the smartest. It is a relief to discover Mr Trump doesn't 'need anybody's money.' In his own words, he is 'really rich.' He also thinks he is 'a very nice person.' He is very proud of his family, and gives 'a lot of money away to charities and other things.' He is building 'the best hotel in Washington, D.C.' which he got from the General Services Administration in Washington. 'The Obama administration. People were shocked [but] Trump got it.'

His net worth – he treats us to a bit of suspense and a humble appeal to his accomplishments before the crucial figure is disclosed. So far, he has let us know what he has achieved but a bit of family history is important to emphasize the magnitude of his success. We find out he 'started off in a small office with his father' – he loves his father, but contrary to his cautious parental advice young Donald spread his wings from Brooklyn into Manhattan, 'did a lot of great deals ... early, and young.' He is 'building all over the world' and loves what he is doing; he has 'employed tens of thousands of people over [his] lifetime. That means medical. That means education. That means everything.' He has 'assets— big accounting firm, one of the most highly respected— 9 billion 240 million dollars.'; 'liabilities of about \$500 million. That's long-term debt, very low interest rates.' We are also treated

---

<sup>24</sup> 'He has never been known to use a word that might send a reader to the dictionary.' – Faulkner about Hemingway (Baggini, p. 254)

<sup>25</sup> Hemingway's response.

to an anecdote – 'one of the big banks came to [him] and said, 'Donald, you don't have enough borrowings. Could we loan you \$4 billion'? To that kind offer he replied, 'I don't need it. I don't want it. And I've been there. I don't want it.' But in two seconds, they give me whatever I wanted.' Well, for a moment there we thought he didn't need anything. In any case, after giving us an account of his 'greatest assets', we finally get to hear the grand ground total - '\$8,737,540,00'.

He says: 'I'm not doing that to brag, because you know what? I don't have to brag. I don't have to, believe it or not.' But this is exactly what he is doing - bragging throughout the entire speech, boasting how competent, insightful, capable and rich he is. And this is how he uses the **appeal to success**, a fallacy we detect when arguments are assessed on the basis of the accomplishments of the speaker rather than on the substance of the argument itself. The running for president candidate has laid out in detail how accomplished he is and has led us think his personal choice to help the country at this critical moment is in fact vital. So the people should see that, believe him as he constantly pleads and do the right thing – vote for him. He is generous and altruistic – the stock market has been good to him, but he still hates 'to see what is happening', and this is exactly why he will wilfully and selflessly sacrifice his well-being. This is an emotional appeal or **argumentum ad misericordiam** – using emotion to make the listener accept one's reasoning and conclusion.

So far, this is what we have learned about Mr Trump. Let us turn our attention to other valuable information though – let us look at the world, the past, present and future alike through his eyes. To make us see the rest of the world through his magnifying glass, he constantly makes **abusive attacks** – on individuals and their commitment to America, which he diminishes and insults, and on other countries and their accomplishments which he presents as threats to America's wellbeing. With other countries for example we discover he often has a love & hate relationship. With China – one minute China is killing America, the next minute he loves it, why? – Because 'The biggest bank in the world is from China' and their US headquarters are located in the very building in which he is delivering his presidential announcement speech, in the Trump Tower, in his tower. The next minute though he claims China is a 'bigger problem' than ISIS. Mexico, which sends its criminals to the US, is the new China in terms of trade. 'Saudi Arabia without [the Americans] is gone'.

When it comes to individuals, the now former President of the US, Barack Obama, is Mr Trump's favourite object of derision, abusive attacks and persistent attempts at humiliation. When one listens to or reads the speech, all that one can picture is a caricature of *Obama the cheerleader*. Obama, the *negative force doesn't have a clue*, Obama the *bad negotiator*. All that leads the audience to the speaker's bluntly stated conclusion – Obama, your current leader is 'not a leader'!

Trump's wording 'Obama's illegal executive order on immigration' implies: 1. Obama issues illegal executive orders. 2. Obama supports illegal immigration. 3. Illegal immigration is legal in this country. Consider the meaning of the above phrase without the middle term *illegal*. While there are cases of illegal immigration, it does not follow that Obama's executive order on immigration is illegal or that he supports and issues illegal orders on it. Not only is this an example of the ***undistributed middle term*** logical fallacy similar to the one referred to in Trump's inauguration speech - radical Islamic terrorism, but it is also an abusive attack on Obama.

Secretary Kerry, who according to Trump 'has absolutely no concept of negotiation', is presented to us as a silly 72-year-old who attends a bicycle race and breaks his leg.

Former President Bush, Senator Marco Rubio, and generally all other politicians - 'They don't have a clue.' Trump doesn't question their intelligence by saying 'Is he intelligent?' – he actually tells us none of them is. We are led to believe that neither of the politicians and previous American leaders knew the answer to the question on Iraq, but we are also told a number of times Mr Trump has always possessed the eye of providence – from the moment he refused to listen to his father and stick to his humble origins to the invasion of Iraq - he always foresaw what would happen, he always knew the right answer, he always offered his wisdom, but to no avail. And look at the results now – the politicians are incompetent and 'they don't have a clue', 'I'm the one that made all of the right predictions' and we, 'We're dying. We're dying. We need money. We have to do it. And we need the right people.' This is an excellent use of **divisiveness** – the *us vs. them* approach discussed earlier, where the speaker consistently emphasizes his own merits through deliberately cynical and sarcastic remarks about his opponents. Whenever it serves the purpose, whenever he needs to point out his excellence and at the same time his opponents' disadvantages, it is *I* and *they*; whenever he needs to connect to his audience, it is *us*. And this is how he stirs the listener's emotions, through othering, through the **appeal to the common man** – *look at me, I am one of you; we are together in this*.

Through numerous repetitions aimed at laying and sealing his arguments, Trump paves his way towards persuasion. He has repeatedly told us he is the best person for the job; he is doing it for the people; his opponents are incompetent and no leaders.

**Bold assertions** combined with constant **ad hominem attacks** are his specialty. They are abundant in his speech and as Baggini reflects (p.267-8), the power of the bold assertion is in the fact that 'it makes us accept things which even the briefest reflection would show to be false.' And if we are skilled at delivering false statements confidently and boldly, people tend to accept our arguments without much thought or even an attempt at critical evaluation. As long as a statement sounds plausible, we would not plant the seeds of suspicion among our listeners or readers. They might not

just support us, but they might even admire and applaud us. And if we flatter them a bit, we have already put them 'into the right frame of mind' in Aristotle's words. Thus, if Trump labels Mexico a land of *rapists* and *drug dealers*, this is how the audience is set to regard Mexico in the future. Similarly, if Obama is called a negative force, if Obamacare is branded *the big lie*, not a big lie, but the big lie; if judge Trump's verdict reads *Bowe Bergdahl is a traitor*; if the audience is told - *You are tremendous people and I know you don't need the rhetoric, because all you want is a job!* – this is exactly what the audience hears, this is exactly what the audience thoughtfully nods to, or seemingly deservedly applauds to. And by casually slipping an anecdotal account of how he foresees the head of Ford will be treated by almighty Trump – and let's not forget Trump's oracle-like predictions are always right; by engaging the listener with allegedly real-life stories, Trump displays the three traits an orator should possess in Aristotle's terms – (1) to reason logically, (2) to understand human character and (3) to understand emotions. 'I'm going to tell you a couple of stories about trade.', he says and then compassionately ventures into a real-life story, a story from his own rich experience about a friend of his, a great manufacturer; or another one, drawn from the experience of another good friend of his – this time a doctor. And if the doctor, who is a friend of our accomplished orator says *Obamacare is a disaster!* – well, we have to believe him, he is the expert, he knows. Isn't that a sound argument to convince us Obamacare is *the big lie*?!

One can't miss the obvious contradictions either - one minute he hates China, the next minute he loves it; the American people seem to be both tremendous people and stupid at the same time; politicians and lobbyists – he cannot make his mind – at one point they are stupid, next minute – well, they are not so stupid after all – depending on what suits his argument; the military has sophisticated equipment, next thing we know – it's not sophisticated, it's 30-years old.

**Fake precision** does not seem to falter the forcefulness of his argument either. 'Yesterday, it came out that costs are going for people up 29, 39, 49, and even 55 percent, and deductibles are through the roof.' So which is it – 29, 39, 49 or 55? These statistics provoke disbelief and their purpose is to sound truthful and convincing in order to make the listener infer what the speaker wants him to. He doesn't seem to be able to decide whether the unemployment rate is 18, 19, 20 or even 21 per cent. Initially he states – 'We got \$18 trillion in debt.' Later on, 'We're soon going to be at \$20 trillion.' and 'According to the economists— who I'm not big believers in, but, nevertheless, this is what they're saying— that \$24 trillion— we're very close— that's the point of no return. \$24 trillion. We will be there soon.' – so there, his altruistic high purpose in life – with the comfort and success in his life, he will sacrifice all that for *the people*, a personal sacrifice so that the country's situation does not become *unsalvageable*.

