

A Critical Discourse Analysis of Online Hate Speech in Donald Trump's Tweets

Bashdar Ahmed Ali Khoshnaw¹, Kurdistan rafeeq Moheddin²

¹Soran University Presidency, ²Soran University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31918/twejer.2583.17>

Published:1/12/2025

Abstract

Researchers have used Critical Discourse Analysis to examine how hate speech is constructed in the Social media posts of former U.S. President Donald J. Trump. The analysis utilizes Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional approach to examine a carefully selected set of President Trump's tweets from 2017, which coincided with intense political polarization and polarizing policy enactments. The study explores how Trump's online speech expresses, organizes and reinforces hateful beliefs and attitudes. The analysis demonstrates that Donald Trump is a Populis rhetoric that employs recurrent rhetorical devices such as negative stereotyping, division-making, and implied intimidation to create clear differences between those in power and perceived outsiders. Such techniques help reinforce prejudiced notions and strengthen the positions of dominant groups. This research places Trump's tweets in their wider socio-political setting to show how social media influences the ways in which prejudicial views are conveyed and disseminated. This research adds to the scholarship on how hate speech is perpetuated via online political discourse.

Keyword: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Hate Speech, Political Polarization, Social Media, Populist Rhetoric

A Critical Discourse Analysis of Online Hate Speech in Donald Trump's Tweets

Bashdar Ahmed Ali Khoshnaw

Certificate: MA Student, Soran University Presidency

Bashdar.ali@soran.edu.iq

Asst. Prof. Dr. Kurdistan rafeeq Moheddin

Certificate: PHD in English Linguistics, Soran University

Kurdistan.mhyadin@soran.edu.iq

Introduction

Digital communication has significantly changed how political discussions are created, shared and interpreted by people. Politicians now have the ability to deliver messages and interact with constituents through social media without waiting for broadcast or print media to filter what gets published (Ott, 2017). One individual who's taken advantage of Twitter to a significant degree is Donald J. Trump, the former U.S. President. His tweets are both a form of political communication and a means of popularizing inflammatory beliefs and statements that go so far as to include hate speech (Wodak, 2021).

Words or expressions that inflame hatred, promote the rejection or harm of people or whole groups due to their traits such as ethnicity, faith, gender identity, or country, undermine respectful debate and damage communal unity (Gagliardone et al., 2015). The effects of such discourse are greatly magnified when delivered by political figures since it can influence attitudes and endorsed titles too. Van Dijk (1993)

The present study uses Norman Fairclough's (1995) Critical Discourse Analysis to explore how Donald Trump's use of Twitter contributes to the propagation of hate speech online. CDA provides a valuable approach to

analyzing how the ideology informs the ways language is used to sustain and perpetuate existing forms of power in society. The study seeks to demonstrate that Trump's tweets enacts language to exert power and shape beliefs and behaviors.

New research adds to our understanding of how political communication on social media is rooted in and reinforces the use of language that expresses hatred and bigotry. It examines how Trump's language on Twitter shapes and is shaped by currents of popular thought.

Literature review

The launch of social media networks has reshaped global communication, increasing as well as the degree to which people around the world are able to connect, share information, and present their own views in the digital realm. However, this digital revolution has also introduced new challenges, most notably the rise of hate speech. The anonymous nature of social media worsens this issue by enabling individuals to express harmful opinions without fear of legal consequences.

The authors Pamungkas et al., (2022) in their research entitled 'Abusive language detection in social media' strongly urged the betterment of these detection models for which profanity alone is equally indicating the negative intent in certain cases. Citron 2015 in a research entitled 'Hate Crimes in Cyberspace' portrayed the increased cyber harassment and hate crimes against minorities; noting that current and emerging techniques in law and technology need to be implemented over time to curb this vice.

Further, Waseem and Hovy (2016) in their study entitled 'Hateful symbols or hateful people? Predicting hate speech on online social media revealed some linguistic features. Hate speech, particularly prevalent on platforms like Twitter, is defined by distinct characteristics that target marginalized communities. It often contains language that's designed to insult or disparage people due to their race, gender, religion or sexuality. One distinctive characteristic is the prominence it gives to attacking the rights and values of groups from ethnic,

religious, or sexual minorities. Much of the emotional tone in hate speech indicates hostility and a lack of respect for those targeted. Moreover, hate speech often resorts to using stereotypes and generalizations to perpetuate false negative views about certain communities. Using imperatives, warnings and authoritative tone fosters antagonism toward the intended victims. These qualities are closely connected with larger problems like racism, sexism and political intolerance, often exerting unequal affect on marginalized groups.

Davidson et al. (2017) in their study ‘Automated hate speech detection and the problem of offensive language’ state that designing such a system that differentiates hateful content on Twitter from other forms of harassment is a difficult task. It's shown that achieving a fully precise hate speech detection across platforms with varying cultures and languages is challenging. That is, it cannot be overemphasized that hate speech has sociopolitical and cultural determinants and embellishments.

Regarding the differences in hate speech uttered in different political environments, Gevers et al. (2022) in their study entitled ‘Linguistic analysis of toxic language on social media’ reported variation in corresponding linguistic markers. They called attention to the “listener” about hate speech since sociopolitical conflict typically generates and sustains harassment.

