

لغة الإقصاء: تحليل نقدي لخطابات التيار اليميني السياسي حول الهجرة في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية

هدى قاسم كوزان

كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية، قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، جامعة ذي قار
huda.q.kozan@utq.edu.iq

حيدر حسين كاطع

كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية، قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، جامعة ذي قار
dr.Haider.Hussein.vKatea@utq.edu.iq

الملخص

تتناول هذه الدراسة التمييز والاقناع السياسي في خطابات دونالد ج. ترامب حول الهجرة في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية خلال الفترة من 2015 إلى 2025. يستند التحليل إلى النظرية التاريخية-الخطابية لرايسل وفوداك ونظرية أرسطو في البلاغة. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تقصي الآلية المنهجية التي بني فيها خطاب التمييز في ضوء استخدام عناصر التحليل من النظرية التاريخية الخطابية والكيفية التي نجح فيها ترامب في اقناع جمهوره بالتأييد لخطابه المناهض للمهاجرين. أظهرت النتائج أن خطاب ترامب حول الهجرة قد صيغ بطريقة تنتج إطاراً سلبياً عن المهاجرين بوصفهم أنهم خطر وتهديد والذي استهدف به المهاجرين الشرعيين وغير الشرعيين على حد سواء. وقد أشار ترامب في وصفه للمهاجرين بصور سلبية عبر اسناد مجموعة صفات مختارة وسرد وقائع محددة للطعن فيهم وكما قدم نفسه بصفته المنقذ الصرح بينما شكل صورة للمهاجرين باعتبارهم مصدر تهديد من خلال توظيف عدد من الحجج. يعتمد خطابه على استخدام المنطق بوصفه الاستراتيجية الرئيسية في الاقناع بما يعكس بناء خطابه على الاسباب والوقائع وتلى ذلك الاعتماد على استثارة مشاعر الخوف والكراهية ضد المهاجرين كاستراتيجية للإقناع.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الهجرة، التيار اليميني، التمييز السياسي، الاقناع السياسي، النظرية البلاغية.

Language Of Othering: A Cda Of Right-Wing Discourse On Migration In The Usa

Huda Qasem Kozan

College of Education for Humanities, Department of English, Thi-Qar University
huda.q.kozan@utq.edu.iq

Haider Hussein Katea

College of Education for Humanities, Department of English, Thi-Qar University
dr.Haider.Hussein.vKatea@utq.edu.iq

Abstract

This paper explores the discrimination and persuasion in Donald J. Trump's discourse on migration in the USA from 2015 to 2025. The analysis is grounded on Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) of Reisigl and Wodak and Aristotle's rhetoric. This study aims to examine how the discrimination in Trump's discourse is systematically accounted for under the use of the DHA, and how Trump persuaded the audience to align with his anti-immigration speech. The results show that Trump's discourse on migration was constructed to create a negative other representation of dangerous, threatening others, which attacks both legal and illegal immigrants. Trump referred to immigrants negatively by using selected qualities and trials to attack them, presents himself as the truthful savior, and collectively constructs immigrants as a threat using several Topoi. His speech relies on logos as the main strategy for persuasion, which represents how his discourse was built on employing reasons and facts, followed by appealing to emotions of fear and hate using pathos.

Keywords: Immigration, Right-wing, Discrimination, Persuasion, Rhetoric.

1. Introduction

The USA is known as a country of diversity. Historically, its society was structured by people of many nationalities. According to Stephanie Kramer & Jeffry Passel (2025), immigrants in the United States have reached 53.3 million in 2025. However, these numbers have sparked debate among politicians from different political parties. In this deliberation, language is their tool; they use linguistic strategies along with non-linguistic ones to convey the ideology that brings them closer to their goals. One way to achieve this control linguistically is to create a division between the politicians and their supporters and the opponents of these policies, or, in other words, us vs. them. This research will limit the examination to the discrimination of the 'threatening others' in D.J. Trump's speeches on immigration from 2015 to 2025. To explore how his speech frames immigration and which ideological viewpoint he uses to frame it, using the five strategies of Reisigl & Wodak's Discourse Historical approach (DHA). In addition to that, the research will employ the use of Aristotle's rhetorical theory to identify the strategies that Trump uses in order to persuade his audiences using pathos, logos, and ethos, along with other linguistic devices.

2. Right-wing political party

A political party or party-family is defined as a group of people from different countries, mainly united by their ideologies. This concept of classifying political parties under different families based on the ideologies that they align with or support is widely used in political science due to its simplicity (Mudde 2000: 2). The political parties are not one rigid group, but rather a spectrum on which a scale of mainly two parties, one is the right-wing, and the other is the left-wing, with the right-wing emphasizing tradition, national identity, hierarchy, and social order (Sykes 2024: 456). The right-wing tends to direct its speech and policies toward the social outsiders, which challenge the liberal norms of inclusion and diversity (Diehl 2019: 4).