**Non sequiturs** are another device Mr Trump has mastered. Mentioned earlier, these are fallacies which by presenting a reason or evidence add no or little value to the conclusion as they are simply irrelevant to the question at hand. They can be often introduced by the common *let me tell you a story*, which Mr Trump evidently likes to resort to. The objective is to shift the focus from what is important to something engaging but irrelevant. Unfortunately, in his stories one doesn't know where the beginning and the end of the story is. For instance, he starts telling us about his friend the manufacturer, jumps onto Boeing, then back to China and his 15m-\$-worth apartment, then Tom Brady and the New England Patriots analogy is slipped in, China's military island in the South China Sea, ISIS, Mexico, finally to conclude this story with 'So this man tells me about the manufacturing. I say, 'That's a terrible story. I hate to hear it.' 'But I have another one, Ford.' – and there starts the story about Ford, and Mexico this time. A similarly disjointed one which makes it particularly hard to get the gist of the story.

Having told us his stories, leaving us with no time to deduce the morale they are loaded with, Mr Trump tells the audience once again he's running for president, only to return to the stories – to his case studies and finally to convey his wisdom. He then reveals the solutions to the 'case studies' – there is actually only one solution, and that solution is called Donald Trump.

**Value speak and shared aspirations** are another rhetorical device Mr Trump uses frequently. He establishes a personal connection with the audience, makes sure he maintains it throughout the speech by constantly acknowledging the importance of the listener. He detects his critical time of making a strong announcement – *kairos*. Once again, as pointed out earlier shared aspirations and hope for the future is what we all aim at – this is what unites us, this is one aspect in life we all agree upon. And Mr Trump seems to be a master of the appeal to popular consent, or **argumentum ad populum**.

The **cui bono**, or *who benefits* logical fallacy is another one of his favourite devices. The question he poses in various forms is *who benefits from what our previous and current leaders do?* And the answer always points out that anything the leaders do, they do at the expense of the American people - a strong argument against his opponents. The beneficiaries are Mexico, China, the politicians and lobbyists, the current incompetent non-leaders, to name but a few. The fact of the matter is it is never the audience that benefits. And put that way, it sounds truthful, and the truth more often than not hurts. But the ordinary man should not worry, because there is a solution to this dreadful state – once again it is called Donald Trump. And he assures the apprehensive listeners – 'Believe me folks, we will do very, very well, very, very well.', BECAUSE 'Nobody can do that like me. Believe me.'

Interestingly, Trump does not use the **passive voice** often. Why? Because the purpose of the passive is to avoid mentioning the agent, and how can we not mention the agent - that is himself – in this never-ending odyssey of boastfulness, where he is either insulting or bragging – and there you have to name the culprit, that is the agent. Similarly, he does not use unrealistic, improbable **conditionals**. He emotionally says – ‘Sadly, the American dream is dead. But if I get elected president I will bring it back bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and we will make America great again.’ This is the conclusion and there is no doubt in his mind he will be elected - *will* expresses certainty.

**So what does Trump do well and does he manage to persuade his audience in Aristotelian terms?**

Detecting **Kairos** - the critical time, the moment of epiphany is something he handles artfully and masterfully. He clearly states he is aware people don’t need the rhetoric, they need jobs, and ‘the greatest social program is a job’. And his seemingly not much of a rhetor, his lack of eloquence, his inarticulate speech aim at sounding like the opposite of rhetoric – a very clever device that opens wide the road to persuasion that the country needs a truly great leader – and that leader is he.

**His motto – *I will bring back* ...** strikes exactly where it aims – the ordinary American. The simplified way in which he presents economics is convincing exactly because it is simple, because it does not require reflection upon his words. A sentence everyone wishes to hear is: ‘It will be done on time, on budget, way below cost, way below what anyone ever thought.’ And that is what he states – brief and to the point. As Baggini would say, ‘The short, sharp, memorable case is king.’ (p.156).

**With all the incoherence, he sums up rather well** - he would repeal Obamacare; build a wall along America’s border with Mexico and the latter will pay for it; would be tough with ISIS; ‘will stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons’ and Obama’s illegal executive order on immigration; support the Second Amendment; save Medicare and Social Security; renegotiated foreign trade deals; reduce the debt; strengthen the military and take care of the vets.

Risk assessment – you are in such a bad state that: ***what do you actually have to lose?!*** This is a phrase that seems to appear in the majority of his speeches – the situation is so bad that you actually have nothing to lose.

**The strategy put simply is as follows** – he lays out the problem, the situation, labels it – usually a disaster, very bad, slams! –the moment of epiphany: I will solve the problem and here’s what will happen under President Trump; and then – repeat, repeat, repeat. Repetition conveys his message. He presents the situation (we are dying x2 for emphasis, and we need money), paints a grim picture in ordinary simple language, street-smart, uses examples from ‘the real world?’- this is his argument, and then gives us the solution – he himself!- to the rosy future. It’s either/or – either what you have

got so far and no jobs OR me and a brilliant future. And the tragic, or the happiness in it, depending on your point of view, is that he DID become a president.

**Disjointed, incoherent, at times inarticulate, repetitive, nevertheless, the speech is persuasive. It is precisely those repetitions that carry the message he wants to convey. To return to Aristotle's principles** - 'The point is not just how persuasion is derived from facts, but also how to express these facts and deliver the speech properly as 'the way in which a thing is said does affect its intelligibility' (Book III, Part 1). So Trump makes it simple, for simple people. After a deliberately lengthy introduction, he makes his statement, he delivers his argument using 'demonstrative proofs' and closes with an epilogue all the while repeating what his target audience needs and expects to hear. Yes, his sentences are disjointed, yes there is no apparent sequence to his arguments, but when one looks at it closely, he lays the foundation, builds his argument on it and then leads the audience to the obvious conclusion, letting it think it is an either/or situation in which there are no other options. So, believe him and vote for him!

**Finally**, in Aristotelian terms - (1) he has made 'the audience well-disposed' towards himself and 'ill-disposed towards' his opponents (2) he has both - magnified and minimized the leading facts, (3) he has excited 'the required state of emotion' in his listeners, and (4) he has repeatedly refreshed their memories. (Book III, Part 19).

## **II.2. Translatability**

**In terms of translatability**, this speech would be a challenge not only for the interpreter, but also for the translator. What are the difficulties one might encounter when translating it?

**Repetitions and some idioms** and fixed expressions may constitute a problem. Mr Trump seems to be fond of the phrase *big league* and likes to use it in various contexts (3 times in the announcement speech); *small potatoes* also has a prominent place in his vocabulary – 'They have bridges that make the George Washington Bridge look like small potatoes' or ' what you've seen in the past might be small potatoes compared to what happens'; phrases such as they 'are selling this country down the drain', and 'deductibles are through the roof' are also quite unexpected in political speeches.

It is admittedly challenging to make sense of sentences such as 'I will be the greatest jobs president that God ever created.' or 'they are bringing those problems with us'. Surely there is a mistake there.

On the other hand, the speech is peppered with insipid words such as *nice, good, bad*, and the well worn out by now *disaster, unbelievable, believe me!, stupid* – which at least should make translating it easier.



## Context

In terms of context, the translator would have to know and explain who the ‘no-good traitor’ Bowe Bergdahl is – a US army Sergeant who walked off post in Afghanistan in 2009 and was held prisoner of war for five years; at the time of the speech Bergdahl was facing court-martial trial and Trump’s repeated *traitor* remarks were considered by many a violation of Bergdahl’s right to a fair trial (Politico, 2016). Regardless of any further discussions, the damage is done.

The analogy - 'it's like take the New England Patriots and Tom Brady and have them play your high school football team. That's the difference between China's leaders and our leaders.' Hardly anyone who does not follow American sports would know that Tom Brady is an American football quarterback who plays for the New England Patriots and the only one to have won five Super Bowls while playing for one team (Wikipedia, 2017).

Common Core – adopted in 42 states, this is a set of ‘college- and career-ready standards for kindergarten through 12th grade in English language arts/literacy and mathematics’ (Common Core Standards Initiative, 2017). ‘End— end Common Core. Common Core should— it is a disaster. Bush is totally in favor of Common Core. I don't see how he can possibly get the nomination. He's weak on immigration. He's in favor of Common Core. How the hell can you vote for this guy? You just can't do it. We have to end education has to be local. Rebuild the country's infrastructure.’ – in this incoherent passage, it would be difficult for a translator to link Common Core with education, if she knew nothing about it. At the same time, it is very unlikely that non-American audience would be familiar with these standards. The same applies to Medicare, Medicaid, even though the prefix *medi* might help us guess.

The Second Amendment – not everyone knows or needs to know what it is about. It protects the right of the people to keep and bear Arms’ (Constitution Centre, 2017).

In terms of context, these are some of the names and terms that might constitute a problem when translating the speech.