The contribution of Pelzer et al. (2021) in the study ‘Far-right discourse and the normalization of hate speech on social media’ reviewed how far-right players are able to use disguised hate speech on social media by embracing even ‘dog whistle’ vectors and more subtly making it harder to prevent or resist the normalization process of hate. Such practices facilitate the steady dissemination of hate messages, which automated systems acting as moderators fail to easily recognize.

Namely, in ‘Multilingual Hate Speech Detection’ by Vashistha and Zubiaga (2021) the English and Hindi language hate speech models are compared. This work of theirs further proved the fact that creating the models in detection, which are sensitive to cultural and language differences, is not an easy task whatsoever.

Furthermore, in their published paper, ‘Linguistic analysis of toxic language on social media’, Gevers et al. (2022) highlighted the need for linguistic analysis of toxic language in social media, and how this can help improve the reliability of such detection in the multi-lingual world.

In addition, Jay & Janschewitz (2008) in a study entitled ‘The pragmatics of swearing’ considered how swearing serves both the creation of the bond between people and the expression of their mutual exclusion; thus, the definition of ‘bad’ words and of ‘humane’ language was rather vague. It is viewed that their work postulates that there is a continuation, where the identification of hate speech is made easier in the sociocultural value by the extent of swearing, especially in brotherhood.

To the best of the authors’ knowledge, previous work by Kovács et al. (2021) ‘Deep learning for hate speech detection’ highlighted limitations when it comes to the identification of hate speech, primarily owing to a lack of annotated data and contextual sensitivity of the abuse. They suggested that deep neural networks (DNNs) enhance detection accuracy, and they also clarified that the concern is overfitting when the models are trained on a small sample.

Schäfer et al., 2023 in their study entitled ‘Counter speech and polarization in online communities’, suggested that counter-speech is effective in lowering the effects of hate speech, but the process can trigger social polarization mainly because of political grounds.

Megersa and Minaye (2023) in their research entitled ‘User behaviours in response to online hate speech’ studied various patterns of user engagement (e.g., as a troll, a peacemaker, an informant) which affect the diffusion and management of hate speech. The authors also discovered that assessing the requirements of users is imperative for implementing the intervention.

The authors Benton, et al. (2022) in their work ‘Hate Speech Spikes on Twitter after Elon Musk Acquires the Platform’ also stressed the need to involve community support. They discussed how engagement widgets could be added to social media systems. Their studies revealed that the combination of automated detection and community moderation has a better approach towards filtering out hate speech while encouraging togetherness in the online social platform.

Ghosh et al. (2022) in the 2022 study ‘A Benchmark Setup to Identify Online Hate Speech in English’ found that continued exposure to hateful online content may cause people to grow numb to it, leading to worse disparities and making it harder to limit.

Recently, scholars have focused intensively on investigating the linguistic, cultural, and technical aspects of hate speech. According to the research by Pamungkas et al. (2022) titled ‘Abusive language detection in social media, The study advocated using contextual information to determine the abusiveness of language.

Research such as the study conducted by Nguyen et al. in 2021 known as ‘How Familiarity with Hate Speech Leads to Acceptance of It’ showed that repeated exposure to hate speech makes it seem more acceptable or normal. Rojas-Galeano (2017) in his study entitled ‘Obfuscated obscenities: Subtle tactics for evading detection in online hate speech’ dealt with how toxic language disguises itself in a way that moderators will not capture or penalize. This demonstrated how shifts in language facilitate the propagation and sustenance of hate on the internet.

While many studies have focused on detecting hate speech through automated models, identifying linguistic markers, and understanding user behaviors, few have critically analyzed how hate speech is *strategically constructed* through political discourse on social media platforms. In particular, there is limited research applying Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to examine the sociopolitical and ideological mechanisms behind hate speech in the tweets of influential political figures like Donald Trump.

Thus, this paper addresses an important gap by using CDA to reveal the deeper structures of power, ideology, and normalization processes embedded in Trump's 2017 tweets, showing not just *what* hate speech looks like, but *how* it is framed, justified, and propagated within political communication.

Problem Statement

The rise of social media and digital communication has significantly influenced language use, fostering both positive and negative interactions in online spaces. Among the most concerning developments is the proliferation of hate speech, which poses serious social, psychological, and legal challenges. While various studies have examined hate speech from legal, ethical, and computational perspectives, there remains a need for a critical approach that explores how language choices, discourse patterns, and social identities shape and reinforce hate speech in English.

A great deal of research has centered on detecting and moderating hate speech through automated methods but there has been limited exploration of the underlying linguistic features, discourse patterns and cultural influences that propel its continued existence online. Important questions still need to be addressed, including how hate speech shifts among various online communities,

the ways in which it's oriented to shape an “us” and “them” perception and the linguistic strategies used to accomplish this distinction. Moreover, the dynamism of online communication requires a renewed approach to assessing hate speech and how it constantly adapts in new linguistic forms.

The paper evaluates the linguistic and discursive elements of hate speech online in English and considers how it shapes society. This research analyzes how hateful language is used in online forums in order to shed light on how communication online both mirrors and reinforces societally entrenched prejudices and inform actions to combat discrimination on the Internet.

