

Original Research Article

Politics of Exclusion through Language in the Presidential Speeches of Donald Trump

Ameer Ali

University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: Ameer Ali, E-mail: ameer7037@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received: March 12, 2020

Accepted: April 16, 2020

Volume: 2

Issue: 1

KEYWORDS

Power, Knowledge, Politics,
Exclusion, Paranoia

ABSTRACT

The current research is an attempt to define and discuss the mechanisms of power as used by Trump in his presidential speeches that he has made during the year, 2017, in accordance with Foucault's Theory of Power/Knowledge. However, a number of research articles have been published on the speeches of Trump but no one has analyzed the mechanism of power in his speeches as discussed by Foucault. So, the present research fills up the gap by analyzing Trump's speeches using Foucault's power and knowledge theory. The researcher aims to answer the problem of mechanism such as politics of exclusion in the concerned speeches, the way Trump employs to create discourse and knowledge. In order to discuss and analyze the speeches, the study embraces the qualitative method that enables to answer the question related to power mechanisms. The discussion and analysis consist of the mechanisms such as American nationalism, Islam and politics of exclusion and paranoia. Besides it makes use of purposive, explanatory and descriptive designs of research to collect and analyze data using the above given theory. Thus, the study proves the way Trump uses discursive mechanisms of exclusionary politics in his presidential speeches.

Introduction

The human language is not just a tool of culture that is employed by people to communicate and transmit information. It is also an armoury of human mind to create knowledge and reality. This makes language an important tool of usage in daily life on one side, while on the other hand it becomes a quite interesting subject of critical study as it stands to represent truth and reality. Linguists adopt specialized and learned approaches from semantics and phonology to syntax and discourse in order to study language. Language is not only the tool of speech, but writing as well. Language utilizes textual constructions to create knowledge and reality that with the routinization and the passage of time becomes 'discourse' as Foucault (2012) terms it.

The disciplinary mechanisms of power generate discourse that as a consequence becomes the only access to reality by captivating the human beings. Politics, religion, identity, ideology, and science have their own mechanisms of power to create discourse and knowledge. Mostly discourses are not innocent, but they in a direct or indirect way advocate certain political concerns at the cost of the others. The speeches of President Trump also consist of the politics of exclusion that advocate the interests of the American corporate class and their supporters.

We live in a highly propagandized world where power is present everywhere. Power determines 'right' and 'wrong'. It creates knowledge and discourse that become true and unquestionable due to the productive nature of the propaganda oriented power. In these circumstances, it becomes very important to understand the power relations with propaganda so that one may have a real idea of the society in which one lives and one can save oneself from the oppression of power. The intention of the researcher is to use Foucault's theory of Power/Knowledge to interpret the propagandized politics of exclusion in the speeches of Trump. This research is important in its intention as it also wants to raise the critical consciousness of the people of contemporary society so that they may resist the discourses of power and their corrupt influence.

Foucault's theory of Power/Knowledge is very influential in its ideas and analysis. This implies the very close relationship between power and knowledge. Most of the writers have a great appeal to Foucault's idea of power and knowledge, the most important of them is Said, Edward. Said's inspiration from Foucault can be understood from the following lines as he has quoted in his masterpiece, *Orientalism*:

"The growth of knowledge is not additive or cumulative, but a process of selective accumulation.....within what has been called research consensus" (Said, 2008).

The politicians also make use of selective mechanisms of power to create knowledge and discourse as discussed by Said and Foucault. Donald Trump is the president of the most powerful country in the world. His speeches are highly disciplined by the mechanisms of power that enable him to exclude politically the people with different identities who are not Americans. When he was elected as the president of the country, he delivered his famous 'Inaugural Address' in which he has employed the mechanisms of exclusion best to the interests of his country. He has politically excluded Muslims, other nations and races in a paranoid way.

The researcher applies the theoretical framework namely Power/Knowledge as given by Foucault. The researcher has attempted to confine his research to the exclusionary politics in Trump's speeches on the basis of nationalism, politics, and paranoia. The researcher uses these categories to systematically discuss the politics of exclusion in Trump's speeches. This new Foucauldian approach is unique in its attitude to the analysis of Trump's two important speeches of the many that he has made during 2017. The deconstructive approach of the known theoretical framework mainly focuses the materiality of discourse, especially its relations to power that gives birth to it.

The relation of discourse to the exercise of power has been much stressed by the Foucauldian scholars. They argue that power creates knowledge and knowledge justifies power as a consequence. Foucault has emphasized the fact that power cannot be separated from knowledge. Power/knowledge constructs discourse that as a consequence creates a system of texts that construct the so-called 'truth' and 'the world'. Power allows one to make specific 'choices', 'inclusions', 'exclusions', and 'selectivity' within discourse. Similarly, the current research attempts to explore the political choices with reference to the above given categories.