## Register & coherence

A greater problem, however, would be the speaker’s low register – already touched upon earlier - which in truth makes us question how educated he is. To use Trump’s own phrase – ‘Is he intelligent?’ No interpreter would take pleasure in having to resort to lower register in order to reproduce what undoubtedly sounds disrespectful and rude. The very beginning of the speech where Trump emphasises that the other candidates ‘sweated like dogs’ is the first shock. And these shocks take the translator on a roller-coaster of similar surprises with no pause to inhale or exhale, until the

very end. Having to reiterate that Mexicans are rapists who bring drugs and crime may easily make the interpreter question his own understanding of what he hears and whether he hears correctly at all. Insulting the then president Obama by repeatedly saying he is not a true leader, he is a bad negotiator, he doesn't have a clue; calling all other politicians stupid and incompetent; branding a soldier a 'no-good traitor' – it isn't easy to keep repeating these insults. And as mentioned in chapter III, translators tend to adhere to a higher standard of language for fear of being blamed for a faulty or poor translation. Earlier, the question was posed whether it is better to censor, and try to convey the sense of what is being said rather than translate word-for-word, vulgarities and all. It was also pointed out that translation is about reproducing the meaning and the force of an utterance. It was stressed that if the translator resorts to censoring, the message surely loses its force and the speaker's status is quite undeservedly elevated, all to the credit of the translator. At the same time, rendering the speech word-for-word reveals the person behind the speaker and reproduces the reality.

The above considerations regarding low register apply to incoherence and lack of sequence as well – typical of Mr Trump's impromptu comments and speeches without a teleprompter. It has been repeatedly pointed out that Trump's sentences in the above speech are disjointed, and inconsequential. A single example was chosen among many in the close text analysis to illustrate that characteristic of his speech. To illustrate further, another equally confusing example would be: 'Now, Ford announces a few weeks ago that Ford is going to build a \$2.5 billion car and truck and parts manufacturing plant in Mexico. \$2.5 billion, it's going to be one of the largest in the world. Ford. Good company. .... So I announced that I'm running for president. I would... ... one of the early things I would do, probably before I even got in— and I wouldn't even use— you know, I have— I know the smartest negotiators in the world. I know the good ones. I know the bad ones. I know the overrated ones.' He simply veers from one point to another, with no sense of direction, puzzling the poor translator and leaving him helpless and perplexed.

When discussing incoherence it would be quite illustrative to consider the following part of a speech which Trump 'delivered' in Sun City, South Carolina, on 21 July 2015 (Slate, 2015):

'Look, having nuclear—my uncle was a great professor and scientist and engineer, Dr. John Trump at MIT; good genes, very good genes, OK, very smart, the Wharton School of Finance, very good, very smart—you know, if you're a conservative Republican, if I were a liberal, if, like, OK, if I ran as a liberal Democrat, they would say I'm one of the smartest people anywhere in the world—it's true!— but when you're a conservative Republican they try—oh, do they do a number—that's why I always start off: *Went to Wharton, was a good student, went there, went there, did this, built a fortune*—you know I have to give my like credentials all the time, because we're a little disadvantaged—but you

look at the nuclear deal, the thing that really bothers me—it would have been so easy, and it's not as important as these lives are (nuclear is powerful; my uncle explained that to me many, many years ago, the power and that was 35 years ago; he would explain the power of what's going to happen and he was right—who would have thought?), but when you look at what's going on with the four prisoners—now it used to be three, now it's four—but when it was three and even now, I would have said it's all in the messenger; fellas, and it is fellas because, you know, they don't, they haven't figured that the women are smarter right now than the men, so, you know, it's gonna take them about another 150 years—but the Persians are great negotiators, the Iranians are great negotiators, so, and they, they just killed, they just killed us.'

What exactly would one make of this incredibly long and incoherent single sentence?! It is perhaps better to reproduce it through word-for-word translation, as how else would one convey the message. But let us consider what some professional translators have to say on the topic of coherence and translating Trump.

#### **What other translators say**

Bérengère Viennot, a **French** translator, explains that Trump's repetitiveness, poor vocabulary and shredded syntax constitute quite a problem when translating into French - 'a very structured and logical language'. According to her, "Most of the time, when he speaks he seems not to know quite where he's going," and "It's as if he had thematic clouds in his head that he would pick from with no need of a logical thread to link them." (Schmidt, 2017)

Agness Kaku, a **Japanese** translator, comments on the *structural challenge* of translating Trump — 'understanding a sentence in English involves pinning down who or what the subject is. Japanese, on the other hand, requires tracking the *topic* of a conversation.' (Schmidt, 2017) Further on, she explains it is not hard to grasp the subject – it is either he himself, or the enemy, but that it is quite hard to grasp the point of his sentences as he simply *drifts*. Her examples include the Japanese translations of Trump's comments on Ghazala, Khizr Khan's wife, who remained silent at the Democratic National Convention after her husband had delivered his speech: 'His wife — if you look at his wife, she was standing there, she had nothing to say, she probably, maybe she wasn't allowed to have anything to say, you tell me, but plenty of people have written that,' - Trump's comment on ABC News. Back-translated, the Japanese translation released by its public forecaster NHK was: 'She likely wasn't allowed to give a statement.' CNN Japan's version was: 'It could be she wasn't allowed to speak.' Thus, according to Kaku 'the rambling, unframed implication' was turned 'into a much clearer accusation' (Schmidt, 2017).

In another article Kaku explains that by omitting some of Trump's favourite phrases such as 'I don't know, probably, maybe, I'm not sure, other people say, the lawyers say, I haven't looked at it, I'm not familiar'—the Japanese translation makes him 'sound more authoritative' (MacLellan, 2016).

Trump's slogan, *Make America Great Again* — is not an easy challenge either. Back-translated from **Spanish**, for example, one version would be 'Make America big again,' or 'Do America great again.' At the same time, to most Spanish and Portuguese speakers *América* encompasses the whole of the Americas, and not just the US.

Soraya Caicedo of the SBS Spanish programme associates Trump's slogan with 'the kind of America that used to intervene in governments in Latin America,' as it was the case in Chile, Nicaragua and El Salvador. (Winsor, 2017)

Daniel Sánchez Reinaldo, a Spanish interpreter for National Spanish Televisión RTVE in Madrid translated the third presidential debate phrase *bad hombres* with *hombres malos*, which he says 'made Trump sound childish' (MacLellan, 2016). Trump's 'Wrong!'—Reinaldo explains would be too lengthy in Spanish – 'Eso no es correcto' and the translator replaced it with 'Es falso', or 'That is not true,' which is certainly more polite.

**In conclusion**, Trump's confusing logic, limited vocabulary, repetitiveness, indispensable digressions are almost always likely to puzzle the translator. While his simplicity and conciseness can be considered a relief, his unpredictability and lack of structure more often than not force a dilemma on translators – should they let the style of expression produce the (right) impression of the speech, or should they *diplomatise* and seek to convey the meaning and the force of the message to their best.

### **III. Tweets**

Tweets are a relatively recent –only 11-year-old - but exhaustively employed trend which illustrates the power and impact social media has on political debate. A few years back only, it was a non-traditional method of campaigning and rallying, but in its remarkably short life-time it has turned into a major weapon of persuasion where the main objective is power. In the present day this is no longer just a tool - this is in fact political reality as a candidate with no Twitter account is - simply put - a weak candidate. It has become a necessity now. It is the virtual *agora* – a 'place' for people to rejoice, criticize, support, oppose, lament – simply to voice their feelings and opinions. Immediate and unfiltered, it has become central to politics and therefore to diplomacy.

Why is tweeting so (ab)used? It is instant, cost-effective, and influential – it brings immediate results, it links and expands circles of people who are physically distant, but ideologically close. Moreover, re-tweeting has an amplifying power – it can make a message go viral. It helps people to be better

informed and more reactive. The message usually gets through instantly as the platform has a pre-set rule of writing messages of no more than 140 characters. This way the author is forced to be brief and there are seemingly no excessive words in a message. The intense, informal style which dominates allows to share, amplify a message and to call to action in an instant. It ensures immediacy, conciseness, spontaneity and little pretentiousness in a debate.

But as positive to political debate as these changes might be, this trend has made it possible for candidates to hurl insults in a way unthinkable and completely unsuited to the conventional style of diplomatic language. Anyone can engage with everyone into a debate with unexpected and new form of openness and rudeness, even meanness. Who might the latter suit better than the current American president?!

**So how does Mr Trump make the best of this social-media platform?** Of course, he uses its power to his own benefit. Twitter's 'gifts' – enforced rapidity and brevity, and amplifying power – match Trump's style perfectly – provocative, unadorned, concise, acid rapid-fire talk. Because of this match, tweeting has become an integral part not only of his campaign, but also of his office; it has multiplied his forces; it has turned into the backbone of his administration. And unfortunately, it has also unleashed his acidity and cynicism by giving prominence to his assertive *ad hominem* attacks. The power of tweeting to link like-minded people is what wipes out the thought *I am alone*. It has also helped Trump emphasise divisiveness thus reinforcing the idea of *us* – the in-group vs. *them* – the out-group. This is a skilfully employed way of rallying supporters and supporters-to-be.

In the subsequent text, various tweets made by President Trump have been chosen to illustrate the already familiar linguistic devices used in his rhetoric. The same antagonists appear; identical or very similar words and phrases are used – the only difference is perhaps the fact the short messages are loaded with more bitterness, more spite and cynicism. There is a tremendous amount of tweets to choose from – tweets which would illustrate Trump's obsession with insulting and mocking – be it individuals, countries or institutions – domestic or international alike.

