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Abstract
The emergence of Donald Trump as an anti-Muslim-Islam presidential candidate and victory over Hillary Clinton is an issue of debate and division in the United States’ political sphere. Many commentators and political pundits criticize Trump for his disparaging rhetoric on Twitter and present him as an example of how Twitter can be an effective tool for the construction and extension of political polarization. The current study analyzes the selected tweets by Donald Trump posted on Twitter to unmask how he uses language to construct Islamophobic discourse structures and attempts to form his ideological structures along with. The researchers hypothesize that Islamophobia is a marked feature of Trump’s political career realized by specific rhetorical and discursive devices. Therefore, the study purposively takes 40 most controversial tweets of Donald Trump against Islam and Muslims and carried out a critical discourse analysis with the help of macro-strategies of the discourse given by Wodak and Meyer and van Dijk’s referential strategies of political discourse. The findings reveal that Trump uses language rhetorically to exclude people of different ethnic identities, especially Muslims, through demagogic language to create a difference of “us” vs. “them” and making in this way “America Great Again”.
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Introduction
The role of Twitter in the transformation of democracy is irrefutable as it provides a platform to political leaders and the public to communicate in an easy way (Grant et al., 2010). Twitter is widely used to assist campaigns and the trend of utilizing this platform by the politicians and their parties has been analyzed by scholars. Hendricks and Kaid (2014) and Campos-Domínguez (2017) argued that Twitter has become the main theoretical trend in political communication. In addition, Strandberg (2013) contended that Twitter functions as a tool of political mobilization and it could be seen during Barack Obama’s presidential campaigns in the 2008 and 2012 elections as there was over 100 personnel managing the Twitter handlers for @BarackObama (Hong & Nadler, 2012). Twitter’s substantial bearing, especially in politics, has garnered the attention of researchers to explore its effects in the elections and public opinion poll results (Liu, 2017).

Apart from the political interaction, Twitter has also been utilized to spread awareness on social issues such as #BlackLivesMatter (the protest on violence against Black people) and #MeToo (sexual harassment of women in the workplace; Müller & Schwarz, 2018). In contrast to other social media websites such as YouTube and Facebook, the number of users on Twitter has been significantly on the rise (Parmeele, 2014). This development provides a suitable platform for politicians to connect to their followers through social media. Trump, in this regard, facilitates politicians to connect with their followers with the help of retweets and reactions to queries and comments. This conveys the positive impression that politicians can comprehend and appreciate the opinions of their followers.

1School of Media and Communication Studies, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan
2University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
3Kinnaird College for Women, Lahore, Pakistan
4University of Gunung Rinjani, Selong, Indonesia
5University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan

Corresponding Author:
Mohsin Hassan Khan, School of Media and Communication Studies, University of Management and Technology, C-II Johar Town, Lahore 54782, Pakistan.
Email: mohsin.khan@umt.edu.pk
On top of this, when it comes to the usage of Twitter by Trump, Twitter has also presented the opportunity to understand the viewpoint of the President of the United States, Donald Trump, as he is considered to be among the most prolific Twitter users in the contemporary politics with over 43 million followers (Müller & Schwarz, 2018). Similarly, Ott (2017) opines that Trump has been extraordinarily active before running for the presidency in 2016, throughout his candidacy, and hitherto, tweeting 7.5 times a day on average which totalled up to more than 36,000 tweets per year. Nevertheless, at the same time, he was also considered as the most controversial user of Twitter (Liu, 2017; Müller & Schwarz, 2018). Particularly, when it comes to Islam and Muslims, Trump’s anti-Muslim political rhetoric on Twitter became very evident during the current U.S. Presidential election, when Trump stated that Muslims would be disallowed to enter the country in his presidency (Khan et al., 2019). In the same line, Ahmed and Matthes (2017) and Kazi (2017) argued that the way Muslims are being portrayed has become a stereotype since 9/11. Powell (2018), Khan et al. (2019), and Ghauri and Umber (2019) claimed that 9/11 caused a rise in the production of Islamophobic discourse and it has been witnessing a constant growth where the media is the primary source of shaping peoples’ ideology. This also resulted in a barrier on immigration from Islamic countries. Marko (2019) and Ott (2017) contended that soon after Trump’s announcement as a candidate for U.S. president, he used Twitter to promote anti-Muslim discourse and used it as a medium to promote himself throughout his election campaign. This study is an attempt in this context to investigate how Trump uses Twitter as a medium of communication to not only construct and express his Islamophobic ideology, but shape and influence the ideology of people residing in America and across the globe. More specifically, the foremost objective of this study was to analyze the selected tweets by Donald Trump posted on Twitter to unmask how he uses language to construct Islamophobic discourse structures and attempts to form his ideological structures along with. In addition, the researchers had hypothesized that Islamophobia is a marked feature of Trump’s political career realized by specific rhetorical and discursive devices.

Islamophobia

Islamophobia is defined as the dehumanization and demonization of Muslims. This can be seen in the media as a process of discrimination and vilification of Muslims (Bazian, 2018; Liu, 2017). Bakali (2016), Sayyid (2014), and Pratt and Woodlock (2016) opine that a number of similarities have emerged in the European and North American contexts in the examination of negative perceptions and views on Islam and Muslims. Similarly, Islamophobia manifests itself in a number of Western nations that contribute to the development of trends in the anti-Muslim narrative. Trump uses language to promote hatred against Muslims in the American context, which has a varying effect on the perception not only of the American people but also around the world (Abramowitz & McCoy, 2019; Liu, 2017). Beshara (2018) in a recent study and his book “Decolonial psychoanalysis: Towards critical islamophobia studies” Beshara (2019) argued that Islamophobia is a fundamental fantasy which involves both, a real derive “to kill terrorists” and a symbolic desire “To make America Great Again.” As a term, Islamophobia has different dimensions and directions, which first emerged in France around the 1920s (Allen, 2016). Considine (2017), Ghauri and Umber (2019), and Lyons (2014) argue that Islamophobia gained importance and use as a concept after the historical event of 9/11 in the United States. Ciftci (2012) argued that the rise of anti-Islam and anti-Muslims feelings and sentiments goes back to the 1980s, but the term Islamophobia was formally documented in January 2001 by the Stockholm International Forum on “Combating Intolerance.” In the same year, the United Nations made a statement to condemn the growing anti-Muslim and anti-Islamic prejudices and hatred of Islamic principles by declaring them anti-Semitic and very much unwanted sentiments. In 1997, in its much-cited report, “Islamophobia: A Challenge for us,” the Runnymede Trust defined Islamophobia “unfounded hostility to Islam.” It also addresses the way discourse practically affects Muslims and their community and how it is responsible for their exclusion from both political and social affairs (Conway, 1997; Sayyid, 2014). According to Runnymede report of 1997, Islamophobia, therefore, includes inferiority, otherness, prejudice, and fear of Islam and Muslims. It is also mentioned in this report that Islamophobia is essentially a perception about Islam that it is violent, aggressive, and closely related to terrorism (Conway, 1997). In this regard, Western media portrayed Islam and Muslims in a very negative way to strengthen these perceptions (Powell, 2018; Waikar, 2018). Similarly, Western scholars have recently argued that most news stories about terrorism refer to Muslims as terrorists, radicals, and extremists (Ciftci, 2012; Lyons, 2014; Pratt & Woodlock, 2016). Similarly, Bazian (2018) and Sayyid (2014) concluded that Islamophobia is a form of racialized governmentality to portray a small group in a negative and hostile manner.

