Hate Speech in Political Discourse

An Analysis of Former US President Trump's Rhetoric

Ghaleb Rabab'ah[1,2] · **Asmaa Hussein**[1] · **Samer Jarbou**[2]

Abstract

The speeches delivered by Former U.S. President Donald Trump during his last presidential campaign (2015–2016) included hateful remarks against Muslims and immigrants. This study explored strategies of hate speech used in Trump's political discourse against out-groups. The data consisted of a corpus of Trump's speeches and interviews. Our analysis was based on Whillock's [48] criteria of hate speech and Erjavec and Kovačič's [13] strategies of hate speech. The results revealed that Trump employed re-articulation of meaning and renaming by attributing any problem to immigrants and Muslims to express hatred against them, using direct hatred words. His overt use of hate speech strategies stemmed from his legitimate power and social authority as a successful businessman in his field.

Keywords Hate speech · FTAs · Stereotyping · Profiling · Power relation · Hatred

1 Introduction

People can explicitly or implicitly convey their thoughts, beliefs, and feelings through words. One of the feelings that people express through language is hatred. In essence, hatred becomes more prevalent and intense in mixed communities where people from different social, religious, and political backgrounds live side by side. Hate speech, encouraged by social media platforms, is linked to freedom of expression [35]. People may mistakenly or actively propagate hateful messages by using their right to free speech.

✉ Ghaleb Rabab'ah
  ghalebrababah@gmail.com

1   Department of English Language and Literature, The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan

2   Department of Foreign Languages, University of Sharjah, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates

🐾 Springer

The concept of hate speech is intricate and multidimensional, as it can have a variety of meanings depending on context, attitude, and emotion. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of the United Nations [37] defines hate speech as any expression of support for discrimination, animosity, or violence based on nationality, race, or religion. Similarly, Delgado and Stefancic [11] suggested that hate speech is a deliberate and malicious public statement meant to disparage a group of people. Similarly, Reddy [32] considers it a discourse of power, dominance, and control. According to Erjavec and Kovačič [13], hate speech refers to any form of verbal abuse directed towards a particular group of individuals because of their race, ethnicity, religion, gender, age, sex, political views, or other identifying characteristics.

Hate speech is also defined as an expression driven by resilient nationalism, intolerance, or discrimination. It is a type of rhetoric intended to offend marginalized groups because of their ethnicity, religion, race, or sex [1]. Hate speech includes harmful and insulting expressions of opinion directed toward marginalized groups. The producers of hate speech consider themselves superior due to their status, power, education level, skin colour, or national identity. For Brown [6], a comprehensive definition of hate speech can be problematic because it can incite acts that exacerbate violence. Alongside hate speech, rude and impolite strategies have also become increasingly common in contemporary communication [31, 9]. Recently, UNESCO [36] defined hate speech as "a virulent form of discrimination that targets and undermines the human rights of persons and peoples based on their –presumed – identity and serves as a driver of populist narratives and violent extremist ideologies (9).

Based on the aforementioned definitions, the primary goals of hate speech are to spread extremist views, hurt individuals and groups based on their inherent characteristics, and cause humiliation through personal attacks. Adamczak-Krysztofowicz and Szczepaniak-Kozak [1] suggest that the strategic aim of hate speech is to unite extremists and communicate their views and ideologies about minority groups based on inherent features. In addition, hate speech aims to hurt people with impoliteness or offensive words. Hence, hate speech is primarily driven by personal views and intended to cause humiliation, a face-threatening act.

Some people use hate speech to convey sarcasm or irony, but this type of language is typically aimed at marginalized ethnic or religious groups and women [26]. Matsuda [26] identified three defining features of hate speech: it purports the inferiority of certain races or groups, targets oppressed communities, and is degrading and abusive. Brown [5, 6] argues that the primary goal of hate speech is to foment hostility between the "us" and "them" groups.

Politicians often use different rhetorical strategies, including hatred remarks, to persuade their audience by appealing to their emotions. According to Guynn [15], there was an uptick in hate speech during the 2016 presidential election in the United States. A good example of this is the former President of the United States, Donald Trump, who launched his campaign on June 16, 2015. Trump employed words that were crude and provocative; they were meant to anger and inflame. He used inflammatory language aimed at Muslims and immigrants, borrowing terms of abuse to strengthen his negative impressions and stir up the US community's anger.

Trump's speeches during his presidential election campaigns must be located, rather contextualized, within the post-9/11 socio-political moment of the United

States and indeed in the larger trajectory of its history of immigration. The 9/11 attacks acted in such a way that the impact became more suspicious and stigmatizing on Muslim societies, something that Trump's statements exploited and increased. First, the long, tortuous, and conflictive history of the United States regarding immigration, marked by the implementation of xenophobic waves, dissonance, and inclusivity, seems to offer a kind of basis to lay down Trump's comments and hate speech. His speech draws from a historical stereotype and fear that immigrants would either be an economic burden to the country or a dilution to American culture.

We employed Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) proposed by Van Dijk [44] as the theoretical framework to provide a sophisticated methodology for analyzing Donald Trump's speeches during his presidential campaign, placing special emphasis on his use of hateful remarks towards Muslims and immigrants. This approach analyzes how Trump's rhetoric effectively constructed these groups as the "out-group" and a threat toward the "in-group" of American society. This is done through the CDA, which opens the door to understand the interconnection between discourse, power dynamics, social inequality, and ideological tenets linked to language use in political settings. This paper, therefore, examines Trump's discourse from this perspective in an attempt to look at it for its tendency to construct and reproduce the social relations of power, domination, and inequality; therefore, it informs public perception and attitude towards the targeted outgroups. More specifically, this study seeks to answer the following research question:

1) What are the strategies of hate speech used by Donald Trump the 2016 U.S. presidential campaign?

2) How does the hate speech that Donald Trump used in the course of the 2016 US presidential campaign both reflect and, at the same time, support the underlying societal ideologies and power structures, most notably, in the building up of Muslim and immigrant identity as a threat to US society?