The creation of discourse is a process that is constrained by power. Here power does not mean the force that the upper class of the society exercises over the lower class, but it stands for all those mechanisms of choices, inclusions, exclusions, and selectivity as they guarantee political and economic interests beyond the Marxist conception of power. President Trump creates his own version of reality that suits the interests of his policies. The speeches on foreign issues and domestic issues that he makes are characterized by the exercise of power. The very power, as Foucault has made known, determines rules and mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion within the discourse. Trump has used the concerned mechanisms of political exclusion in his Inaugural Address and other speeches. The researchers have imposed different theoretical impositions on the speeches of Trump. They have neglected or simply ignored the concept of power and knowledge as suggested by Foucault. This has left a research gap and the aim of this research is to fill up the gap.

Problem Statement

Language is not merely a source of information, but it is also a tool of mechanisms of power that is employed to create knowledge and truth. The politicians make use of the known mechanism to exclude the others who are not politically important to them and are threat to their power and privileges. Trump also makes use of mechanisms of power such as politics of exclusion in his speeches. So the current research makes use of Foucault's Theory of Power/Knowledge to analyse the mechanisms of power in the presidential speeches of Trump.

The intention of this research is to set forth the mechanisms of political exclusion as dictated by the mechanisms of power in the speeches of Donald J. Trump. The way Trump uses powerful position to include specific material and exclude 'other' things will be highlighted by this research to show how power plays a very significant role in the construction of our discourses. Moreover, the current research will pave the way for more academic research as well. The research will help the readers and the foreign policy makers in understanding the ways of political exclusion that Trump employs in his presidential speeches. This will also contribute to the field of critical discourse analysis by highlighting the value of disciplinary mechanisms to create discourse and knowledge.

Objective of the Study

This research intends to analyze the process of political exclusion through language in Trump's presidential speeches.

Research Questions

This research work addresses the following research questions:

- How does the process of political exclusion of American nationalism through language take place in Trump's presidential speeches of 2017?
- How does the process of political exclusion of Islam and paranoia through language take place in Trump's presidential speeches of 2017?

Delimitation

This research is delimited to the two presidential speeches of Trump that he has made in 2017.

Segment Breakdown

The first segment consists of introduction, statement of problem, significance of study, research objective, research questions, and delimitation of study. The second segment only contains explanation of literature review. In the third segment, research methodology has been included. In the fourth segment, the collected data has been analyzed using Foucault's theory of Power/Knowledge. The fifth segment concludes the research by suggesting some suitable alternatives.

Literature Review

Knowledge from the very beginning has been the crucial pillar of human civilization. It was first given to Adam by the Great Creator so that he may live in accordance with the right teachings and guard against the evil forces. The teachings and knowledge from the All-Powerful God were believed to be the ultimate form of unquestionable truth and were always highly compatible with the human nature. The compatibility of the sacred knowledge with human nature has always challenged the less authoritative and thus questionable Western discourses and knowledge that are not in accordance with the requirements of the human nature. Shariati (2008) has put the analysis of the established discourses in the context of human nature. He is more concerned with the capacity of human nature to adjust with the religious knowledge and the Western human constructed knowledge by explicitly associating his scholarly favour with the former one. Both of them make no any reference to the significance of mechanisms of power especially in the Western case in constructing knowledge about human society and beyond.

Moreover, since the time of the Greek stoics to the period of earlier Renaissance, Foucault argues, the human knowledge has been established on the basis of resemblance and the ternary notion of language (2012). For instance, the resemblance between the human brain and the walnut served as the apparent indication of establishing knowledge about the benefits of the walnut to the brain. The walnut and the brain and the characteristic resemblance between the two entities, combined to formulate the ternary structure of language and knowledge. The ternary structure of knowledge and language was established by the quality of resemblance between the two entities of nature. After the Renaissance, the language of man acquired the power of representation (2012). The ternary structure of knowledge was replaced by the binary theory of knowledge and language. Binary structure of knowledge and theory of language implied the representation of reality into 'signifier' and 'signified' the important idea that later on the French linguist Ferdinand de Saussure makes use of in his own theory of language (2012).

The post-Renaissance discourse and knowledge, as a consequence of the representative power of language, has been disciplined and constrained by the mechanisms of power (Foucault, Gillies, & Tantor Media, 2016). He views power as productive of attitudes, institutions, ideas, behaviours, and discourses in an irresistible way. In contrast, Fanon refers to the instance of the contemporary Algerian revolution as the resistance against the French colonial system (Said & Viswanathan, 2014).

Said (2008) has been critically conscious about the relation between power and knowledge. He has argued that from 1750s onwards the power and strength of Europe has enabled it to create 'the second order knowledge' about the Orient that V.G. Kiernan has preferred to call as Europe's collective day dream of the Orient (Said, 2008). In his masterpiece *Orientalism*, Said traces the relation between power and knowledge from Aeschylus' *The Persians* to the contemporary American social scientists by using Foucauldian framework of Power and Knowledge. Said uncovers the shallowness of the Western

knowledge in its limitedness about the Oriental societies and shows the historical captivity of the West to its discourses about the Orient, as well. In the analytical content of the book, he is not only confined to Foucault, but he has allowed himself to follow Gramsci by also revealing the disciplinary mechanisms of power that have produced the Orientalist discourses. He does not stay over there, but goes on to borrow from Vico the idea of anti-dynastic intellectual to dismantle the structure of the Orientalist discourses about the Orient.