Aims of the Study

The paper seeks to investigate the language patterns and discursive tactics employed in online hate speech delivered in English. This study analyses the linguistic characteristics of hate speech to determine the strategies and vocabulary that help distribute and amplify such messages across the digital world.

Another important goal is to examine how the hate speech language reflects adjustments to the particular digital environment of X. Exploring differences in pattern usage across various online platforms will help understand whether and how the characteristics of hate speech change in relationship to technological and societal contexts.

One goal of this study is to explore how cultural and social influences shape both the ways people use and perceive online hate speech. Group affiliations, ideologies and social power dynamics significantly influence the way hate speech manifests and operates online in the English-speaking community.

A secondary aim is to examine how normalization contributes to the ongoing presence and strengthening of hateful language online. The researchers aim to investigate how certain words or phrases are normalized within certain

communities, in order to explain how they contribute to the enduring presence of hate speech online.

The research will also evaluate how hate speech influences the development of internal unity and alienates individuals from different backgrounds on the internet. Studying hate speech aims to understand how language forms and strengthens the bond among one group and highlights differences and stigmatizes individuals from other groups.

As a result, this study hopes to offer guidance for developing effective approaches to combat and control online hate speech. By offering a critical perspective on the issue, this study will contribute to discussions on language regulation, content moderation, and digital ethics, ultimately helping to develop more effective approaches to countering harmful online discourse.

Research Questions

1. What are the key linguistic features and discourse strategies used in online hate speech?
2. How do sociocultural factors, such as group identity and ideological affiliation, shape the use and perception of hate speech online, and in what ways does it function to construct in-group cohesion while marginalizing out-groups?
3. How does the normalization of certain linguistic forms contribute to the persistence and reinforcement of hate speech in online spaces(x platform)?

The Hypotheses

Online hate speech exhibits distinct linguistic patterns and discourse strategies that vary in digital platforms and communities. These patterns are shaped by sociocultural factors, including group identity, power dynamics, and

ideological affiliations. Additionally, the normalization of specific linguistic forms within certain online spaces contributes to the persistence and reinforcement of hate speech, making it more resistant to moderation efforts. By analyzing these elements, this study hypothesizes that hate speech is not only a reflection of societal prejudices but also a means of constructing and maintaining in-group cohesion while marginalizing out-groups.

Data and Method

The data for this study consists of Donald Trump's tweets from his last mandate as president, a period marked by heightened political polarization and widespread digital discourse. Trump's reliance on Twitter as his primary means of communication offers a valuable lens through which to study the techniques and forms of expression he uses in crafting his political discourse online, particularly when it comes to statements that promote or perpetuate hate speech. The study employs a qualitative approach to explore how Trump's tweets express and construct meaning beyond what can be measured by simple counts.

The analysis draws on Fairclough's three-dimensional model of discourse, which focuses on the interplay between language, how it's used and its relationship to the wider society. The study analyzes both the linguistic content of Trump's tweets and the ways they're produced, shared and understood within the sociopolitical context in which they occur. The method allows us to recognize the ways in which President Trump's language potentially legitimizes divisive discourse, shapes the creation of divisive groups and reinforces dominant hierarchies in online environments.

The Scope of the Study

The study analyzes how Trump used Twitter in 2017 to disseminate hateful messages on the topic of immigration. Trump's use of Twitter during the period

of high political division and digital discourse is a useful window into the prevalent rhetorical tactics found in both his immigration-related claims and expressions of hate speech.

A qualitative analysis explores the ways in which Trump's immigration discourse is shaped by particular contexts, expresses specific ideologies, and institutionalizes specific structures. The study adopts Fairclough's three-dimensional approach to discourse to examine the relationship between Trump's tweets, his rhetoric and their influence on social identities and political ideologies. This approach makes it possible to analyze how Trump's immigration-related posts influence the creation and maintenance of social identities, perpetuate the formation of boundary lines between different social groups and play a critical role in the increasing acceptance of exclusionary language online.

This study focuses on the content of Trump's tweets about immigration and identifies Twitter as an important medium through which his views shape public conversation and perceptions. Still, the study doesn't claim to accurately represent the scope of hate speech online. The focus is on shedding light on the ways in which online political communication contributes to the propagation of polarizing views and strengthens established patterns of marginalization in current society.

The Significance of the Study

This study is important because it sheds light on the complex impacts and consequences of online hate speech. Instead of looking primarily at how laws or technology interpret hate speech, this study explores how its linguistic and discourse form contributes to its spread and effect. It helps advance our knowledge of the ways in which language operates and plays a role in online hate speech.

An important finding of this study is the analysis of the various forms of hate speech expressed in the X online platform. Recognizing how hate speech changes to fit the unique conventions of the digital environment is essential for creating targeted approaches to controlling and reducing such speech on individual platforms. This research also reveals that intermingle to fuel and perpetuate online hate speech.

As a result, this study suggests important implications for policymakers, social media companies and those who moderate online content. It sheds light on how hate speech is integrated in online discussions in ways that render it less susceptible to basic moderation approaches. This research provides guidance to improve methods of detecting, preventing and countering hate speech without infringing on individuals' right to free speech.