### **Bold assertions and *ad hominem* attacks**

As always, Mr Trump attacks former president **Obama**. The latter is: '[Bad \(or sick\) guy!](https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/837996746236182529)'<sup>26</sup>; '[Only makes bad deals!](https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/772793658072559616)' , '[not a natural deal maker](https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/761386025323225088)'<sup>27</sup>, has '[disastrous judgment](https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/760552601356267520)' which gave us ISIS, rise of Iran, and the worst economic numbers since the Great Depression!<sup>28</sup>, '[perhaps the worst president in the history of the United States!](https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/760552601356267520)' – repeatedly stated<sup>29</sup>, '[doesn't have a clue](https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/760552601356267520)'<sup>30</sup>, '[looks and sounds](https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/760552601356267520)

<sup>26</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/837996746236182529>

<sup>27</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/772793658072559616>

<sup>28</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/761386025323225088>

<sup>29</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/760552601356267520>

[so ridiculous](#)<sup>'31</sup>, [‘has a horrible attitude](#)<sup>'32</sup>, [‘he is just so bad!](#)<sup>'33</sup>, [‘horrible](#)<sup>'34</sup>, [‘incompetent leader](#)<sup>'35</sup>, [‘all talk & no action](#)<sup>'36</sup>. Nothing new under the sun really, many of the comments are familiar and have been numerous repeated. Irrational, insulting assertions with no evident reason for labelling rather than making the attacker, Mr Trump, feel better about himself.

**Other politicians** at the same time are: [‘dumb](#)<sup>'37</sup>, [‘all talk, no action](#)’ and [‘very stupid, highly incompetent people running our country into the ground](#)<sup>'38</sup>, [‘we are all tired \[of them\]](#)<sup>'39</sup>. Once again, the attempt at othering – they, the current leaders, are the ones who have brought this disastrous situation to us and to our country. By degrading and slandering the out-group, he defines his circle, expands it, sympathizes with it, identifies with it.

**The public** on the other hand, [‘have got to stop working to be so politically correct](#)<sup>'40</sup> – one might interpret this as a sort of flattery and encouragement as what he actually means is – *Open up, don’t be afraid, say what you think! You can do that with me!*

The phrase **radical Islamism** and its slight variations are indispensable here as well - ‘Politically correct fools, [‘won’t even call it what it is - RADICAL ISLAM!’](#)<sup>'41</sup> Brave, isn’t he?! And this is exactly what *the American people* need – a shrewd, competent leader who would call things by their real names. ‘Our country is facing a major threat from radical Islamic terrorism. We better get very smart, and very tough, FAST, before it is too late!’<sup>'42</sup> This is his warning – and as we now know, he is always right.

### Stories in a capsule

It is perhaps the inevitable and forced upon the user brevity that makes Trump use his tweets as tiny stories – *stories in a capsule*. With just a few words he paints a powerful, vivid picture that would trigger the 'right' emotions – a story in a picture which conveys a message and excites the required emotions. A few examples:

---

<sup>30</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/754789482621243392>

<sup>31</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/712291134991691777>

<sup>32</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/666606474613886976>

<sup>33</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/665524569961287680>

<sup>34</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/645230169997881344>

<sup>35</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/626079024373202946>

<sup>36</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/626068052891836416>

<sup>37</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/759509936002957314>

<sup>38</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/692171744845664258>

<sup>39</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/633299285971501056>

<sup>40</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/676198180757852160>

<sup>41</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/749989709275885568>

<sup>42</sup>

[https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/674422386620502016?ref\\_src=twsrc%5Etfw&ref\\_url=https%3A%2F%2Fstorify.com%2Fsaenpremium%2Fdonald-trump-on-islam-muslims-and-the-middle-east](https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/674422386620502016?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fstorify.com%2Fsaenpremium%2Fdonald-trump-on-islam-muslims-and-the-middle-east)

‘Wow, Jeb Bush, whose campaign is a total disaster, had to bring in mommy to take a slap at me. Not nice!’<sup>43</sup> One can’t help but imagine this grown up person led down the path towards Mr Trump by his granny-like belligerent mother who makes a move to smack the righteous nominee. The moral – Jeb Bush is an adolescent kid that takes his mommy everywhere, and can’t make his own decisions, let alone run a country – the greatest country in the world. Let us not forget though, that this granny is former first lady, Barbara Bush. Accidentally, she is also the mother of another American President, who, although, Mr Trump questions his intelligence as we saw earlier, served two terms – but that must also have been accidental.

‘For eight years Russia ‘ran over’ President Obama, got stronger and stronger, picked-off Crimea and added missiles. Weak!’<sup>44</sup> The reader instantly envisions a road, Obama lying on it, helpless, and a film frame of a Russian *Lada Niva* running him over – back and forth, lest it miss! Cut! Next frame – Putin getting bigger and taller, haughtier as military ships approach, observe and conquer the peninsula – Caesar-like style. The moral – you, see what you had to deal with, for eight whole long years?! How do you expect me to fix it right away?!

Bill & Hillary Clinton are ‘the real predators’<sup>45</sup> – a couple of animals that hunt and capture other animals for food. The moral – the vicious couple has continuously robbed, victimized and exploited the American people for their personal gain. This has to stop, it has to stop now, and I am your saviour!

[‘We are being led to slaughter’](#)<sup>46</sup> – a tearful picture of a lamb led to the slaughter. The moral – in this heartbreaking analogy, the lamb is the American people – oppressed and silent. *This is what your current leaders are doing to you! Raise your voice! Pick me! I will be your shepherd! I will listen to you!*

**CHINA** is [‘Terrible!’](#) as it ‘wouldn’t provide a red carpet stairway from Air Force One and then Philippines President calls Obama ‘the son of a whore.’<sup>47</sup> Don’t you just envision Obama, the President of the United States of America, emerging from the back of his monster of a plane to no proper stairway, no red carpet? Is this why China is terrible? We wouldn’t know for sure, at least for now, whether China put together a deliberate diplomatic snub for the American president when he arrived for the G20 summit in Hangzhou<sup>48</sup> (The Guardian, 2016) or whether that was just an example of Chinese style disorganisation. The moral though – *China does not respect us, China does not*

---

<sup>43</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/695979656617578496>

<sup>44</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/839101660886614016>

<sup>45</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/769143845892136960>

<sup>46</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/679000573241393154>

<sup>47</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/773116580733587456>

<sup>48</sup> 4 September 2016

*respect you – the American people! Look what China does to your so-called leader? And don't get me started on the Philippines!*

**MEXICO** has a 'totally corrupt gov't'<sup>49</sup>; 'we get the killers, drugs & crime, they get the money!'<sup>50</sup>. This time, we can imagine a Hollywood-style movie rendering the reality of ordinary American cities – gang wars, drugs, crime; gun shots at the border. But, Mr Trump is also faithful to his contradictory style, because his eternal love & hate relationship with Mexico is not over – 'I love the Mexican people, but Mexico is 'not our friend. They're killing us at the border and they're killing us on jobs and trade. FIGHT!'<sup>51</sup> The moral – I am trying to open your eyes. Listen to me – choose me and we'll fight together!

**Europe**, on the other hand, has 'weak leaders'<sup>52</sup>. Is there anyone who is not weak, or mentally damaged or incompetent in Mr Trump's opinion?! Is there anyone who could be at least close to a worthy opponent of his?

**The United Nations** 'has such great potential but right now it is just a club for people to get together, talk and have a good time. So sad!'<sup>53</sup> A pensioners' club perhaps, or a more sophisticate aristocratic one? It doesn't really matter what we picture. The statement is a complete negation of all the organisation represents; it aims to denigrate and ridicule it.

**NATO** – in Mr Trump's competent view, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is 'obsolete'<sup>54</sup>. Well, who could argue with him?!

The US 'has become a dumping ground for the world'<sup>55</sup> – a metaphor used in the introduction of the presidential announcement speech discussed in part II of this chapter. An enormous pile of garbage is what we image, desolate plains and poverty – which is not how the rest of the world regards the US. The moral – *once again, fight for a better future to which I AM the solution!*

Along with the vivid encapsulated stories, Trump cannot possibly forget to praise himself. A personal tribute to his ego – the whining of a petulant, spoiled child, desperate to get some attention - 'I don't believe I have been given any credit by the voters for self-funding my campaign'<sup>56</sup>; I told you @TIME Magazine would never pick me as person of the year despite being the big favorite They picked person who is ruining Germany.'<sup>57</sup> How insignificant he makes that person running Germany sound;

---

<sup>49</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/620629175897096193>

<sup>50</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/620546522556534784>

<sup>51</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/615866741994954752>

<sup>52</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/680877571542790144>

<sup>53</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/813500123053490176>

<sup>54</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/712969068396093440>

<sup>55</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/618443159547322368>

<sup>56</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/694560681090248704>

<sup>57</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/674587800835092480>



he is, however, unable to hide his envy! These tweets are in the style of bragging and forgetting of anyone else's existence let alone competence we discussed earlier in this chapter.

