



SCIREA Journal of Sociology

<http://www.scirea.org/journal/Sociology>

June 19, 2020

Volume 4, Issue 3, June 2020

Killed by His Own Words: The media and Trump's Poor Communication Skills During Coronavirus Briefings Jeopardized His Political Career.

Aysar T. Yaseen

Arab American University-Palestine (AAUP)

Email: aysar.yaseen@aaup.edu

Abstract:

More often than not, the president in democratic countries is the role model for his people as they expect him to work for the welfare of the public and the welfare of the country and its institutions. Right from the outset of his presidency, president Trump evinced signs of ethnocentrism, discrimination, and love of power and authority. Furthermore, he showed affection and admiration for dictatorship governance. He fired a number of his aids after serving only for a short period of time in the White House, secretary of state Rex Tillerson for example. Trump enjoys playing the role of an omnipotent God. This was so prevalent since his inauguration. He downgraded countries. In his inauguration speech, he said: "We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products steeling our companies and destroying our jobs." The slogan "only America first" which carries racist connotations is repeatedly used by Trump on countless occasions. Trump humiliated journalists and downplayed their TV networks.

He accused mainstream media of peddling “fake news”. As for correspondents, Trump seized every opportunity to humiliate and belittle them; on many occasions, Trump sarcastically answer their questions. He called many of them derogatory names such as, “terrible reporters”, “hush, you are a very bad reporter”, “your network is bad”, “you are fake”, “you ought to be ashamed of yourself”, and “I think it is a nasty question”. The mainstream media realized that it is evident Trump’s narcissism, racism, bigotry, misogyny, ignorance, and lack of empathy. Getting rid of this dictator in a democratic and well planned way became a patriotic duty and a priority of the American mainstream media. The media found in the White House coronavirus task force briefings the only opportunity to get revenge for the unfair persistent humiliation by president Trump. They facilitated and participated strategically in these briefings. They came to these briefings knowing that Trump’s poor communication skills along with his affection for power and authority will put an end to this nightmare.

Key words: *communication; media; briefings; jeopardize; ethnocentrism; narcissism.*

Introduction:

Tannen (1998) argues that media purposefully try to create two sides for every story, “debate format”, to initiate the fight and to create the “presupposed” balance in reporting, and the result is paying more concern to this “assumed” balance rather than informing audience of the truth. Eventually, telling lies becomes inevitable. In many situations, there is no such existence for the “other side” or at least, this existence must be overlooked when the threat is nationwide or global. Presenting lies as a characteristic of one side or another is so devastating since people are often persuaded by lies rather than by truth. Media balancing between the two sides is an unachievable endeavor, and the predestined result is discrediting people and views for the sake of achieving the assumed balance. Tannen further suggests that this “debate format” approach entails erasing essential moral distinctions. The tendency to frame discussion of an issue as a debate between two opposing sides actually shapes policy makers’ attempts to address those issues and solve problems. In the end, it makes it much harder to see viable solutions and therefore less likely that a solution will be found. Media need to stir audience interest, which means arousing emotions,

and anger is one of the easiest emotions to arouse. When polarized debate is sought, those with the greatest expertise are often rejected or refuse to take part because they resist slotting complex issues into a simplified debate format. Those who are willing or eager to cloak their moderate expertise—or lack of it—in fiery capes are given the platform instead. When this happens, the entire society loses.

Not only the relative weight of opinions but essential moral distinctions can be erased when ideas are pressed into the debate format. So the biggest danger of the two-sides approach is erasing crucial moral distinctions. This might lead to not being able to differentiate between what constitutes lies and what is considered true; and hegemony in governance becomes inevitable.

In other words, the tendency to perceive discussion of an issue as a debate between two opposing sides actually shapes policy makers' attempts to address those issues and solve problems. In the end, it makes it more difficult to see viable solutions and therefore unlikely that a solution will be reached.