3. Discrimination

Discrimination refers to unequal and unfair treatment of a group that is similar to others in all aspects but still treated differently because of their gender, race, or ethnicity (Zayed, 2023, p. 1). Not all unequal treatment is considered as discrimination; Zayed (2023) classifies two criteria of discrimination: first, the person or the group must be treated less favorably than the others; second, it must be based on ascribed group membership whether or not it accurately reflects them (Ibid, 2023, p. 1). What makes discrimination different is that it is not merely opinion or prejudice but rather a form of action or policy that can operate directly or indirectly through institutional practices (Fiske, 1998, p. 358). Direct discrimination occurs when an individual or group is explicitly treated unfavorably because of their gender or religion, while indirect discrimination occurs when policies or rules of a community or country have a negative effect on a particular group (Fredman, 2022, p. 4). Discrimination can occur at multiple dimensions at the same time; for instance, a person may face discrimination for being black Muslim (the dimensions of race and religion). Stereotypes (cognitive ideas about a group that involve beliefs that are generalized) and prejudice (it refers to emotional reaction or feelings that a society has toward a particular group) are identified by Zayed (2023) as the major causes of discrimination, as these three elements work by reinforcing one another, for instance if an individual has a specific stereotype about a group

this will result in generating prejudice which in return motivate discrimination against that group (Zayed, 2023, p. 2). Well-known examples of discrimination in history are the slavery of black people in America, racial segregation in South America, the denial of voting rights for women, the incarceration of Japanese Americans in the United States, the illegal deportation of Mexican Americans in 1920, and the genocide of six million Jews during WWII.

4. Persuasion

It can be defined as changing the attitudes, beliefs, or behaviors of a group or individual, or it can be defined as shaping how people mentally understand events or social actors through language that guides the audience toward a preferred interpretation that aligns with the speaker's goals (van Dijk, 2009, p. 111). According to van Dijk (2009, p. 111), persuasion can be viewed through a wide lens, extending beyond individuals or socially specific subjective representations (mental models) to the control of knowledge and ideologies. Reardon (1981, p. 25) aligns with van Dijk's definition of Persuasion, which he explains as an act of using symbolic communication (precisely language) to intentionally influence and change at least one person's beliefs, attitudes, or behaviours. Changes in a person's beliefs or behaviors are done through the misuse of power, such as the manufacture of approval or other forms of artificial influence (Mullholland, 1994, p. 24). To apply this in a political context, persuasion can be achieved through the use of empty words or political lying, which function to manipulate people's minds (Ibid, 1994, p. 24). At this moment, it's important to distinguish between the two concepts of manipulation and persuasion, as they are frequently used interchangeably. According to Harré (1985, p. 126), both persuasion and manipulation are interpersonal actions that go in one direction from the speaker to the subject of influence; the difference is that persuasion involves a psychological awareness from the audience that they are being convinced, while in manipulation, there is psychological unawareness with negative effects that is being exercised over them making them victims. For van Dijk (van Dijk, 2006, p. 13), the distinction between the two terms is that persuasion is a legitimate act, as the people can act as they choose and remain free to accept or reject the argument of the social actor, while in manipulation it is an illegitimate act where the audience is misled or guided without awareness of the action making them victims.

5. Rhetoric theory

Rhetoric theory (the word rhetoric derived from the Greek word '*rhētor*' that means the art of public speaking) was invented by the great scholar Aristotle, who was the first to study persuasion as a systematic use of language (Kennedy, 2007, p. 8). Aristotle's rhetoric is concerned with how language is used to accomplish persuasion, primarily through rational arguments and debating opposing viewpoints, in addition to emphasizing the three artistic proofs of logos, pathos, and ethos (Torto, 2020, p. 271). Aristotle's rational proof is based on logical reasoning in any argument (Logos), pathos is understood as the link between the emotions or the feeling that the speaker draws from the audience, and the argument itself, while ethos refers to the manners that the speaker's attitude and personality affect the interpretation of the message (Griffin, 2000, p. 2).



Fig 1 Aristotle's rhetorical theory

For Richards (2008, p. 32), Aristotle identifies several techniques by which the speaker persuades his audience, as persuasion is linked to the activity the speaker does during the process of uttering a discourse, such as invention, arrangement, and style. According to Torto (2020, p. 271), this theory serves as a tool for accomplishing persuasion in any discourse and has been applied to a vast number of research studies aimed at identifying the theme of persuasion.