**I told you so!** – 'Mexico's biggest drug lord escapes from jail. Unbelievable corruption and USA is paying the price. I told you so!'<sup>58</sup> As Bagginis would point out (p.128), by saying - '**I told you so!**' – the speaker shows wisdom and confidence; the Past Simple of the verb *tell* here implies what the speaker 'said was a fact before it even happened' (B. p.128). That would in turn mean he possesses 'a foresight denied to the rest of us.' But the *I told you/them so!*-sentence should by now not be unfamiliar to us as it was addressed a number of times earlier in the presidential announcement speech analysis.

In terms of **translatability**, the same difficulties might arise as mentioned earlier in this chapter – low register, context ambiguities, and incoherence. As the Japanese translator Kaku points out, 'the character limits and immense speed in which tweets are posted make it difficult to circulate accurate translations of Trump's tweets.' (Schmidt, 2017). Thus, a re-tweeted message which goes viral is very likely to reduce the quality of translation available - not only of that single message but also of translation in general.

Having to analyze all of Trump's tweets looks like a Sisyphean task – the moment we might think we have reached the top of the hill, the stone will surely escape our grasp and roll back to the bottom. However, if we attempt a summary of at least the above considered tweets, we could conclude the following – there isn't a single drop of positivism except for when bragging and giving credit to himself – in Trump's own words, *this is really sad*. The linguistic devices he resorts to are his very usual and by now typical in this analysis - argumentum ad hominem; repetitions ad nauseam; divisiveness; encapsulated stories loaded with metaphors and analogies – all the while sensational and shocking, abusive and insulting, denigrating, humiliating. The good-news tweets are self-praise.

His tweets are strategic – particularly if he is accused of something, for a change. First he likes to frame his argument and create a sensation, shock, scandal; then he usually accuses – who? - well everyone, but himself – his predecessors, his opponents, the current leaders – domestic or world leaders; after that the attention is supposedly diverted and he waits to see if the media, the public are still concerned with what he has tried to prevent. The strategy is effective. Why? Because it makes his opponents explain and negate the accusation which requires repeating it thus leaving it under public scrutiny for a lot longer than his opponent would wish. And as George Lakoff (2017) rightly points out, 'when the press treats tweets as "breaking news" it just plays out the Trump strategy.'

---

<sup>58</sup> <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/620337666912059392>

So how effective is tweeting? - Extremely. It nurtures the remarkably short attention span of today's internet world. When people have no time and no desire to read and listen to long analyses, they simply read the headlines. And tweets are just like headlines – catchy and short, long enough though to provoke what they aim to; persuasive in Aristotelian terms as they manage to - (1) 'make the reader well-disposed' towards us and ill-disposed towards our opponent '(2) magnify or minimize the leading facts, (3) excite the required state of emotion' in the reader - pity, indignation, anger, hatred, envy, emulation, pugnacity, and (4) refresh their memories. (Book III, Part 19).

Delighted with the following conclusion or disheartened by it, it is hard to deny that, yet, there is one more technique Trump uses to give hope, or to rob of hope – depending on the point of view.

#### IV. The *unsaid*

It would be an unfair and an incomplete analysis, were we to omit the *unsaid* employed as a persuasive technique by Mr Trump. It is difficult to describe it as no words can be so effective as to describe what has not been said.

The following example will be used as an attempt to illustrate the above - on the occasion of German Chancellor Angela Merkel visiting the White House this year in March, sitting in the Oval Office, both leaders were prompted to shake hands by the press. When Mrs Merkel noticed Trump was irresponsive, pointedly leaning towards him she repeated the reporters' question: 'Do you want to have a hand-shake?'<sup>59</sup>



Source: Ernst/Reuters, 2017

President Trump, however, stared ahead and aside, sitting with his legs apart firmly planted on the ground, hands kept together between them, completely and obviously resolutely silent. The Chancellor appeared relaxed.

Speech constitutes an act – (1) the act of saying something, (2) the meaning and the intention behind what is being said, and (3) the effect it has had, that is what we have achieved by saying it. In Austin's words, '*in' and 'by' doing x I am doing y*' (1962, p.107). Similarly, the lack of speech, the inaction also constitutes an act – an act perhaps even more powerful than the speech itself. There is the act of not saying anything, the meaning behind this act and the effect it has achieved. What does Trump 'say' by not saying anything? He 'says' he doesn't care about the person sitting next to him, or about

<sup>59</sup> Video with subtitles available at <http://www.bbc.com/news/av/world-us-canada-39311760/merkel-handshake-offer-to-trump-falls-on-deaf-ears>

anyone else, for that matter. This 'says' – *I'm bigger than you*. Not very diplomatic, one might say. The intention is to be rude and dismissive. The effect – the whole world commented on his inaction.

The **body language** behind this act – as Navarro explains, such a position of the legs is a territorial display aiming at establishing authority and control over the situation (2009, p.66-67); hand steeping at the same time is considered to be the most powerful sign of high confidence display – it lets the other party know exactly how you feel about the issue at hand (p.147). On the other hand, leg crossing is a sign of comfort and confidence – we do not use it if we feel uncomfortable (p. 69). Similarly, leaning towards someone as Chancellor Merkel does is also a sign of comfort (p.90).

Mr Trump's body language has been widely discussed. But some of his signature gestures are worth summarising:



- pinching the air or threading-the-needle gesture signifies precision

(Source: VBS, 2016);



- the same applies for slicing the air – precision again, certainty

(Source: CDN, 2015);



- the palms up or out gesture is supposed to scare people, to alert them and to dismiss them at the same time (Source: heavy., 2016);



- pointing is considered accusatory (Source: Quartz, 2016);



- wild gesturing signifies chaos (Source: La presse, 2016); and is there anyone better than Donald Trump to fix that chaos?!

In any case, 'hand movement is a profound, unconscious, inseparable part of natural speech' (Bellos, p.330). How do we translate it? We don't. We might describe it, we might point out at it in an account of what has been said, but we surely cannot *translate* it at the moment of speaking.

Although it is a non-verbal act, body language speaks for itself; it communicates messages – at times subtly, at times unmistakably forcefully and abruptly.

---

**In conclusion**, this chapter addressing President Trump's language and style attempted to provide an analysis of:

- a prepared speech;
- a speech delivered without the use of a teleprompter;
- a selection of tweets;
- an instance of a non-verbal act, and body language; and
- the translatability of his language in each of the above categories.

The linguistic devices used by President Trump were identified and discussed. An attempt was made to conclude whether President Trump's rhetoric is persuasive and how he accomplishes it. The intention was to make it at least slightly clearer what makes some support him, and others detest him, all the while being conscious of the changes his linguistic style is bringing about.

In terms of persuasion, the speaker tends to adhere to a certain amount of linguistic devices such as logical fallacies; moral-packed stories loaded with exaggerations, metaphors and analogies; value speak and shared aspirations; divisiveness; brevity and simplicity; and a choice of phrases and sentences which have become an integral part of his rhetoric. No matter the contradictions, no matter the non-sequiturs, repetitions work their way through, the argument sinks in and the conviction begins to grow and spread. The speaker's ability to appeal to hearts rather than minds helps visualize and frame reality the way he does. By laying out the situation, providing a seemingly logical argument through assertions and supposedly real-life examples, using a very simple style, Mr Trump provides a solution to the problem or situation he has identified. All with the intention to persuade of his worthiness.

## CHAPTER V A New Diplomatic Language?

*'Aliis licet: tibi non licet —  
others may : you mayn't.'*<sup>60</sup>

### ***Diplomatic language – old and new***

As discussed in Chapter II, *diplomatic language* is the art of conveying a message effectively, that is, tactfully and persuasively, without resorting to (unnecessary) confrontation. Careful gradation of language, subtlety and tact, manners and adherence to tradition and culture; the understanding that what we've said once cannot simply be unsaid and its consequences cannot merely be erased and forgotten – all that helps the diplomat, the politician, any individual to say important and sharp things without being provocative or arrogant. This conventional, old-style form of communication seeks to maintain 'an atmosphere of calm', as Sir Nicolson calls it (1939, p.228). Unfortunately, what it is turning into is exactly that – *old style*.

We have seen how short sentences and small words made a rich man an extremely powerful man – to the horror and disbelief of some and to the delight of others. If that is possible, if complete disregard for manner, conventions and traditions have become the standard, what are we to expect? Is the new style concise, offensive language which aims at divisiveness? Is that a new type of diplomatic language? How might it help avoid or escalate conflicts, or resolve them for that matter?

### ***Social media***

In the spirit of constant development – of making everything 'better' by making it faster (and becoming lazier in the process), social media has gained unprecedented importance. It also seems to have become an integral part of the new 'diplomatic' style. This (relatively) new means of communication is an excellent propaganda tool, which has indeed enforced an intriguing diplomatic language on the way. Although President Trump seems to be Twitter's current champion, he is neither the first nor the only world leader who has stirred controversies on the text-based platform. In 2014 for example, Azerbaijan's President Ilham Aliyev threatened Armenia with war via Twitter<sup>61</sup>.

