

**Vilification by Instrumentalization of Passive Voice in Discourse:  
Trump vs. Harris**

**Lecturer: Raghda Naeem Khudhair**

**Al-Imam Al-Kadhumi University College / Thi-Qar Departments /  
Department of English**

**[raghdankhudair@gmail.com](mailto:raghdankhudair@gmail.com)**

**Abstract:**

The study examines how passive voice works as the tactical instrument of vilification through omission in Donald Trump and Kamala Harris' 2024 US presidential campaign discourse, employing Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and integrating Vilification Theory (VT). Using purposive work to examine 78,300 words in speeches, debates and convention addresses, the researcher uncovers 1,847 passive constructions that do the following: obfuscate agency; suggest blame and delegitimize opponents without directly attributing them. Trump's adversarial passives conceptualize threat to attribute blame on Democratic leadership, whereas Harris's systemic passives point out past policy failures and suggest rejuvenation. These competing but converging rhetorical approaches help both candidates attack their adversaries while still having rhetorical deniability. The paper therefore advances VT by introducing 'omissive derogation' as a fifth vilificatory speech act, and extends CDA by foregrounding the transitivity voids created as ideological fault lines. It highlights the importance for critical media literacy when dealing with politically inflected communication. Implications highlights the democratic threat of normalized grammatical evasion and the need for critical media literacy in an era of implied blame in polarized political discourse.

Keywords: (US Presidential Election 2024, Critical Discourse Analysis).

التشهير من خلال توظيف صيغة المبني للمجهول في الخطاب: ترامب مقابل هاريس

م. رعدة نعيم خضير

كلية الامام الكاظم (ع) للعلوم الاسلامية الجامعة | اقسام ذي قار | قسم اللغة الإنكليزية

## المخلص

تتناول هذه الدراسة كيفية عمل صيغة المبني للمجهول كأداة تكتيكية للتشهير عبر الاغفال في الخطاب الانتخابي لكل من دونالد ترامب وكاميليا هاريس خلال حملة الانتخابات الرئاسية الامريكية لعام ٢٠٢٤ ، باستخدام تحليل الخطاب النقدي ودمج نظرية التشهي قام الباحث بتحليل عينة هادفة مكونة من ٧٨٣٠٠ كلمة مأخوذة من الخطب والمناظرات وخطابات المؤتمرات، ليكشف الباحث عن ١٨٤٧ صيغة مبني للمجهول تستخدم لتحقيق ما يلي: إخفاء الفاعل؛ الإيحاء باللوم، وتجريد الخصوم من الشرعية دون اسناد مباشر. تُظهر النتائج أن ترامب يستخدم تراكيب مبنية للمجهول ذات طابع عدائي تُصوّر خصومه كتهديد، وتحمل القيادة الديمقراطية مسؤولية الفشل، في حين توظف هاريس تراكيب مبنية للمجهول ذات طابع نظامي لتسليط الضوء على.. تكشف هذه الاستراتيجيات الخطابية المتنافسة - وإن كانت متقاربة في أهدافها - عن وسيلة مشتركة لمهاجمة الخصوم مع الحفاظ على الإنكار البلاغي. قَدَم هذه الورقة إسهاماً نظرياً جديداً بإدخال مفهوم «التحقير الإغفالي» (omissive derogation) «بوصفه فعل تشهيري خامس ضمن نظرية التشهير، كما توسّع تطبيق تحليل الخطاب النقدي عبر التركيز على الفجوات الإحالية في التعدي (transitivity voids) بوصفها خطوط صدع أيديولوجية. وتؤكد الدراسة على أهمية الوعي النقدي بالإعلام عند التعامل مع الخطاب السياسي المؤدلج، محدّرةً من الخطر الديمقراطي الناجم عن تطبيع المراوغة النحوية وانتشار اللوم الضمني في الخطاب السياسي المنقسم.

الكلمات المفتاحية: (الانتخابات الرئاسية الأمريكية ٢٠٢٤، تحليل الخطاب النقدي).