6. Data

The current study uses a mixed-methods approach; seven speeches from Donald J. Trump's discourse were selected for analysis. The research data and sample sizes were based on several criteria, among which were the following: one of the main criteria was the study's objectives. The present study aims to provide generalized results on how Donald Trump discriminates against immigration and to identify similar patterns of *US* vs *THEM* across different years and speeches. The number and size of the selected speeches allow the research to provide a vast, amusing, and perceptive explanation of how D.J. Trump discriminated against immigrants from 2015 to 2025. Most of the speeches on immigration were brief (only a few paragraphs each), which requires taking only the relevant paragraphs of more than one speech to ensure a satisfactory, detailed, and insightful analysis. The selection of these seven speeches was intended to provide variety in the study. This variety shows how Trump's discourse was oriented to harass immigrants in different ways and different discourses across the years, which suits the purpose of this study uniquely. For the above reasons, the number, size, and specification of these paragraphs of the speeches are reasonable and required to arrive at detailed, linguistically valid, and generalized findings.

7. Data description and sources

The current study uses several selected political speeches delivered by D.J. Trump. These speeches were collected during the years from 2015 to 2025 from internet websites and transcribed in written form for straightforward analysis of the speeches. The data were then checked and corrected against the original video form of the speech manually to ensure the correctness of the

transcription. The first speech was delivered on December 7, 2015, in Mt. Pleasant with 8261 words (<https://rollcall.com/factbase/trump/transcript/donald-trump-speech-mt.-pleasant-sc-december-7-2015/>). The second speech was delivered in Phoenix on August. 31, 2016, with 6854 words (Transcript: Donald Trump's full immigration speech, annotated - Los Angeles Times). The third speech was on November 1, 2018, with 5277 words (Remarks by President Trump on the Illegal Immigration Crisis and Border Security – The White House). The fourth speech was on February 6, 2019, with 5563 words (<https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-state-union-address-2/>). The fifth speech was on December 16, 2023, in Durham, New Hampshire, with 13094 words (<https://www.rev.com/transcripts/trump-rally-from-durham-new-hampshire-12-16-23-transcript>). The sixth speech was in Arizona, October 24, 2024, with 7111 words (<https://www.c-span.org/program/campaign-2024/former-president-trump-campaigns-in-tempe-arizona/650893>). The seventh speech was on September 23, 2025, with 8223 words (<chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.astrid-online.it/static/upload/trum/0001/trump-un-23-9-25.pdf>). The total words for the seven speeches are 54,383 words.

8. Methodological procedures

The study will analyze Donald Trump's speech using DHA, which Ruth Wodak and her colleague Reisigl developed. In terms of the discursive strategies, Wodak identifies five strategies with the objectives and devices that are used with each one. According to Wodak & Meyer (2015: 33), these linguistic strategies are five, starting with Nomination, and ending with Mitigation & Intensification. The first strategy, the analysis will examine the social actors, the references used by the speaker, and direct quotes from the text in which these references appear. The second strategy is predication, which examines the traits or characteristics assigned to social actors by the speaker. The third strategy is argumentation, which will depend on Topos and the argument schema of Reisigl & Wodak (2015). The fourth strategy is perspectivization, which considers the social actor's point of view, involvement, and distance that he creates in his discourse. Finally, intensification & mitigation are the strategies that will be examined, focusing on the intensifiers and modal auxiliaries that were used in the speech. These intensifiers (such as very, completely) modify the degree of how something is expressed, indicating that it is expressed strongly, weakly, completely, or partially (Quirk et al. 1973: 589). In addition to the detailed description of each strategy, the research includes the use of Aristotle's rhetorical theory with its three components of logos, pathos, and ethos. Also, the analysis will contain the use of several linguistic devices that will be presented in tables that list the devices used in the analysis, along with other variables, such as frequency and rank. Figures explaining the argument schema of Wodak (2015) will be presented to provide a richer, more insightful explanation of the Topoi.

9. Data analysis

The analysis of the data in Donald J. Trump is divided into six parts. The first part, 8.1, is the analysis of the nomination strategy, the second part, 8.2, will deal with the predication strategy, the third part, 8.3, will examine the argumentation strategy, the fourth part, 8.4, will be the

perspectivization strategy, the fifth part, 8.5, is the intensification & mitigation strategy, and the sixth part 8.6 will explain persuasion in his discourse.

9.1 Nomination strategy

This strategy involves examining who the immigrants (out-group) are referred to in Trump's speech. The analysis shows what linguistic terms are used to refer to immigration in the seven selected speeches. The table below will classify this discursive strategy.

Table 1: Categories of the analysis for the discourse of immigration in Trump's speech.