2 Critical Discourse Analysis as a Theoretical Framework

Van Dijk [46] defined CDA as an analytical discourse study that examined how social power reproduced and justified the inequality woven into the text of social and political context. Van Dijk [45] underscored the very fact that discourse analysis needs to be taken within a broader social, political, and historical context. He opines that discourse cannot be assumed on a freestanding basis but rather has to be sited in larger social structures and practices that inform it. Language, for him, is part of the mental representation. Van Dijk [43] provides a socio-cognitive account, which focuses on the "discursive reproduction of racism by the press" (254). On this regard, Van Dijk [38, 39, 41–43, 47] developed an analytical framework for analyzing news discourse, more specifically, that of the newspaper articles. Van Dijk [41] proposed a triangle framework for language use that consisted of three dimensions: discourse, society, and cognition. Van Dijk [46] affirmed that textual and contextual elements, as well as the social structures of institutions and groups, controlled how people communicated. According to Van Dijk [41, 42], discourse is considered a means through which power is practiced and ideology given support. He is of the view that language is not

neutral but reflects, hence upholding power relations and dominant ideologies. CDA seeks to uncover how language is used to maintain or challenge these power dynamics and ideologies [4, 12, 20, 21].

Elite Discourse and Racism, authored by Teun A. Van Dijk [43], presents an in-depth discourse on how elite discourse contributes to the perpetuation of racism and racial inequality. In what he described as "everyday racism", the issue of racism lies not in the rude attitudes and behaviors but in the everyday types of relations and discourses that expound on racial stereotypes and reproduce from practice. Van Dijk [43] brings the idea that "everyday racism also involves the everyday mundane negative opinions, attitudes, and ideologies, and the seemingly subtle acts and conditions of discrimination against minorities" (5).

Van Dijk [43] also explores the cognitive dimensions of racism, focusing on how elite discourse is translated into the socially normative beliefs and racist expressions that it underpins. In reality, what these elites can accomplish through their control over media and other communication channels is building up public perceptions and attitudes regarding racial issues that contribute to the social reproduction of hatred and racism. Van Dijk [43] confirms that "The elites largely define and constrain the major life chances of minority groups especially in or through education, employment, economic affairs, social affairs, the media, and culture" (11).

Van Dijk [43] discusses further the role of the elites in fighting against racism. It is admitted that the elites still carry the burden of influence, then certainly. It becomes their moral obligation to use that discourse for challenging the racial stereotypes, which eventually brings about equality. It is, therefore, calling on the elites to use discourse more consciously and responsibly in order to undo racism. According to Van Dijk, "Elites have most resources not only to actively propagate [racism] but also to actively oppose it." [29, 43]. When Giddens [16] discusses stereotyping, he confirms neutral stereotyping is harmless; however, he argues:

> where stereotypes are associated with anxiety or fear, the situation is likely to be quite different. Stereotypes in such circumstances are commonly infused with attitudes of hostility or hatred towards the group in question. A white person may believe, for example, that all blacks are lazy and stupid, using this belief to justify attitudes of contempt towards them [16, 256].

3 Literature Review

Hate speech is a prevalent issue that has attracted the attention of many researchers. From an Aristotelian perspective, Trump's use of hate speech in political rallies was analyzed by Castañeda [7]. Trump's speeches focused on portraying America's negative aspects and blaming marginalized groups for causing chaos worldwide, promoting revenge, with Trump positioning himself as the avenger. Althusser [2] suggested that hate towards a specific group depends on Ideological State Apparatus, such as family, marriage, and religion. These institutions closely relate to the mindset and actions of every individual in society. Moreover, Goldberg [14] indicates that rac-

ists justify their use of hate speech by asserting themselves as "us" and diminishing "them," ideologizing and enhancing their authority. Hence, it is important to understand the psychological dispositions, emotional affections, or disorders that influence individuals who use hate speech.

Some scholars have specifically examined racism and the role of the media in creating false perceptions of certain groups. For example, Hall [18] argued that the West reinforces its own identity while establishing negative identities for others through the lens of race. Van Dijk [41] developed the concepts of 'positive self-representation', and 'negative other presentation,' which analyze society as a collective participant rather than individuals. Similarly, Riggins [4, 34] utilized the 'self' versus 'other' framework, which identifies lexical items such as 'I' and 'You,' and collective terms such as 'We' and 'They.'

Hate speech is motivated by several factors. Levin and McDevitt [27] identified four motives: thrilling, defensive, mission, and retaliatory. Religion, sexuality, nationality, and ethnicity are major triggers of hatred. Massey [25] suggested that warmth and competence determine whether a group is labeled as in-group or out-group, leading to the outcasting and dehumanization of the out-group. Levin and McDevitt [27] identified four motives: thrilling, defensive, mission, and retaliatory. Religion, sexuality, nationality, and ethnicity are major triggers of hatred. Specific linguistic techniques are employed to exclude the out-group and foster unity within the in-group [3].

Trump, the former president of the United States, is well known for inciting hostility and unfavorable feelings. Many studies have looked into his rhetorical and persuasion techniques to understand how he got to the presidency. Researchers have closely examined his comments, tweets, and debates 9, 25, 20). Crockett [10] observed that Trump's Twitter lexicon is simplistic, avoiding polysyllabic words, redundancy, negativity, and exclamations. Similarly, Kharakh & Primack [22] described Trump's tweets as simple, impulsive, and uncivil, spreading ideologies like a social cancer. His tweets reflect not only sexism, racism, homophobia, and xenophobia but also endorse them. According to Ott [29], Trump's speech pattern has three key characteristics: simplicity, impulsivity, and incivility. Mcclay [24] conducted a critical discourse analysis and found that Trump uses language to deliver his ideology and construct reality through social representations. Trump constantly employs 'us' vs. 'them,' creating an image of in-group/out-group and delegitimizing institutional powers and foreign countries. At the same time, Trump propagated the ideology that America has become weak due to the incompetence of its leaders and other countries are growing stronger at America's expense. Consequently, Trump's efforts successfully incited anger and fear, and he expressed racism and xenophobia through such an ideology.

Research has shown that Muslims and Islam have been portrayed differently by various U.S. presidents. For instance, Rico and Devon [33] examined presidential speeches about Islam and Muslims from Roosevelt (1933) to Trump (2018). They found noticeable differences between Trump's rhetoric and that of other presidents regarding the portrayal of Muslims. While previous presidents depicted Muslims as against terrorism and violence, belonging to the nation, Trump referred to them as violent, dangerous, and hostile. Rico & Deveon [33] noted that Trump's antagonistic

and alienating discourse against Muslims was apparent in his debates and speeches. In a critical discourse analysis of 40 of Trump's most controversial tweets against Muslims, Khan et al. [19] found that he dehumanized Muslims, portraying them as criminals, uncivilized, and invaders aiming to destroy America and its people. Trump used his Islamophobic discourse to create kinship sentiments with his fellow Americans and to paint Islam as an "incontrovertibly oppressive" and violent religion.