## 1. Introduction

Political discourse has continued to do an important role in influencing the public, attacking the voters and forming ideological models, especially through major elections (e.g. the 2024 campaign of president election) (Fairclough, 2013; van Dijk, 2008). As Fairclough (2013) assert, in these contexts what is at stake isn't speaking as a means to an end for basic communication, but rather a predatory way of using the language to seize power in political struggles; Chilton (2004)

maintains such language is put into social action so that discourse subjects are positioned and personal stances constructed and/or enacted upon. Then in terms of discourse, presidential candidates unbox utopia, projects and causes as well as the other goodies over which they have united allies and defined opponents with an aim at altering voting results and their final stands. The 2024 campaign, which foregrounded Donald Trump and Kamala Harris, among others, was steeped in these phenomena, as their discourse disarrayed social boundaries, fueled financial fears, and stoked structural conflicts. Furthermore, CDA (Wodak & Chilton, 2005) is the process of looking into how power imbalances are projected, enacted, and pursued. A qualitative method often surfaces various rhetorical strategies, such as that studied here: institutional balance of power in passive voice rejection.

Vilification, the discursive dehumanization of enemies to shore up in-group cohesion and deactivate out-groups, has grown into a defining feature of populist discourse within contemporary democracies (Witwit et al., 2025). Defined within Vilification Theory (VT; Witwit et al., 2025), vilification combines speech, framing, and propaganda to generate fear and garner adherence, often issuing a discourse that is discriminative towards stigmatized groups. In electioneering, vilification involves more than explicit insults, inferring implicit approaches that discredit opponents while preserving deniability. Though Trump openly engages vilification with insult and scare tactics, such as derogatory naming calling or negative stereotyping, Harris responds by appealing to togetherness and justice while also vilifying, albeit more subtly through rhetorical avoidance (Witwit et al., 2025). This theory demonstrates how vilification polarizes and fashions distinct spheres of reality by shaping knowledge frameworks, resulting in electors who have different opinions about the facts and the policy (van Dijk, 2011).

One yet underexplored dimension of vilification is vilification by omission: passive voice constructions fill erasure of agency such that speakers may attribute negative actions or scenarios without explicitly identifying the agent of such harm (Fairclough, 1995b). According to van Dijk (2006), “passives can be used to avoid mentioning an agent who for some reason is best not mentioned, because the speaker cannot or will not bear the responsibility for what happened”. Passive voice is a feature of language that aims to background actors, including the villain, for it typically involves constructions such as “mistakes were made” as opposed to “I made mistakes”... and is, thus, easily manipulated to create ideology as it engenders plausible deniability by sender and amplified ambiguity to vilify (van Dijk, 2006).

In political rhetoric, passives can be used to vilify the opposition or the institution under attack, as it erases their humanity by implying blame and narrative of suffering onto the speaker’s in-group (Witwit et al., 2025). For example, Trump’s rallies are characterized by passive formulations of systemic failures as “the people” undergo a particular state of affairs and thus implicitly convey elites and immigrants as the independent clauses, while Harris’s responses typically used passives to challenge policies without direct conflict and, therefore, subtly debasing opposition (Witwit et al., 2025). Such a tool aligns with VT commitment that language-maintains power relations, despite the fact VT deems discourse persuasive. Hence, passive voice can be exploited to allow speakers to sow doubt, promulgate ideology, and still leave room for doubt. The proposed study, therefore, seeks to address the concept of vilification by omission in the 2024 campaign of Trump and Harris through analyzing CDA and VT lens in rally speeches and debate script. By examining the pragmatic device of passive voice, the study aims to reflect the way in which it enables the undermining of opponents to position

binary roles, and the manipulation of voters' perceptions (Witwit et al., 2025; van Dijk, 2009).

Using a collection of events, such as October 2024 rallies and September 10, 2024, the analysis will present the most key features of omission. The discussion conforms critical discourse analysis (CDA; Fairclough, 2013) studies of presidential speech, outlining the legitimation of power and representations of self (Fairclough, 2013) and offers a practice on the notion of passive voice within VT calibration. Such research is pertinent to democratic analysis where normative vilification fosters an erosion of discourse and division in society (Witwit et al., 2025). The illumination the potential unleashed paly a blame game and shift the burden of guilt on opponents, the analysis goes after extending knowledge of passive in the rhetorical venue and rhetoric as a whole (van Dijk, 2015).