As a result, the findings of this study have important implications for scholarship focused on topics such as digital communication, social cohesion, and the ethics of online interaction. It sheds light on the ways language can reinforce group unity and widen some people's belongingness at the expense of others. These findings can be used to both help reduce instances of online hate and promote greater kindness and understanding in the community.

Data Analysis

The present analysis is based on 23 tweets by Donald Trump in 2017, specifically, related to immigration, available at <https://x.com/realDonaldTrump>, and <https://www.thetrumparchive.com>. Donald Trump is a prominent American businessman, television personality, and politician who served as the 45th President of the United States from January 2017 to January 2021. The data is examined using Fairclough's theoretical framework and analyzed through a qualitative approach. Furthermore, the 23 presidential tweets (analyzed texts) are

organized sequentially by month and year (e.g., January, February, etc.; see Appendix).

January Month 2017 tweets (ex.1,2,3,4,5)

1. Textual Analysis (Micro-Level)

Trump uses strong, emotive words such as "horrible mess," "extreme vetting," "weak," "World War III," "terrorists" to create a sense of urgency and threat. Further, the capitalization of "NATIONAL SECURITY" and "NOW" emphasizes importance and immediacy.

Regarding sentence structure and rhetorical strategies, the tweets use short, direct, and declarative sentences, making the message more forceful and accessible. Moreover, the use of imperatives like "Study the world!" commands action, reinforcing his authority. And repetition of security-related themes (borders, terrorism, vetting) constructs a dominant narrative.

Concerning intertextuality and presuppositions, "big day planned on NATIONAL SECURITY tomorrow" implies that strong actions will be taken; linking his administration to security. In addition, "Look what is happening all over Europe" assumes the reader already agrees that Europe is in crisis due to immigration. Finally, attacks on McCain and Graham frame them as obstacles, reinforcing Trump's authority and outsider stance.

2. Discursive Practice (Meso-Level)

This level considers how the tweets are produced, distributed, and consumed.

Focusing on platform and audience, Twitter allows for direct, unfiltered communication, bypassing traditional media. These tweets likely energize his base, reinforcing their fears about immigration and national security.

Moreover, McCain and Graham are framed as “weak” on immigration, positioning them as obstacles rather than allies. Judges and other political figures are often dismissed or criticized, portraying Trump as a leader against an ineffective establishment. And "This was a big part of my campaign" ties current policies back to promises, reinforcing legitimacy.

3. Sociocultural Practice (Macro-Level)

This level examines the broader social and political context.

These tweets were posted in Trump’s first days in office, aligning with his promises to implement a travel ban and build the border wall. They reflect broader nationalist and populist sentiments, emphasizing protectionism.

Further, the tweets promote a nationalist, anti-immigration ideology. The emphasis on security over human rights or diplomacy suggests a law-and-order approach. By attacking McCain and Graham, Trump undermines traditional conservative leadership. Moreover, by suggesting that strong security measures were ignored before him, he positions himself as the only leader capable of fixing these issues.

February month 2017 tweets(ex.6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18)

1. Textual Analysis (Micro-Level)

In fact, "dumb deal", "bad and dangerous people", "evil", "broken legal system", "SO DANGEROUS!". These words create fear and suggest that the U.S. is under imminent threat from immigrants and terrorists.

Further, "Courts must act fast!", "People pouring in. Bad!", "Our people are far more vulnerable" create a sense of crisis; pressuring legal institutions to align with Trump's policies.

Trump's use of Capitalization "VERY CAREFULLY", "EASY D!", "SO DANGEROUS!" acts as a persuasive technique, reinforcing the severity of the situation.

In addition, Trump makes Repetition of key themes; immigration as a security threat: ("radical Islamic terrorism," "very bad and dangerous people"), the judiciary as an obstacle: ("The courts are making the job very difficult!") and Trump's role as a protector: ("I have instructed Homeland Security...").

Regarding intertextuality and presuppositions, the tweets assume that Obama's administration made a harmful deal with Australia. The statement about Sweden ("My statement... was in reference to Fox News") suggests that Trump relies on media narratives to justify his claims rather than official reports. Further, the inclusion of polls (Feb 8 tweets) implies that his immigration ban has widespread support, reinforcing his legitimacy.

2. Discursive Practice (Meso-Level)

Twitter, as a Medium, allows Trump to bypass traditional media and communicate directly with the public. His tweets are designed for maximum engagement, using provocative language and short, impactful phrases. Supporters

see these tweets as proof of decisive leadership on national security. However, Critics view them as fearmongering and anti-immigrant rhetoric.

Trump is reinforcing an 'Us vs. Them' narrative; immigrants are framed as "dangerous", "radical", and "evil". Further, Judges and the legal system are portrayed as barriers to security rather than protectors of democracy.

Eventually, the judiciary is presented as an obstacle to national security. Trump's dismissal of legal decisions undermines the authority of the courts, which may erode public trust.

3. Sociocultural Practice (Macro-Level)

These tweets were posted shortly after Trump's travel ban (Executive Order 13769), which was challenged in court. The Obama-Australia immigration deal (Feb 1 tweet) refers to a refugee resettlement agreement made before Trump took office.

Further, the tweets align with right-wing populism, emphasizing national sovereignty and fear of outsiders. By citing polls (Feb 8 tweets), Trump justifies his policies as reflecting the will of the people, reinforcing populist themes.