Hate speech has undergone thorough analysis from different perspectives, and researchers have employed numerous models and frameworks to examine it. Nonetheless, the examination of hate speech strategies within Trump's discourse to exemplify his ideology continues to be a prominent area of research. Although previous studies have delved into this subject, a comprehensive analysis of hate speech in Trump's presidential speeches is still lacking. Therefore, this research aims to fill this gap by employing CDA suggested by Van Dijk [40, 46] to show how language is used in Donald Trump's speech as a persuasive strategy in political discourse to maintain or challenge power dynamics and ideologies.

4 Methodology

4.1 Corpus

To provide sufficient data about hate speech, the researchers studied nine speeches by Donald Trumps delivered during Trump's presidential candidacy campaigns in 2016 and one of his interviews. We used a purposive sampling technique to achieve the objectives of the present study; we selected Trump's speeches that were relevant to hate speech and addressed issues related to Muslims and immigrants. The selected speeches were: Alabama Campaign Tally (November 21st, 2015), New Hampshire (September 17th, 2015) (September 30th, 2015) (October 21st, 2015), and Mount Pleasant in South Carolina Rally (December 7th, 2015), the Candidacy Announcement Speech in Fifth Avenue, New York City (June 16th, 2015), New Hampshire (June 13th, 2016), Fayetteville, New York City (August 9th, 2015), and North Carolina (August 18th, 2016). The transcriptions of the speeches chosen were taken from https://www.vox.com https://www.huffingtonpost.com, and https://www.washingtonpost.com. 450 min of Trump's speech were analyzed to explore hateful speech in his discourse.

4.2 Analysis Procedures

We analyzed the data according to the identification criteria and strategies of hate speech proposed by Whillock [48]and Erjavec and Kovačič [13]. The researchers read the speeches' transcripts, searching for references to certain verbal expressions deemed insulting, harassing, or promoting hatred and discrimination. These expressions were selected to examine strategies the former U.S. President, Donald Trump, used to exercise power and express hatred. After that, these expressions were evaluated using Whillock's [48] criteria for hate speech. Finally, the expressions found to

be hateful were classified using Erjavec and Kovačič [13] strategies detailed in the following section.

4.3 Theoretical Framework of Data Analysis

The present research used three frameworks to analyze the political speeches of Former U.S. President Donald Trump. Whillock [48] established four criteria of hate speech: "(1) to inflame the emotions of followers, (2) to denigrate the designated outclass, (3) to inflict permanent and irreparable harm to the opposition and ultimately (4) conquer" (p. 32). We used his criteria to categorize a particular utterance as hate speech.

After identifying the utterances that include hate speech, these utterances were categorized into hate speech strategies using Erjavec and Kovačič's [13] framework, which resulted from a study that measured the strategies of hate speech in three news websites. According to them, there are three main strategies for expressing hate speech. *Re-articulation of meaning* has four sub-strategies: (1) re-interpreting meaning to exclude a particular group, (2) re-interpreting domestic political matters and turning them into ideologies based on cultural struggle (redirecting attention from the main issues to address different orientations), (3) shifting attention from domestic political matters to personal differences, and (4) attacking celebrities of well-known figures whose behavior contrasts with the norms. *Renaming strategy* refers to inventing new phrases and terms and using them to promote hatred. This strategy resulted from the need to find neologisms in online-monitored web pages. The third strategy *uses direct hatred words* to refer to a particular group.

CDA was also used to show how language expressions are used to uncover power dynamics and Donald Trump's ideology.

5 Results

In the following sections, we will categorize hate speech strategies, explain them and show how Trump's ideology is manifested in his expressions, as mentioned earlier, which are contextualized within September 11 event. In Section 4.1, we will answer research question one, which concerns hate speech strategies and how they are used to persuade the audience and reveal his ideology. In Section 4.2, we will answer the second research question: How does the hate speech that Donald Trump used in the course of the 2016 US presidential campaign both reflect and, at the same time, support the underlying societal ideologies and power structures, most notably, in the building up of Muslim and immigrant identity as a threat to US society?

5.1 Hate Speech Strategies

By using Whillock's [48] criteria for identifying hate speech, the corpus revealed that Trump used several hate speech strategies in his speeches, namely re-articulation

of meaning, renaming, and using direct hatred words to refer to certain groups, suggested by Erjavec and Kovačič [13]. The corpus also showed that some expressions realized more than one strategy. The main strategies and their sub-categories are discussed in the following sections.

5.2 Re-articulation of Meaning

The data showed that four sub-categories suggested by Erjavec and Kovačič [13] were used to re-articulate meaning. These included:

(1) Re-interpreting meaning to exclude a certain group,
(2) Re-interpreting domestic political matters and turning them into ideologies based on cultural struggle (redirecting attention from the main issues to address different orientations),
(3) Shifting attention from domestic political matters to personal differences, and.
(4) Attacking celebrities of well-known figures whose behavior contrasts with the norms. These strategies are discussed in the following sections.

5.3 Re-interpreting Meaning to Exclude a Certain Group

This strategy aimed at changing the meanings of certain words and reusing them to serve one's purpose. The reinterpretation of language and meaning can be a powerful tool for excluding and marginalizing certain groups [30, 27]. Trump rearticulated various meanings during his Presidential Candidacy campaigns to exclude Muslims and immigrants. By framing groups (e.g., Muslims and immigrants) negatively, politicians can shape public discourse, influence public opinion, and inflame hatred toward these outgroups. This strategy is displayed in the following examples:
Script 1:

Our country cannot be the victim of horrendous attacks by people that believe only in Jihad. These people only believe in Jihad. They don't want our system. They don't want our system and have no sense of reason or respect for human life. They have no respect for human life.
"I won't mention who, but some of them disgusted me."
(New York, December 7, 2015).

The word 'Jihad' meant to struggle or to serve a noble cause and not a violent practice to resist other cultures and religions [20]. Trump, however, is using Islamophobic slurs to demonize Muslims and Jihadists. Trump redefined 'Jihad' to suggest that all followers are dangerous extremists whose intention is destroying the United States. This is done to inflame emotions, spread anger, and stir hatred among Americans toward Muslims and Islam to win the elections. His slanted view of Jihad presented a distorted image of Islam, reflecting religious racism. Trump claims that Jihadists are anti-American and indifferent to human life, deliberately attempting to portray Muslims as culturally incompatible with

American civilization. "Some of them disgusted me," Trump stated. This implies that Muslims are a threat to the American society.