Media need to stir audience interest, which means arousing emotions. Anger is one of the easiest emotions to arouse. It is tempting for media outlets to step into existing debate framework. When polarized debate is sought, those with the greatest expertise are often rejected or refuse to take part because they resist slotting complex issues into a simplified debate format. Those who are willing or eager to cloak their moderate expertise—or lack of it—in fiery capes are given the platform instead. When this happens, the entire society loses, Tannen (1998).

There have always been missing moral tenets underpinning to the Trump presidency and Trump the man. Our life is more precious than just winning against opponents. It is evident that Trump is programmed to win. That's how he was raised, and that's how he lives. Everything is weighed against win/lose equilibrium. Many believe that no one human being has been given a lot of power and money and done almost nothing with it like Trump. As a president, people all over the world will remember him as an immoral president.

Positioning Theory:

According to the positioning act of the position theory, someone might be positioned by others or has positioned himself. In both cases, this positioning involves the attribution of qualities of

character, intellect, or temperament, sometimes supported by biographical reports on the past behavior of the person in question, Davis and Harre (1990). Furthermore, the positioned person is assigned or denied certain rights and duties for the sake of performing certain sorts of acts, thus constraining what he can rightly do or say, Harre, Moghaddam, Pilkerton-Cairine, and Sabat (2009).

The way in which this person's behaviours evolve, judged and justified in particular context is totally dependent on his performance as being competent/incompetent and trustworthy/untrustworthy, and whether these attributions such as being arrogant, overbearing, and excitable are context-sensitive. The question remains of the relevance of these attributes to the activities to which the positioning is germane. This involves presumptive valuation of personal characteristics in relation to these activities. Thus, being bossy can be the relevant personality trait when someone is positioned as having the right to issue orders during a natural disaster.

This pandemic must have placed Trump as the elected president in positions where he can act quickly and to the purpose anticipated by the American public. Being arrogant, overbearing, unsympathetic, a person who lacks empathy, and offensive cannot be the relevant personality trait appropriate for such emotions wrecker situation.

According to positioning theory, a public figure, a president for example, has to be more socially engaged. Assignments of rights and duties to a person depends on prior evaluative descriptions of that person. Drawing on personality psychology cannot be separated from attribution of qualities of character , since the key question relevant to local assignments to positions is what someone who tends to display this or that character trait in such and such social and material contexts is likely to do.

Public vs. Rhetoric presidency:

Presidential communication matters and makes difference. Beyond any doubt, presidential communication is a vital and crucial element of modern American presidential politics especially in the midst of exponential growth of the apparatus of presidential communication in the White House Office (WHO). No one denies that all American presidents in general and modern

presidents in particular devote more attention to communication especially in time of national disasters. Culturally, Americans simply expect presidents to communicate often and at great length about every public issue of the moment even if formalities of the office are not strictly applied, Ryfe (2005). Ryfe (2005) further stipulates that the thornier questions are how and why presidential communication matters. In addition, scholarly community differentiated between two approaches of presidential communication that stem from the premise that presidential communication matters, namely, “public” and “rhetoric” presidency.

Kernell (1997), argues that presidential power which relies mainly on presidential bargaining for agendas to go through operates on a two-tiered track: first along the line of the president’s reputation within the Washington Community, and a second according to the president’s public prestige. Kernell (1997) contends that in the “going public” model, Presidents rely upon public opinion for their leadership in Washington to an extent unknown when Neustadt predicated presidential power on bargaining. According to Ceasar et. al. (1981), this is due to the rapid rise of media outlets. The presidency is supposed to be the primary legislative catalyst in American politics, and rhetoric is its central tool in playing this role.

The rhetorical presidency model stresses the structural context of presidential communication far more than the public model. Presidential rhetoric came into being due to the changing institutional environment. As we know, the public presidency model suggests that presidents are simply misjudging or miscalculating the costs and benefits of engaging in this activity. For the rhetorical presidency model, however, going public maybe perfectly rational even when it is not especially useful for individual presidents. On its terms, all modern presidents must go public because the idea of presidential rhetoric has been institutionalized as a taken-for-granted norm in modern politics. This expectation, in other words, exercises a certain force on presidential behavior. Even if it is not a winning strategy, and even when particular presidents express discomfort with it, presidents go public because not to do so risks seeming “unpresidential.” For Tulis (1987), this idea—that the presidency ought to serve as a primary source of legislative and deliberative energy—represents nothing less than a “second constitution” in American politics—a layer of understanding about how the constitutional system is supposed to work that has been overlaid on to the original, founding conception.