<i>Social actor</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Rank</i>
<i>Immigrants</i>	Immigration	71	1 st
	Migrants	36	2 nd
	Immigrants	30	3 rd
	Illegal immigrants	21	4
	Illegal aliens	16	5
	Illegal immigration	15	6
	Criminal	11	7
	Criminal aliens	10	8
	Traffickers	9	9
	Gang members	8	10
	Terrorists	7	11
	Asylum seeker	4	12
	Migrant gang	3	13
	Illegal immigrant	3	13
	Legal immigration	3	13
	These people	3	13
	Criminal illegal immigrants	2	14
	Violent criminal	2	14
	Lawful immigration	1	15
	Criminal immigrants	1	14

Uncontrolled immigration	1	14
Bad people	1	14
Vicious people	1	14

The analysis of the nomination strategy shows that Trump mostly used neutral words like “Immigration, Migrants, Immigrants”, occupying the top three ranks. By commencing with neutral terms, he appears factual and law-focused, which allows him to gradually introduce more charged terminology such as “Criminal, Uncontrolled, Bad people, Vicious people”. He also attached the adjective “illegal” to the neutral terms, creating phrases like “Illegal immigrants, Illegal aliens, Illegal immigration”, which frame immigration entirely through legal status, making the word “illegally” a crucial part of their description. The shift towards using the word “aliens” marks distance, describing them as non-human and non-belonging, as they came from nowhere to occupy America and bring distraction. He also used the word “criminal” to show the audience that these people are not only illegal immigrants, but also criminals, which associates them with violence, corruption, and danger. Using these words adds emotional weight to the speech by evoking feelings of fear, threat, and urgency. To induce fear, he also suggests they harm innocents by employing words like “Traffickers, Gang members, Terrorists, Migrant gang,” portraying them not as individual actors but as a hostile force acting for their own benefit at the expense of innocent American citizens. By generalizing immigrants from humanitarian issues to a dangerous collective group, he shifts immigration to a political issue, suggesting militarization, implying the need for ICE (Immigration and Customs Enforcement) troops.

9. 2 Predication strategy

This discursive strategy states that the attributes, characteristics, and traits assigned to immigration in the discourse of D.J. Trump. In other words, it clarifies the qualifications, either positively or negatively, regarding immigration (out-group). The table below will explain the predication strategy.

Table 2: Predication Strategy of D. J. Trump.

<i>Social actor</i>	<i>Predication</i>
<i>Immigrants</i> <i>(out-group)</i>	They bring drugs (heroin, cocaine)
	They commit violent crimes
	Kill innocent American people
	They are cold-blooded killers
	If they are here, every bad thing will happen
	They take advantage of America
	They are involved in human trafficking

The US already had many immigrants
They are Criminal aliens
They are negatively affecting the American citizens' lives
They are Gang members
They are Terrorists
They are pouring in massive numbers
They are rapist
All of them are illegal immigrants
They are destroying countries
They are Criminal illegal people
They do all the terrible things in America
They are responsible for the 9/11 catastrophe
They cause death and suffering
They travel in massive groups
They are Bad people
They are Vicious people
They are a burden on the country
They are destroying America's future
Immigrants are uncontrolled and low-skilled
They are from ISIS
The immigrants who can come are those whom the state
thinks worthy
They are attacking defenseless citizens
They are aliens
Only successful immigrants are allowed into the US
They are unwanted people in their countries
They are Iraqi and Afghan misogynistic killers
They are from Syria and Libya
They don't have a legal statute

They are low-skilled people with less education than American workers

Immigration takes everything from Americans

They cost America billions of dollars

They are invaded US

They are not looking for asylum; they want to get into the US only

They are illegal aliens

They are breaking the law of America

They are unknown people who came through Mexico

They are people whom nobody wants

American families have to suffer because of immigration

They are people who only believe in jihad

Some of them are Muslims who want to be governed according to Sharia.

They are poisoning the blood of the US citizens

They are bloodthirsty criminals

They are animals

They killed the law enforcement officers

They are an army of immigrant gangs

They are pouring and invading Europe, not only the U.S.

They are suicidal, and they will bring death to all of Europe

They repaid all the kindness of America with crimes

They are prisoners from all over the world

They are trafficking, abusing, and raping children

The above trails are part of Trump's speech to construct an image about immigration. This image is explicitly built around the danger they pose; America's economy declines because of the large numbers of immigrants, and justifies his policy against them. His speech directly links immigration with drugs, murder, rape, terrorism, trafficking, and fear. He creates a reality where immigration is not merely a movement across the border but a crisis that threatens the national security of the country. When he gives the characteristics of "*killing innocents, poisoning the blood of people, bringing drugs, invading countries, being a suicidal bomber, and costing America billions of dollars*".