The Fox News reference in the Sweden tweet shows how media reports shape political discourse. Further, Trump's selective use of statistics (Feb 11 tweet) frames the legal system as dysfunctional.

By repeatedly associating immigrants with terrorism, Trump creates a sense of emergency that justifies extreme measures (e.g., travel bans, strict border control). The idea that the courts are making the U.S. less safe fuels public distrust in legal institutions.

April 2017 tweets (ex.19,20)

1. Textual Analysis (Micro-Level)

The phrase “hide illegal immigrants from the feds” (RT from Fox & Friends) implies deception and lawlessness. Moreover, the word “illegals” (April 27 tweets) dehumanizes immigrants by reducing them to their legal status. “Pour through our borders” evokes an image of uncontrolled invasion, creating fear and urgency.

The use of “Democrats used to support border security” implies they have betrayed their past stance, fueling partisan division. The contrast between past (security) vs. present (allowing illegal immigration) constructs a binary opposition between responsible (Republicans) and irresponsible (Democrats).

Concerning intertextuality and presuppositions, The Fox News retweet reinforces Trump’s alignment with right-wing media and suggests that Chicago’s policies are a threat to law and order. The ex.19 April 27 tweet presupposes that Democrats actively want open borders, shaping the audience’s perception of immigration policies.

2. Discursive Practice (Meso-Level)

Retweeting Fox & Friends helps validate Trump’s stance by using a media source known for supporting him. This strategy amplifies the narrative that Democratic-led cities (like Chicago) are working against federal law enforcement.

These tweets mobilize Trump’s base by reinforcing their existing fears about immigration. They also pressure Democrats to adopt stricter immigration

policies, using historical revisionism to claim they once supported border security. Twitter again allows Trump to bypass traditional media, ensuring his message reaches millions instantly. His direct, emotionally charged language is crafted for quick consumption and viral engagement.

3. Sociocultural Practice (Macro-Level)

These tweets were posted in April 2017, a time when Trump was pushing for stricter immigration policies and facing resistance from Democratic cities. His administration was also threatening sanctuary cities with loss of federal funding. The tweets reinforce a partisan conflict, presenting Republicans as enforcers of the law and Democrats as protectors of illegal immigrants.

The framing of immigrants as a security threat aligns with nationalist and populist ideologies. By suggesting that cities are hiding criminals, the discourse creates moral panic and justifies strict immigration laws.

The use of Fox News as a reference point reflects how right-wing media influences Trump's rhetoric. The Chicago reference taps into a broader conservative narrative that liberal cities promote lawlessness.

July 2017 tweet(ex.21)

1. Textual Analysis (Micro-Level)

The use of capitalization "ENFORCE," "PROTECT," "SUPPORT" emphasizes strong, decisive action. These verbs reinforce Trump's authoritative stance on law and order.

Further, the sentence follows a tripartite structure:

"ENFORCE our laws" emphasizes strict legal control, "PROTECT our borders" reinforces anti-immigration policies. And "SUPPORT our police" aligns with law enforcement and conservative values. Thus, this rhetorical structure makes the message memorable and impactful.

The employment of Hashtags and references to crime as LESM (Law Enforcement Support Movement) appeals to pro-police audiences, MS13 links immigration to gang violence, reinforcing a fear-based narrative, and FlashbackFriday suggests consistency in his policies, reinforcing that Trump has always prioritized these issues.

Regarding implicit meaning and presuppositions, the tweet assumes that laws are not currently being enforced effectively, suggesting a need for stricter policies. By mentioning MS-13, it presupposes that immigration is directly linked to gang violence, which is a recurring theme in Trump's discourse.

2. Discursive Practice (Meso-Level)

The message is tailored to Trump's core supporters, who favor strict immigration laws and strong policing. The reference to MS-13 and border security reinforces his broader "America First" policy.

The tweet associates crime with immigration while ignoring other social factors (e.g., economic inequality, domestic crime). By linking law enforcement to national security, the tweet justifies tough policies like border control and travel bans.

Tackling intertextuality (Referencing Past Discourses), Trump has repeatedly framed immigrants as criminals in speeches and policies (e.g., 2016 campaign

rhetoric, travel bans).The "Flashback" reference suggests continuity in his stance, appealing to supporters who value strong leadership.

3. Sociocultural Practice (Macro-Level)

The tweet supports nationalist ideas (protecting borders, prioritizing law enforcement).The “us vs. them” framing (Americans vs. criminals) aligns with populist rhetoric, positioning Trump as the protector of American values.

Mentioning MS-13 links immigration to organized crime, fueling moral panic.This supports policies like ICE crackdowns, border walls, and travel bans.

The hashtag #LESM aligns with pro-police movements, which gained traction after protests against police brutality.The tweet taps into conservative narratives that Democrats are “weak” on crime and immigration.

October 2017 tweet (ex.22)

1. Textual Analysis (Micro-Level)

Concerning polarization and "Us vs. Them" framing, the tweet constructs a binary opposition between Trump’s administration (security-focused, pro-America) and Democrats (careless, anti-security). That is, “Democrats don’t want secure borders” implies intentional opposition to security, rather than policy differences. And “They don’t care about safety” suggests Democrats are indifferent to national security, intensifying partisan division.