Crockett (2003) argues that according to the rhetorical presidency model, there is a symbolic dimension of presidential rhetoric in addition to moving and affecting the public opinion, and presidents seek to reinforce and consolidate this. Going public serves an important systemic function. By doing so, presidents propose and campaign for policies because Congress and every other political institution is ill-equipped to do so since not every person or institution has access to media outlets. Going public then plays a major role in initiating and defining policy agendas. Individual presidents may go public to win legislative victories. However, the larger purpose of going public is institutional—the political system demands that presidents set and frame public and policy agendas for the sake and the welfare of his political party and political future.

Cultural presidency:

Mc Coombs (1976), Rogers and Dearing (2000), and Cook (1998) contend that public opinion is shaped by the media. News covered by the media tends to be identified by citizens as more important or salient than what is not reported or covered. For the public, the importance of the incidence or the reported issue is totally dependent on the time assigned for coverage; It is obvious that media favor official sources, and there is nothing more official than the president himself. Together, these facts give modern presidents a power and prominence enjoyed by no other political actor. It does not mean that they can rhetorically determine legislative outcomes. However, it does mean that presidents are capable of determining which issues will be placed on public and policy agendas, and how subsequent discussions will be framed as it is easier for them to appear on TV stations. Presidents set the terms of political discourse far more, and far more often, than other political actors. This gives them advantage in framing how these issues will be portrayed and discussed , Epstein (1973), Foote (1990), Kernell and Baum (1999), Sigal (1973), and Smoller (1990).

Contrary to the persuasive role of the presidents, Skowronek (1997), Jacobs and Shapiro (2000), and Mansfield (1989) insist that presidency is a matter of imposing its will. There is no time for persuasion; Presidents only endeavor is getting others to accept their choices. Presidential communication in this sense looks more like a form of accounting than of persuasion. Can presidents provide accounts of their actions (or potential actions) that seem authoritative to others? With recent overarching media and the globalization issues, it is hard for presidents to easily sell

their accounts of particular actions and decisions. The overwhelming accesses to media venues by the public as well as the competitions between media outlets for scoops make it difficult for the president to appear other than an authoritarian when forcing and imposing his account or will.

Communicative Competence:

Communicative competence is a term coined by Dell Hymes to mean the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in a particular communicative situation, Mesthrie et. al. (2009). Culture is learned through communication, and we also use communication to express our culture. Because people perceive the world differently and have different worldviews, misunderstandings, anger, hurting feelings, and other challenges are inevitable when they engage in communicative events, O’Hair et al. (2015), Lustic and Koester (2010), Solomon, and Theiss, (2013). Ethnocentrism, the belief that you and your culture are superior to others and their cultures results in anxiety and intimidation during communication. Ethnocentrism inhibits the ability to have successful communicative interactions, and therefore leads to discrimination. Ethnocentric communicator finds himself in situations where undermining, humiliating, and attacking (verbally and non-verbally) other interlocutors is inevitable since he communicates from the perspective of his own group without acknowledging other perspectives. Trump seized every opportunity to downplay whatever other countries and other heads of states do. He repeatedly blamed and accused China of doing nothing to hinder the spread of the virus. He further accused Chinese policy of being very detrimental to the health issue worldwide. Trump also showed tendency for enslaving as well as blackmailing heads of states, Gulf States in particular. He keeps on asking for billions of dollars in lieu of the so-called “protection”. This is done out of superiority and invincible belief of his own abilities. Accommodation which entails adjusting your language use toward the people participating in the communicative act is a successful strategy to improve your communication. Another strategy is improving your listening behavior; critical listening (evaluate and analyze before making judgement about a message you hear) and empathetic listening (openness, sensitivity and caring along with showing nonverbal cues) play a critical role in improving one’s communication skills. Since president Trump is fully convinced that he is superior to other presidents and America is invincible and superior to other countries,

and that his listening behavior is crippling, he will not be able to communicate appropriately and effectively in any context.