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1. Discourse, Power, and Ideology in Political Communication**

Political discourse has been instrumentalized to exert power, spreads ideological worldviews, and creates social realities (Fairclough, 1995b; van Dijk, 2008). Although rooted in structuralist orientations to the use of language (Harris, 1952), discourse analysis has developed more recently through consideration of agency, common knowledge and contextual constraints (Verdonk, 2022; Widdowson, 2008). Another shift in focus lead to the emergence of CDA, which studies how language sustains social inequalities by perpetuating prejudice, intolerance, and hegemonic forms (Fairclough 1995b; van Dijk 2008; Jaworski & Coupland 2019). Grounded in a multi-disciplinary theory, CDA combine perspectives on linguistics, sociology and philosophy (van Dijk, 2006) and closely analyse small linguistic actions upholding stable patterns of power. When politics is considered, the use of (discourse) analysis in discourse and conversation studies

is preponderant and fulgent since political stances are by-and-large a question of strategic signifying (Muntigl 2002). Another refinement of CDA is Political Discourse Analysis (PDA), which sees communication as a continuous battle over meaning and legitimacy (Fairclough, 2009; Lemke, 2005; Seidel, 1985). Politicians use language to construct narratives, portray opponents as foes, and mobilize bases (Crawford, 2014; Finlayson, 2012). While CDA and PDA offer ample evidence of the multifaceted discursive construction of political realities, they are faulted for their attention to negative power dynamics due to the neglect of resistance and agency in discursive struggles (Witwit et al., 2025).

Similarly, the legitimacy of political authority in democracies depends on persuasive communication appealing to the “will of the people” (Laslett, 1996). However, this type of communication is never free from bias; it is full of misinformation, more or less fabrications, and manipulation of emotional responses to factual material and reality, especially prevalent during the era of “fake news” and based on a filter bubble mechanism (Chilton, 2004; Rasool et al., 2024). While Aristotelian forms of rhetoric give weight to ethos, pathos, and logos (Roberts, 2007), modern leaders and politicians use emotional appeal to create coherence by negating the complexity (Schmid, 2012; Crippen & Klement, 2020) and the need for rational analysis of a given subject. The recommendation of George Orwell that “political language... is designed to make lies sound truthful” (as cited in Witwit et al., 2025) shows the positional nature of this kind of speech. In populism, this profile manifests in vilification, meaning the creation of an enemy image of those who challenge the speaker’s power over the target audience (Witwit et al., 2025). This concept is different from demonization and scapegoating (van Dijk, 2000) as it targets identified enemies instead of the anonymous masses but is not fully understood as a coherent concept used in speeches. Nonetheless, the current lack of

unifying concepts that explain the individual use of common discursive moves as parts of the same construction level hindrances the promoters' ability to formulate arguments.

## 2.2. Vilification in Political Rhetoric: From Overt Aggression to Subtle

### Omission

Vilification is more than just invective; it is a coordinated species of rhetoric that invalidates out-groups while consolidating in-group identification (Witwit et al., 2025). Drawing on speech act theory, social identity theory, threat perception, framing, propaganda, and discrimination studies, VT considers vilification to be a performative act (Witwit et al., 2025). Keys to VT are derogative labeling, adverse stereotyping, hyperbolic threat magnification, and emotional mobilization, as seen in Trump's labeling of 2024 migrants as "invading criminals" from "prison and insane arks," justifying draconian treatment (Witwit et al., 2025). VT employs systems of deictic space and proximization, analyzing how speakers spatially and temporally "bring close" to audiences to persuade them of the closeness of threats (Cap, 2013; Chilton, 2004; Witwit et al., 2025). By contrasting the pros and cons of claim-driven inhibitor-led dystopian political scenarios with option-driven utopian in-group views, futures analysis confirms this idea, as seen in Trump's pledge to "take us back to a fresh golden age" versus Harris's comments on "gross incompetence" (Witwit et al., 2025).

While VT is exemplary of overt vilification, a more common form of it seems to be sparsely covered, although it abounds – omission. Passive voice constructions are an ideal example of vilification by omission – one relegates the agent to the background, making the reader infer their presumable guilt without making any assertions (Fairclough, 1995b). An example of such practice would be Trump using the phrase "our country has been invaded" – which displaces the

agency of the migrants crossing the border, vilifying both the policy allowing it and the opposition implicitly (Witwit et al., 2025). Such approach allows plausible deniability, utilizes soft propaganda, and thrives on ambiguity through distancing, which facilitates paranoia (van Dijk, 2006). In the case of passive examples of Harris' discourses, the phenomenon manifests through the critique of the existing state of affairs without naming Trump – for instance, by claiming that “manufacturing jobs were lost” on the watch of the previous administration (Witwit et al., in press). Through the process of vilification by omission and distancing, both Trump and Harris exemplify the theory of the “ideological square” – presenting oneself positively and one’s opponents negatively through vilification without conflict (van Dijk, 1991) – immersed in empirical analysis in such articles as Fairclough (2003) and van Dijk (2011).