9.3 Argumentation strategy

The argumentation strategy examines the justifications and questions the claims of truth that D.J. Trump makes using the Topoi. In this regard, the argumentation strategy will explore the claims of truth in D.J. Trump's anti-immigration discourse in the selected speeches and the claim of appropriateness regarding actions related to immigration in the USA. In his speech, the topos of Danger and threat was dominant. This was based on the claim that if a group poses a threat, the government should act to eliminate the danger and protect citizens from it. In Trump's discourse, immigration is framed as people who cause crimes, terrorism, a burden on the economy, and cultural erosion. For instance;




Fig. 2 Example

He portrays this image using storytelling of people who are murdered by immigrants, immigrants who commit terrorism, immigrants who hate the USA citizens, and immigrants who rape innocent people, and this applies not only to younger people, but even older individuals are not safe. He constructed an image of an evil out-group to invoke a strong sense of fear and threat. The topos of Burdening is evident in this speech, as it creates the image that if a group of people is burdening the USA, the actions are justified in removing them. Here, when immigrants take jobs, usually at much lower salaries than Americans, issues arise as wages go down and potential jobs disappear, creating a burden on American citizens who are searching for a proper income. Trump's discourse also employed Topoi of number and responsibility. The former one gives credibility to charge an emotional argument, while the second one works toward assigning blame to the current leadership (President Obama) for failing to take responsibility for the immigration crisis. Topoi of threat, burden, and numbers construct the problem of immigration; the topos of responsibility assigns an obligation to act against them. The topos of definition works toward attaching a series of terms to immigration, such as criminals, rapist, illegal, and terrorists. This works in the sense that if specific traits define a group, then they actually match those traits, which is the central point of Trump's discourse. Trump also used the topos of humanitarianism to print an image where the immigrants are vicious people who do not even care about any other human besides themselves. Trump creates a reality where immigrants have no concerns about the American citizens' rights and will harass them at any given moment. This extreme discourse will charge a negative emotion into the audience, which in turn will push his anti-immigrant policies. Furthermore, Trump heavily used Islamophobic and anti-Islam ideas to attack immigrants. The topos of religion was used multiple times to evoke these ideas; by assigning the aspect of terror

and fear to immigration, the mere existence of any immigrants is a threat, and the logical action is to reduce and deport any immigrants from the country.

Table 3: The topoi in Trump's speech.

<i>Topos</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
<i>Danger and Threat</i>	188
<i>Law and right</i>	95
<i>Definition, name-interpretation</i>	87
<i>Numbers</i>	84
<i>Burdening, weighting</i>	40
<i>Justice</i>	34
<i>Reality</i>	32
<i>History</i>	25
<i>Uselessness, disadvantage</i>	17
<i>Usefulness, advantage, & Responsibility</i>	12
<i>Humanitarianism</i>	10
<i>Religion</i>	9
<i>Finances, & Culture</i>	7
<i>Abuse</i>	3

9.4 perspectivization strategy

The analysis of perspectivization strategy shows that Trump firmly distances himself from immigration and presents himself as a savior and truth teller. He frames the out-group as the hidden threat that the Biden and Obama administrations try to cover. He rejected and clearly doubts the official number of immigrations on one hand, and on the other hand, exaggerated the number to three times more than what the government's official immigration document said. Trump shows that immigrants are one homogeneous group by the use of the *they/them* pronoun, which helps him to direct the hate as they are merely viewed as inhuman, dangerous objects. He blended several voices in his speech of people who had suffered from the immigrants' actions. This technique made him the voice of the weaker and strengthened his anti-immigration stance. He also depends, on different occasions, on storytelling, either a real story or a fictional one, to target an adverse emotional reaction within the public. His speech constantly attacks the other political party, using the immigration policy as a symbol of their political failure rather than a human who seeks a home. Overall, his speech tends to use simple words, extreme language, and vulgar vocabulary when

addressing the out-group, with many repetitions of the exact phrase or single linguistic item multiple times.

9.5 Intensification & Mitigation strategy

This strategy explains how D.J. Trump's utterances describing immigration are intensified or mitigated through specific linguistic devices. To look at how his utterances concerning the description of negative or positive traits and the illocutionary force intensified or mitigated. The analysis will first examine the intensifiers (amplifiers and downtoners), then the modal auxiliaries.

Table 4: Intensification & Mitigation Strategy

<i>Downtoner</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Amplifier</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Modal verb</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Rank</i>
<i>Just</i>	150	1 st	So	293	1 st	Will	390	1 st
<i>Only</i>	54	2 nd	Very	229	2 nd	Can	187	2 nd
<i>Little</i>	33	3 rd	Most	153	3 rd	Would	123	3 rd
<i>Almost</i>	25	4 th	Great	146	4 th	Have to	120	4 th
<i>Probably</i>	24	5 th	Much	98	5 th	Could	54	5 th
<i>Sort of</i>	9	6 th	Really	64	6 th	Must	48	6 th
<i>Honestly</i>	8	7 th	Such	25	7 th	Should	23	7 th
<i>Kind of</i>	7	8 th	Totally, Far	20	8 th	May	16	8 th
<i>Perhaps</i>	5	9 th	Worst	13	9	Might	5	9 th
			Unbelievably	10	10	Shall	1	10 th
			Highly	7	11			
			Absolutely, Fully	4	12			
			Completely	3	13			
			Perfectly, Extremely,	2	14			
			Inherently	1	15 th			