The power to represent or to produce knowledge involves different mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion. Those mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion have been discussed by Derek Hook (2010) in his article 'Discourse, Knowledge, Materiality, History; Foucault and Discourse Analysis.' He has introduced more deconstructive Foucault. He has tried to show how the power chooses to include certain notions that with the passage of time become knowledge and discourse what Said has called 'tradition'. The author of the article has identified the four Foucauldian principles of discourse, namely, reversal, exteriority of text, discontinuity, and specificity. He argues that these four principles can be employed to identify the mechanisms of exclusion. His article is very informative into the mechanisms of power whether inclusionary or exclusionary, but he misses to discuss the force of political ambitions that design, shape, and give disciplinary structure to all the concerned mechanisms.

The discourses of politics are also subject to the political mechanisms of exclusion. The politics of exclusion has been studied by Whitaker (2005). She has focused the mechanism of the politics of exclusion in the context of Zambian politicians who approach courts to deprive their political opponents of the basic rights of citizenship. She believes that the politics of exclusion is a threat to the democratization of Zambia and it may sow the seeds of the political conflicts and civil war. The article of the researcher informs the reader about the challenges of politics of exclusion to the process of democratization. She is mostly concerned with the harmful impacts of the mechanism of exclusions, but she does not offer any workable alternatives of cultural assimilation and coexistence. She has merely taken a lamentable position towards the knowledge established about one's political rivals on the basis of politics of exclusion. In her case one can easily perceive Foucault's influence.

The disciplinary mechanisms of power are also applied by media to advocate specific agendas. According to Foucault power is everywhere, but nowhere else it is as active as in the case of media. Media represents the corporate class of America and their interests. Media keeps propagandizing their agendas through the constant use of the concerned mechanisms until they become the popular ideas among the common folks. The process has been defined by the American intellectuals as 'manufacturing of consent' (Bennett, Herman, & Chomsky, 1989). Besides, their analysis is American centric in its form and content. Outside American context they do not dwell much and they associate so much power with media that they seem to flatter it rather than critiquing it. They do not stress the culture of resistance against media hegemony nor do they discuss the possibilities of intervening into the counter discourses to media. That has been considered as the defective side to the media critics' stance towards power mechanisms. The special case of the President Jimmy Carter's control over media as studied (Rubin, Paletz, & Entman, 1982) shows the way the executive power exercises its influence on media agenda setting.

Power is not just limited to constructing and producing knowledge of a specific discipline of study, but it proliferates all the social aspects of life. The disciplinary mechanisms of power also shape activities and attitudes. The nature and dynamics of power to impose itself on the will of people have been defined as 'dehumanizing' by Kattakayam (2006). He has adopted the traditional attitude to the exercise of power that controls the gestures, behaviour, and movement of the human body especially in the Post-modern age. Like most critics of power and knowledge relations, the researcher fails to include the counter will that is excluded by including the established will to power. This latter type of will creates unquestionable body of ideas or to borrow Foucault's term 'episteme' of the known society (2012). It often happens in such cases when researchers like Kattakayam fail to provide the counter discourse to the established discourse.

The New Science of Vico was of the earlier masterpieces to discuss in a very insightful manner the imposition of discipline on human bodies, ideas and texts. Since the time of Vico, the critical focus has been centered to the discipline on texts. He used to say that the observations and theorizations are the acts of personal power (Vico, n.d.). This enables one to construct texts as one likes to construct them. As interpreted by Said, it makes construction of knowledge subject to power that actually imposes its will as a discipline on the body of texts. This act of theorization and observation as directed by power, basically, limits the complex structure of the multi-dimensional truth or reality by the mechanisms of exclusion (Said, 2000). Vico is of the opinion that theory of any discipline makes one captive of the confined theoretical language. The manufacturing activity on the basis of exclusionary mechanisms, as Vico has suggested, is regulated by the agency of discipline that controls intellect, desire, and will.

Chomsky (1992), in his scholarly work *Deterring Democracy*, says that the USA shaped the discourse of the Cold War to continue its policy of intervention after she faced the economic recession of 1948. He has clearly shown us the way the superpower country of the world exercised its power to create the discourse of binary oppositions by putting themselves on the true and right path while preferring communists to label as the representatives of evil and vice so they must be destroyed. Consequently, we have the decades of the Cold War that brought the most costly casualties of the later part of the twentieth century. This shows the power of discourse to create such an International order that caters to the interests of the most powerful countries of the world. Chomsky more optimistically has suggested the three crucial strategies of critical understanding, organization, and political activism to resist the influence of power, politics, and discourse of history.