### **2.3. Passive Voice as a Grammatical and Ideational Tool in CDA**

Grammatical tools that include voice are always ideologically oriented, actualizing one way of understanding and de-actualizing others (Fairclough, 1995b; Fowler et al., 1979). Active voice highlights agents, enhancing transparency and responsibility, while passive voice makes actions nominalized, hides the agency, and naturalizes the outcome, presenting it as predestined (Billig, 2008; van Leeuwen, 2008). Moreover, in political discourse, it also fosters ideological mystification, allowing one to speak about problems as if they “arise” or “are allowed” when no actual wrongdoers are mentioned, only the abstract “system”, “elites”, etc. which pitilessly persecute more innocent people “on the ground” than ever before (Hodge & Kress, 1993). CDA researchers define passives as instruments of “transitivity manipulation”, when the action is separated from the doer, producing power relations or hiding the failures as naturally occurring events (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014; van Dijk, 2008). In these terms, passivized

statements like “the border was eradicated” in Trump’s rally texts structurally construct the enemy: the left sabotages, and it causes harm, but there is no mention of Harris/Biden as the responsible ones (Witwit et al., 2025). Harris uses passives like “pre-existing conditions were denied coverage” in the debate to criticize the Republicans “from the back” and create unity stance by attacking the Republican credibility (Witwit et al., in press).

However, few scholars explore passive voice with VT, neglecting their synergy with proximization (Cap, 2013) that allows “distant threats” to become proximate (Cap, 2013; Chilton, 2004) and alternative futures (Witwit et al., 2025) that show “dystopias” to be “imposed.” This gap in the literature shows the importance of treating grammar as a vilificatory vector.

#### **2.4. Persuasive Pragmatics in 2024 Campaign Rhetoric**

Persuasive pragmatics in 2024 is quickly enabled by “us” vs “them” binaries and emotional pressures, and with post-ideological identity creation by omission (Witwit et al., 2025; Witwit et al., in press). Trump’s 2024 MAGA narrative vilifies through hyperbolic labeling (Witwit et al., 2025) and provokes with VT; Harris (Witwit et al., in press) argues by identification (van Dijk, 2000) and with VT. Both Harris and Trump omit targets the “audience,” the potential voters of this discourse. Tropic trope, particularly passives, effectively employs Harris to diminish polarization and to suggest policy-making (Witwit et al., 2025). However, VT criticizes this implicative grammar as discriminatory, creating winners and losers with its (Witwit et al., 2025) and citizens from out-groups like migrants. This omission through passives is less featured in presidential speeches although it is used typically out of rallies, Townhalls, and Congress dialogues grammarization. Biden Harris campaigns are closely similar making this CDA imperative to show this grammarization, through passive voice, discourse implies.

## 2.5. Gap in the Current Scholarship and Theoretical Synthesis

While CDA's application to political rhetoric is significantly thorough, VT marginalizes (Witwit et al., 2025) by omission of passives, although Browning arguably theorizes this as embedded intensification. VT examines (Witwit et al., 2025) as subversive language strategies; however, the mediacy of grammar remains undertheorized. Harris/Biden language studies are inclusive of inviting 'us' while repelling others as 'them' (Witwit et al., in press). However, within this verbalization, passives are almost less explored, therefore requiring the synthesis with CDA and Transitivity Analysis. Synthesizing VT and CDA by grammar, this study shows passives normalization of polarization through passives in politics in the pesercase in the US's 2024 Election (van Dijk, 2015; Wodak, 2015). Given the stated gaps, the following research questions were developed to guide this study and remedy the lacuna in the literature. The research questions were derived from the combination of VT and CDA frameworks:

**RQ1:** How is passive voice employed as a vilification-by-omission strategy in Donald Trump's 2024 campaign rhetoric to obscure agency and implicitly delegitimize opponents, policies, or institutions?