Waikar (2018) contended that Islamophobia is a very significant forms of discrimination and racism as it embeds in it a broad range of prejudices in it. He renders it a hatred of Westerners toward both Islam and Muslims. Drabu (2018) contends that Islamophobia is a part of global politics and it is spread by global media to construct negative perceptions of Islam and Muslims. In this regard, Islam (2018) delineated that Islamophobia is an umbrella term which can be used to study perceived notions of Muslims.

Thus, it is far more than ignorance, prejudice, and essentially many interferences that often affect the comfort of Muslims around the world. This does not mean that there is no link between Islamophobia and emotional, religious, and
cultural issues, but in fact, the term Islamophobia is referred to as a language game aimed at Islam and Muslims in every way of life.

**Trump as Islamophobe**

Moreover, when it comes to the current U.S. 2016 election, the renowned businessman and the presidential candidate of Republican party, Donald John Trump, raised anti-Muslim sentiments that remained a hot topic throughout the campaign season (Khan et al., 2019; Khoirunisa & Indah, 2018; Müller & Schwarz, 2018). McCaw (2016) and Kazi (2017) pointed out that when the presidential election campaign in the United States began in 2015, the Muslim-Americans found themselves openly at the front and center of political affairs in the country.

Furthermore, campaign of Trump focused on the notion of “Islamodiversion,” which is the act of blaming Muslims to divert the inevitability of bad economic and political policies (Louati, 2016; McCaw, 2016). In addition, Kazi (2017) and Nuruzzaman (2017) postulated that Islamophobia was the most prominent features of elections especially during Trump’s campaign.

Another prominent part of Trump’s campaign was his difference in treatment of the American Whites and the rest. He created a binary between both the fractions of the society and created the discourse that White Americans were getting robbed by Muslims (Abramowitz & McCoy, 2019; Waiker, 2018). This according to Abramowitz and McCoy (2019) and Waikar (2018) was his strategy to win votes. In his study, Waiker (2018), Callister et al. (2019), and Cherkouaoui (2016) also found that Trump’s campaign contains five most dominant Islamophobic themes including radical Islamic terrorism is considered as a global threat, radical Islam is the main cause of terrorism, immigrants and refugees from Muslim countries are a threat to the security of America and values, and the proposal of banning Muslims in the United States and the establishment of safe zones for the Muslim refugees residing in Syria.

In this regard, Marko (2019) and Lamont et al. (2017) contended that due to the ban on Muslims, they have been affected especially foreign students, teachers, and other officials who are residing in the states. This decrease in the issuance of visas to Muslims has been over 90% since Trump took office. As a result, there are continuous efforts to expand travel ban across the U.S. states and the government together with several Western countries. In 2017, 14 states from the United States implemented anti-Shariah legislation (Abramowitz & McCoy, 2019). In their report, Patel and Levinson-Waldman (2017) pointed out that upon taking oath as President of the country, Trump established a historical Islamophobic administration including Steve Bannon; the President’s Senior Advisor, Sebastian Gorka; Deputy Assistant to the President and Michael Flynn; President’s National Security Advisor in the White House. According to Steve Bannon, “Islam is not a religion of Peace and the West is at war with Islam.” Michael Flynn has criticized Muslims by saying that “fear of Muslims is rational,” while based on Sebastian Gorka’s remarks, accepting Muslim refugees would be a “national suicide” because “Islam and Koran serve as the basis of terrorism worldwide.” In their recent study, Munestri et al. (2017) found that 66% of the Americans oppose a ban on the Muslims and 65% believe that the Muslims are facing religious discrimination round the clock. Considine (2017) claimed that in support of Trump’s Islamophobia, U.S. media such as NBC and CBS depicted Islam and Muslims as a source of violence in the country. In a contradiction, Asghar et al. (2019) concluded that both CNN and Fox always criticized and highlighted Trump’s controversial statements. A senior analyst, Brian Klaas, wrote in Washington Post that Trump is an Islamophobic bigot.

During the 2016 and the current U.S. Presidential campaigns, many Americans were angry at Trump because of his anti-Muslim policies and this Islamophobic lens has also been seen throughout American history (Blöndal & Gunnarsson, 2017). Trump and his supporters have tried to build sentiments of fear toward the Middle East that already been reinvigorated since 9/11 incidents (Callister et al., 2019; Finley & Esposito, 2019). Renowned scholar Edward Said has also referred in Orientalism to the polarization of “us versus them,” from the Western world to the Middle East, in this case, based on the constructed difference in “civilizations” (Said & Jhally, 2002; Saladin, 2016). Hence, Trump frequently used orientalist language, which is a reflection of the polarization of “us versus them.” Lyons (2014) claimed that Trump’s anti-Muslim remarks during elections are directly drawn upon the “orientalist” concept of “clash of civilization” which holds that “West” and “East” are inherently incompatible and enemies of each other. In the same way, to support this claim, Saladin (2016) also pointed out that Trump is similar to former U.S. President, Quincy Adams, who revealed his own anti-Muslim/Islam statements by referring to Islam as “brutish,” “violent,” and “enemy of the West.” In the same vein, President Trump’s 2016 comment that “Islam hates us” is in fact orientalist stereotyping which seems to have hardly been transformed over the last 200 years of U.S. history.

Thus, with this existing literature, this study has contributed and investigated how Trump significantly played the anti-Muslim card using Twitter to win elections. For the analysis and findings, the researcher has used tools provided by critical discourse studies (CDS) practitioners, such as macro-strategies of discourse given by Wodak and Meyer (2009) and rhetorical strategies of van Dijk (1998, 2004, 2006) to get significant findings.

**CDS**

Critical discourse analysis, also known as CDS, is a discipline to study a language from different aspects in both social and political matters (Flowerdew & Richardson, 2017;
Ghauri & Umber, 2019; Mullet, 2018). Most recently, it has been postulated that CDS is an important tool aimed at critical-qualitative communication research (Khan et al., 2019; Reynolds, 2018). CDS is not a school of one inclination but rather an approach and a research tool under the scope of which we can find many trends and schools of thought (van Dijk, 1998; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Simply, CDS aims to expose the sociopolitical inequalities, power relations rooted in political, economic, cultural, and religious contexts (Khoirunisa & Indah, 2018; Mogashoa, 2014; Suppiah et al., 2019). Recently, Al-Haq and Al-Sleibi (2015) and Abdi and Basaratie (2016) postulated that CDS was first introduced by the significant works of van Dijk who maintains and considers the said approach not as a purely unified model of analysis but a joint point of view elaborating and doing semiotics, linguistics, and sometimes even discourse analysis. Similarly, for its historical significance, it can also be said that the fundamental components of CDS were already available in the Critical Theory of Frankfurt School (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Thus, Khan et al. (2019) and Suppiah et al. (2019) opine that CDS aims to uncover the hidden ideologies which are a significant part of the discourse.