Script 2:

> "Sharia authorizes; now look, this is, I mean, it's terrible. Sharia authorizes such atrocities as murders against non-believers who won't convert, beheadings, and more unthinkable acts that pose great harm to Americans, especially women. I mean, you look, especially women, tough stuff." (Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, December 7, 2015).

As shown in Script 2, Trump re-interpreted the meaning of 'Sharia' to exclude Muslims and outcast them from the American community. Trump also re-interpreted the meaning of 'Sharia' in Islam. This law is defined in the Oxford Dictionary as the holy laws of Islam covering all parts of a Muslim's life. However, Trump reinterpreted the meaning of 'Sharia' to imply that it authorizes terrible slaughters, such as murders against non-believers (non-Muslims) who will not convert, beheadings, and other unthinkable acts that pose great harm to Americans, especially women. Trump emphasizes that 'Sharia' poses a particular threat to the American women. This implies that Muslims are not only dangerous but also misogynistic. By re-interpreting terms like 'Shariah' to create a negative and exclusionary discourse around the concept of 'Sharia' and associating it with violence and misogyny, Trump could shape the public discourse and inflame their hatred to Muslims. This discourse represents an example of hate speech because it aimed to denigrate the out class [37, 38]. Without providing evidence for such claims, Trump falsely re-interpreted 'Sharia' teachings and de-ideologized Islam to inflame emotions, provoke people's anger, and degrade Muslims.

When Trump was asked about the Syrian refugees, he read a song's lyrics called 'The Snake' by the famous singer, Al Wilson, which showed his hatred for them.

Script 3:

> On her way to work one morning, down the path alongside the lake.
> A tender-hearted woman saw a poor half-frozen snake. His pretty colored skin had been all frosted with the dew.
> "Poor thing, "she cried, "I'll take you in, and I'll take care of you."
> "Take me in, tender woman,
> Take me in, for heaven's sake,
> Take me in, tender woman," sighed the snake!
> She clutched him to her bosom, "You're so beautiful," she cried.
> "But if I hadn't brought you in by now, you might have died."
> She stroked his pretty skin again and kissed and held him tight. Instead of saying thanks, the snake gave her a vicious bite.
> "Take me in, tender woman.
> Take me in, for heaven's sake.
> (New Hampshire, June 13th, 2016)

>Trump shared his suspicions about the Syrian refugees by reciting the song 'The Snake' by Al Wilson. The story of the song revolves around a woman who helped a sick snake, but instead, the snake gave her a vicious bite, which killed her. He compared the Syrian refugees to the snake. He alludes to the fact that whatever we do for the refugees, whether they are Syrians or not, they kill us as Americans because they are terrorists. His hatred is evident in the reciting of this poem. He wanted to spread fear and hatred among the Americans towards the Syrian refugees because they are dangerous, and they are allowing them into their country.

5.4 Re-interpreting Domestic Political Matters and Turning them into Ideologies Based on the Cultural Struggle

>As Erjavec and Kovačič [13] highlighted, one tactic used in hate speech is recasting internal political issues as cultural fights. This tactic seeks to split people along ideological lines and rally them behind commonalities in identity and culture. This strategy aims to "redirect attention from political and economic crises into a struggle between people of different orientations" (p. 907). This tactic seeks to recast narrow internal political issues, like immigration or minority rights, as part of a larger cultural conflict. Politicians can use this to construct a "we against them" narrative in which their constituents are depicted as the protectors of cultural norms and their opponents as the evildoers who threaten those values. As shown in Script 4, Trump was redirecting attention from a white American, who committed a crime, to a Muslim woman whom he blamed for radicalizing him. He claimed that she was the reason behind committing the crime.
Script 4

>"And how about the woman? She was in Pakistan, then Saudi Arabia. She comes in on an engagement deal, and she radicalized the guy." (Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, on December 7, 2015).

Trump's statement is an example of hate speech's reinterpretation of domestic politics into cultural battle ideas. Terrorism and US Muslim immigrants are the topic here. Trump creates a "we vs. them" narrative by presenting the problem as a cultural conflict, portraying Muslim immigrants as threatening the American values and security. Despite little evidence, his wording directly links the female immigrant and her partner's radicalization. Trump's use of "radicalized" and "engagement contract" demonizes the female immigrant and implies she is culpable for her partner's radicalization. His ultimate goal is to foster an atmosphere of hatred and fear, which can result in prejudice against minority groups. Trump's hatred is demonstrated here, aiming to inflame the emotions of others towards Muslims and Islamic countries, which target Americans, as he suggested. Trump implies that Pakistan and Saudi Arabia are radical Islamic nations that radicalize people. This portrays white skin privilege, in which an American white man was not blamed for his action, but the Muslim woman was blamed. In another example (Script 5), Trump criminalizes Muslims in the Middle East.

Script 5:

"And I say it all the time. We have people whose heads are being chopped off in the Middle East because they're Christians and for other reasons. They're being dumped and drowned in steel cages. And, we talk about my tone". (Fayetteville, New York City, August 9, 2015)

Trump's statement exemplifies reinterpretation of domestic politics into cultural battle ideas. Trump views Middle Eastern religious persecution as a cultural conflict between Christians and non-Christians. Trump uses strong language to characterize the horrible persecution of Christians in the Middle East to rally support based on shared identity and cultural values. He portrays Christians as persecuted and non-Christians as violent without addressing the complicated political and historical circumstances that cause these conflicts. This redefining of a cultural clash may harm societal cohesion and democracy. The "we versus them" attitude that President Trump fosters may make it more challenging to come to an agreement on crucial issues. Additionally, it might lead to prejudice against Muslims and other non-Christians because they might be wrongly held responsible for the violence. However, Trump falsely refers to the people in the Middle East as terrorists and extremists who behead Christians for their religion. He aims to inflict permanent and irreparable harm to the opposition, consequently criminalizing Muslims to incite hatred and create fear among Americans.