How do diplomats and leaders around the world use social media and what kind of language have they adopted? Wichowski (2013) gives some good examples. In 2012, following protests outside the American Embassy in Cairo in response to an American anti-Islamic video posted on the Internet, along with an official statement, the Embassy posted a tweet: 'We firmly reject the actions by those who abuse the universal right of free speech to hurt the religious beliefs of others.' Soon after that, however, the White House rejected any responsibility for the statement stating it "was not cleared

<sup>60</sup> Nicolson *Diplomacy*, p.111 - Baron Sonnino, Italian Foreign Minister in 1918, had the motto carved in his study.

<sup>61</sup> [https://twitter.com/presidentaz/status/497364299908542464?ref\\_src=twsrc%5Etfw&ref\\_url=about%3Asrcdoc](https://twitter.com/presidentaz/status/497364299908542464?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw&ref_url=about%3Asrcdoc)

by Washington and does not reflect the views of the United States government.” Wichowski provides another example of diplomatic tweeting, namely – in 2012, in a series of tweets on UN’s air travel budget excesses, former U.S. ambassador for UN management and reform, Joseph Torsella recasted the UNGA complexly set rules in a seemingly more understandable Twitter language. He wrote: ‘29 Feb Joe Torsella @USJoe\_UN Senior UN officials can fly biz class any flight, others if 9hrs "travel" (not flight). So two 3hr flights + 3hr layover=biz class. Ouch.’ Later he even praised the Pope – ‘14 Mar Joe Torsella @USJoe\_UN: As budget committee considers excessive #UN biz class travel, attn delegates: new pope takes the bus & flies coach. Habemus Good Example.’ The purpose here (and presumably the benefit) was transparency and an insight into what public representatives do.

In 2014, after the Crimean peninsula was annexed by Russia, the Canadian and Russian delegations to NATO engaged in an informal-language-*tweet-battle* over a very serious international issue as seen below<sup>62</sup>:



More recently, in response to PM May’s statement ‘Engage but beware’<sup>63</sup> - the right approach to Putin in her opinion, the Russian embassy in London tweeted: ‘Engage but beware”, Prime Minister said. As far as we’re aware, Cold War was long dead. #PoemsAboutTrumpAndMay’ (SkyNews, 2017).

Indian External Affairs Minister Sushma Swaraj was recently criticized about the way she tweeted instructions to the diplomats at the Indian High Commission in Canada with regards to the Amazon doormats incident – doormats depicting the Indian flag were being sold on the Amazon Canada website. In his article (2017), Tharoor criticized the Minister’s manner of issuing diplomatic instruction over Twitter saying - ‘Such a move is unprecedented, and not particularly welcome. Social media is no substitute for a diplomatic cable.’ Further on, Tharoor comments on Swaraj’s tweeted threat to refuse visas to ‘any Amazon official’ and to cancel those already issued. The author says: ‘A profession famed for summoning ambassadors for a discreet dressing-down has been reduced to

<sup>62</sup> [https://twitter.com/natomission\\_ru/status/505052838184370176/photo/1](https://twitter.com/natomission_ru/status/505052838184370176/photo/1)

<sup>63</sup> PM May cited former US President R. Reagan.

upbraiding companies on Twitter.' There are numerous other examples of social media being used by diplomats that reflect Tharoor's sentiments on the lack of *diplomatic language and style*.

*Twiplomacy*, a study of world leaders on social media, conducted by Burson-Marsteller also illustrates the pervasive nature of social media and Twitter in particular. In his report, Lüfkens explains (2017) the research team identified '856 Twitter accounts of heads of state and government, foreign ministers, and their institutions in 178 countries worldwide', 'representing 92 percent of all UN member states'. Each leader's profile, history and connections were analysed. The study describes social media as 'diplomacy's significant other' and calls Twitter a 'diplomatic barometer' (Lüfkens, 2017). The 2016-study emphasises it is not just text-based Twitter which has gained in salience. In addition to his Twitter account, Pope Francis for instance has an Instagram account as well (Lüfkens, 2016).

Naturally, one would want to know who the most influential Twitter-world-leader is. Unsurprisingly, Donald Trump, followed by India's Narendra Modi, Turkey's Erdogan, Pope Francis, President US@POTUS. The most effective ones, the criteria being retweeting, are – King Salman of Saudi Arabia, Donald Trump, Pope Francis, President US@POTUS, Erdogan<sup>64</sup>. An interesting finding of the study is that the 10 most followed use the platform 'as a powerful one-way broadcasting tool'; they follow few other leaders and 'are not very conversational'. (Lüfkens, 2017)

Furthermore, there is even <http://emojipedia.org/> nowadays to help with the 'new diplomatic sign language' (Lüfkens, 2016). Many world leaders seem to use their national flag emojis as a substitute to words. The 2016 study also claims the European Commission's International Trade department [@Trade EU](#) 'has made its tweets more digestible with an average of three emojis per tweet' (Twiplomacy blog, 2016). Australia's Foreign Minister, Julie Bishop's keenness on the use of emojis, particularly after portraying President 'Putin with a single red-faced angry man emoji' sparked a debate on the use of Unicode symbols in diplomatic communications in the Australian Senate (Twiplomacy blog, 2016). The Finnish Foreign Ministry created a whole series of emojis to promote their country in 2015.

Of course **there are positive messages** on Twitter as well! To take just one good example - Mann of the European External Action Service (the EU's diplomatic service) proudly points out the Iran nuclear deal implementation video on Twitter was a fast and effective way to mark 'a truly historic diplomatic achievement' (Mann, 2016). However, unless the public has a specific interest in these positive posts, they are hardly ever covered by the media which is in search of more sensational, shocking news – like Trump's tweets for example. This is precisely why his style is dangerous.

---

<sup>64</sup> For more statistics see: <http://twiplomacy.com/blog/twiplomacy-study-2017/>



It is not that Trump has created a new diplomatic language – as based on the above data, a new type of language already exists. It is, however, his style described on a number of occasions in this paper that is imposing on the world scene. It is not therefore accidental South Korea's Foreign Ministry has created a new position to monitor the US President's tweets (The Telegraph, 2017).

**Have other diplomats adopted Trump's style?** It is a bit too early to say, because they certainly need to learn new rules from a new 'coursebook'. And even if the US Foreign Service is demoralised and discontent with his disagreeable style, it is rightly to expect its loyalty as it represents the national interests. The ones who disagree and are unable to follow suit could always do what David A. Rank, the charge d'affaires at the U.S. embassy in Beijing did - resign (Tobin, 2017).

What **conclusion** about social media might we draw? Whether we regard it as an excellent propaganda tool or as a way to imitate busyness, it is wide spread and used, as well as abused. It aims at avoiding subtlety and tact, at scoring by insulting and branding – be it individuals, countries or institutions. It aims at achieving more with less – as in 140 characters one can supposedly stick to the point, with no verbosity, to the dubious purpose of propaganda – to praise, brag, mock or denigrating thus provoking an equally toxic response. We do not offend our opponents the same way in person, and when using a headline-type message on Facebook or Twitter. It is not the same because it takes a lot more courage and nerve to insult in person than when you are hidden behind a screen. One might say social media helps transparency and reduces hypocrisy. But what it also does in the process is expose cowardice and nurture hatred.

Saying that one single man can change the course of centuries-long traditions is too pessimistic and places too much undeserved importance on that particular person. But it is clear and evident the style of one man, who happens to be the new president of one of the most powerful countries today, has obviously been persuasive and this is beginning to change our perception of how politics and diplomacy are conducted. It makes us question not which way is right, but which way is more efficient – the old way or the new way.

What is dangerous is the climate of distrust and animosity this new diplomatic language brings about. And that in turn leads to divisiveness – **divisiveness** that seeps into everything. If divisiveness is the ultimate objective in order to embrace populism, nationalism and isolation, what would eventually become of institutions such as NATO, the UN, the EU? What is the purpose of the Paris Agreement for example if the selfishness and naiveté of one single person with limited knowledge on crucial world issues blindly supported by his pawns can constitute an insurmountable obstacle? And are 'the times in which we could completely rely on others' really 'over to a certain extent' as Chancellor Merkel concluded? (Spiegel, 2017) The new style seems to be aiming at dismantling



rather than improving and building upon what has been achieved - because other people's achievements appear to mean nothing. Divisiveness and disrespect sow the seeds of distrust and eventually conflict. Are we not supposed to strive for the opposite?!

***Where does translation fit? Why was it addressed?***

Translation fits and it is addressed in this paper as it mirrors reality, it represents reality, and it makes communication and understanding between peoples possible. Whenever we wish to come out of our little boxes and find out what is happening in the rest of the world, it is translators who make all the available information accessible and understandable to us. We don't even think about it, as they live in the shadows of others. It is precisely because translation is a part and parcel of every-day life, that we are unaware of its importance.