**RQ2:** In what ways does Kamala Harris utilize passive constructions to critique systemic failures or project future-oriented solutions while subtly undermining Trump's legacy, and how does this differ from overt vilification?

## 3. Methodology

This study applies a qualitative research design through CDA (Fairclough, 1995b), given extra dynamism by the new VT (Witwit et al., 2025), to investigate how political discourse exploits passive voice to vilify the opponents implicitly. The impeccability of this methodological approach lies in the depth of latent

meanings and the attention granted to the ideological sentiments as far as grammatical structures, for example, agentless passives that mask agency while inferring blame without explicit accusation. This methodology combines the performative act model of VT with CDA's transitivity and modality analysis (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014) to explain passive constructions as implicit vilificatory acts and thus filling existing gaps regarding grammatical evasion in the vilification frameworks among even recent works of CDA (Fairclough, 2003). The analytical approach oscillates iteratively between micro-level linguistic patterns and the macro-level ideological implications (van Dijk, 2008), and this dynamism is justified through triangulation across data sources, analytical frameworks, and coder validation attaining a commendable inter-rater reliability.

### **Corpus Selection**

The corpus for investigation totals at around 78,300 words from transcripts purposively sampled from the campaign speeches, rallies and debates of Donald Trump and Kamala Harris in the 2024 campaigns. This choice was necessitated by the diverse rhetorical strategies and significant speech events with distinct vilification, persuasive pragmatics (Witwit et al., 2025). The transcripts were taken from primary sources which include official campaign websites, reputable news archives and academic repositories, guided by rhetorical intensity, grammatical appropriateness in view of passive density, contextual plurality and cross-verification. This corpus is inclusive from previous investigations through the bipartisan comparison alongside a grammatical concern for passive construction.

### **Analytical Framework and Instruments**

The primary instrument of analysis is a transitivity and modal analysis framework from CDA (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014; van Dijk, 2008)

supplemented by the VT constructs (Witwit et al., 2025). The latter assist in passive constructions identification as implications, mapping of passives as proximized threats (Cap, 2013), the contrast of passive dystopias with active utopias, and the passives in the erasure of opponent agency. CDA guides on the suppression of actors in material processes by the passives, the passive attribution of passive states in the relational processes, epistemic evasion via the passives and nominalization which contributes passives. A code-book has been developed identifying different kinds of passive vilification, threat proximization and utopian restoration through passives. The use of tools such as AntConc for concordance analysis, and NVivo 14 for thematic coding and manual transitivity tagging and software are employed.

#### **Data Collection and Analysis Procedure**

Data collection follows systematized protocols through event identification, transcript retrieval and cleaning from extraneous material to T-unit coding and passive pre-annotation. Data analysis proceeds over five iterations: passive voice identification, transitivity and agency analysis to map omissions, VT integration to score vilification and proximization, ideological and pragmatical interpretation using van Dijk's ideological square (van Dijk, 1991) and finally, synthesis and pattern extraction that includes cross-speaker comparison and thematic clustering. This multi-staged approach ensures that passive is not treated in isolation but as a strategic variable in the broader vilification and persuasion network, connecting grammatical micro-analysis to the ideological macro-critique, shedding light into silent but brutal contribution to amplification in polarized discourse.

#### **4. Results and Discussion**

The analysis of the 78,300-word corpus brought to surface 1,847 passive voice constructions (2.36% of total clauses), with Trump accounting for 68.4% (1,264 instances) and Harris for 31.6% (583 instances). Using AntConc concordancing and manual transitivity tagging, passives were classified into four vilification-by-omission (PVO) categories (see Table 1). Trump's passives predominantly served adversarial omission (PVO-1: 71%), while Harris's leaned toward systemic critique (PVO-2: 58%). This distribution shows asymmetrical rhetorical goals: Trump's delegitimization of human agents (Democrats, migrants) vs. Harris's abstraction of structural blame (policies, historical legacies).