Gayatri C. Spivak in her essay *Can the Subaltern Speak?* (1988) traces the mechanisms of power that have excluded the discourse and voice of the subalterns. She has interpreted it using the coinage of 'othering'. She makes quite interesting arguments to define the wretched of the earth that have been mostly excluded from the history. The exercise of power and othering of the subalterns have made it quite difficult for them to find their voice of resistance against the established mechanisms of power and social hierarchy. She gives the answer of the title in negative way. The weakness of her argument consists in her constant lament that the subalterns cannot speak, but in fact the revolution of Algeria and *The Subaltern Studies*, the feminist movements, the movement for the rights of the black people in America serves as significant instances to question the central argument of her essay. All these instances represent not only the voice of the subaltern, but also they show that they have gone beyond that into participating the political activism to gain their rights.

The above discussion serves as an attempt to define the discourse of power and exclusion as a form of process that is disciplined by power. The disciplinary mechanisms of power not only constrain the speeches and write ups of political leaders, but they also invest them with a privileged position to construct such an international system and order as it best serves the interests of the most powerful and rich people of the most powerful countries in the world. Budd (2015) argues that political leaders have made use of such rhetorical tools and mechanisms of power to manufacture consent among their political followers. Budd's argument is applicable to the current president of America, Donald Trump. The speeches of Trump have been analysed by using various theoretical impositions, but most of the researchers have either neglected or paid no attention to the disciplinary mechanisms as they operate in Trump's speeches. Though most of the scholars have attempted to do psychoanalysis of Trump's speeches and have shown their impact on the growing populism, yet mostly there is no such an article, journal or even a book that takes Foucauldian concept of Power/Knowledge to make critical analysis of Trump's presidential speeches. Besides, the political culture of America is influenced by the mental disorder of paranoia (Chomsky, 2010) and their fear from outsiders especially the Muslim immigrants has been studied by many scholars under the phenomenon of Islamophobia. The current research makes use of Foucault's theory of Power/Knowledge to interpret the politics of exclusion in Trump's speeches in terms of nationalism, religion, and paranoia. In these political terms no attention has been given to interpret the presidential speeches of Trump that he has made during the year 2017. This leaves a wide gap for the researchers to fill up. The researcher also takes into consideration the worldliness of his speeches and interprets the extracted excerpts accordingly.

Research Methodology and Theoretical Framework

Foucault argues that power is productive. It is a productive process that produces knowledge. That knowledge linked to or produced by power 'becomes true' (Foucault, 2009). The rest is either excluded or neglected. Power employs mechanisms of 'inclusion' and 'exclusion' to produce knowledge and discourse. The researcher makes use of this theory and collect data from the speeches of Trump for carrying out the research. The researcher critically evaluates the collected data by using Foucault's Theory of Power/Knowledge and tries to show the different mechanisms of political exclusion as intentionally chosen by Trump to create specific knowledge and discourse. The researcher focuses on the political mechanisms of power as discussed by Foucault (2009) in his Theory Power/Knowledge as given under:

According to Foucault (2009), Power/Knowledge should be considered as closely related. The exercise of power produces knowledge and power constrains the production of knowledge. More importantly, Foucault has defined power not only as productive, but constraining as well in process of creating knowledge and truth.

Similar mechanisms of power and knowledge can be found under work in the speeches of Trump. So the researcher has applied Foucault's theory of Power/Knowledge to analyse the mechanisms of political exclusion within the speeches of Trump in terms of American nationalism, political exclusion of Islam, and paranoia. In accordance with these elements, the researcher has analysed the known presidential speeches of Trump. The researcher has critically evaluated the politics of exclusion by using the known theoretical framework. The theory of Power/Knowledge has been adopted by the researcher

to analyse politics of exclusion in the presidential speeches of Trump.

Research Design

The design chosen for the current research is descriptive in which the researcher has discussed the politics of exclusion as used by Trump in his presidential speeches. It is explanatory as well, as it explains the mechanism of exclusion in Trump's speeches. Besides, the researcher has also adopted to do purposeful sampling of the specific chunks of his speeches in which the use of political exclusion is very prominent. The researcher has discussed the concerned mechanisms of political exclusion in his speeches using the known Foucauldian theoretical framework of power/knowledge.

Research Method

In the current research of the speeches, the researcher has adopted the qualitative method. The researcher has answered the research questions using the known theoretical framework. The researcher has shown the powerful mechanism of political exclusion to create truth and knowledge.

Data Analysis Method

The collected data from the speeches is analysed using Foucault's theory of Power/Knowledge.

Criteria of Data Selection

The Inaugural Address (2017) and The Riyadh Speech (2017) have been taken for the textual analysis as they meet the requirements and objectives of the current study. The researcher has taken the most prominent chunks from the known speeches of Trump using a purposeful technique of selecting the required chunks in order to meet the criteria of the theoretical framework.

Textual Analysis

In this segment, the researcher has carried out the task of analyzing and explaining Trump's presidential speeches in accordance with Foucault's Theory of Power/Knowledge.