Textual Analysis:

As a form of accounting, presidential rhetoric is evaluated and deemed appropriate only in public life. This assumption extends to the act of presidential communication. Presidents do not define or create realities, only words do, and these words arise in context, not out of individual intentions or interests. In other words, presidential communication is cultural and carry cultural dimensions. A cultural approach to presidential communication gives room for questions: what is the context of presidential communication? Do presidents restrict themselves to particular contexts, or maneuverability is inevitable? The context of the presidential communication must be the events that are going on and are of concern to the public. But presidents voluntarily and purposefully choose at times to be irrelevant to the topic framework to serve particular interests. Taking into consideration the time constraints available for the presidents (presidency terms), presidents, out of power stance, do not constraint themselves to specific context as we find them switch between different types of contexts such as the cultural, the social, the temporal, and the psychological context seeking approval from the public while imposing their will. Luckily, media outlets, for reasons, can easily detect such practices and start giving them more coverage time for scrutiny.

Trump's long-time known bad temper sparked backlash from the media. The media had always thought of Trump as pliant president. They made him believe that he constitutes plenipotentiary power and formidable political opponent. Media found president Trump an easy prey who might fall for this trick, and they succeeded in pulling his legs; he is a man who is proud of his modest knowledge in almost all sectors of life, and politics is not an exception, for example, he never knew that there are so many countries in the world. He is as tyrannical, totalitarian, and stubborn as most power and authority seekers and lovers all over the world. He fell an easy prey for the interests and the manipulation of the media. Eventually, he turned these briefings into attacking and blaming others such as China, Europe, The World Health Organization, the rival Democratic party, etc. Less concerns were given to the pandemic itself and the victims and their families. Trump polarized the issue where he found it a chance to promote a free-of-charge campaign for

his upcoming election on the expense of the American taxpayers, and he mistakenly thought that the media implement his campaign. The pandemic forms a free campaign that costs neither Trump nor his party a penny. He campaigned based on lies at this critical time when people are so vulnerable. We all know that it is not the time for polarizing the White House coronavirus task force briefings when every single household in America is susceptible to this virus. It is a national enemy where all Americans must face this pandemic united. Trump proved that he is an entrepreneur who has little interest in public issues as well as politics. He appeared greedy investor whether at the national level or globally. On several occasions, he called for reopening the country and going back to work. He mentioned his own private businesses and how hard he was hit economically. Furthermore, he assigned the largest portion of his talk to business and investment rather than the pandemic itself.

The media grasped early the president's love of dictatorship along with his grudge against them. After a long and thorough scrutiny of the strategy on how the media response at the president's mistreatment is going to be, they find a golden chance in these briefings for appropriate and effective revenge. The "debate format" strategy was successfully used and consolidated by the media. They succeeded in (politicizing the pandemic) creating two opposing sides of this political-free issue. Almost none of the correspondents is a medical correspondent (all mainstream media outlets have medical doctors on their teams as correspondents). Unspecialized (nonmedical) journalists were purposefully and tactically drafted to the White House briefings. These journalists (on their news agencies directions) were preoccupied with the idea that the president is a dictator, a person who lacks knowledge in countless sectors of life, and a person who is under the pressure of the press going to fall into mishaps when talking about the present issue. They were all convinced that this is going to lead to political suicide. Tit-for-tat policy where the media tried to expose the president and portray him as narcissistic, a person with modest intellectual abilities, bigoted, ignorant, and a person who lacks empathy did really work. The journalists succeeded in agitating and annoying the president and making him angry on countless occasions by intentionally introducing the "debate format" where they brilliantly pulled his legs and aroused his emotions and anger. They managed to direct all the questions to him even the medical ones pushing him to control the talk time. Journalists made him lie as he is the type of person who hates to say "I do not know" and hates to get embarrassed. He is the kind of a person who hates to appear vulnerable. In addition, they were able to direct the president's