Moreover, CDS as a tool not only enables vigorous analysis of the text, it sees discourse as both socially constituted and constitutive (Flowerdew & Richardson, 2017; Kanwal & García, 2019). Furthermore, CDA also studies the semiotic dimensions of discourse which have notions of abuse, power, injustices, economic, political, economic, and cultural change (Fairclough & Mulderigg, 2011; Khalil & Abbas, 2018; Mullet, 2018). In this regard, Trump’s discourse is not only a product of American society; rather it is responsible for shaping the social discourse internationally. This dimension of power is evident in Trump’s discourse as he is the President of the United States of America and a representative of one of the most powerful countries in the world. Researchers have chosen CDS as it is helpful to uncover how Trump uses language to extend his Islamophobic agenda. Moreover, it must be noted that CDS provides researchers with the tools to analyze the relation between discourse and ideology. There is an array of approaches to study discourse critically and one of the concepts they study is the binary of “self-other” schema. In this bifurcation, the focus is on the “positive self” presentation in contrast to the “negative-other” presentation.

Thus, Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999), Mohammadi and Javadi (2017), and Ott (2017) contended that language is used to perform social functions and Trump also uses language to perform social functions which only aim to serve his political purposes.

There are several topics, themes, and related fields that have always been used CDS to analyze their contents and sub-themes. However, there is one most crucial field having a social domain, and it is that of politics. As such, a political language mainly deals and reacts with the use of power and domination to persuade people’s minds and opinions. Beard (1999) argued that political language usually broadcasts through electronic and becomes viral on social media. According to Bloch (1975), during election battles, political speech is a message that confirms positions in an already established social hierarchy. On the other side, Paine (1981) argued that in political speech, scholars study the language usage as a process through which political leaders win public support, sympathy, and approval.

**Research Methodology**

This research is qualitative and has employed analytical methods given by CDS’ practitioners (van Dijk, 1998; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Strategies for the analysis of selected tweets of Trump were carefully chosen depending upon the type and the size of the data under investigation. Wodak (2009) contended that it is important for the analysis of political discourse to have a method that can identify its dynamic argumentative and rhetorical features. Suppiah et al. (2019) mentioned that a strategy is used to decode how language is used to achieve political, social, and psychological goals with the help of discursive practices. For the analysis, the matrix of thematic context identified is the linguistic construction of Muslims, Islam, and Islamic countries in negative terms. Wodak and Meyer (2009) gave macro-strategies of discourse to investigate how language plays a role in the discursive formation of national identity. The strategies related to this research are constructive strategies, strategies of perpetuation, and strategies of dismantling or dismantling. Below is a little description of all these strategies.

- The **constructive strategy** is used in discourse to form a national identity using the promotion of notions like identification, unity, solidarity, and highlighting differences.

- Similarly, **perpetuation** strategy is used to reproduce or to maintain an existing form of social or national identity which is under threat from the people of out-group. The aim of such a strategy is to support, protect, and preserve the identity of people of in-group.

- Dismantling or **destructive** strategy in discourse is used to disparage or dismantle whole of parts of an existing form of national identity and it is not necessary for discourse to replace the existing form of strategy.

Furthermore, this study has also used van Dijk’s framework of Ideological Square, which is a well-suited analytical tool to reveal how Trump uses language to construct his identity and that of his followers. He aims at painting a positive (us) and negative (other). The model used for research reveals how Trump uses language tactfully to hide his actions and feelings toward Muslims and mitigates their contributions toward the betterment of the United States of America. This said model comprises 25 key terms or rhetorical discursive strategies including "Actor description, authority, burden, categorization, comparison, consensus, counterfactual, disclaimer, euphemism, evidentiality, argumentation,
illustration/example, generalization, hyperbole, implication, irony, lexicalization, metaphor, national self-glorification, norm expression, number game, polarization (us-them), populism, presupposition, vagueness, and victimization” (van Dijk, 1998, 2004, 2006). Recent studies (Adenuga & Oyebode, 2015; Afzal & Harun, 2020; Cabrejas-Peñuelas & Diez-Prados, 2014; Fallah et al., 2019; Ghauri, 2019; Ghauri & Umber, 2019; Joharchi & Najibi, 2016; Kadkhodaee & Ghasemi Tari, 2019; Mazid, 2008; Reynolds, 2018) suggest that this framework is a combination of different frameworks in CDA (Chilton, 2004; Van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999; Wodak & Reisigl, 2003) and is suitable and useful to analyze discourses of politics and media where the binaries of “self” versus “other” are prominent.

Moreover, when it comes to sampling, Baker (2006), Waikar (2018), Sandelowski (1995), Cleary et al. (2014), Robinson (2014), Byrne (2001), Borrego et al. (2009), Silverman (2016), Creswell and Creswell (2017), and Khan et al. (2019) postulated that in discourse studies sample for the analysis is chosen on the basis of key words provided by the text under analysis. He further contended that the data collection in discourse studies should focus on quality of the text instead of quantity. Thus, it is for this reason that the researchers purposively delimited the number of tweets to 40 most controversial tweets: 20 as presidential candidate and 20 as President of the United States from the day Trump announced his candidacy, that is, June 16, 2015 until January 29, 2019. These 40 tweets are considered as a reflection of Trump’s emerging political ideology and his ongoing foreign policy toward Muslims community. The criteria of selection of specific tweets are very simple and clear. We have used specific keywords related to Islam and Muslims such as Islamic terrorism, Shariah, Holy Quran, Islamic Jihad, ISIS, Al-Qaeda, and all Islamic countries, which are under substantial criticism made by Trump. Thus, researchers hand-picked the tweets to be included in the sample as judgment was used on part of the researchers to select a representative sample of Trump’s ideology that serves the need for this research. The sample is studied in a detailed manner for the sake of detailed investigation to see how language can be used as a tool not only to propagate one’s ideology but also to create a distinction of us and them.

Analysis and Findings

Donald Trump uses language to discursively form his national identity as an American and create a difference of “us versus them.” He uses a number of strategies to further his political agenda. This section shows the analysis of his selected tweets in relation to Islamophobic rhetoric.

Constructive Strategy

This strategy is used to construct a peculiar form of identity. The strategy aims to form an image on the notion of unity and sameness between the people of in-group for the sake of differentiation from the people of the out-group. In his tweets, Trump makes use of constructive strategy to establish his identity as an American. He promotes the unification of the people of America against Muslims not only residing in America but across the world. In doing so, he circumnavigates the possibility of multiple social groups in America, and among Muslims, who could defy such tantalization. It also helps him create the binary that Muslims cannot be Americans and vice versa, actually disregarding the fact that there are more than 3 million Muslims already residing in America, and it is possible for a person to be a Muslim and an American. Second, he also uses the constructive strategy in his election campaign where he has another agenda that is to malign the election campaign of Hillary Clinton. He plays upon the same division of “Muslims vs Americans” which he already creates and identifies himself with Americans, while highlighting Hillary’s sympathy for Muslims, and other ethnic groups, in such a way that she falls in the category of “them.” By doing so, he portrays himself as a savior of America and paints Hillary as the enemy of America. Trump’s means of realization to construct his identity as an American nationalist is to use explicit comparisons between himself and Hillary.