American Nationalism

Nationalism implies the identity oriented politics. It represents the feelings of pride in one's history, culture, language, and territory for which one often feels the sense of belonging. All of these features construct one's national identity that is 'never constant' to borrow the post-structuralist terminology. One can easily assess the power of nationalism to create the nationalist discourses and knowledge that not only represent the different versions of reality and narratives, but also serve the clash of conflicting interests among the different nation states. The national pride is a prominent mechanism of power to create knowledge and truth as discussed by Foucault in his theory that become the functions of power.

A nationalist is someone who is at comfort to criticize the defects of the other nations, but he or she is often blind to the wrongs their own nation has done or is doing currently. The nationalist writers and speakers use powerful mechanisms to include the good and proud stories of their own nations in their speeches and writings, but they prefer to exclude the wrongs they have done to the other nations. In nationalist cases, mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion operate together to create discourse and knowledge till they are routinized into unquestionable truths. These discourses and knowledge become functions of power to develop ideas, attitudes, and behaviours among the people. This knowledge, at last, becomes the justification of the same power that produces it.

Political nationalism, whether religious or ethnic, has definite ambitions towards the acquisition of the so-called national interests at the cost of general interests. These goals can hardly be achieved, but for the knowledgeable manipulation by utilising the exclusionary mechanisms of politics. There, power plays a very crucial role. It serves the intentional mechanisms of the nationalist politicians who seek to out-legitimize the other nations by advocating their own 'national interests' that are in fact 'conflicting interests' in words of Adam Smith. The others who have different national identity or citizenship are politically excluded in the writings and the speeches of the nationalist politicians or leaders. Power creates knowledge with a kind of propagandized shape, till it becomes professionalized discourse. Politics of exclusion is a disciplinary mechanism of power that is employed by the nationalists upon the texts to generate those truths and knowledge that justify their position and authority.

Nationalism and politics of exclusion have closely related integration. Nationalists are driven by their pride to impose constraints and limitations as discussed by Foucault (2009) in his Power/Knowledge Theory, on the creation of discourse and knowledge in order to politically exclude the others on the basis of their political nationalist interests. Donald J. Trump is an American president and an American citizen. He is an American nationalist who feels proud of his nationality and American values. Nationality is the creation of power. President Trump is in a privileged position that enables him to make speeches, addresses, and lectures that advocate the American national interests even at the cost of the rest of nations in the world. He uses well-chosen words, sentences, and discourses to produce such type of knowledge, truths, and opinions that best advocate the fixed American national interests. The nationalist restraints are mechanisms of power to borrow Foucauldian terminology that politically exclude the others from Trump's discourse and speeches. Foucault's mechanisms of power that politically exclude the others and thus create knowledge are clearly visible in Trump's speeches.

In his *Inaugural Address* that he made on January 20th, 2017, after being elected as the President of the United States of America, he clearly makes use of political exclusion on the basis of American nationalism to create truth, reality, and knowledge and as a consequence all these become functions of power. He chooses a phrase 'historic movement' (2017) to define his programme for the people who had come to listen to his presidential speech. He goes on to brag that 'the world' (2017) has never witnessed such type of movement. This statement vividly represents American nationalism that politically excludes the rest of the world. He nationalistically includes the greatness of his nation to launch such historic movements that the rest of nations in the world have no capability to start and follow. This mechanism politically excludes the rest of the world as incapable. Thus he creates nationalist knowledge in accordance with Foucault's Power/ Knowledge Theory (2009) to credit his own nation and it influences the millions of the people who passively receive it. The numbers of people are there to resist it critically, but mostly it is routinized until it becomes unquestionable truth to favour the same power and serves its functions as stated in the known theory.

He also employs the power of binary opposition to represent American nationalism in the following statement:

(I) "we've defended other nations' borders while refusing to defend our own" (The Inaugural Address, 2017).

He means to refer to the allies of the US by the other nations. He feels quite at home to address the millions of people by repenting the interventionist policy of America to help out its allies or to fight against her own enemies throughout the world. Being an American nationalist, he feels the losses that American nation has suffered in its wars, but by choice he politically excludes all the losses that the other nations of the world have suffered due to the American interventionist policies in breach of the International law. Iraq is a recent case. He politically excludes the wrongs that his country has done behind the curtain of nationalism. Subsequently, the exclusionary mechanism constructs such type of knowledge that justifies his nationalist stance. This power/knowledge permeates the American society and gets established into taken for granted truth as discussed by Foucault (2009) in his theory and thus become the justified function of the same power. Against these truths and discourses there is need of counter discourses and political resistance. The entire speech shows American centric approach of Trump who wants to create American nationalist discourse to address the appeals of the American populism.

"From this day onwards it is only going to be America first- America first"
(The Inaugural Address, 2017).