attention to other trivial topics which are irrelevant to the situation especially political issues so he does not show interest in talking about the victims and their families. As a result the president appeared to be a person who lacks empathy. Journalists succeeded in consolidating the idea “the other side” and portraying the other side as a rival or even an enemy. Above all, journalists managed to create some sort of disagreement and points of difference within the task force itself (on many occasions, Dr. Fauci corrected inaccurate or even false information said by the president regarding the virus) so a distrust and confusion may result. They also dedicated most of the time asking about the shortcomings and weaknesses in services to deepen the distrust between the president and his team, the governors, and eventually the American public. All in all, the media succeeded in portraying the president as a person unfit for the job.

On the one hand, some media outlets, CNN for example, dedicated hundreds of hours for live coverages of the White House briefings lead by Trump, and they knew that these briefings do not worth the time and the efforts. These briefing are simply a wrestling ring for Trump and his rivals where media outlets are not an exception. They knew that these briefings are uninformative, a time dedicated for lies and hyperboles, and they are simply money thrown away. On the other hand, CNN made available live coverages of New York governor Andrew Cuomo’s briefings on the pandemic. This was not haphazardly done. CNN knew that by drawing a comparison between Trump and Cuomo, the American public will realize that Trump is far behind Cuomo when it comes to commands of language, professionalism, reliability, trustworthiness, crisis management, and patience. American people tune into Governor Cuomo's briefings daily to get the information they need to know what's what. They believe that he is doing a masterful job of informing, consoling, and inspiring them. I quote an American lady by the name Mary once commented: “I make the same assumptions about what will come out of Trump's mouth. I watch and read Cuomo and other thoughtful, smart public figures for actual information. But I did watch some of Trump's briefings; I think it's important for us to know what our president is saying, even if 99% of it is utter nonsense. Americans need to be aware.” This is exactly what the media want to achieve by the live coverages of the president’s nonsense; they want the American people to become aware of their president who lacks the basics for successful communication. This comparison meant to tarnish Trump’s image and destroy his political future. I think that the plan worked, and mission was successfully accomplished. These briefings formed the mercy bullet that put an end for Trump’s era, and media have just pulled the trigger.

Briefings lead by Trump are loaded with lack of knowledge (using Clorox as an injection for treating coronavirus), outright lies (we have more than enough ventilators; we are going to start exporting ventilators to other countries; everyone outside the US is excited to watch us), distortions of truths (touting hydroxychloroquine as a cure for coronavirus), exaggerations (we will perform five million tests everyday), twisted ideas (the virus leaked in one of Wuhan's laboratories), criticism of others and their worldviews and perspectives (criticizing the Democrats as a political rival), personal attacks (called Joe Biden "sleepy Joe", and called Chuck Schumer "crying Chuck Schumer"), and blaming others without evidence, for example, blaming China for the spread of the virus, blaming the democrats of being his haters, and so forth. We all knew that his briefings were nothing but a mess of hyperbole (the virus will disappear like a miracle; it will disappear by April; it will disappear by August; it will kill 60,000 people by August; the virus will kill 2,500,000 people, but we are going to mitigate this to less than 100,000; coronavirus is a hoax, and the World Health Organization declared it a pandemic; we have a little problem in this country, and so forth). It's hard to imagine that such prattle about issues and a disease the whole world knows little about is from the leader of the free world. For example, his stunningly ignorant advice about injecting ourselves with Clorox and other disinfectants showed how naïve and ill-informed the president is. On many instances, Trump intentionally blamed and accused previous administrations of faulty conditions. On countless occasions, he claimed that nobody has done anything like we've been able to do. Actually, It's hard to think of any previous administration that could have so totally mismanaged a health crisis. By the use of these lies and distortions, Trump's lack of communication skills strikes Americans and their intelligence with insults on daily basis.