Translators also carry a heavy burden upon their shoulders – they have the duty and responsibility to inform us in an understandable manner because as we mentioned earlier, translation is interpretation – interpretation of the meaning. And when they face a dilemma such as the one outlined in the case study of this work – when they need to choose between conveying the message by reproducing its meaning and force, or informing by translating word-for-word without searching for a (perfect) match, then translators also have to choose whether to patch up and even adorn undeservedly the integrity of the speaker, or whether to let the audience struggle to make out the sense of what has been said. Should translators diplomatised and help President Trump (or any other speaker) by polishing his rhetoric so that the world can understand him, his politics, his views, or should they leave his pugnacious and narcissistic utterances unadorned, stripped off, often barren of meaning and sense, simply as they are – disassembled, unintelligible? If we could all vote for the latter! But, translators are mediators and they are not always allowed the luxury of choice.

**Finally,** were it not for the fact that heads of state and government nowadays negotiate and communicate across cultures, in other words - conduct diplomacy - President Trump's sin of dishonouring language would not have been so unforgivable. And if the *diplomat* in each of us acted upon the premise cited above – *Others may, you may not* – the world could have been a little less dishonest.

## CHAPTER VI *Conclusions*

**In conclusion**, this thesis has attempted to demonstrate the importance of diplomatic language, persuasive rhetoric and translation – all three overlapping and thus interdependent in a fast-moving world.

We started out by looking at diplomatic language as we know it – old-style, some might say conservative, but carefully balanced, tactful and respectful, causing no offense and thus relieving us of the consequence of insult. This led to a close analysis of the art of persuasion as described by the ancient but wise and pertinent words of Aristotle, which in turn set the assessment criteria for the subsequent chapters on whether a speaker is a persuasive and thus successful orator. We went on to discuss translation – both oral and written and its significance in modern diplomatic affairs. The question of literal translation was raised suggesting translators often face a moral dilemma – to censor and diplomatised a speaker's crude language so as to convey an understandable to the audience meaning with an adequate force, **or** to render the speaker's utterances word-for-word disregarding uncouth language and low register, thus portraying them in their true light. Whereas both initial chapters presented a great amount of historical facts and information, the following chapter which presented the case study of this thesis adopted a different – more analytical thus critical approach. Through the close reading of several texts representing different spheres of rhetoric the case study illustrated the new linguistic trend rapidly absorbing our world. We analysed the speaker's persuasiveness and the translatability of his speeches, reaching the conclusion that this simple, unadorned language specifically selected for his target audience has an undoubtedly persuasive power. We concluded by showing the possible implications of this new diplomatic language giving examples of how and to what purpose diplomats use social media.

A possible **controversy** raised by this thesis is that: on the one hand, President Trump has introduced a completely new style of communication, and on the other, the argument that Aristotle's prescriptions still hold. Since we are used to equate rhetoric with eloquence, it is not conspicuous at first how the philosopher's principal rules are applied in Trump's rhetoric. The principles are the same, they are just applied with less eloquence to suit his style. He attempts to reason logically; he seems to understand human character; and to understand emotions – the three traits an orator should possess according to the philosopher. What represents a departure from the above prescriptions are Trump's unorthodox style, his brevity, simplicity, intemperance and brashness.

Another question to explore is whether these departures from classical rhetoric are the main difficulties translators face. Can they themselves draw on the age-old resources of their craft to meet the challenge, or do they need to devise new tools? And ultimately, is the key challenge for

translators a linguistic one or one of personal judgment - whether to practise political acumen and diplomatic sensitivity, or whether to translate word-for-word and avoid facilitation. But that, in turn, raises the question of whether translators, whose job it is to facilitate communication across language barriers, should betray their profession by refusing to facilitate. Once again, this is more of a moral dilemma than a linguistic shortfall.

### ***Further research***

A final point to address is how the current research might be improved upon in future studies. One possible topic for further research could be developing the section on translation. This could be done through interviews with practitioners to discover how the sample subjects respond to - (1) the linguistic challenges and (2) the moral dilemma of translating *Trump-speak*. A second topic of interest might be to look for evidence of the language of diplomats actually changing under the influence of President Trump - by following ambassador's tweets over time and in different cultures, for instance, or by showing how diplomats under the Trump administration have adapted their style. Thirdly, the confluence and possible conflation of politicians and diplomats could also be explored further.

### ***Food for thought***

The following insight may leave the reader with some food for thought – we live in a fast-moving, constantly changing world, where simplicity, verbal and non-verbal aggression and conciseness (the latter being not necessarily a negative trait) seem to set the standard for winners. A style where manners mean nothing, where brashness and vulgarity are used to add to the persuasive force of arguments; where subtlety is replaced by arrogance; temperance by rashness; politeness and respect by disparaging. Does this lack of mildness and tact make us better *diplomats* in life, more efficient, more successful?

Twenty-five centuries later, has anything changed in Aristotelian terms? - Not really. Except for the fact there was no Twitter or the like in his time. But, politicians – trying to be our new diplomats - continue to deliver the same type of speeches. They still use the same five topics on which they make us deliberate – ways and means, war and peace, national defence, imports and exports and legislation. The only difference is language is simpler, cruder, more forceful and derisive. Is the world order changing our word order as well?

(24 526 words)

## REFERENCE LIST:

- Aristotle *Rhetoric*. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. Available at <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/rhetoric.mb.txt> [accessed 27 June 2017].
- Austin JL (1962) *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
- Baggini J (2010) *Do They Think You're Stupid?* Granta Books. Kindle edition.
- Baker M (2008) *In Other Words - a coursebook on translation*. Canada & USA: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- BBC News (2017) Merkel handshake offer to Trump falls on deaf ears. 17 March. Available at <http://www.bbc.com/news/av/world-us-canada-39311760/merkel-handshake-offer-to-trump-falls-on-deaf-ears> [accessed 29 June 2017].
- Bellos D (2012) *Is That a Fish in Your Ear?* Farrar, Straus and Giroux New York. Kindle edition.
- Berridge GR & James A (2001) *Dictionary of Diplomacy*. Palgrave.
- Berridge GR (2015) *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. Palgrave. Kindle edition.
- Cassell's Latin Dictionary (1994) 5<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Macmillan Publishing
- CDN The Atlantic (2015) *The Appeal of 'Trump-ism'* [image]. Available at [https://cdn.theatlantic.com/assets/media/img/nj/2015/7/24/the-appeal-of-trump-ism/gettyimages-480309132/lead\\_large.jpg?1453996909](https://cdn.theatlantic.com/assets/media/img/nj/2015/7/24/the-appeal-of-trump-ism/gettyimages-480309132/lead_large.jpg?1453996909) [accessed 29 June 2017].
- Cicero M. *Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum V 47*. Available at <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/cicero/tusc5.shtml#47> [accessed 27 June 2017].
- Cicero *Tusculan Disputations, Book V. 47*. Translated by Peabody AP, Boston, 1886.
- CNN (2017) Lavrov on Comey: Was he fired? You're kidding. 10 May. Available at <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/05/10/politics/sergey-lavrov-james-comey-meeting/> [accessed 27 June 2017].
- CNN (2017) Words from the past: Inauguration speech library. Donald Trump 2017 speech. Available at <http://edition.cnn.com/interactive/2017/01/politics/words-from-the-past/> [accessed 27 June 2017].
- Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged, 12th Edition 2014. *Diplomatic*. HarperCollins Publishers.
- Collins German-English Dictionary (2017) *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*. Available at <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/german-english/vergangenheitsbew%C3%A4ltigung> [accessed 27 June 2017].
- Common Core State Standards Initiative (2017) *Frequently Asked Questions*. Available at <http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/frequently-asked-questions/> [accessed 27 June 2017].
- Constitution Centre (2017) *Amendment II*. Available at <https://constitutioncenter.org/interactive-constitution/amendments/amendment-ii> [accessed 27 June 2017].

Ernst J/Reuters (2017) *Watch: Trump meets Angela Merkel at the White House* [image]. Available at <https://www.pri.org/stories/2017-03-17/watch-live-trump-meeting-angela-merkel-white-house> [accessed 29 June 2017].

Liddell & Scott Greek – English Lexicon (1997) 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Oxford

heavy. (2016) *Donald Trump Rally in West Palm Beach, Florida: The Photos You Need to See* [image]. Available at <http://heavy.com/news/2016/10/donald-trump-campaign-rally-speech-event-west-palm-beach-florida-crowd-supporters-signs-shirts-children-paul-ryan-hillary-clinton/> [accessed 29 June 2017].

Horace *Ars Poetica*. Available at <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/horace/arspoet.shtml> [accessed 27 June 2017].

Kurbalija J and Slavik H [eds] (2001) *Language and Diplomacy*. Msida, Malta: DiploFoundation. Available at <https://www.diplomacy.edu/resources/books/language-and-diplomacy> [accessed 27 June 2017].

Lakoff G (2017) *Trump's Twitter Distraction, 7 March*. Available at <https://georgelakoff.com/2017/03/07/trumps-twitter-distraction/> [accessed 29 June 2017].

La Presse (2016) *La citation du jour* [image]. Available at [http://blogues.lapresse.ca/hetu/files/2016/11/CwW9\\_uhXgAA1jBO-420x236.jpg](http://blogues.lapresse.ca/hetu/files/2016/11/CwW9_uhXgAA1jBO-420x236.jpg) [accessed 29 June 2017].