Further, he presupposes that secure borders equals to caring for safety, creating a false dilemma, thus, if one disagrees with Trump’s policies, they are against safety. It Implies Democrats refuse to negotiate on immigration, even though political debates often involve complex compromises.

Regarding conversational and direct style, simple, declarative structure makes the message easy to process and emotionally engaging. And the absence of qualifiers (e.g., "some Democrats") generalizes an entire political party, reinforcing partisan hostility.

2. Discursive Practice (Meso-Level)

The tweet appeals to Trump's conservative base, reinforcing their belief that Democrats are a threat to national security. It also pressures Republican lawmakers to remain firm on immigration policies. It ignores Democratic arguments about border security (e.g., focus on humane immigration enforcement, pathways to citizenship). Further, it simplifies a complex policy debate into an emotionally charged, partisan conflict.

It likely posted during immigration policy negotiations, shaping public opinion against Democrats. By framing the debate as Democrats vs. national security, the tweet helps justify border enforcement measures (e.g., the wall, ICE crackdowns, travel bans).

3. Sociocultural Practice (Macro-Level)

The tweet reflects populist themes, portraying Trump as the protector of the nation against elite politicians who "don't care" about the people. It emphasizes national security and border control as central to American identity and sovereignty. It reinforces the idea among Trump supporters that those who disagree with him are morally reprehensible. As a result, finding compromises between the two sides becomes increasingly challenging.

It often treats immigration as a problem, instead of a matter that should be evaluated and discussed.

Further, it reinforces the idea that Democrats are “soft” on crime and security, which aligns with Trump’s broader law-and-order messaging.

November 2017 tweet (ex.23)

1. Textual Analysis (Micro-Level)

In fact, instead of using formal titles (Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer & Speaker Nancy Pelosi), Trump casualizes and diminishes them. This framing undermines their authority, making them appear unserious or incompetent.

Trump by stating “They want illegal immigrants flooding into our Country unchecked” uses fear-based imagery (“flooding”) to suggest overwhelming, dangerous immigration. Further, the word “unchecked” implies a lack of control, reinforcing a law-and-order narrative. Moreover, the “Are weak on Crime” is a simplistic, partisan attack; reinforcing the idea that Democrats endanger national security. He, via the use of the expression of “Want to substantially RAISE Taxes”, uses capitalization for emphasis, suggesting financial harm to Americans. In addition, it frames tax policy as a harmful Democratic agenda, rather than a legitimate policy debate.

Regarding presuppositions and binary opposition, the tweet presupposes that immigration is dangerous and Democrats support it regardless. It creates a false choice. That is, if you oppose Trump, you support crime, tax increases, and open borders.

The final phrase, “I don’t see a deal!”, is a declarative statement that preemptively blames Democrats for any negotiation failure. This simple tweet-

friendly sentence structure makes the message easy to process and emotionally resonant.

2. Discursive Practice (Meso-Level)

This tweet directly appeals to Trump's conservative base, reinforcing their belief that Democrats are reckless and anti-American. It pressures Republican lawmakers to adopt a hardline stance on immigration and taxes. Thus, it positions Trump as the strong, rational leader defending the country.

It ignores Democratic arguments on immigration reform, crime reduction, and tax policies. It frames the negotiation as doomed from the start, allowing Trump to claim Democrats were unwilling to compromise.

The tweet colors public opinion by turning a complicated debate into a fight between political parties. It makes it seem like Trump is the only one working to solve problems facing the nation.

3. Sociocultural Practice (Macro-Level)

The social media message paints Democrats as people who support bringing immigrants into the country at the expense of American citizens. It mirrors Trump's nationalist approach.

Protecting our nation's limits, cracking down on criminals and resisting increases in taxation. This divisive rhetoric chips away at civility in politics and hampers efforts to work across party lines. His critics argue that Trump's language degenerates conversations from issues to individual criticisms.

"Flooding into our Country unchecked" is a typical instance of nativist language designed to stoke fears about immigration. It argues for tougher immigration control measures.

Findings and Discussion

As evidenced by his wording, Trump often adopts a narrative filled with crisis and displays of authority. He frequently uses words loaded with emotion, capitalizes speech, and repeats commands to emphasize alarm and importance. Words and expressions such as “Surge into our nation,” “Unrestrained,” and descriptions of the violent MS-13 gang contribute to strong visuals of disorder and crime. Emphasizing certain words with capital letters like (“ENFORCE,” “RAISE TAXES,” “SO DANGEROUS!”) makes his language sound urgent and important to the nation.

Rhetorical schemes such as “ENFORCE our laws, PROTECT our borders, SUPPORT our police” lend a sense of cohesiveness and authority to Trump’s statements. Their language distances Trump from those deemed a threat while simultaneously labeling his adversaries as responsible for the country’s problems. As a consequence, the issue becomes a stark division between two competing perspectives. Ablating Trump as a defender and painting his adversaries as perils to justify apparent separation.

At the meso – level, Trump’s use of Twitter fulfills dual purposes: as a communicative means and also as a form of strategic discourse. Avoiding the media and speaking directly to his followers, Trump has been able to control the discourse and avoid any challenges to his messages. His punchy, passionate, and direct messages largely ensure his posts achieve the highest possible reach in this medium.