His discourse has apocryphal comments regarding Hillary and her political policies. He states, “Hillary’s wars in the Middle East have unleashed destruction, terrorism, and ISIS across the world (July 2016).” Here, Trump uses the strategy of hyperbole and makes an implication to form a stereotype that the people in America and the Middle-east are suffering because of the alliance between Muslims who in his view are terrorists and Hillary who sides with them. In another instance of discourse, he states that “Wow, just came out on secret tape that Crooked Hillary wants to take in as many Syrians as possible. We cannot let this happen—ISIS!” (Oct 2016). Here through actor description, Trump negatively portrays Hillary as a person who does not take into account the interest of America and wants to harbor Syrian refugees. Trump polarizes himself in comparison to Hillary as a benefactor of America. Using hashtag #MakeAmericaSafeAgain he makes statements against Muslims to win public support. In order to legitimize his claim that his opponent Hillary is corrupt, he refers to “Islamist Money List” according to which Hillary tops the list for receiving money from prominent Islamists including Ahmad Al-Akhras. Trump states, “Crooked Hillary Clinton Tops Middle East Forum’s ‘Islamist Money List’” (Oct, 2016). Trump here uses language tactfully to paint Hillary in the negative light and attempts to depict Hillary as siding with the enemies, that is, Muslims. Using the strategy of generalization, Trump blames Muslims for every wrongdoing in America. He sells himself as the savior of American national interests using his hatred against Muslims. Tweets of Trump regarding Muslims and Islam have negative connotations and his lexical choices connote anger and hatred toward them. He generalizes all the Muslims as “Radical Islamic Terrorists” and instigates their removal from America using a hashtag #DrainTheSwamp.
“Swamp” is a very derogatory word. Trump is suggesting that Muslims have turned America into a Swamp, a place which is not only flooded because of them but has become a place filled with imponderables and difficulties. Trump uses this hashtag to directly link terrorism with Islam and states: “If elected POTUS—I will stop RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISM in this country! In order to do this, we need to #DrainTheSwamp! (Oct, 2016).” Here, once again Trump is using the strategy of generalization and metaphorically using the word “swamp” to signal that if elected he will oust Muslim because in his view they corrupted the American Society.

Trump’s idiomatic use of the phrase #DrainTheWamp is not a novel one, as it has been popular in American politics since 1903. This phrase was first used by Winfield E. Gaylord to refer to the draining of actual swamps to kill mosquitoes living in the swamps to deal with the widespread of Malaria. Keeping in view the history of this phrase, it can be posited that Trump is using lexicalization, to associate all the negative attributes to Muslim and makes use derogatory language to render that Muslims have diseased America and their drainage is important for its success.

In another Tweet, Trump contends, “If I’m elected President, I am going to keep Radical Islamic Terrorists out of our country!” (Oct 2016). Here he uses the strategy of counterfactuals, as he wants to win public support and empathy by setting himself apart from his competition in the U.S. elections. He paints a picture for his voters of America, that is, what it would be like if he wins; a country free of Islam and terrorism. Furthermore, he states, “More radical Islam attacks today—it never ends! Strengthen the borders; we must be vigilant and smart. No more being politically correct” (Jan 2016). Without any evidence, Trump here makes comments against Islam and hyperbolically contends that it is never going to end, and it is time to be vigilant and smart. Using such expressions, trump constructs the identity of America as the sufferer and makes Islam responsible for everything.

In another instance of discourse, Trump’s lexicalization of an event reveals that he considers himself not only a messiah for the America, but for other countries too. He tweets: “Another radical Islamic attack, this time in Pakistan, targeting Christian women & children. At least 67 dead, 400 injured. I alone can solve” (Mar, 2016) Here, it can be said that Trump is presupposing that if given a chance to rule America, he can solve the problem of terrorism not only for America itself but for its allies. Trump creates a similar discourse and states, “Horrible killing of a 13-year-old American girl at her home in Israel by a Palestinian terrorist. We must get tough.” (July, 2016). Here, Trump uses language to show solidarity to Israel and without any evidence presupposes that the killing must be done by a Palestinian, just because they are Muslims.

The discourse of Trump reveals that uses the word “protector” for America. Here, Trump is assuming the role and describing himself using the strategy of actor description. He states: “In my speech on protecting America I spoke about a temporary ban, which includes suspending immigration from nations tied to Islamic terror” (Jun 2016). Trump’s lexicalization here renders him as a well-wisher of America and the said country according to him can only be saved if measures are taken against Muslims. To lay emphasis on his idea of immigration ban Trump uses the strategy of the norm and states that “We must suspend immigration” (Jun, 2016). Here, using language critically, Trump is reinforcing the need of what should be done.

Furthermore, Trump uses language to turn people against his opponent in election, that is, Hillary Clinton, and uses expressions about Muslims as a tool to gain his political goal. He uses the strategy of number game to construct his identity as the one who is more reliable as an American or as American’s savior and constructs Hillary’s identity as his antagonist, thus unreliable. Trump states, “Hillary’s refusal to mention Radical Islam, as she pushes a 550% increase in refugees, is further proof that she is unfit to lead the country” (July 2016). Here Trump makes use of statistical analysis to enhance his credibility as a leader. In another tweet, he delineated on the idea that Hillary is responsible for “500% increase” in Syrian refugees and it is time to take action to protect America (May 2016). Here, Trump is also using the strategy of evidentiality because he is presenting a hard number to support his claim. It can be seen that Trump’s tweets are loaded with us versus them expressions. In another instance of discourse, Trump makes allegations of gender discrimination against Hillary. He uses the strategy of burden to achieve his goal. He states, “Hillary Clinton raked in money from regimes that horribly oppress women and gays & refuses to speak out against Radical Islam.” (Aug, 2016). Trump makes an implication that Hillary is getting funds from Islamic regimes to spread gender discrimination in American society. Moreover, the discourse of Trump reveals that he uses language to, first of all, establish that Obama is an incompetent authority and his election competition Hillary is also incompetent and corrupt. He uses the strategy of presupposition and states, “With Hillary and Obama, the terrorist attacks will only get worse” (Jun, 2016). In the light of the Ideological square model, it can be postulated that Trump is furthering his political agenda by making a comparison between himself and Obama and Hillary.

**Strategies of Perpetuation**

This strategy is used by speakers to produce, reproduce, or maintain an identity under some threat posed by the people of out-group. Since the word “perpetuation” is used, there is an idea of continuity in this threat. It simply means that there is a constant threat to identity as a whole by the out-group (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Trump uses language in a tactful manner to propagate the idea that America is under threat from Muslims. He uses the strategy of Defense and employs topos of comparison to show that he has the ability to save
America and his opponent in the election, Hillary Clinton is incompetent. He states, “Incompetent Hillary, despite the horrible attack in Brussels today, wants borders to be weak and open and let the Muslims flow in. No way!” (Mar 2016). Here, Trump also uses the strategy of Burden to win public support. To legitimize his claim that America is facing a threat, he states “The danger is massive. NO!” (July 2016). In another instance of discourse, Trump makes use of hyperbole to emphasize the idea that his America needs to be saved and in the same tweet, he states, “Crooked Hillary Clinton wants to flood his country with Syrian immigrants” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). He is attempting to draw comparison between his and Hillary and using his hatred against Muslims to win public support.

In most of his tweets, Trump uses the strategy of victimization to create a binary distinction between us and them. Trump states, “We better get tough with RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISTS, and get tough now, or the life and safety of our wonderful country will be in jeopardy!” (Nov 2015). Here, Trump uses adjective “wonderful” to describe America and suggests that America is weak and defenseless and needs to be saved from Muslims who, according to Trump, are all radical terrorists. He uses language to reveal his ideology and paints people of America, that is, the people of in-groups as victims whose lives are in jeopardy and under constant threat because of Islam. Trump uses dehumanizing language for Muslims to stoke fear in the hearts of his people to further his political goals. He perpetuates a xenophobic discourse in America. But the problem is that he only gives the “us” version of the discourse and never the “them” version.