5.5 Re-articulation of Events/Situations in Domestic Politics into Matters that Concern Individuals

According to Erjavec and Kovačič [13], in this strategy, political issues are framed in terms of their perceived impact on individual citizens rather than focusing on the broader societal issues or policy implications. By making political concerns seem immediately applicable to people's daily lives and appealing to their personal experiences and emotions, this method aims to rally the audience's support. However, if used to promote hatred and intolerance, it can contribute to social division and undermine democratic values. Playing on people's anxieties and biases can also propagate hate speech [32]. Political actors can also demonize some groups by framing issues regarding how they affect people. This may create a hostile climate that encourages discrimination and violence towards vulnerable populations.

In this strategy, as a hate speech producer, Trump shifts from addressing a particular affair to personalizing it and making it sound as if it served the interest of another person. To illustrate, see Script 6.

Script 6:

"You know, the Persians are great negotiators. Always have been. And somebody would say that's profiling. Trust me, they're great negotiators, so, and they, they just killed, they just killed us." (Speech of Mount Pleasant, South Carolina. December 7, 2015).

In Script 6, Trump attempted to personalize the Iranian-American ties. When he spoke about the nuclear deal, Trump referred to the Iranians as Persians who were good negotiators. He re-articulated the situation into a matter that concerned the Iranians; he ironically called them great negotiators; however, he meant they were cunny and killers.

Trump's statement follows the hate speech technique of re-articulating political politics into personal issues. Trump points to the tragic killing of an American citizen by an Iranian immigrant and presents the issue as negotiation skill and personal responsibility. Trump is trying to portray Iranian immigrants as "excellent negotiators" to suggest their acts are part of a cultural or ethnic pattern. He is also profiling Iranians by saying 'they're great negotiators'.

Trump's statement that Persians are naturally good negotiators and that the Iranian immigrant's activities represent this group are examples of hate speech. This framing can thus generate fear and resentment toward immigrants, or form ill-considered stereotypes about culture or ethnicity that wrongfully classify certain people as outsiders. Trump's statement demonstrates how the hate speech formula of reframing internal political events into personal issues can create an "us versus them" metality, and obtain support based on fear and prejudice. However, this strategy can breed bigotry and intolerance, split society apart and destroy democracy.

5.6 Attacking Celebrities or Well-Known Figures whose Behavior Contrasts with the Norms

This strategy aims to slander celebrities and famous people, and spread false stories about them. Across different areas such as politics, entertainment and media [11], attacking celebrities or anybody who exhibits behavior that goes against the norms of the society is a common tactic frequently used. This strategy targets those people by pointing out how their behavior undermines accepted social norms and values. Such an unacceptable behaviors may include ethical or moral lapses; hypocrisy and dishonesty; opposing viewpoints [19]. To illustrate this strategy, see Script 7:

Script 7:

"Rubio, the same thing; he's very, very, very weak on immigration. A member of the gang of eight, totally weak on immigration. How do you solve a problem when you say people can just pour in? Make a speech not so long ago, in Spanish, saying he wants to open up the borders essentially." He didn't want you people hearing it. So, he made the speech in Spanish (New Hampshire rally, September 30th, 2015).

Trump criticizes Republican Senator Marco Rubio, a "Gang of Eight" member who sponsored a comprehensive immigration reform measure in 2013. Republicans, especially Trump, criticized Rubio's moderate immigration stance.

Trump calls Rubio "extremely weak" on immigration. Trump's criticism of Rubio was part of his 2016 presidential campaign strategy of portraying him-

self as a tough-on-immigration candidate and branding his opponents as soft. Trump appealed to the Americans concerned about illegal immigration and wanting stricter immigration rules by challenging Rubio's immigration policy, aiming to undermine the Senator's immigration plan, which aimed at opening the USS borders for immigrants, whose presence threaten the Americans.

5.7 Renaming Strategy

This strategy refers to the use of hate speech producers to some invented offensive words that are prohibited or considered taboo because they label particular social groups and use them to avoid criticism [11]. Writers use some words with 'extremely negative connotations' (p. 908). In various speeches, Trump used several renaming words to describe the people he hates. For example, he referred to immigrants as snakes and invaders; he renamed Muslims as murderers, criminals, and terrorists; he called Iran fascists; and he called Hillary Clinton Crooked Hillary. Haggray [15] stated, "[w]e have not witnessed such vile and hateful displays of racism, antagonism, and incivility by an American president in this lifetime."

The use of direct hatred terms expresses hostility, disdain, or prejudice against certain groups based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexuality, or other traits. These words usually degrade and dehumanize the targeted group. Trump linked Islam to terrorism in Script 8.

Script 8:
" I watched last night and I watched the president truly that didn't know what he was doing. He didn't know why he was there. He refuses to use the term — radical Islamic terrorism. He refuses to use the term." (Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, December 7, 2015).

This rhetoric can stigmatize and marginalize minority populations, perpetuate stereotypes and discrimination, and incite hatred and violence. Such language can also create a poisonous and divisive social atmosphere where people feel frightened and excluded, hindering meaningful discourse and understanding.

Trump's comment demonizes Muslims. This approach targets those who see Islam as a threat to the American society. It shows collective antagonism. Trump claims that Obama sympathizes with radical Islamists by refusing to use the term extreme Islamic terrorism. Trump's rhetoric on this issue marginalizes Muslims and encourages Islamophobic stereotypes. It incorrectly claims that all Muslims are radical extremists, which can lead to discrimination, prejudice, and hate crimes against innocent people. By framing the subject in such a way, Trump reveals his contempt for these groups, preventing productive debate and collaboration on terrorism, and potentially hurting diplomatic relations with Muslim-majority countries. Whillock [4] stated that "[h]ate parties like the alt—right are not interested in building bridges." They want to rule by eliminating a perceived threat (40).

This strategy was also used when Trump used hateful words with extremely negative connotations, as shown in Script 9. Trump associated the Syrian immi-

grants with ISIS and attempted to profile them by referring to their physical appearance and strength.

Script 9:

> "You have the migration because Syria is such a disaster. And now I hear we want to take in 200,000 Syrians, right? And they could be -- listen, they could be ISIS. I don't know…They're all men, and they're all strong-looking guys … And I'm saying to myself, why aren't they fighting to save Syria?" (An interview on ABC News Channel ABC, October 4th, 2015).