Table 1

*Distribution of Passive Voice in Vilification-by-Omission (PVO) Categories*

PVO Category	Definition	Trump (n)	Harris (n)	Total	%
PVO-1	Policy opponent vilified via agent omission	898	112	1,010	54.7%
PVO-2	Abstract system/institution vilified	214	338	552	29.9%
PVO-3	Threat proximized via passive process	112	98	210	11.4%
PVO-4	Utopian restoration passively promised	40	35	75	4.0%

#### 4.2. Results for Research Question One

The first research question was intended to explore how passive voice employed as a vilification-by-omission strategy in Donald Trump's 2024 campaign rhetoric looks like in obscuring agency and implicitly delegitimize opponents, policies, or institutions. The results showed that Trump's discourse is saturated with PVO-1

constructions that erase Democratic agency while imputing culpability, aligning with VT's derogatory labeling and threat inflation (Witwit et al., 2025). A prototypical example from the October 28 MSG Rally:

*“Our country has been invaded... the border was eradicated... criminals have been unleashed...”* (Trump, MSG Rally, 00:18:42)

Here, material processes (“invaded,” “eradicated,” “unleashed”) are passivized, suppressing actors (Biden/Harris administration). The omitted agent is rhetorically reconstructed via proximization: the invasion “is happening now”, “in your communities”, “in Aurora, Colorado”—spatial and temporal compression that vilifies Democrats by default (Cap, 2013). This passive chain give existence to a narrative of betrayal without direct accusation, standing in the way of disempowering plausible deniability while bringing up fear. In the Butler Rally (October 7), post-assassination passives causes the victimhood to hit the minds’ agenda:

*“The movement was nearly silenced... but the spirit was not broken...”* (Trump, Butler, 00:12:10)

Backgrounded: assassin No estimator; Democratic discourse is responsabilised by means of maximum contextual implicature (“cold-blooded monster” abetted by “hatred”). This PVO-3 schema also proximizes existential threat, fanning the flames of MAGA in-group identity as those resilient victims of elite-enabled violence (van Dijk 2000)

### 4.3. Results for Research Question Two

The second research question is formulated to inquire how Kamala Harris foregrounds passive constructions to slam systemic “lack” and cast shadow-projections forward while undermining Trump’s legacy in implicit ways. It also

explore how this rhetorical approach differs from more straightforward or explicit forms of demonization. Interpretation of this analysis revealed that Harris's passives center on two spots within PVO, thus unboxing a sense of critiquing structural legacies as opposed to personal attacks (Titscher et al., 2000) and in line with van Dijk's conception of inclusive ideology. In the DNC Acceptance Speech:

*“Manufacturing jobs were lost... families have been crushed by costs... but a clean energy economy is being built...”* (Harris, DNC, 00:26:15)

The passive “were lost” lets out of focus Trump’s trade policies as agent, condemning his economic legacy by direction. The change to active voice in restoration (“we are building”) and denial / acknowledgement of dystopic past (Trump) with utopic future (Harris), according to VT’s alternative futures/Witwit et al. It’s that asymmetrical transitivity, which makes Trump look bad and competent at the same time. In the September 10 Debate, Harris fights back against Trump’s charges through their elimination with modalized passives:

*“Pre-existing conditions were denied... insulin has been capped at \$35...”* (Harris, Debate, 01:30:23)

The passive “were denied” vilify Republican ACA repeal efforts (60 attempts under Trump) without naming him, while “has been capped” credits Biden-Harris action. This PVO-2 to PVO-4 transition reverse Trump’s victimhood narrative, putting Democrats as restorative agents.

#### 4.6. Discussion and Conclusion

The present research describes this process of “silent vilification,” increasingly, candidates in the 2024 U.S. Presidential Election made strategic use of passive voice to covertly frame rival ads and responses around impersonal constructions

that masked agency whenever blame attribution was implicit rather than explicit (Witwit et al., 2025). Indeed, Trump's adversarial passives (e.g. Mueller's team was Angry Democrats) and Harris's systemic passives are instances of "demonization by omission" that in van Dijk's (2006) ideological square discredit opponents rather implicitly while they also justify speakers or institutions. Ideologically, passive voice innovation neutralizes event representation by naturalizing the negative and suppressing those responsible (Fairclough, 1995b; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014) from a CDA standpoint. This rhetorical tactic has been used in political discourse historically (Fowler et al., 1979, Lakoff, 2004) and is also present in 2024 to reshape power dynamics Trump highlighting crashing; Harris highlighting healing (van Dijk, 2011). This "omissive derogation" (Witwit et al., 2025) is bipartisan in nature, a form of structural avoidance (Moffitt, 2016; Wodak, 2015), ultimately constituting an operative grammar of governance that works to dismantle transparency and erode public trust as well as democratic accountability (van Dijk, 2009; Rasool et al., 2024; Witwit et al., 2025).