Trump's lack of knowledge or his shaky knowledge, bad temper, lies, hesitation, reluctance, and irresponsibility emphasized in his daily coronavirus briefings when portraying himself as the only one who can solve the problem encourage the media as an attack dog to constantly chomp at his back. His appearance in these briefings as an expert in virology and vaccinology did more harm than good to Trump as a person and to his political future as a president who might win a second term. According to many political and linguistic analysts, these briefings put an end to his political career and jeopardize all future endeavors as he appears as a danger to the republican party and the United States in particular and the whole world in general. Trump is not convinced that eradicating coronavirus pandemic is a collectivist approach rather than being an

individualistic one. His arrogance, selfishness, pride, totalitarian approach, and dictatorship deny giving credit to any person other than himself on fighting and winning the fight against this virus. He wants the credit for himself alone regardless of the means to achieve this.

Why then Trump was assigned to lead the daily coronavirus task force? Who took this decision? Was Trump aware of his psychological state, his political capabilities, his knowledge in the medical field, the public's satisfaction of his performance as the commander in chief, and most importantly his communication skills. In all these briefings, Trump proved to be far away from social engagement whether in his doings or sayings. He lied on countless instances and was unabashed of doing so, offended journalists and embarrassed members of coronavirus task force, showed no empathy with the victims and their families, dedicated a few minutes to talk about the pandemic itself and its victims, tried on many occasions to divert the attention to economy and financial issues, boycotted the World Health Organization and lashed it with all sorts of accusations, accused China of being secretive regarding the information about the eruption of the pandemic and blamed it for the assumed leak of the virus from one of Wuhan's laboratories, belittled his political adversaries, the Democrats, and heads of states, and imposed more and stricter sanctions on foreign countries on the pretext of fighting terrorism especially in this crucial time where countries of the world must work together to be able to eradicate this pandemic since no country has immunity against the disease.

American public believe that it is necessary to intensify conflicts for the sake of greater good. Positioning irrelevant issues at every level of the political process associated with the conflict lead to damaging consequences. Among the countless irrelevant topics invoked unnecessarily are ethnocentrism, discrimination and self-congratulatory. For example, Calling the virus "the Chinese virus" (ethnocentrism and discrimination), "accusing New York health workers and officials of stealing personal protection equipment (PPE)", "accusing a laboratory in Wuhan of leaking this virus to the outer world", "accusing China of lack of transparency and of holding information regarding the virus and that China did not act quickly to warn the world", "accusing China of intentionally transferring the virus to the world in general and America in particular when saying that China blocked its borders and prevented anyone to get to the country but allowed infected people to leave China to the US", and "accusing the World Health Organization of being pro-China and anti-US". Evidence of Trump's self-absorption, narcissism, self-congratulatory and self-praising is obvious when claiming: ("I'm like a very smart person". "I am

a very stable genius". "I, in my great and unmatched wisdom"), and obnoxiously self-centered can easily be detected in his briefings. One feels like living in dictatorship where anyone questions or objects, he is without doubt fired and punished. It is obvious how frightened the members of the task force whose main job is to defend the indefensible, and the magic word “Mr. president” or “the president” is always there to the rescue. You can only be saved by saying the magic word followed by praising the president and glorifying his doings. It was evident that the vice president, the surgeon general, business leaders, and members of the task force hastened to praise the president during the briefings. It was obvious that not doing so may result in losing their jobs. Their facial expressions, gestures, movements, body language along with their verbal messages reflected how terrified they were.

The American TV series “Apprentice” host by Donald Trump was only an exercise and a prerequisite for his presidency. Later after becoming the US president, he envisioned his role played in the TV series as the blue print for his governance. The role of sole and supreme power Trump indulged himself in in the series which enabled him to fire candidates and to enjoy their misery constituted his new personal constitution. He fired a large number of his aids for no clear reasons, and he enjoyed doing so. Many believe that he just did it for fun.