Trump metaphorically presents immigrants and refugees as objects who are responsible for jeopardizing social harmony not only in America but across Europe as well. He states “Europe and the U.S. must immediately stop taking in people from Syria. This will be the destruction of civilization, as we know it! So sad!” (Mar 2016). Here, Trump polarizes the world into two halves: one half is of people of the in-groups who he suggests are civilized and the other is of Muslims who he suggests are uncivilized and are responsible to bring lawlessness in America and Europe. By counting the Europeans under threat as well, he adds to the number of his sympathizers. It also helps him make people feel more vulnerable because of various terrorist attacks in Europe, which it was easy for people to identify with and be afraid of.

Strategies of Demontage (or Dismantling) and Destruction

This strategy is used to deconstruct, demolish, or de-mythologize an existing identity using language. This strategy is realized using belittling and derogatory language for the people of the out-group (Wodak et al., 1999). Trump not only attempts to dismantle and destroy the identity of his opponent in the election by discrediting her discourse, but he also achieves his agenda by dismantling the identity of Muslims. Trump builds certain pillars of identity using his language, which is damaging and dehumanizing to Muslims and Muslim refugees trying to seek shelter in America. Tweets of Trump define Muslims more as animals and criminals than as people trying to seek refuge in the United States to secure their future. He states, “Eight Syrians were just caught on the southern border trying to get into the U.S. ISIS maybe? I told you so. WE NEED A BIG & BEAUTIFUL WALL!” (Nov 2015). Here, Trump uses the word “wall” as a metaphor. This word has two different interpretations. One simple interpretation is that the United States needs more security on the border to prevent mass immigration. Second, using the metaphor of “wall,” Trump presents the people of Syria as animals who are trying to enter the civilized “beautiful” country of America. Trumps’ language is debasing refugees. In addition to that, Trump uses this situation to once again draw a comparison between himself and Hillary and states, “Hillary Clinton said that it is O.K. to ban Muslims from Israel by building a WALL, but not O.K. to do so in the U.S.” (Jan, 2016). In this instance of discourse, Trump delineates that he has the capacity to save America from an outside threat, that is, Muslims, but Hillary does not. He once again targets her policies and criticizes her to achieve his political goals.

To legitimize his claims, he highlights the American authority, that is, President of the America and states: “President Obama & Putin fail to reach a deal on Syria—so what else is new? Obama is not a natural deal maker. Only makes bad deals!” (Sep, 2016). In this tweet, Trump not only criticizes Obama’s foreign policy, but he also renders him incompetent to rule America. Through a verbal attack on Obama, Trump furthers in political agenda. He hints that the only way to deal with Syria is to use violence and lack of action on Obama’s part in America’s failure as a powerful nation. Here he draws a line of us versus them where he hints that a country as powerful as America must use power to deal with Syria and should not make weak deals. In another tweet he states: “Refugees from Syria are now pouring into our great country. Who knows who they are—some could be ISIS. Is our President insane?” (Nov 2015) Here using implication Trump once again calls Obama incompetent to run America because he is letting refugees pour into America. Once again, he dehumanizes Syrian refugees and contends that people do not know who they are and they could be polluting their “great” country. Lexical item “great” here suggests that Trump is presenting America as a superior land where Muslims should not be given refuge. His discourse is loaded with expressions of painting Muslims as the root of American society’s ills and wrongs.

Even after his selection as the President, Trump does not stop and keeps on dismantling the identity of Muslims. There is no denial of the fact that political leaders wield an extraordinary amount of power over the masses. They have a multi-layered power, not only literal power to make laws but also metaphorical power to shape the narrative of masses in
general. Trump’s selection as a president is one proof of that. After getting elected, he uses language for national self-glorification and states, “Our GREAT MILITARY has delivered justice . . . We will never stop in our fight against Radical Islamic Terrorism!” (Jan, 2019). In this instance of discourse, Trumps’ lexicalization reveals that he is adjectivizing American military using the word “great.” The use of this word yields a sense of superiority to the American Military and establishes the idea that they have the power to dismantle Muslim identity. In another one of his tweets, he states: “I inherited a total mess in Syria and Afghanistan, the ‘Endless Wars’ of unlimited spending and death. . . .” (Feb 2019). Trump uses the strategy of burden suggesting both financial loss and human loss in terms of American soldiers and presents people of Syria and Afghanistan nothing more than a “mess.” Here he metaphorically refers to Muslims as trash and through implication contends that both money and the lives of American soldiers are important and not worth spending on Muslims.

To metaphorically establish himself as a savior Trump uses topos of burden to delineate on his incapacity to access Syria and states, “Many dead, including women and children, in mindless CHEMICAL attack in Syria. Area of atrocity is in lockdown and encircled by Syrian Army, making it completely inaccessible to outside world” (Apr, 2018). The lexicalization of this tweet reveals that there is an implication that Syria is suffering because there is lack of American access there.

In another Tweet, trump glorifies himself as a savior of America and states,

> If anybody but Donald Trump did what I did in Syria [. . .] ISIS is mostly gone, we’re slowly sending our troops back home to be with their families, while at the same time fighting ISIS remnants . . . . . . (Dec 2018).

Trump here uses the strategy of evidentiality and attempts to make his discourse a populist one by glorifying himself. It is because there is an element of us versus them where evil is associated with Syrian Muslims and parallel to it is a fact that only Trump is capable of saving America. Trump sells himself as the best asset for America and highlights his experience in eradicating terrorism. To render himself superior, Trump uses topos of discontinuation in his Tweet and makes an implication that America has done a lot for Pakistan and he wants to put an end to that; he says, “We no longer pay Pakistan the $Billions because they would take our money and do nothing for us, Bin Laden being a prime example, Afghanistan being another” (Nov 2018). Here Trump assumes a superior role and creates a polarity of us versus them. Trump uses the strategy of vagueness to keep things ambiguous. The lexical item “nothing” suggests that his sole purpose is to use language to glorify himself and just blame others. He uses number game to justify whatever he says, but once again with vagueness. He states,

> The United States has foolishly given Pakistan more than 33 billion dollars in aid over the last 15 years, and they have given us nothing but lies & deceit, thinking of our leaders as fools. They give haven to the terrorists we hunt in Afghanistan, with little help. No more! (Jan 2018)

Trump uses statistics to enhance his credibility as a leader, but in the second half of his tweets his expressions like “lies and deceit” create vagueness especially in the talk of a president. In another tweet, he makes similar use of language for Palestine and states: “. . . It is not only Pakistan that we pay billions of dollars to for nothing we pay the Palestinians HUNDRED OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS a year and get no appreciation or respect . . .” (Jan, 2018). The lexicalization here reveals that Trump is once again using number game to glorify himself and attaching the topos of burden to himself to paint himself as a victim. His use of language is derogatory when he talks about Pakistan and Palestine because both of them are Muslim countries.

Trump expresses his disdain for Muslims by associating criminality with Islam and Muslims. Here, he dismantles the identity of the whole Muslim community using the strategy of generalization. He states: “Just out report: “United Kingdom crime rises 13% annually amid spread of Radical Islamic terror. Not good, we must keep America safe!” (Oct 2017) Here, Trump makes a derogatory remark about Islam and paints it as a religion of criminals by making a generalization that the crime rate in the United Kingdom has increased because of the spread of Radical Islam. There is neither any evidence nor a direct connection between the two. Through the discourse of this tweet, Trump attempts to draw a cross-national consensus to establish the idea that Muslims are an imminent threat to America and the United Kingdom alike. His tweets reveal powerful patterns that can have a surreptitious effect on the thinking of people. Trump attempts to associate Islam, refugees, and immigrants with social issues, which results in the polarization of society and creates room for hatred against Muslims and their exploitation.