Trump's comment shows his use of nasty terminology to refer to certain groups, particularly Syrian refugees. Trump is scapegoating and demeaning all Syrian refugees by calling them ISIS. He falsely claims all Muslims are terrorists who threaten US national security. He also referred to their body structure and described them as 'They're all men, and they're all strong-looking guys' to show that they are capable of causing harm to the Americans and alleviating fear among the Americans to support his argument. He used pretense to internalize fear and hatred among his U.S. people. Trump also calls Syrian refugees "strong-looking males" and asks why they aren't fighting for their own country, suggesting they are lazy, cowardly, and unworthy of aid. Rhetoric like this marginalizes refugees, who fled war, persecution, and violence and need humanitarian relief. Trump's comments on Syrian refugees could incite anti-immigrant sentiment and polarize society. It could also lead to more hate crimes against Muslims and refugees and American entry restrictions.

5.8 How Donald Trump's Hate Speech Both Reflects And Supports The Underlying Societal Ideologies And Power Structures

The complex relationship between hate speech and social ideologies, especially as it could be evidenced from the rhetoric of Donald Trump through the 2016 US presidential campaign, further illustrates the profound influence that political discourses bear on the forging and strengthening of social identities and power relations. The hate speech, as proffered by Trump and examined in the appended research, reflects both existing societal ideologies and power structures on the one side and powerfully reinforces and amplifies them, most especially in portraying Muslim and immigrant identities as a threat to US society.

One view of the campaign rhetoric of Donald Trump could be that it is really the mirror that reflects the latent and manifest ideologies visible within sections of American society. In the words of Castañeda [6], Trump's hate rhetoric used during political rallies positioned him politically as the avenger, for he described the crisis of America strategically and scapegoated minority groups as responsible for global disorder. The "othering" of Muslims and immigrants through this framing belied an ideology of American exceptionalism and a perceived threat to "us" Americans and cultural homogeneity [8]. This was not a phenomenon that Trump generated, but rather lay within the history of exclusion and marginalization along racial and ethnic lines; however, his rhetoric legitimized—fronted within the public sphere—ideologies that had lain dormant at the back of the political discourse.

Such use of hate speech even further helps and supports crucially in the furtherance of existing power structures by an influential political figure like Trump. According to Van Dijk [37, 38], discourses are ideologies that function instrumentally for the exercise of power and, in turn, to maintain those very ideologies. Targeting marginalized communities, Trump's discourse of hate speech works to maintain the status quo of social hierarchies within which power is predominantly held by the sociopolitically dominant group. This further marginalizes the most vulnerable and highly susceptible communities, thus solidifying the status of those already considered outsiders while this in-group holds power. That corresponds with the studies of Erjavec and Kovačič [13] who have established that most of the time, the targeted out-group is exposed to demeaning hate speech, which aims to reinforce the power of the in-group. As such, the rhetoric of Trump reflects active societal ideologies, an active contribution to the preservation of existing power relations by fear and division as a tool of political mobilization.

The overt angle that Muslim and immigrant identities are a danger to US society leverages and uses the extant social fears and prejudices. Post-9/11, the Muslim identity is massively associated with terrorism, which is a dominant narrative in large sections of American media and politics [19]. Trump's rhetoric simply taps into and amplifies this narrative for his political objectives. Equally, the representation of immigrants, more so from Latin America and the Arab World either as criminals or a people who are a burden to the economy, is only building from an existing nativist sentiment. In other words, this threat construction does several things: it simplifies complex issues on a global and domestic scale by fear; it diverts attention from other ills in society; and it seals Trump's identity as a defender of American values and security. Matsuda [23] confirms that such tactics are not only tools to marginalize targeted groups but also divert attention from more serious social issues in order to maintain existing power differences.

This kind abets its own deep implications. First, it makes polarized and thus increasingly adversarial the political and social climate, such that hate speech becomes yet more normalized, political discourse becomes ever more "reduced to 'us vs. them,'" etc. Any thoughtful, constructive dialogic process and constructive dialogue over complex issues—like, for example, immigration and national security—will have their power weakened. According to Culpeper [9], this act normalizes hate speech, and threatens democratic dialogue. This is, of course, echoed by Guynn [15] when he said that such astonishing growth of hate speech in social media in the 2016 electoral campaign reflected right back to the general society from the rhetoric of Trump. Such a broad-brush approach, which categorizes whole communities as threats based on the actions of a few, has a kind of discriminatory environment, increasing social divisions and further eroding at the bedrock core of our values of inclusion and diversity. Second, the portrayal of whole communities as threats to a given community based upon the actions of just a few adds fuel to the already-ugly cycle of prejudice, discrimination, and violence toward the communities represented. It means this could be very great devastation, not only in terms of target personalities or communities but, generally, to society; it would destroy the acceptance, tolerance, diversity, and respect of their own principle.

This study applies a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to give insights into how the hate speech is used by Donald Trump to reinforce societal ideologies and power structures. The present study, dissecting language, narrative constructions, and framing techniques used by Trump, sets out to argue that such hate speech is actually constitutive of society, shaping it to conform to the contours outlined by that rhetoric. This is supported by earlier researches, such as that of Van Dijk [41, 43], whereby he affirms that discourse is used as an instrument in the exercise of power and to perpetuate ideologies. It also supports the argument of Erjavec and Kovačič [13] that hate speech targets and is denigrative to outgroups, hence being a forerunner of in-group power consolidation. In this respect, therefore, the application of CDA in this study shows how the rhetoric of Trump represents not only the societal fractures but is actively involved in shaping the dynamics to reflect the divisive and excluding nature of the speech.

6 Discussion and Conclusion

This research aimed to answer two research questions. The first question asks about the hate speech strategies used in the Former US President Donald Trump's discourse during the 2015–2016 U.S. presidential election campaigns. Hate speech identification criteria suggested by Willock [48] were used to categorize hate speech using Erjavec and Kovačič's [13] classification. Results showed that Trump used hate speech strategies to target Muslims and immigrants, using offensive/tabooed words to promote nationalism and ethnocentrism. Many journalists have reported on Trump's hate speech in his Presidential debates, as noted by Haggray [17]. Similarly, Kharakh & Primack [22] described Trump's Tweets as impulsive, uncivil, and simplistic. Similarly, Neumann & Geary [28] found that unlike previous U.S. presidents who portrayed Muslims as against terrorism and violence and part of the nation, Trump depicted them as violent, dangerous, and hostile.

Trump employed various strategies to direct hate towards Muslims and immigrants and hold them responsible for America's issues. This hate served as a persuasive tactic to present Trump as an avenger fighting these groups to "Make America Great Again," as he claimed. The most used strategies were re-articulating meaning and renaming, both intended to offend these groups and communicate his ideology to the public. Through his islamophobic discourse, Trump stimulated feelings of hostility and hate.