The tweets regularly undermine opponents and Democrats in general by using simplistic language and suggestion that they're undermining their duties. Hashtags such as #LESM and deference to news sources like Fox News amplify a shared perception among supporters, cementing cohesion within the Trump-supporting community. As a result, nuanced discussions about policy issues are

simplified to stark contrasts that dismiss any hint of compromise or negotiation as indicators of weakness.

Trump's rhetoric solidifies an increasingly anti-elite narrative by painting his opponents and key institutions like the courts, Congress or media as enemies of America's national defense.

On the macro level, Trump's tweets draw heavily on right-wing populism and nationalism built on an "America First" agenda. His rhetoric positions the nation as besieged by threats within and outside its borders (immigrants and criminals as well as Democrats and liberal institutions). The concept of America under siege is used to construct such measures as essential means of maintaining national integrity and independence.

Furthermore, such tweets help to create an atmosphere of sharply divided opinion and unfounded alarm when confronting opposing political views. Repeatedly linking immigrants to crime and Democrats to incompetence leads to a starkly simplified perspective that displaces nuanced discussions of issues with emotional accusations of wrongdoing.

Trump's ongoing attempts to devalue democratic institutions (such as remarking "I don't believe an agreement will be reached") lead the public to lose faith in government and convince them that only he can regain control.

Conclusion

The analysis shows that Trump's 2017 tweets are a calculated and ideologically motivated form of political messaging. Critical Discourse Analysis demonstrates that Trump's discourse is based on depicting the world as in crisis, sharply divided and behind an allegedly united national identity.

His language conveys a sense of extreme importance and imminent danger by using highly stressful terms, emboldening some words, and arranging

information in ways that drastically divide the world into good and evil. The way he phrases this implies that he is defending the country against potential risks posed by outsiders and those who oppose him.

Thanks to Twitter, Trump is able to circumvent established media gatekeepers and keep his own message front and center. His tweets are designed to go viral and repeatedly appeal to his followers using familiar rhetoric and references. Trump portrays disagreement as disloyalty or impediments to the national interest. The tweets resonate with and amplify populist and nationalist beliefs, casting American identity as threatened and making radical policies appear justified in the name of national security. His rhetoric game is masterful. He plays on Americans' fears while undermining their trust in the traditional systems that ensure democracy and the nation live by its principles.

The study concludes that Trump's tweets should be understood as strategic uses of language rather than spontaneous expressions of personal view. These messages function as discursive strategies shaping public views, defining the framework of public discourse and endangering the heart of democratic discourse. This underscores the importance of critical media literacy and holding leaders and their language accountable in the digital age.

References

- Benton, B., Choi, J.-A., Luo, Y., & Green, K. (2022). *Hate speech spikes on Twitter after Elon Musk acquires the platform*. School of Communication and Media Scholarship and Creative Works (33). Montclair State University Digital Commons.
- Citron, D. K. (2015). *Hate crimes in cyberspace*. Harvard University Press.
- Davidson, T., Warmesley, D., Macy, M., & Weber, I. (2017). Automated hate speech detection and the problem of offensive language. *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*.

- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Gagliardone, I., Gal, D., Alves, T., & Martinez, G. (2015). *Countering online hate speech*. UNESCO Publishing. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000233236>
- Gevers, I., Markov, I., & Daelemans, W. (2022). Linguistic analysis of toxic language on social media. *Computational Linguistics in the Netherlands Journal*, 12, 33–48.
- Ghosh, S., Ekbil, A., Bhattacharyya, P., Saha, T., Kumar, A., & Srivastava, S. (2022). SEHC: A benchmark setup to identify online hate speech in English. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*.
- Giles, H., & Ogay, T. (2007). Communication accommodation theory. In B. B. Whaley & W. Samter (Eds.), *Explaining communication: Contemporary theories and exemplars* (pp. 293–310). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Jay, T., & Janschewitz, K. (2008). The pragmatics of swearing. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 4(2), 267–288.
- Kovács, J., et al. (2021). Deep learning for hate speech detection: Overcoming data scarcity and contextual challenges. *Journal of Machine Learning*, 38(4), 147–161.
- Megersa, A., & Minaye, T. (2023). User behaviours in response to online hate speech. (*Details missing—please add journal, volume, and pages.*)
- Nguyen, M., et al. (2021). The role of repeated exposure in normalizing hate speech. *Social Psychology and Behavior Review*, 17(1), 22–38.
- Ott, B. 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>
- Pamungkas, R., et al. (2022). Abusive language detection in social media: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Online Behavior*, 9(1), 67–81.
- Pelzer, B., et al. (2021). Far-right discourse and the normalization of hate speech on social media. *Political Psychology*, 43(3), 211–227.
- Rojas-Galeano, M. (2017). Obfuscated obscenities: Subtle tactics for evading detection in online hate speech. *Journal of Social Media Studies*.
- Schäfer, M., et al. (2023). Counter speech and polarization in online communities. *Journal of Digital Communication*, 18(4), 320–335.

- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- Vashistha, A., & Zubiaga, A. (2021). Multilingual hate speech detection: A model for English and Hindi. *Proceedings of the 12th International Workshop on Social Media*.
- Waseem, Z., & Hovy, D. (2016). Hateful symbols or hateful people? Predicting hate speech in online social media. *Proceedings of the NAACL-HLT 2016*.
- Wodak, R. (2021). *The politics of fear: The shameless normalization of far-right discourse*. SAGE Publications.

شیکردنه‌وه‌ی وتاری ره‌خه‌یه‌ی وتاری رق و کینه‌ی سه‌ره‌یل له تویه‌ته‌کانی دۆنای تره‌مپ

یوخته

ئەم لىنكۆلىنەمىيە باس لە چۆنىمەنى دەرشتى وتارى رىق و كىنە لە سەرھىل لە تويتمەكانى سەرۆكى پىشەوى ئەمەرىكا دۆنالد جەي ترمپ دەكات بە بەكارھەينانى شىكردنەوى رەخنەيى (CDA) وەك چوارچۆمەيەك. مۆدىلى سى رەھەندى نۆرمان فەيركلوف بەكاردەھىنئىت و مېتودى چۆنايەتى بەكاردەھىنئىت بۆ شىكردنەوى ھەلبۇزاردەيەكى مەبەستدار لە تويتمەكانى ترمپ لە سالى 2017. سەرنجى شىكردنەمەكە لەسەر ئەو شىوازەنەيەكە وتارى رىق و كىنە لە دەقدا دەردەبەردىت، لە رىگەي گەتوگۆھە شىوہ دەردىت، وەھەر وەھا چۆن لەرووى ئايدىالۆزىيەو لە پەيوەندىيە دىجىتالىيەكانى ترمپدا دەردەكەون. دەرنەجامەكان ئامازە بەو دەمدەن كە ستراتيگى رەوانبىزى وەك نوپنەرايەتى نەرىنى ئەوانى تر، جەمسەرگىرى و ھەرەشەي ورد بەشىوہەيەكى گەشتى بەكاردەھىنرەن، كە داينامىكەيەك لەننەوان گرووپەكانى ناوہو و دەروہوى گرووپەكان دەروست دەكەن، بەتايبەتى بۆ كۆچەران، رەكابەرە سىياسىيەكان و مېدياكان. ئەم ستراتيگىزەنە يارمەتيدەرن بۆ شەرعەتدان بە بىروباوهرى پەراويزخستەن و بەھىزكردنى پىكەتەكانى دەسەلاتى ئىستا. تويژىنەمەكە بە دانانى تويتمەكانى ترمپ لە چوارچۆمەيەكى كۆمەلايەتى و سىياسى فراوانتردا، جەخت لەو دەكاتەوہە كە چۆن تۆرە كۆمەلايەتییەكان كاريگەرى لەسەر گوتارى سىياسى ھەيە و چىرۆكى جياكارى بەھىز دەكەن. ئەنجامەكان زياتر دەبن بۆ فراوانبونى تويژىنەوہ لەسەر پەيوەندى سىياسى ئۆنلەين و شىوازەكانى رەوانبىزى كە لە وتارى رىق و كىنە تۆوگەلەون.

وشه سهرمكيهكان: شيكردنهوى وتارى رمخنهى(CDA) ، وتارى رق، پهيوهندى سياسى، توره
كومه لايهتيهكان، رهوانبىژى پوپوليسى

تحليل الخطاب النقدي لخطاب الكراهية على الإنترنت في تغريدات دونالد ترامب

الملخص

تتناول هذه الدراسة البناء اللغوي لخطاب الكراهية عبر الإنترنت في تغريدات (تويت) الرئيس الأمريكي السابق دونالد جيه. ترامب من خلال التحليل النقدي للخطاب النموذج الثلاثي الأبعاد لنورمان فيركلاف، وتستوظف الدراسة منهجية نوعية لتحليل عينة هادفة من تغريدات ترامب المنشورة عام 2017، وهو عام اتسم بالاستقطاب السياسي الحاد وقرارات سياسية مثيرة للجدل. تركز التحليلات على الكيفية التي يتجلى بها خطاب الكراهية نصياً، ويتشكل خطابياً، ويستدام أيديولوجياً ضمن خطاب ترامب الرقمي. تكشف النتائج عن الاستخدام المتكرر لاستراتيجيات خطابية مثل تمثيل "الآخر" بشكل سلبي، والاستقطاب، والتهديدات الضمنية، والتي تركز ديناميكيات "نحن" مقابل "هم"، مع استهداف خاص للمهاجرين والخصوم السياسيين ووسائل الإعلام. وتعمل هذه الاستراتيجيات على إضفاء الشرعية على الإيديولوجيات الإقصائية وتعزيز البنى الهرمية للسلطة. ومن خلال وضع تغريدات ترامب ضمن سياقها الاجتماعي والسياسي الأوسع، تسلط الدراسة الضوء على دور وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي في تشكيل الخطاب السياسي وتضخيم السرديات التمييزية. وتسهم النتائج في إثراء الأدبيات المتنامية حول الاتصال السياسي عبر الإنترنت وآليات الخطاب الكراهية. الكلمات المفتاحية: تحليل الخطاب النقدي(CDA) ، خطاب الكراهية، الاتصال السياسي، وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي، الخطاب الشعبي