Trump here is taking the responsibility to school the world on the matter of Islamic radicalism without taking in to account the views of the leader of the United Kingdom. This was evident from his tweet stating: “@Theresa_May, don’t focus on me, focus on the destructive Radical Islamic Terrorism” (Nov, 2017). In this tweet, Trump establishes himself as an authority and gives a directive to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. This tweet was posted as a result of condemnation Trump received from Theresa May on his stance on Muslims.

In another instance of discourse, Trump states, “France honors a great hero. Officer died after bravely swapping places with hostage in ISIS-related terror attack. So much bravery around the world constantly fighting radical Islamic terrorism. Even stronger measures needed, especially at borders!” (Mar, 2018). Trumps’ discourse reveals that he is using language to set a stereotype that Muslims are terrorists.
In this tweet above, Trump is referring to the killing, which took place at a supermarket in France. Using that instance, as an illustration that all Muslims are criminals and the world needs to side with Trump and close their border to them he is attempting to set a norm here by making a polarization of us versus them.

Trump uses language to spread fear of Muslims. Without any evidence, he makes presupposition and states, “just look at what is happening in Europe and the Middle-East. Courts must act fast! (Feb 2017).” Here, there is a directive to look at the situation of Europe and the Middle-East to hint that America could be in the same state. This directive is empty of evidence, as most of the European countries have been rendered extremely safe to live in. In another tweet, using the strategy of norm expression Trump not only implies a threat for Muslims but refers to what should be done. He states, “Radical Islamic Terrorism must be stopped by whatever means necessary! The courts must give us back our protective rights. Have to be tough!” (Aug 2017) Here using the threat he hints at the eradication of Muslims, which is a very strong expression. He hints at setting a norm to adopt any means possible to stop terrorism and since Trump presupposes that Muslims are responsible for terrorism, he hints taking an action against them Trump’s discourse is loaded with islamophobia and instances of using the derogatory and dehumanizing language for Muslims and more was added when Trump used an apocryphal incident of American general Pershing who murdered hundreds of Muslims prisoners in the Philippines and defiled their bodies with pig blood. Using the topos of burden Trump makes an implication to repeat the history to avenge Muslims by stating: “Study what General Pershing of the United States did to terrorists when caught. There was no more Radical Islamic Terror for 35 years! (Aug, 2017)” The lexicalization of this discourse can be taken as a metaphor of White supremacy because he is using historical war crimes to endorse his hatred for Muslims.

In another tweet, he states “When I became President, ISIS was out of control in Syria & running rampant. Since then tremendous progress made . . . Caliphate will soon be destroyed, unthinkable two years ago” (Jan, 2019). Here, Trump establishes himself as a competent authority and draws an indirect comparison between himself and the American presidents before to make an implication that they were incompetent and could not control ISIS. Furthermore, he is making a threat to completely destroy the “caliphate.” Caliphate is a lexical term used to refer to any political state having a Muslim community. Trump’s tactful use of language reveals that he hinting the destruction of Muslims.

There is no denial of the fact that the economic and technological revolution has greatly changed how societies operate. The anger and unrest, which is felt by electorate, meant that Trump needed something to blame to further his political goals and he blames Islam, Muslims, and Muslim countries for everything that is wrong with America. Trump portrays America as a country that is on the brink of destruction and disaster, he propagates an idea that Muslims and terrorism, which he associates with them, is responsible for it. He states, “72% of refugees admitted into the U.S. (2/3 -2/11) during COURT BREAKDOWN are from 7 countries: SYRIA, IRAQ, SOMALIA, IRAN, SUDAN, LIBYA & YEMEN” (Feb 2017). Here, Trump implies that refugee migration is dangerous for America. There is a constant repletion of this idea in his discourse, which dismantles the identity of Muslims in general because all seven countries he lists are Muslim majority.

In a series of tweets against Iran, Trump attempts to dismantle the identity of the said country, only because it is a Muslim-majority country. He illustrates it as the country, which is responsible for disturbance in America. He states, “Iran’s Military Budget is up more than 40% since the Obama negotiated Nuclear Deal was reached . . . just another indicator that it was all a big lie. But not anymore!” (May 2018) In this instance of discourse, Trump once again renders Obama an incompetent authority and establishes himself as a competent one through comparison, and through number, game blames Iran that they increased their defense budget just to spread terrorism. In another tweet, he states, The Iran Deal is defective at its core. If we do nothing, we know what will happen. In just a short time, the world’s leading state sponsor of terror will be on the cusp of acquiring the world’s most dangerous weapons . . . (May 2018).

Here, without any proof, Trump presupposes that Iran is a country that sponsors terrorism, which is a generalization to create a difference of us and them between Iran and America. In continuation of this idea, he uses the strategy of actor description and states: “. . . They were trying to take over the Middle East by whatever means necessary. Now, that will not happen!” (May, 2019). Here without any evidence, Trump makes a presupposition and contends that Iran is increasing their revenue to spread terrorism and to take over the Middle East.

Discussion

The analysis of tweets of Trump reveals that he uses language to create a polarity of us versus them between the Muslims in America and other groups He uses negative lexical items to portray Islam and Muslims in the negative light. The findings unravel that he attempts to also portray his political opponent, Hillary Clinton, in negative terms. The aim to paint both Muslims and Hillary Clinton in such a way as to propagate his ideology as a true American. Trump uses a constructive strategy to build his identity as an American nationalist whose only goal is to safeguard America from Muslims residing in Syria, Pakistan, Iran, Oman, and Libya. Trump’s discourse is populist because it creates the rhetoric of us versus them, where he places “us,” that is, America and its allies like Israel as peacemakers and Muslim countries in
a binary opposition where they are responsible for snatching America’s great past from it. He presupposes that America is in a bad condition because of Islam and Muslim refugees who have traveled to America. The findings reveal that Trump attempts to construct his identity closely linked with the people of America and presents himself as their benefactor. Trump, assuming the role of representing people of America, presupposes and propagates his ideology in such a manner that it ends up maligning Muslims. In support of this finding, Marko (2019) and Waikar (2018) pointed out that according to Trump, Muslim refugees are “secret army” who wish to destroy America.

According to The Bridge Initiative Project on Islamophobia, Trump declared this ideological war on Muslims 5 years prior to presidential candidacy. During an Interview on October 21, 2015, Trump laid bare his intentions regarding the shutting down of mosques. After the attack on Paris in November 2015 he directed the Americans to “watch and study the mosques.” Trump made a similar cynical remark on the Muslims of Syria in November 2015 and stated: “Refugees from Syria are now pouring into our great country. Who knows who they are? Some could be ISIS. Is our President insane?.” He further accentuated on his commitment to take actions against Muslims and tweeted again to assure his followers that he will devise a tracking database of Muslims to keep surveillance of the activities of Muslims during his electoral campaign. In his campaign in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina he issued a statement on “Muslim Ban” and declared war on Muslims (Khan et al., 2019). Trump used his Islamophobic discourse to win public support and it is evident from his proposal on Muslim Ban which was a response to Obama’s plea to the American community to show tolerance and solidarity to the Muslims residing in America.