The mitigation and intensification strategy shows that Trump's speech relies heavily on amplifiers, indicating a substantial intensification of the negative representation of immigration across all seven selected speeches. The amplifiers like 'so, very, and most' dominated the first three ranks. These amplifiers work on two aspects: first, to intensify the image of crisis, danger,

and disaster created by the presence of immigrants, and second, to strengthen the negative portrait of immigration that was analyzed in the first two strategies (*nomination & predication strategies*). This works to set immigration and any related action to them as an existential threat to the USA. This use of the amplifiers to emphasize a harmful representation of out group while emphasizing an optimistic representation of in group works to discriminate between the two groups as ‘*the bad them*’ vs ‘*the good us*’. The significant different between the use of amplifiers and downtoners reflect two facts, first it shows that Trump speech relies generally on intensifying rather than mitigating his utterances. Secondly, Trump tends to avoid mentioning the positive traits and actions rather than mitigating them. The analysis reveals that the use of downtoners was mainly to reduce the positive illustration and minimize the alternative solution for the immigration situation. One notable use of downtoners was to mitigate the future danger if he were to become the president, which worked to promote his policies in general and anti-immigration in specific. Finally, the analysis of modal verbs shows how his utterances against immigration were intensified and how his future policies and promises to eliminate them were emphasized. He mainly relied on the use of ‘will’ to present his future action as legitimate because of the previous and current evil actions of immigration. He also used some obligation model verbs, such as ‘have to’, to insist on deporting and reducing the number of immigrants, both legal and illegal, to zero, and to commend the government that they must act against them even when he declares that anti-immigration is not politically correct on several occasions in the select speeches.

9.6 persuasion

The analysis of persuasion in D.J. Trump’s discourse shows that he used a specific set of persuasive strategies proposed by Aristotle to convince the audience. According to the data, Trump tries to convince the audience to his side by the use of persuasive devices as evoking history or numbers, to connect with his listeners on a deeper level. The table below presents examples of the analysis:

Table 5: Examples of persuasion in Tramp’s discourse

Utterance	Nature of the utterance	Meaning	Rhetorical strategy	Device
<i>Just three weeks ago, Debra’s parents, Gerald and Sharon, were burglarized and shot to death in their Reno, Nevada home by an illegal alien. L157-159 (2019)</i>	Stating	Immigrants are killing the Americans.	pathos	Evoking history and vocative
<i>In many cases, by the way, they’re treated better than our vets. L98-99 (2016)</i>	Comparison and framing of grievance	The immigrants who came illegally are treated better than legal Americans.	pathos	Appeal to logic and personal pronouns

<i>In the last two years, our brave ICE officers made 266,000 arrests of criminal aliens, including those charged or convicted of nearly 100,000 assaults, 30,000 sex crimes, and 4,000 killings or murders. L166-168 (2019)</i>	Danger and criminalization	Immigration killed, assaults, and committed sex crimes against countless Americans.	Logos		Numbers and evoking history
<i>I will invoke the Alien Enemies Act of 1798. Can you believe that, to go back that far? To target and dismantle every migrant criminal network operating on American soil. Can you imagine having to go back to 1798? L212-214 (2024)</i>	Legal declaration	Immigrants are a network of criminals, and they should be out of the country, even at the cost of bringing back an old law.	Ethos and logos		Evoking history and a rhetorical question
<i>On top of that, illegal immigration costs our country more than \$113 billion dollars a year. L86-87 (2016)</i>	Burdening	Immigrants are a financial burden for the USA	Logos		Numbers
<i>If you come illegally into the United States, you're going to jail or you're going back to where you came from, or perhaps even further than that, you know what that means. L53-55 (2025)</i>	Threatening	Trump is establishing the punishment that immigrants will face if they cross the border.	Logos and Ethos		Appeal to logic
<i>Both the immigration and their suicidal energy ideas will be the death of Western Europe if something is not done immediately. L281-284 (2025)</i>	Threatening	Immigrants are suicidal boomers, and they will bring chaos to Europe	Pathos		Appeal to logic and the poetic aspect
<i>We're a dumping ground. We're like a garbage can for the world. That's what's happened. First time I've ever said garbage can. But you know what? It's a very accurate description. L45-50 (2024)</i>	Stating and approving	Immigration is framed as a waste that is thrown at America, as no other country wants them	Pathos		Poetic aspect, appeal to logic, and rhetorical question
<i>So they took them back and we took out thousands and thousands of people in this country, and I mean the most evil you've ever seen, gang members, a lot of terrorists. L111-113 (2024)</i>	Stating and threatening	Immigrants are thousands of the vilest gang members and terrorists in the country.	Logos and pathos		Personal pronouns , numbers, vocatives , and appealing to logic