Latin Dictionary (2017). *Nec verbum verbo curabis redder fidus interpres*. Available at [http://www.latin-dictionary.org/Nec\\_verbum\\_verbo\\_curabis\\_reddere\\_fidus\\_interpres](http://www.latin-dictionary.org/Nec_verbum_verbo_curabis_reddere_fidus_interpres) [accessed 27 June 2017].

Lüfkens M (2017) *Twiplomacy Study 2017*, 31 May. Available at <http://twiplomacy.com/blog/twiplomacy-study-2017/> [accessed 29 June 2017].

Lüfkens M (2016) *Twiplomacy Study 2016*, 31 May. Available at <http://twiplomacy.com/blog/twiplomacy-study-2016/> [accessed 29 June 2017].

Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2017) *diplomatic; glasnost; perestroika*. Available at <https://www.merriam-webster.com/> [accessed 27 June 2017].

MacLellan L (2016) Interpreters say it's nearly "impossible" to translate Donald Trump's rhetoric into other languages. *Quartz*, 26 October. Available at <https://qz.com/817886/i-pursued-her-like-a-strumpet-the-hazards-of-translating-trump-into-foreign-languages/> [accessed 27 June 2017].

Mann M (2016) *Social media has become the main driving force for change in diplomatic communication*, 31 May. Available at <http://twiplomacy.com/blog/social-media-has-become-the-main-driving-force-for-change-in-diplomatic-communication/> [accessed 29 June 2017].

Meko T, Lu D and Gamio L (2016) How Trump won the presidency with razor-thin margins in swing states. *The Washington Post*, 11 November. Available at <https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/2016-election/swing-state-margins/> [accessed 27 June 2017].

Navarro J with Karlins M (2009) *What Every BODY is Saying*. HarperCollins.

NPR - National Public Radio (2016) TRANSCRIPT: Donald Trump's Speech Responding To Assault Accusations. 13 October. Available at <http://www.npr.org/2016/10/13/497857068/transcript-donald-trumps-speech-responding-to-assault-accusations> [accessed 27 June 2017].

Nicolson H (1939) *Diplomacy*. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.

Permanent Mission of Russia to NATO (2014) Helping our Canadian colleagues to catch up with contemporary geography of [#Europe @CanadaNATO](#) [Twitter]. 28 August. Available from: [https://twitter.com/natomission\\_ru/status/505052838184370176/photo/1](https://twitter.com/natomission_ru/status/505052838184370176/photo/1) [accessed 29 June 2017].

*Politico* (2016) Full text: Donald Trump campaign speech in Wisconsin. 17 August. Available at <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/full-text-donald-trumps-speech-on-227095> [accessed 27 June 2017].

*Politico* (2016) Full Transcript: Donald Trump speaks in Michigan. 19 August. Available at <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/donald-trump-michigan-speech-transcript-227221> [accessed 27 June 2017].

*Politico* (2016) Full transcript: Donald Trump's jobs plan speech. 28 June. Available at <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/06/full-transcript-trump-job-plan-speech-224891> [accessed 27 June 2017].

*Politico* (2016) Trump has 'compromised' Bergdahl's right to a fair trial, lawyer says. 22 January. Available at <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/01/bowe-bergdahl-trump-218127> [accessed 27 June 2017].

Quartz (2016) *A body language expert analyzes Trump's awkward double finger-point* [image]. Available at <https://qzprod.files.wordpress.com/2016/10/gettyimages-615698544-e1476977186219.jpg?quality=80&strip=all&w=3200> [accessed 29 June 2017].

Rana K (2011) *The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Ambassador: Plenipotentiary to Chief Executive*. Msida, Malta: DiploFoundation.

RT (2014) Interpreter of Khrushchev's 'We will bury you' phrase dies at 81. 16 May. Available at <https://www.rt.com/news/159524-sukhodrev-interpreter-khrushchev-cold-war/> [accessed 27 June 2017].

Schmidt S (2017) 'Make America big again'? The headache of translating Trump into foreign languages. *The Washington Post*, 23 January. Available at [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2017/01/23/make-america-big-again-the-headache-of-translating-trump-into-foreign-languages/?utm\\_term=.0510c3664e3b](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2017/01/23/make-america-big-again-the-headache-of-translating-trump-into-foreign-languages/?utm_term=.0510c3664e3b) [accessed 27 June 2017].

Schudel M (2014) Viktor Sukhodrev, polished interpreter for Soviet leaders, dies at 81. *The Washington Post*, 17 May. Available at [https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/viktor-sukhodrev-polished-interpreter-for-soviet-leaders-dies-at-81/2014/05/17/674731d8-dde8-11e3-b745-87d39690c5c0\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.0f753fc6dd1f](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/viktor-sukhodrev-polished-interpreter-for-soviet-leaders-dies-at-81/2014/05/17/674731d8-dde8-11e3-b745-87d39690c5c0_story.html?utm_term=.0f753fc6dd1f) [accessed 27 June 2017].

Scott B (2016) Building relationships – politeness and face. *Language and Diplomacy 1610 Lecture 2*. Malta: DiploFoundation.

Scott B (2016) Soft Persuasion. *Language and Diplomacy 1610 Lecture 5*. Malta: DiploFoundation.

- Sky News* (2017) Diplomats slam PM's Russia warning to Trump in verse. 27 February. Available at <http://news.sky.com/story/diplomats-slam-pms-russia-warning-to-trump-in-verse-10744721> [accessed 29 June 2017].
- Slate* (2015) Lexicon Valley Blog - Help Us Diagram This Sentence by Donald Trump! 31 July. Available at [http://www.slate.com/blogs/lexicon\\_valley/2015/07/31/donald\\_trump\\_this\\_run\\_on\\_sentence\\_from\\_a\\_speech\\_in\\_sun\\_city\\_south\\_carolina.html](http://www.slate.com/blogs/lexicon_valley/2015/07/31/donald_trump_this_run_on_sentence_from_a_speech_in_sun_city_south_carolina.html) [accessed 27 June 2017].
- Spiegel* (2017) Donald Trump's Triumph of Stupidity. 2 June. Available at <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/trump-pulls-out-of-climate-deal-western-rift-deepens-a-1150486.html> [accessed 29 June 2017].
- Techniput (2015) Kuzka's Mother or Lost in Diplomatic Translation. 1 April. Available at <http://www.techinput.com/news/kuzka's-mother-en> [accessed 27 June 2017].
- Tessicini D and Federici FM [eds] (2014) *Translators, Interpreters, and Cultural Negotiators*. Palgrave Macmillan. Kindle edition.
- Tharoor S (2017) When Tweets Trump Diplomacy. Project Syndicate, 18 January. Available at <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/amazon-india-doormat-controversy-twitter-by-shashi-tharoor-2017-01?barrier=accessreg> [accessed 29 June 2017].
- The Free Dictionary (2017). *facilities; kairos*. Available at <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/> [accessed 27 June 2017].
- The Guardian* (2016) Barack Obama 'deliberately snubbed' by Chinese in chaotic arrival at G20. 4 September. Available at <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/sep/04/barack-obama-deliberately-snubbed-by-chinese-in-chaotic-arrival-at-g20> [accessed 27 June 2017].
- The Telegraph* (2017) Twitter diplomacy: South Korea appoints officer to monitor Donald Trump's tweets for foreign policy insights. 5 January. Available at <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/01/05/twitter-diplomacy-south-korea-appoints-officer-monitor-donald/> [accessed 29 June 2017].
- Time* (2015) Here's Donald Trump's Presidential Announcement Speech. 16 June. Available at <http://time.com/3923128/donald-trump-announcement-speech/> [accessed 27 June 2017].
- Tobin J (2017) A Revolt at the State Department? *National Review*, 7 June. Available at <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/448375/trump-vs-diplomats-state-department-officials-shouldnt-undermine-president> [accessed 29 June 2017].
- Trump D (2015, 2016, 2017) Twitter. Available from <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/>
- Twiplomacy blog (2016) *Emoji Diplomacy – a new diplomatic sign language*, 8 April. Available at <http://twiplomacy.com/blog/emoji-diplomacy-a-new-diplomatic-sign-language/> [accessed 29 June 2017].
- VSb (2016) *Locker Room Talk* [image]. Available at <http://verysmartbrothas.com/images/2016/10/trump-talk.jpg> [accessed 29 June 2017].
- Wheeler LK (2016) *Logical Fallacies Handlist*. Available at [https://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/fallacies\\_list.html](https://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/fallacies_list.html) [accessed 27 June 2017].

Wichowski A (2013) Social Diplomacy Or How Diplomats Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Tweet. *Foreign Affairs*, 5 April. Available at <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2013-04-05/social-diplomacy> [accessed 29 June 2017].

Winsor B (2017) Translators are struggling to interpret Donald Trump. *SBS Australia*, 24 January. Available at <http://www.sbs.com.au/news/article/2017/01/24/translators-are-struggling-interpret-donald-trump> [accessed 27 June 2017].

Wikipedia (2017) *Tom Brady*. Available at [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tom\\_Brady](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tom_Brady) [accessed 27 June 2017].