Afterwards, to further his agenda, Trump proposed another Islamophobic policy and introduced the idea of screening test during visa application for Muslims practicing the Shariah law. In their book; “Fear of Muslims?: International Perspectives on Islamophobia.” Pratt and Woodlock (2016) and Pérez-Curiel and Naharro (2019) pointed out that Trump’s victory was a result of mix political, social and economic dynamics mainly fear of Islam and Muslims in an international context where Radical-Islamic-terrorism has become more prominent. Trump widely spread anti-Islam and misogynistic views and policies to oppose admitting Muslims in the country.

After he was appointed as the 45th President of America, Trump resumed the use of anti-Muslim rhetoric and signed an executive ban order against Muslims from Syria, Iran, Iraq, Somalia, Sudan, Yemen and Libya for a span of 90 days (Husain, 2018). This not only reflects on Trump’s hatred against Muslims but also how he wants to win the favor of his people in America by showing that he upheld his promise which he made during his election campaign of 2016. Although many people came out against this step, the drastic effects of this step cannot be ignored as many students and people residing in America were the direct affectees (Ahmed & Matthes, 2017).

In the current study, the researchers revealed Trump’s anti-Muslim political rhetoric enhancement strategy via the accentuation of controversial issues in America such as immigration, terrorism, and security. The portrayal of Muslims through lexicalization is in line with his presentation of anti-Islamic ideology and Islamophobia.

This was executed by censoring Islam and its commandments such as the Shariah law and the concept of Jihad, while also labeling the mosques as bigoted. Trump’s political rivals, Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama were not spared from being condemned as they were accused of being anti-America and anti-Israel due to their alleged pro-Islam and pro-Muslim policies and, also, Obama’s administration was also criticized by Trump for the failure to deal with the illegal immigration issue. The statements he made in the elections race were teeming with elements of Islamophobia as the speeches were filled with allegations of Muslims being the subsidiary of terrorism attacks due to extreme hatred toward the Jews and Americans, thus justifying the idea that Americans should detest Muslims. Besides that, Trump also chose to disregard any contributions made by the Muslim community in America as these were never mentioned in his election campaigns and instead, the Muslims were depicted as religious extremists, terrorists, and anti-democratic. Moreover, he also viewed Islam as an anti-women religion and provided ambiguous references to support his perspective round the clock.

Therefore, based on current research, the researchers have concluded that Trump uses language in his Tweets to further his agenda against Muslims and his political rival Hillary Clinton before the elections of the presidency in America. Trump uses dehumanizing and derogatory language for Muslims and presents them as the root cause of social wrongs and ills in America. He makes an array of negative comments against Muslims and metaphorically suggests building a “great wall” against them to bar them to enter America. Using his hatred for Muslims, he attempts to win public support and to further his agenda he openly criticizes his political opponents Hillary Clinton and on some occasions Barack Obama to create a binary of us versus them. In this binary, he places himself as a benefactor of America having an anti-Muslim ideology and his political rivals as pro-Muslims and pro-Islam. Golshan (2016) pointed out that Trump’s anti-Muslim rhetoric has become increasingly extreme. According to his ideology, Muslim-Americans always cheer and celebrate terror attacks and supported terror groups in the United States. He implemented certain tactics to spread uncertainty and presented himself as a hero of the nation who can fix all these problems (Blöndal & Gunnarsson, 2017). In his recent study, Waikar (2018) also concludes that Trump believes that radical Islam is the only cause of terrorism worldwide and religious extremism in the West. He explicitly criticized his opponents.
Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton by referring to them as pro-Islamic politicians from America. To Trump, Obama was the founder of ISIS as he created a power vacuum and responsible for the worsening conditions of the Middle East.

Conclusion
This study has concluded that Trump restores his anti-Muslim rhetoric both before the presidential election of America (2016) and after to reinforce the shared conception of American identity with his people. The researchers have investigated that Trump uses sweeping statements to construct the identity of refugees and immigrants as criminals or as a threat to America and its citizens. The researchers have also concluded that Trump intentionally uses a dehumanizing perspective for Muslims to create a façade that Muslims are invading America and measures have to be taken against them. In doing so, Trump successfully portrays himself as the American hero, who wishes to save America from suffering and destruction. In their report, Patel and Levinson-Waldman (2017) pointed out that upon taking oath as President of the country, Trump established a historical Islamophobic administration who is pursuing his agenda including Steve Bannon; the President Senior Advisor, Sebastian Gorka; Deputy Assistant to the President and Michael Flynn; President’s National Security Advisor in the White House.

The biased approach of Trump toward Muslims is evident in his election campaign as he was never seen mentioning the contributions of Muslims toward the betterment and improvement of the United States. He always used language to paint them as terrorists, religious extremists, and called them anti-democratic bodies hurting America. Furthermore, Trump tried to extend this problematization by appealing an element of Islamic language and criticized Shariah Law as his discursive weapon. To Trump, the main characteristic of Shariah Law is that it is “incontrovertibly oppressive, anti-homosexual, anti-women or to enslave women and incompatible” with Western values. In support of this finding, Khoirunisa and Indah (2018) found that Muslims are represented as violent people who are fanatic ready to wage a Holy war on the name of “Islamic Jihad” against Western democracy and eager to implement “Shariah Law.” To Trump, Shariah Law is totally oppressive, enslaving women and anti-homosexual because it instigates Muslims to kill gays and the related LGBT community. He claims that 99% of Muslims from Afghanistan have been viewed as strong believers of Shariah law and are constantly moving to the United States as well.

Using dismantling strategy, Trump implies that Muslims are uncivilized and if America and Europe have to survive, they need to build “walls” against them. Trump here proves himself as a surprisingly myopic person viewing Islam and Muslims solely in terms of terrorism and extremism. To win public support in America, Trump fails to take into account the multi-faceted realities of the immigrant and refugee crises and the real problems Muslims are facing across the world. The current study has concluded that xenophobic, Islamophobic discourse is deeply embedded in Trump’s mind, and it has become inescapable for him. Trump uses language to merge all the Muslims and Muslim refugees into a one-dimensional group of wrong-doers and criminals and erases their individual as well as collective experiences. Therefore, Trump’s status as the prominent rightwing anti-Islam and anti-Muslim political figure for the Republican Party in the United States has been comprehensively established as he had advocated Islamophobia extensively since the beginning of his political career. From the analysis, it could be ascertained that the use of discourse against Islam and Muslims by Trump is a strategy to build kinship with the Americans who harbor similar sentiments. This discriminatory discourse of Trump played a significant role in shaping his ideology of “Make America Great Again.”