The president used euphemism to make serious issue and situations sound better or even trivial. On several occasions, he claimed that the virus is a little problem in America while it turned to be astounding public health crisis. The word “little problem” is used to soften the impact of a harsher word, namely “pandemic”. He used the word “hoax” instead of “fatal disease” in order to lie to the American public. Trump used the word “very quickly” instead of “a year and a half” or “two years” when asked about the availability of the vaccine. He suggested on several occasions that the virus was less serious than the flu. He used “We’re talking about a much smaller range” of deaths than from the flu. He used the word “mild” instead of “severe” when describing the symptoms saying: “It’s very mild”. He mitigated all the sufferings accompanied the infection by saying: “I’m not concerned at all” and “It will go away. Just stay calm. It will go away”.

The president used dysphemism at a large scale in his briefings where he tended to exaggerate the assumed bad qualities of his opponents. For example, before leaving to the state of Arizona on May 5th to visit the N-95 mask factory there he commented on the imported masks “the masks manufactured in Arizona are great not like the ones sent from other countries”. He accused China

of intentionally not doing enough to stop the spread of the virus saying “the Chinese could have stopped it, but they did not”. Before leaving to Arizona also he attacked his opponents saying “Dr. Fauci will testify before senate, not the House because there are Trump haters there”.

No one and no institution was out of Trump’s shooting range. He humiliated, blackmailed and threatened heads of states (Gulf states for example). News agencies, TV channel, and journalists were humiliated and publicly embarrassed by him. From the outset of his presidency, Trump saved no efforts to humiliate, belittle, threaten, warn journalist. Furthermore, their news agencies were not saved too; he sometimes accused them of treason. This phenomenon was consolidated during coronavirus task force briefings. The president who appeared appreciative of dictatorship governance used every single briefing to dominate the talk time, humiliated journalists along with their news channels, undermined all the American achievements and all the efforts done by others including governors, lied publicly by the use of hyperboles, proved to be ill-informed but insisted to be the all-knowing in wide range of disciplines (he claimed he knew as much as any scientist; he said: I like this stuff. I really get it. People are surprised that I understand it. Every one of these doctors said, ‘how do you know so much about this?’ Maybe I have a natural ability. Maybe I should have done that instead of running for president), embarrassed almost all advisors and members on the coronavirus task force, and ignored speaking topically where he was irrelevant most of the time to the main topic framework.

Conclusion:

The nature of Trump’s speech is without doubt self-aggrandizing, dishonest, and lacks consistency. Above all, his speech is immature. On many occasions, the use of technical terms (medical terminology) is just a mere of echoing medical professionals. His financial and economic repertoire as a businessman along with his ignorance in other fields, irrelevant to the topic framework, the pandemic, creep and dominate the talk exchange which added insult to injury. The level of vocabulary and sentence structure is nearly at the level of a toddler. His briefings are only repeating particular themes (ventilators, testing, China, reopening the economy) that lack solid evidence and reliability. His cognitive/linguistic repertoire is extremely limited. In his briefings, the mostly circulated and stressed terms are those self-congratulatory adjectives, specious arguments, and powerful words embedded with threat, authority, and undermining other

people and other countries. His briefings are only repetitions of the same words and sentences. In addition, most of his words are used out of context. On many occasions, he resorts for de-contextualization and re-contextualization where he strips speeches of professionals in the medical fields in particular of some of their parts and he parrots them publicly in different contexts.

The American people were fed up with made-up news and stopped believing the communication from top. The briefings were a waste of time. They were not worthy the time and the money spent. Trump's briefings were used mainly as a forum to extoll his imagined and false claims and accomplishments. They were a waste of time for the Americans who deserve better and for the country to move forward. Trump eluded showing compassion for the tens of thousands who have died and the unemployed millions who live on weekly pay checks. The real leader must have empathy with his people at least verbally. He rarely mentioned those Americans at the front lines (medical personnel, first responders, supermarket employees, civil servants) who risk their lives on daily basis providing care, support and services to keep the country running. These people do not want to hear a president who lacks the basic knowledge of communication skills, a president who thinks that people and countries are nothing and he is everything, a president whose main interest is to praise himself and threaten other people and countries at this crucial and critical time where unity and reconciliation are needed. They want to hear words that are real, true, and warm in addition to the nonverbal cues that support what is said so what is verbal does not appear dry and unrealistic.