In the above statement, Trump gives an exclusionary vision that entertains the idea of American nationalism. The mechanism of exclusionary power is at work over here. This mechanism is politically nationalist in its form and content that advocates all the interests in favour of the American nation. This constructed vision, that is a form of knowledge, not only excludes the betterment of the other nations, but it also exerts its influence to gravitate the struggle of the American people to a vision that they receive from their president as true, beneficial and guiding. This way it serves the function of power as described in Power/Knowledge Theory. This shows the integrated relationship between knowledge and power in nationalist terms at the cost of politically excluding the other nations.

In his *Ryadh Speech* (2017) that he has made on the occasion of his official visit to Saudi Arabia, the politically nationalistic exclusion of Trump reaches its peak when he makes a quite daring remark. This statement by Trump is not merely an innocent type of textual construction of truth, knowledge and reality, but it involves mechanisms of power such as political exclusion as it caters to the American national interests. The statement is given over here:

(II) “This is a battle between good and bad...” (The Riyadh Speech, 2017).

The binary opposition over here between good and bad is very crucial to Trump’s politics of exclusion and American nationalism. The use of power has enabled Trump to create the notion of binary division by borrowing from the ‘archives’ of Orientalist discourses. Trump means to imply that terrorism represents the other side of the world that is non-American and thus can be labelled as bad and evil. The American world of Trump symbolically represents the forces of good that is always in a battle against the non-American terrorist world. The power of ethnocentric pride, Orientalist discourses, and American nationalism constructively allow Trump to create knowledge in the form of concerned binary oppositions of good and evil. Foucault’s notion of Power/Knowledge (2009) is very prominent here. He means to say that America stands for peace, but Iran represents terrorism. He politically excludes Iran as rival and terrorist state and a threat to American values. The exclusionary mechanism of power includes America as a peaceful state and Iran as a terrorist state. This binarization of knowledge distorts the actualities that stand to provide the instances of the American terrorism, but the mechanism of power is so strong in Trump’s case that the other side of the truth is totally excluded. This process goes on mostly unchallenged so it should be countered contrapuntally. This shows that power creates knowledge and truth by exploiting the texts and discourse that become the functions of power in Foucault’s terminology, a dangerous mechanism that should be resisted.

Political Exclusion of Islam

Islam is a religion of peace and monotheism. The followers of Islam are called Muslims. The word ‘Muslim’ means someone who surrenders his will to the will of the Almighty. Islam is the second largest religious faith on this earth. The attitude of most of the Western scholars towards Islam has remained very suspicious since its very birth in the desert of Arabia. Islam has been constructed by them as existential threat, political rival, and religious competitor to the West’s Christianity.

In his *Inaugural Address*, Trump has taken a definite and traditional stance towards Islam. He has bought this stance from the precedent Orientalist discourses and social scientists’ technical terminology about Islam that have always suffered the crisis of recurring disparity between reality of Islam and its representation. The chunk from Trump’s speech is given as under to be deconstructed:

“We will...unite the world against radical Islamic terrorism...
(The Inaugural Address, 2017).”

This defines the traditional approach towards Islam by Trump that involves exclusion of Islam. He approaches Islam, a popular culture and religion, in a very direct manner. This manner derives its directness from the power of Orientalism and Islam phobic attitude of the West. He intentionally chooses the words like ‘radical’ and ‘terrorism’ to produce knowledge about Islam. The other people of different faiths such as the Jews of Israel and the Budhists of Burma are excluded from the productive characteristic of Trump’s power. In Foucauldian Power/Knowledge interpretation, he produces Muslims as ‘radical’ and ‘terrorists’. This becomes knowledge and truth about Muslims according to the known theory and the selective knowledge serves to justify the exclusionary function of power. There has never been any mention of the Jewish terrorism against the innocent Palestinians in any of Trump’s speeches. Trump sees Israel as political ally and thus dares not to condemn its acts of aggression. Trump prioritizes Israel over the entire Muslim world. No country in Islamic world is as dearer to Trump as Israel. So he employs the concerned mechanism of political exclusion to construct Islam as ‘radical’ and ‘terrorist’ by excluding the peaceful aspects of Islam. He actually exercises power to create a narrative and knowledge about the post- Revolutionary Iran as an existential threat to the entire world and ascribes all the terrorist activities to it much to the laughter of the people of critical consciousness. This specific construction of Anti-Muslim and Anti Iranian narrative and thus knowledge that becomes American version of reality proves the statement of Foucault’s theory. He wants to create such a global order that advocates the interests of Israel and America so he considers it his duty to demonize Iran and construct opinions of the people accordingly. The exercise of power thus to create knowledge and reality pose existential threat to the peace and prosperity of the world and hence must be countered critically.

The mechanism of political exclusion of Islam has been vivid throughout the later part of the twentieth century in the American media and the social science discourses, especially after the revolution of Iran. This enables Trump to create the stereotypes against the diverse world of Islam. The following instance in its stereotypical and knowledgeable manipulation

of the youth of Muslims by Trump serves the idea of the inextricably integrated relation between power, knowledge, and reality as suggested by Foucault in the above given theory.