<i>We have to have our borders. Can't let drugs come in. Not just — it's not just people. It's people; it's drugs. It's human traffickers.</i> L176-178 (2018)	Declaring	Because the current government allows immigrants to come into the country, they bring drugs with them	Logos and ethos	Appeal to logic
--	-----------	---	-----------------	-----------------

The analysis shows that logos was dominant in Trump's speech with 224 times. His discourse was built mainly on using facts, evidence, and logic as a form of persuasion. In his discourse, he repeatedly tries to present his anti-immigration speech as a matter of fact, using persuasive devices like appealing to logic and numbers. Trump relies on reports, statistics, and references to other institutions, such as ICE, to logically justify his argument as a rational action. The high frequency of 199 in the use of appealing to logic reflects the fact that Trump's speech was structured on justification and reasoning, as he constantly uses evidence and facts to frame immigration as a problem and a crisis. What worth mentioning is the fact that Trump uses video footage of immigrants attempting a violent acts as hurting officers at the border or burning and breaking things in public places as evidences to support his anti-immigration policies along with using ideologies about other religions and nations as logical reasons to deport any immigrants like referring to Muslims as barbaric and suicide boomers or Mexicans as low-quality workers and violent gang members. The second strategy was pathos, with 189 times. It shows that Trump uses victims' stories, the theme of fear and crisis, and the moral, religious, and cultural threat as main devices for his discourse. What was noticeable is the fact that he, most of the time, uses pathos along with logos in the form of victims' numbers or age, reports on the violent acts of immigrants like drug dealing or human trafficking, and an exaggerated number of cross-border passing. The main emotions that Trump works to build or intensified is fear, anger, and hate. He used vocatives to refer to immigrants as terrorists, gang members, and criminals to activate fear and hate in his audience. He also directs anger and hate at immigrants by pointing out that they are the reason for high housing prices, low wages, bad healthcare services, and a decrease in the quality and opportunities of education in the USA. Trump also used the personal pronoun 'They' to discriminate and show hostility against immigrants by separating them from the Americans through drawing a line between him and his supporters (usually under a relationship of protector\leader and his follower\protected) and immigrants. He also used storytelling of horrific incidents that immigrants cause, either real or imaginary ones. In addition to that, he used historical events and incidents in two ways: first, with logos as a form of evidence to support his claim, like referring to 9/11 as a result of an open border policy, and second, with pathos in the theme of fear and danger, as the past reports of Americans murdered by immigrants. Ethos appears 150 times during Trump's speech as he presents himself as the protector, truth-teller, the only one who understands the victims of immigrants, and the needed leader. He creates a framework of credibility by positioning himself as the only one who can solve the crisis of immigration, the only one who recognizes and supports the victims of immigration, and the truthful leader who will bring justice and law back to America. He constructed an image of authority by promising that his future

administration would solve the problem of immigration, which creates an image of a trusted leader who listens to the difficulties of his people. Trump uses poetic aspects, like metaphors to refer to America as a dumping ground, and referring to immigrants as an invasion or flooding, in addition to a few times using rhetorical questions, which shows that his speech relies more on assertive direct speech than on dialogic reasoning prompts.

Table 6: persuasion strategies in Trump's speech (total)

Rhetorical strategy	Frequency	Rank
Logos	224	1 st
Pathos	189	2 nd
Ethos	150	3 rd

Table 7: persuasion devices in Trump's speech (total)

Device	Frequency	Rank
Appeal to logic	199	1 st
Vocative	144	2 nd
Numbers	135	3 rd
Personal pronouns	124	4 th
Evoking history	50	5 th
Poetic aspect	28	6 th
Rhetorical questions	7	7 th

10. Results and Conclusions

The present study reveals the following conclusions: in the analysis of the five strategies of Wodak and Reisigl's DHA has allowed the researcher to reach a central finding of this study, which is that Trump's discourse on immigration was constructed to create a discriminatory, negative other representation of dangerous, threatening others, which attacks both the legal and illegal immigrants. This allows him to discriminate against immigration by framing it as a collective danger rather than a separate individual, recreating the positive us vs negative them dichotomy. The nomination strategy reveals that the linguistic terms that were used to refer to immigration carried a strong negative connotation, as Trump constantly refers to them as criminals, drug dealers, and more. Trump used a '*they/them*' pronoun to construct a single homogenous group or a unified entity that was typically young males who were represented as a threatening entity. The analysis of the predication strategy shows that Trump uses the issue of immigration as