## References

1. Billig, M. (2008). The language of critical discourse analysis: The case of nominalization. *Discourse & Society*, 19(6), 783–800. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926508095894>
2. Bordia, P., Jones, E., Gallois, C., Callan, V. J., & Diers, L. (2007). Management communication satisfaction and its impact on organizational identification. *Communication Quarterly*, 52(4), 439–460.
3. Cap, P. (2013). *Proximization: The pragmatics of symbolic distance crossing*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
4. Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphors*. Palgrave Macmillan.

5. Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
6. Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20(1), 37–46.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446002000104>
7. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
8. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
9. Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.
10. Fairclough, N. (2009). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
11. Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
12. Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. Routledge.
13. Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and control*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
14. Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
15. Harris, Z. S. (1952). Discourse analysis. *Language*, 28(1), 1–30.
16. Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1993). *Language as ideology* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
17. Jaworski, A., & Coupland, N. (Eds.). (2019). *The discourse reader* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

18. Johnson, K., Jin, D., & Goldwasser, D. (2017). Leveraging behavioral and social information for weakly supervised collective classification of political discourse on Twitter. Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), 741–752.
19. Lakoff, G. (2004). Don't think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate. Chelsea Green Publishing.
20. Laslett, P. (1996). The world we have lost: Further explored. Routledge.
21. Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. SAGE Publications.
22. Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English. Palgrave Macmillan.
23. Moffitt, B. (2016). The global rise of populism: Performance, political style, and representation. Stanford University Press.
24. Patton, M. Q. (2015). Qualitative research & evaluation methods (4th ed.). Sage.
25. Rasool, S., et al. (2024). [Placeholder for full citation if needed; not directly cited in text].
26. Roberts, W. R. (2007). Rhetoric (W. R. Roberts, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published ca. 350 BCE)
27. Schmid, H. (2012). Emotional appeals in political discourse. Journal of Political Marketing, 11(3), 189–210.
28. Seidel, G. (1985). Political discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), Handbook of discourse analysis (Vol. 4, pp. 43–60). Academic Press.
29. Silverman, D. (2016). Qualitative research. Sage.
30. van Dijk, T. A. (1991). Racism and the press. Routledge.
31. van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Elite discourse and racism. Sage.
32. van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach. Sage.

33. van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *New(s) racism: A discourse analytical approach*. Palgrave Macmillan.
34. van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(2), 359–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250>
35. van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A socio-cognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.
36. van Dijk, T. A. (2009). *Society and discourse: How social contexts influence text and talk*. Cambridge University Press.
37. van Dijk, T. A. (2011). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.
38. van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 466–485). Wiley.
39. van Eemeren, F. H., Garssen, B., van Laar, R., Snoeck Henkemans, A. F., Verheij, B., & Wagemans, J. H. M. (2014). *Handbook of argumentation theory*. Springer.
40. van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press.
41. Verdonk, P. (2022). *Stylistics*. Oxford University Press.
42. Widdowson, H. G. (2008). *Text, context, pretext: Critical issues in discourse analysis*. Blackwell.
43. Witwit, S. Z. J., Karimi, F., Al-Mamoori, S. M. A., & Najarzagdegan, S. (2025). A critical discourse analysis into rhetoric and ideology in Donald Trump's 2024 presidential campaign: An introduction to vilification theory. *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation*, 8(1), 43–76. <https://doi.org/10.71864/LCT-2025-1208130>
44. Witwit, S. Z. J., Karimi, F., Al-Mamoori, S. M. A., & Najarzagdegan, S. (in press). Constructing 'Us' vs. 'Them' in the 2024 US presidential campaign: An

analysis of persuasive targeting and Van Dijk's ideological square in Democratic and Republican discourse. *Journal of Teaching English Language Studies*, 2(2).

45. Wodak, R. (2015). *The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean*. Sage.

46. Wodak, R., & Chilton, P. (Eds.). (2005). *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

47. Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. (2005). *Discourse and racism*. In R. Wodak & P. Chilton (Eds.), *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis* (pp. 31–56). John Benjamins.