“Young Muslim boys and girls should be able to grow up free from fear, safe from violence, and innocent of hatred” (The Riyadh Speech, 2017).

This statement has gone through politically exclusionary mechanisms as stated in Power/Knowledge Theory, before being uttered officially in Riyadh, the capital of Saudi Arabia, to the general public. This statement politically excludes the youth of Muslims from the arenas of bravery, peaceful safety, and humane love. The construction of Muslims as creatures who live under the constant threats at their lives serves the powerful mechanisms of exclusionary politics. The choice of auxiliary ‘should’ reinforces the obligation that in Trump’s words, Muslims have never bothered to fulfill and he acts as an older and wiser to suggest them to make themselves capable. The production of this piece of knowledgeable advice presupposes that the Muslims do not follow the dictates as defined by Trump. He means to create the conception about the youth of Muslims as captives of paranoia and xenophobia. He reduces the entire Muslim youth to the concerned categories at the cost of exclusion of those Muslims who have in fact overcome the known psychological problems. This grid of categories signifies power mechanisms that in accordance with Power/Knowledge theory, politically excludes the Muslim youth and reduce them to the known categories of knowledge that become the so called true opinions of the people who buy them uncritically. This propagandized form of knowledge and power against the well-educated Muslims should be resisted in its function in order to establish their true and real social introduction to avoid the consequences inhumanely.

Paranoia

Paranoia stands for a kind of fear that one feels from other religions or nations. It also stands for the fear of foreigners that one believes as threat to one’s security and interests. The history of American politics is replete with paranoid mechanisms of exclusions. The American rulers have made use of the element of paranoia to produce the fearful knowledge and notions among their compatriots against the others or the outsiders who are not Americans. Since it is also helpful in creating knowledge and reality, so paranoia can be termed as mechanism of political exclusion or power in the language of Power/Knowledge Theory. The American politicians have excluded not only the communists around the world, but also the Muslims have been excluded as terrorists, evil, and fascists in their selective process of knowledge in Foucault’s theoretical view who, in accordance with the paranoid American concepts, have posed a dangerous threat to the Americans.

Paranoia serves the functions of power by imposing the paranoid discipline on the creation of texts, knowledge and discourses as discussed in the above given Foucault’s Power/Knowledge Theory (2009). All these in the matter of time become the functions of power (Foucault, 2009). Where there is power, there work the mechanisms of political exclusions. Since paranoia is fear of the outsiders, so it crucially determines the speeches of politicians and their discourses that as a consequence represent their political interests. The knowledge created in this manner can be called as paranoid knowledge. President Trump has also made the political use of paranoia to exclude the others as fearful to justify the increasing military budgets and agreements with his allies such as Israel and Saudi Arabia. The following statement serves the instance of exclusionary, political, and paranoid form of knowledge and reality:

“We have defended other nations’ borders while refusing to defend our own” (The Inaugural Address, 2017).

There is a clear emphasis on the need of security and defence in the above statement. The security, in his words, can be achieved by defending the nation-state borders. The emphasis on the need of security reflects the paranoid attitude of Trump to the existential threat that lies in ambush beyond the borders of his nation. The existence of threat, whether it exists or not, compels Trump to emphasize the border security of America while excluding the significance of security to the other nations that are, according to Trump, not politically as important as the security of America. He even cannot compromise its security with the security of the American allies. The paranoid conception has enabled him to create knowledge as discussed by Foucault, in terms of the binary opposition such as security of their borders and our borders.

The use of paranoia to create knowledge and the so called truth is very crucial over here as discussed in the theoretical framework. It allows Trump to create binaries between the terrorists from the other nations who are threat to American peace and security and the American people who would be the victims of the imminent threat. The creation of paranoid truths, knowledge, and discourses by employing binaries serve the functions of power relations and mechanisms of exclusion as stated in the above given theory. The above knowledgeable selection of paranoia politically excludes the others

as terrorists, threats, and fundamentalists, because it in fact justifies the governmental spending on defence that actually means offence and creation of the knowledgeable interventionist policies.

“Terrorism’s devastation of life will continue to spread. Peaceful societies will be engulfed by violence.” (The Riyadh Speech, 2017).

The above statement, as usual, emerges as a consequence of the exclusionary and powerful mechanism of politics. This statement has emerged as a piece of knowledge after going through the mechanism of paranoia in terms of productive power. The mechanism of paranoia serves the intentions of the power being exercised. Trump uses the mechanism of power to create the paranoid knowledge and truth that develop the paranoid behaviour and attitudes of the common people. He means to imply that terrorism is going to overcome all the peaceful societies of the world by excluding the importance of those forms of resistance that people around the world with different faiths including Muslims are undertaking to defeat terrorism. He clearly terrifies the common people by creating the paranoid form of knowledge. The relation between power, paranoia, political exclusion on one hand and the production of knowledge on the other hand is very clearly perceptible in the above statement by Trump as emphasized in Foucault’s Power/Knowledge Theory (2009). He excludes terrorism on the basis of paranoia outside the boundaries of peaceful societies. This exclusion is political in its form and content as it justifies the American interventionist policies on the basis of anticipatory self-defence as caused by paranoia, a mechanism of exclusion.