a political excuse, as he associates immigration with other crimes like drug flooding, human trafficking, and rape, giving them the label of criminals, which legitimizes the actions against them. Trump uses the ideologies of other religions and nations to the collective reference of immigration, such as African, Afghan, Iraqi, Muslims, terrorists, and misogynists, to collapse them as a group that does not deserve a place in a modern country like the USA. The analysis of the argumentation strategy reveals that Trump's speech relies on the use of Danger and Threat topos as the most prominent topoi, followed by the topos of definition, number, and law and right. These topoi frame immigration as primarily a threat to the life, culture, religion, education, healthcare, security, and law of American citizens. The topoi work to construct immigration as a problem, crisis, and urgent threat that must be stopped using extreme policies such as deportation, rejection of all visas, wall-building, and militarization. Trump's discourse consistently adopts a self-authorized perspective, positioning himself as the protector, the savior, and the enforcer of the law. The perspectivization strategy makes this clear, and it also shows how he aligns himself with the American people and, by objectifying immigration as something that has happened/is happening to the USA, like a crisis, a disaster, he removes any emotional weight from their side and reduces it to a matter of national security and Government policy. Trump uses amplifiers to intensify his speech in two ways: first, by amplifying the extreme lexical choices he used to address immigrants, and second, by emphasizing his utterances when he speaks about them. In both cases, Trump uses repetitive, emotionally charged language to intensify the threatening image he portrayed in the previous four strategies. His utterances intensified when he linked immigration to crime and danger and exaggerated the documented number of immigrants in the USA. This emphasis appeared only when he addressed the negative side of immigration, as he never, in the seven speeches, addressed immigration positively. The frequency of the downtoners was selectively applied only to mitigate his anti-immigration policies, treating them as reasonable, lawful, and necessary acts in light of the crisis the country faced. His anti-immigration speech was a muted killer that relied on extremely hateful speech, vulgar language, criminalization, and ideological beliefs, and resulted in RASIM (refugee, asylum seeker, immigrant) being suspended from applying for citizenship, legal parole programs for immigrants were ended, the CBP app for RASIM appointments was removed, ICE and law enforcement authority was expanded, and arresting immigrants in sensitive areas (hospitals or schools) was allowed. In terms of persuasive strategies, Trump relies on the use of logic, reason, and facts to convince the audience of his anti-immigration claims. He mainly relies on the use of logos, showing that his speech was primarily framed in evidence, like numbers, and appealing to logic. Pathos takes second place as Trump's discourse makes use of emotions such as fear, anger, and danger to build his claim. The emotional persuasion relies on victims' stories, framing a crisis, and the theme of moral and cultural danger. The use of victims' numbers, age, and the reports of immigration crimes was presented through the combined use of Logos and pathos. Trump constructed an image of a protector and truthful leader using ethos to establish his credibility and help him build a claim of exclusive immigration problem-solving capability, authority, and leadership. In addition to that, he employed several devices to further ground his claims, such as the use of numbers, history, pronouns (them), and vocatives.

11. References

- Diehl, T. (2019). *Tabloid news, anti-immigration attitudes, and support for right-wing populist parties*. Sage 16, 3-18.
- Fiske, T. (1998). *Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination*. Sage, 357-411.
- Fredman, S. (2022). *Discrimination law*. New York: Oxford.
- Griffin, E. (2000). *A First Look at Communication Theory*. Hill Companies.
- Harré, R. (1985). *Persuasion and manipulation*. In T. van Dijk, *Discourse and communication: New approaches to the analysis of mass media*. (pp. 126-142). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kennedy, G. (2007). *On rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse*. Oxford University Press.
- Kramer, S., & Passel, J. (2025). *What the data says about immigrants in the U.S*. In Pew Research Center. Aug 2025. from <<https://data.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/map-the-impact/> >
- Mudde, C. (2000). *The ideology of the extreme right*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Mullholland, J. (1994). *A Handbook of Persuasive Tactics: A Practical Language Guide*. Singapore: Routledge.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartik, J. (1973). *A grammar of contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- Reardon, K. (1981). *Persuasion, theory, and context*. Sage.
- Richards, J. (2008). *Rhetoric*. Routledge.
- Sykes, S. (2024). *Tradwives: Right-Wing Social Media Influencers*. Sage 35, 1-35.
- Torto, R. (2020). *Aristotelian Rhetorical Theory as a Framework for Analyzing Advertising Texts in the Print Media in Ghana*. ACADEMY PUBLICATION, 269-283.
- van Dijk, T. (2006). *Ideology and discourse analysis*. Journal of Political Ideologies, 115-140.
- van Dijk, T. (2009). *Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity*. In R. & Wodak, *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95-120). London: Sage.
- Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. (2015). *The discourse historical approach*. In: Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (eds). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed). London: Sage. 63-94.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.
- Zayed, H. (2023). *The concept and reason of discrimination in our society, What is the measurement and consequences of discrimination in European societies*. Research Gate.