The mainstream media outlets, verbally tortured and humiliated for a long time by president Trump, were the main beneficiaries. Knowing that these briefings were worthless and destructive to the nation, but still time, money and efforts were devoted for them by the media to seek revenge on the president. By live coverages, the media managed to portray Trump as the man of the hour and his briefings as important not only for the American public but also for the whole world. As a narcissist, self-absorbed, and a person who lacks the basic knowledge of communication skills, Trump falls for this trick, and the price is going to be hefty and painful.

It is worth mentioning:

- 1- The president should have not lead the briefings

- 2- The president should have not attended all these briefings. The White House should have only aired recorded material for the president where he expressed empathy with the victims and their families or if there is a breakthrough concerning the virus.
- 3- Only the medical team should have answered the questions.
- 4- All journalists must have been specialists, i.e. medical correspondents. This could have worked better for the sake of the country and the American people.

References:

- [1] Ceasar, J., Thurow, G., Tulis, J., and Bessette, J. (1981). "The Rise of the Rhetorical Presidency." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 11: 158–171.
- [2] Cook, T. E. (1998). *Governing with the News: The News as a Political Institution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [3] Crockett, D. (2003). "George W. Bush and the Unrhetorical Rhetorical Presidency." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 6: 465–486.
- [4] Davies, B., and R. Harre. 1990. Positioning. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 21:1–18.
- [5] Epstein, E. J. (1973). *News From Nowhere: Television and the News*. New York: Random House.
- [6] Foote, J. S. (1990). *Television and Political Power: The Networks, the Presidency, and the 'Loyal Opposition.'* Westport, CT: Praeger.
- [7] Harre, R., F. M. Moghaddam, T. Pilkerton-Cairnie, D. Rothbart, and S. Sabat. 2009. Recent advances in positioning theory. *Theory & Psychology* 19: 5–31.
- [8] Jacobs, L., and Shapiro, R. (2000). *Politicians Don't Pander: Political Manipulation and the Loss of Democratic Responsiveness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [9] Kernell, S. (1997). *Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership*. 3rd Ed. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc.
- [10] Kernell, S., and Baum, M. (1999). "Has Cable Ended the Golden Age of Television?" *American Political Science Review* 93: 99–114.

- [11] Lustic, W., M., and Koester, J. (2010). *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication Across Cultures*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- [12] Mansfield, H., Jr. (1989). *Taming the Prince: The Ambivalence of Modern Executive Power*. New York: The Free Press.
- [13] McCoombs, M. (1976). "Agenda-Setting Research: A Bibliographic Essay." *Political Communication Review* 1: 1–7.
- [14] Mesthrie, R., Swann, J., Deumert, A., and Leap, L. W. (2009). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [15] O’Hair, D., Wiemann, M., Imrich, D., Teven, M. J. (2015). *Real Communication: An Introduction*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s.
- [16] Rogers, E. M., and James W. Dearing. (2000). "Agenda-Setting Research: Where Has It Been, Where Is It Going?" In *Media Power in Politics*, edited by Doris Graber, 68–86. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- [17] Ryfe, D. M. (2005). *Presidents in Culture: The Meaning of Presidential Communication*. Peter Lang Publishing: New York.
- [18] Sigal, L. (1973). *Reporters and Officials: The Organization and Politics of News making*. Lexington, MA: D.C.Heath.
- [19] Smoller, F. T. (1990). *The Six O’clock Presidency: A Theory of Presidential Press Relations in the Age of Television*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- [20] Skowronek, S. (1997). *The Politics Presidents Make: Leadership from John Adams to Bill Clinton*. 2nd Ed. Cambridge: Belknap Press.
- [21] Solomon, D., and Theiss, J. (2013). *Interpersonal Communication: Putting Theory into Practice*. New York: Routledge.
- [22] Tannen, D. (1998). *The Argument Culture: Stopping America’s war of words*. New York: The Random House Publishing Group.
- [23] Tulis, J. (1987). *The Rhetorical Presidency*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.