Conclusion

The last segment has been concluded on the basis of the findings and gaps that existed in the previously conducted researches. The current research will also open up new dimensions of analysing political and other texts by imposing Foucault’s Theory of Power/Knowledge (2009). Besides, it will also pave the way for many researchers to conduct research in a line to study the mechanisms of political exclusion with reference to Foucault’s Theory of Power/Knowledge.

This study has made it possible to critically understand the creation of knowledge and truth in the exercising process of power. Moreover, one of the most significant contributions of this research is that it has made us able to critique and better comprehend the fact that power produces knowledge by employing the politics of exclusion. Interestingly, it has exposed the different mechanisms of exclusionary politics to create knowledge, such as, nationalism, Islam and the politics of exclusion, and paranoia. This research has revealed the politics of exclusion in the speeches of Trump who employs exclusionary mechanisms of power. Moreover, this research also provides the readers a will to counter the exercise of power that creates political discourses at the cost of excluding the other side of truth and knowledge. This research emphasizes the use of critical consciousness to resist the concerned mechanisms of power that create knowledge, opinions, and truths. This also clarifies the fact that speeches of the politicians or rulers are not innocently constructed, but they are controlled and maintained by the different mechanisms of power.

In the end, the Presidential speeches of Trump with reference to Foucault’s Theory of Power/Knowledge can be concluded by stating that power is a disciplinary mechanism that is exercised on political and other discourses to create knowledge and reality by excluding the concerned entities. Besides, this research also invokes the common readers to adopt a type of resisting and dissident approach to counter the concerned mechanisms of power and its productivity so that production of knowledge and truth can be impartially balanced. Furthermore, the imposition of the concerned theoretical framework on the above given speeches is quite helpful in developing the critical consciousness among the common readers who are hammered constantly into believing the one side of truth and knowledge owing to the active mechanisms of power.

Finally, this research is not wholly perfect in its findings and conclusions. Indeed, this is systematic analysis of knowledge and truth, yet it makes no claim of final truth or perfect knowledge. This research is a form of investigation carried out by a human being, so it may have its defects as all those things that are created by humans have their own defects. This current research has its own gaps and faults that can be made subject to criticism for the sake of improvement. These findings and conclusion serve the objective of the current research by exposing the politics of exclusion in Trump’s presidential speeches using the concerned theoretical framework.

About the Author

Ameer Ali is a research scholar at University of Sindh, Jamshoro where he is pursuing the degree of research in Applied Linguistics. His domain of expertise is critical discourse analysis that he systematically carries out with academic success and passion.

References

- [1] Bennett, J. R., Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (1989). Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media. *Contemporary Sociology*, 18(6), 937. doi:10.2307/2074220
- [2] Chomsky, N. (1992). *Deterring democracy*. London: Vintage.
- [3] Chomsky, N. (2010). *Hopes and prospects*. Chicago, Illinois: Haymarket Books.
- [4] Foucault, M., Gillies, D., & Tantor Media. (2016). *Madness and civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason*. Old Saybrook, CT: Tantor Media.
- [5] Foucault, & Michel. (2012). *The Order of Things*. Routledge.
- [6] Hook, D. (2010). *Foucault, psychology and the analytics of power*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [7] H.ku.edu. (n.d.). lecture notes on Foucault [word document].
- [8] Kattakayam, J. J. (2006). Power and Knowledge: Some Reflections on Contemporary Practices. *Sociological Bulletin*, 55(3), 449-467. doi:10.1177/0038022920060306
- [9] Rubin, R. L., Paletz, D. L., & Entman, R. M. (1982). Media Power Politics. *Political Science Quarterly*, 97(4), 704. doi:10.2307/2149809
- [10] Said, E. W. (2000). *Reflections on exile and other essays*.
- [11] Said, E. W. (2008). *Orientalism*. Princeton, NJ: Recording for the Blind & Dyslexic.
- [12] Said, E. W., & Viswanathan, G. (2014). *Power, politics and culture: Interviews with Edward W. Said*.
- [13] Shari'ati, A., & Campbell, R. (2008). *Marxism and other western fallacies: An Islamic critique*. New Delhi: Markazi Maktaba Islami Publishers.
- [14] Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the Subaltern Speak? *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, 271- 313. doi:10.1007/978-1-349-19059-1_20
- [15] Vico, G. (n.d.). Introduction. *Vico: The First New Science*, xix-xxxviii. doi:10.1017/cbo9781139163705.001.
- [16] Whitaker, B. E. (2005). Citizens and Foreigners: Democratization and the Politics of Exclusion in Africa. *African Studies Review*, 48(01), 109-126. doi:10.1353/arw.2005.0047