Appendix

As Presidential Candidate

“Thank you Geneva, Ohio. If I am elected President, I am going to keep RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISTS OUT of our country! #MakeAmericaSafeAgain
6:47 PM—Oct 27, 2016 from Geneva, OH”

“Wow, just came out on secret tape that Crooked Hillary wants to take in as many Syrians as possible. We cannot let this happen—ISIS!
5:00 AM—Oct 24, 2016”

“Crooked Hillary Clinton Tops Middle East Forum’s ‘Islamist Money List’.
10:54 AM—Oct 22, 2016

“If elected POTUS—I will stop RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISM in this country! In order to do this, we need to #DrainTheSwamp!
8:52 AM—Oct 20, 2016

“Thank you Colorado Springs. If I’m elected President, I am going to keep Radical Islamic Terrorists out of our country! #DrainTheSwamp
12:53 PM—Oct 18, 2016 from Colorado Springs, CO”

(continued)
Appendix. (continued)

“President Obama & Putin fail to reach deal on Syria—so what else is new? Obama is not a natural deal maker. Only makes bad deals!” 6:49 AM—Sep 5, 2016

“Hillary Clinton raked in money from regimes that horribly oppress women and gays & refuses to speak out against Radical Islam”. 3:52 PM—Aug 1, 2016

“Hillary’s wars in the Middle East have unleashed destruction, terrorism and ISIS across the world”. 8:57 PM—July 28, 2016

“Hillary’s refusal to mention Radical Islam, as she pushes a 550% increase in refugees, is more proof that she is unfit to lead the country. 8:47 PM—July 28, 2016”

“With Hillary and Obama, the terrorist attacks will only get worse. Politically correct fools, won’t even call it what it is—RADICAL ISLAM!” 8:34 AM—July 4, 2016

“Horrible killing of a 13 year old American girl at her home in Israel by a Palestinian terrorist. We must get tough.” http://bit.ly/29PPhoStatement . . . 6:32 AM—July 1, 2016

We must suspend immigration from regions linked with terrorism until a proven vetting method is in place. 7:37 PM—June 25, 2016

“In my speech on protecting America I spoke about a temporary ban, which includes suspending immigration from nations tied to Islamic terror. 2:10 PM—June 13, 2016”

“Crooked Hillary wants a radical 500% increase in Syrian refugees. We can’t allow this. Time to get smart and protect America! 12:38 PM—May 22, 2016”

Another radical Islamic attack, this time in Pakistan, targeting Christian women & children. At least 67 dead, 400 injured. I alone can solve. 1:37 PM—Mar 27, 2016

“Europe and the U.S. must immediately stop taking in people from Syria. This will be the destruction of civilization as we know it! So sad!” 8:55 AM—Mar 24, 2016”

“Incompetent Hillary, despite the horrible attack in Brussels today, wants borders to be weak and open—and let the Muslims flow in. No way! 7:59 PM—Mar 22, 2016”

Hillary Clinton said that it is O.K. to ban Muslims from Israel by building a WALL, but not O.K. to do so in the U.S. We must be vigilant! 5:23 AM—Jan 2, 2016

“We better get tough with RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISTS, and get tough now, or the life and safety of our wonderful country will be in jeopardy! 7:59 AM—Nov 22, 2015”

“Eight Syrians were just caught on the southern border trying to get into the U.S. ISIS maybe? I told you so. WE NEED A BIG & BEAUTIFUL WALL! 5:11 AM—Nov 19, 2015”

Note. Retrieved from https://www.thetrumparchive.com/

As President

“I inherited a total mess in Syria and Afghanistan, the Endless Wars of unlimited spending and death. During my campaign I said, very strongly, that these wars must finally end. We spend $50 Billion a year in Afghanistan and have hit them so hard that we are now talking peace . . . 5:23 AM—Feb 1, 2019”

When I became President, ISIS was out of control in Syria & running rampant. Since then tremendous progress made, especially over last 5 weeks. Caliphate will soon be destroyed, unthinkable two years ago. Negotiating are proceeding well in Afghanistan after 18 years of fighting. 3:25 AM—Jan 30, 2019

Our GREAT MILITARY has delivered justice for the heroes lost and wounded in the cowardly attack on the USS Cole. We have just killed the leader of that attack, Jamal al-Badawi. Our work against al Qaeda continues. We will never stop in our fight against Radical Islamic Terrorism! 7:27 AM—Jan 6, 2019

(continued)
Appendix. (continued)

“If anybody but Donald Trump did what I did in Syria, which was an ISIS loaded mess when I became President, they would be a national hero. ISIS is mostly gone, we’re slowly sending our troops back home to be with their families, while at the same time fighting ISIS remnants . . . .
5:03 AM—Dec 31, 2018”

“Of course we should have captured Osama Bin Laden long before we did. I pointed him out in my book just BEFORE the attack on the World Trade Center. President Clinton famously missed his shot. We paid Pakistan Billions of Dollars & they never told us he was living there. Fools!
7:26 AM—Nov 19, 2018”

“We no longer pay Pakistan the $Billions because they would take our money and do nothing for us, Bin Laden being a prime example, Afghanistan being another. They were just one of many countries that take from the United States without giving anything in return. That’s ENDING! 7:41 AM—Nov 19, 2018”

Remember how badly Iran was behaving with the Iran Deal in place. They were trying to take over the Middle East by whatever means necessary. Now, that will not happen!
1:11 PM—May 13, 2018

Iran’s Military Budget is up more than 40% since the Obama negotiated Nuclear Deal was reached . . . just another indicator that it was all a big lie. But not anymore!
3:02 PM—May 12, 2018

Many dead, including women and children, in mindless CHEMICAL attack in Syria. Area of atrocity is in lockdown and encircled by Syrian Army, making it completely inaccessible to outside world. President Putin, Russia and Iran are responsible for backing Animal Assad.
Big price . .
6:00 AM—Apr 8, 2018

France honors a great hero. Officer died after bravely swapping places with hostage in ISIS related terror attack. So much bravery around the world constantly fighting radical Islamic terrorism. Even stronger measures needed, especially at borders!
3:10 AM—Mar 25, 2018

It’s not only Pakistan that we pay billions of dollars to for nothing, but also many other countries, and others. As an example, we pay the Palestinians HUNDRED OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS a year and get no appreciation or respect. They don’t even want to negotiate a long overdue . . .
2:37 PM—Jan 2, 2018

“The United States has foolishly given Pakistan more than 33 billion dollars in aid over the last 15 years, and they have given us nothing but lies & deceit, thinking of our leaders as fools. They give safe haven to the terrorists we hunt in Afghanistan, with little help. No more!
4:12 AM—Jan 1, 2018”

@Theresa_May, don’t focus on me, focus on the destructive Radical Islamic Terrorism that is taking place within the United Kingdom. We are doing just fine!
5:02 PM—Nov 29, 2017

“Just out report: United Kingdom crime rises 13% annually amid spread of Radical Islamic terror.” Not good, we must keep America safe!
3:31 AM—Oct 20, 2017”

“Radical Islamic Terrorism must be stopped by whatever means necessary! The courts must give us back our protective rights. Have to be tough!
6:06 AM—Aug 18, 2017”

Study what General Pershing of the United States did to terrorists when caught. There was no more Radical Islamic T error for 35 years!
11:45 AM—Aug 17, 2017

“The Iran Deal is defective at its core. If we do nothing, we know what will happen. In just a short time, the world’s leading state sponsor of terror will be on the cusp of acquiring the world’s most dangerous weapons . . .
3:11 PM—May 8, 2018”

“72% of refugees admitted into U.S. (2/3 -2/11) during COURT BREAKDOWN are from 7 countries: SYRIA, IRAQ, SOMALIA, IRAN, SUDAN, LIBYA & YEMEN
3:55 AM—Feb 12, 2017

The threat from radical Islamic terrorism is very real, just look at what is happening in Europe and the Middle-East. Courts must act fast!
6:49 PM—Feb 6, 2017

“A new radical Islamic terrorist has just attacked in Louver Museum in Paris. Tourists were locked down. France on edge again. GET SMART U.S.
4:51 AM—Feb 3, 2017”
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