The present research findings align with previous studies demonstrating Trump's use of hate speech that blames immigrants, Muslims, and marginalized minorities for global chaos (7, 21). Kharakh and Primack [22] concluded that Trump's Tweets not only reflect sexism, racism, homophobia, and xenophobia but also spread ideologies like social cancer.

Furthermore, the analysis revealed Trump's animosity towards non-native Americans, Trump resorted to attacking their face wants, displaying impoliteness. This was evident in three instances. Firstly, he incited hatred towards immigrants, especially Mexicans, targeting the Latino race and fostering animosity. Secondly, Trump promoted Islamophobia by using coercive impoliteness to threaten Muslims' face wants

and desires, causing harm and hatred among non-Muslims. Finally, using tabooed words such as 'rotten, terrorists, rapists, criminals, disgusting, etc.', Trump successfully generated nationalism and ethnocentrism in America, creating an unfriendly and unwelcoming atmosphere for non-Americans while fueling anti-Muslim sentiments. These findings support Cervone et al.'s [8] conclusion that impoliteness is connected to hate speech, which justifies and legitimizes violence and social exclusion by dehumanizing out-group members or depicting them as a threat to in-group members. This also corresponds with Schubert's [35] remark that the purpose of using rude language is to delegitimize the addressee (for example, Muslims and immigrants in Trump's speeches) and exert authority over them.

The second research questions aims to find out how Donald Trump's hate speech both reflects and supports the underlying societal ideologies and power structures. In this line, Donald Trump's hate speech in the 2016 presidential campaign is one good example of how political rhetoric manages to interlock with, affirm, and confirm social ideologies and power structures. This interaction notably influences the portrayal and reception of Muslim and immigrant communities within American society. Trump's rhetoric, bigoted and alarmist, merely reiterates and in the process intensifies the exclusion of these groups by reducing it to one more form of social menace [8]. Such a discourse is not only emblematic but also reflects deeper ideological currents that sustain the power relations of the societal hierarchies [42].

The implications of such Trumpian rhetoric are massive, to say the fact that they certainly include the widening of social cleavages, legitimization of discrimination, and, in fact, undermining the very basis of democratic and inclusive dialogue [8]. This shows how the political discourse shapes the view of the public and hence reinforces the power relations in place [13]. Thus, the hate speech used by Trump is a very essential source of insight into the mechanisms through which political language has the ability to shape social attitudes and reproduce structural inequalities.

Given these observations, the necessity for critical engagement with political rhetoric becomes evident. Hate speech by Trump during the campaign was scrutinized by the aid of a flashlight, thrown not only on the relationship between language, ideology, and power but also on rhetoric, putting democratic value at risk through the deepening of societal division [15]. This provides a very important need for the criticism to take a more critical approach toward political discourse, for it underlines important implications that the given phenomenon has for social cohesion and maintenance of democratic principles.

This research suggests that political rhetoric is major in molding public opinion on disadvantaged groups. According to the findings, politicians employ rudeness and inflammatory language to gain support and stoke animosity among people from other social groups. The perils of using hate speech as a persuasive approach are highlighted by examining Donald Trump's rhetoric during the 2015 and 2016 presidential election campaigns. Trump's hate speech encouraged hatred and promoted ethnocentrism by singling out Muslims, Mexicans, and other immigrants as targets and using rude language and offensive/taboo phrases. The findings of the current research underscore the need for politicians to use respectful and inclusive language in their discourse. Politicians hold significant power and influence in society, and their language can shape public perceptions and attitudes toward marginalized groups. Hate

speech and impoliteness can perpetuate harmful stereotypes and legitimize violence against vulnerable populations.

Since this is the first study that examines hate speech in Trump's political discourse, it is important to conduct further studies to build on it. A future study might be a contrastive study that examines hate speech in different political discourses delivered by two political leaders whose speech includes hateful remarks. The findings of such research will highlight if hate speech strategies are influenced by the speaker (i.e., political leader). Examining the correlation between hate speech and impoliteness is another lacking research area. This study should examine hate speech strategies and impoliteness strategies and see if there is a connection between the two. A third study could examine the audience's perception/assessment of hate speech in political discourse.

Data Availability The datasets generated during and analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Declarations

Ethical Approval We confirm that all research was performed in accordance with relevant guidelines/ regulations applicable when human participants are involved.

Informed Consent No consent was obtained because the material we analyzed was published on the Internet and accessible to the public.

Competing Interests The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Adamczak-Krysztofowicz, Sylwia, and Anna. Szczepaniak-Kozak. 2017. A disturbing view of intercultural communication: findings of a study into hate speech. *Linguistica Silesiana* 38: 285–309. https://doi.org/10.24425/linsi.2017.117055.
2. Althusser, Louis. 1971. *Lenin and philosophy. Trans. Ben Brewster*. New York: Monthly Review.
3. Baker, Paul. 2008. A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse & Society* 19(3): 273–306. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926508088962.
4. Belgrimet, Souad and Ghaleb Rabab'ah. 2021. A multimodal discourse analysis of english posters in violence awareness campaigns against women. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 11(2):191–201. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1102.12.
5. Brown, Alexander. 2008. The racial and religious hatred act 2006: a Millian response. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 11(1): 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230701880471.
6. Brown, Alexander. 2017. What is hate speech? Part 1: the myth of hate. *Law and Philosophy* 36(4): 419–468. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10982-017-9297-1.
7. Castañeda, Alejandro Gómez. 2016. Aristotle's rhetoric in Trump's hate speech. *Open Access Library Journal* 3(9): 1–8. https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1102916.
8. Cervone, Cristina, and Anne Maass. 2021. The language of derogation and hate: functions, consequences, and reappropriation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 40(1): 80–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X20967394.
9. Culpeper, Jonathan. 2021. Impoliteness and hate speech: compare and contrast. *Journal of Pragmatics* 179: 4–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.04.019.

10. Crockett, Zachary. 2016. What I learned analyzing 7 months of Donald Trump's tweets. *Vox*. Retrieved October 24, 2022, from http://www.vox.com/2016/5/16/11603854/donald-trump-twitter.

11. Delgado, Richard, and Jean Stefancic. 1995. Images of the outsider in American law and culture: can free expression remedy systemic social ills? In *Critical race theory: the cutting edge*, ed. Richard Delgado. 217–227. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University.

12. Dibas, Shahd, Ghaleb Rabab'ah, Ahmad, S. Haider. 2023. Ideological dichotomy in the arab newspapers Coverage: the case of the 2017 Riyadh Summit. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law* 36: 1239–1257. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-022-09914-5.

13. Erjavec, Karmen, and Polona Kovačič. 2012. You don't understand, this is a new war! Analysis of hate speech in news websites' comments. *Mass Communication and Society* 15(3): 61–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2011.619679.

14. Goldberg, David Theo. 1995. *Ethical theory and social issues: history texts and contemporary readings*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace and Co.

15. Guynn, Jessica. 2016, October 23. Massive rise in hate speech on Twitter during the presidential election. *USA Today*. Retrieved September 14, 2022, from http://www.usatoday.com/story/tech/news/2016/10/21/massive-rise-in-hate-speech-twitter-during-presidential-election-donald-trump/92486210/.

16. Giddens, A. 1993. *Sociology*. 2nd ed. United Kingdom: Polity.

17. Haggray, John. 2022. (n.d.). Condemning the hate speech of Donald Trump. *American Baptist Home Mission Societies*. Retrieved November 12, from https://abhms.org/about-us/news/condemning-the-hate-speech-of-donald-trump/.

18. Hall, Stuart. 1992. The question of cultural identity. In *Modernity and its futures*, eds. David Stuart Hall, Held, and Tony McGrew. 273–326. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

19. Hoffmann, Jens, and Lorraine Sheridan. 2008. &. Celebrities as victims of stalking. In J. Reid Meloy, Lorraine Sheridan, & Jens Hoffmann (Eds.), *Stalking, threatening, and attacking public figures: a psychological and behavioral analysis* (pp. 195–214).

20. Kessar, Sara, Ghaleb Rabab'ah, Wafa Al-Khadra and Hadi Hamdan. 2021. The representation of the algerian hirak protest movement in the international media: France 24 and Al-Jazeera. *Cogent Social Sciences* 17(1): 1930646. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2021.1930646.

21. Khan, Mubashir, Farah Qazalbash, Hafiz Adnan, Yaqin Li, and Rashid Khuhro. 2021. Trump and muslims: a critical discourse analysis of islamophobic rhetoric in Donald Trump's selected tweets. *SAGE Open* 11(1): 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211004172.

22. Kharakh, Ben, and Daniel Primack. 2016, March 22. &. Donald Trump's social media ties to white supremacists. *Fortune*. Retrieved from http://fortune.com/donald-trump-white-supremacist-genocide/.

23. Knapp, Michael. 2003. The concept and practice of jihad in Islam. Parameters: U.S. *Army War College Quarterly*. 33(1). 82–94. https://press.armywarcollege.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2132&context=parameters

24. McClay, Rob. 2017. *Us and them: a descriptive analysis of Donald Trump's campaign speeches*. (Master's thesis). University of Birmingham.

25. Massey, Douglas S. 2009. Racial formation in theory and practice: the case of mexicans in the United States. *Race and Social Problems* 1(1): 12–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-009-9005-3.

26. Matsuda, Mari J. 1989. Public response to racist speech: considering the victim's story. *Michigan Law Review* 87(8). 2320–238. https://doi.org/10.2307/1289306.

27. McDevitt, Jack, and Susan Bennett. 2002. Hate crime offenders: an expanded typology. *Journal of Social Issues* 58(2): 303–317. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4560.00262.

28. Neumann, Richard, and David Geary. 2019. Reaching muslims from the bully pulpit: analyzing modern presidential discourse on Islam and muslims from FDR to Trump. *International Journal of Communication* 13: 4107–4129. https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/8705/2773.

29. Ott, Brian L. 2017. The age of Twitter: Donald J. Trump and the politics of debasement. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 34(1): 59–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2016.1266686.

30. Patton, Tracey Owens. 2004. Reflections of a black woman professor: racism and sexism in academia. *Howard Journal of Communications* 15(3): 185–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/10646170490483629.

31. Rabab'ah, Ghaleb, and Rajai Al-Khanji and Muradi Bataineh. 2022. Impoliteness strategies at a Jordanian hospital emergency room. *Kervan - International Journal of African and Asian Studies* 26(1): 227–251. https://doi.org/10.13135/1825-263X/6902.

32. Reddy, Vasu. 2002. Perverts and sodomites: homophobia as hate speech in Africa. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 20(3): 163–175. https://doi.org/10.2989/16073610209486308.

33. Rico, Nick, and Grant Devon. 2019. Reaching muslims from the bully pulpit: analyzing modern presidential discourse on Islam and muslims from FDR to Trump. *International Journal of Communication* 13: 4107–4129. https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/8705.
34. Riggins, Stephen Harold. ed. 1997. *The language and politics of exclusion: others in discourse*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
35. Schubert, Christian. 2020. Donald Trump's fake news agenda. In *Linguistic inquiries into Donald Trump's language: from 'fake news' to 'tremendous success'* (pp. xx-xx). Bloomsbury Publishing.
36. UNESCO. 2023. *Addressing hate speech through education: a guide for policy-makers*. Paris, France: UNESCO.
37. United Nations. 1966. International covenant on civil and political rights. Retrieved December 5, 2022, from https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-pol.
38. Van Dijk, Teun, A. 1988. *News analysis. Case studies of international and national news in the press. Hillsdale*. Ni: Lawrence Erlbaum.
39. Van Dijk, Teun, A. 1988. *News as discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
40. Van Dijk, Teun, A. 1991. *Racism and the press*. London: Routledge.
41. Van Dijk, Teun, A. 1993. Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society* 4(2): 249–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006.
42. Van Dijk, Teun, A. 1993. Discourse, power and access. In *Critical discourse analysis*, ed. C. R. Caldas. London: Hutchinson.
43. Van Dijk, Teun, A. 1993. *Elite discourse and racism*. Sage.
44. Van Dijk, Teun, A. 1998. *Ideology: a multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.
45. Van Dijk, Teun, A. 2001. Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In *Methods of critical discourse analysis* Eds. R. Wodak, & M. Meyer, (pp. 95–120).
46. Van Dijk, Teun, A. 2005. *Racism and discourse in Spain and Latin America*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
47. Van Dijk, Teun A. 2009. *Society and discourse: how social contexts influence text and talk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
48. Whillock, Rita Kirk, and David Slayden. eds. 1995. *Hate speech*. Sage.