

---

# Language of Conflict: The Role of Dysphemism in Political Campaign Rhetoric

---

Hashim A. M. Alhusseini<sup>1</sup>, Saja Abdul Ameer Hadi<sup>2</sup>, Itifat Aliwi Mohammed<sup>3</sup>

1Dept. of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Wasit, Wasit, Iraq

2Dept. of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Wasit, Wasit, Iraq

3English Language and Literature Department, College of Arts and Humanities, Al-Mustaqbal University, Babylon, Iraq

\*Corresponding author: [hilewi@uowasit.edu.iq](mailto:hilewi@uowasit.edu.iq)

---

## Abstract

This study evaluates the role of dysphemism as a strategic and effective tool in political communication, with a specific focus on its use in the rhetoric of former U.S. President Donald Trump. By employing the theoretical frameworks of Van Dijk's ideological squaring (1995), Allan and Burrige's dysphemism theory (2006), and Fowler's categorization approach (1991), the research investigates how Trump's rhetorical strategies utilize dysphemistic expressions to influence public opinion and advance his political agenda. The analysis reveals that Trump frequently employs strong, provocative language and comparisons to criticize opponents, defend his actions and policies, and reshape American public attitudes. His use of dysphemistic rhetoric creates polarizing narratives, emphasizing divisions and reinforcing ideological positions. The findings indicate that Trump's speeches effectively leveraged these linguistic tools to mobilize supporters and challenge opponents, showcasing the power of rhetoric in shaping perceptions and political discourse. The study also highlights the need for further research into Trump's paralinguistic elements, such as his body language, facial expressions, vocal intonation, eye contact, and gestures, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of his communication style. This research contributes to the broader understanding of the intersection between language and power in political campaigns, demonstrating how dysphemism serves as a potent mechanism for persuasion and ideological framing.

**Keywords:** Dysphemism; Ideological Squaring; Donald Trump; Political Discourse.

## لغة الصراع: دور التهكم في خطاب الحملات السياسية

هاشم عليوي محمد الحسيني<sup>1</sup>، سجي عبد الأمير هادي<sup>2</sup>، التفات عليوي محمد<sup>3</sup>

1 قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية، جامعة واسط، واسط، العراق

2 قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية، جامعة واسط، واسط، العراق

3 قسم اللغة الانجليزية وآدابها، كلية الآداب والعلوم الإنسانية، جامعة المستقبل، بابل، العراق

\*المؤلف المراسل: [hilewi@uowasit.edu.iq](mailto:hilewi@uowasit.edu.iq)

### المخلص

تبحث هذه الدراسة دور التهكم كأداة استراتيجية وفعالة في الاتصال السياسي، مع التركيز بشكل خاص على استخدامه في خطاب الرئيس الأمريكي السابق دونالد ترامب. من خلال استخدام الأطر النظرية للتربيع الأيديولوجي لفان ديك (1995)، ونظرية التهكم لآلان وبوريدج (2006)، ونهج التصنيف لفاولر (1991)، يبحث البحث في كيفية استخدام استراتيجيات ترامب الخطابية للتعبيرات التهكمية للتأثير على الرأي العام وتعزيز أجندته السياسية. يكشف التحليل أن ترامب يستخدم بشكل متكرر لغة قوية واستفزازية ومقارنات لانتقاد المعارضين والدفاع عن أفعاله وسياساته وإعادة تشكيل المواقف العامة الأمريكية. إن استخدامه للخطاب التهكمي يخلق سرديات استقطابية، ويؤكد على الانقسامات ويعزز المواقف الأيديولوجية. وتشير النتائج إلى أن خطاب ترامب استغل هذه الأدوات اللغوية بفعالية لحشد المؤيدين وتحدي المعارضين، مما يبرز قوة الخطابة في تشكيل التصورات والخطاب السياسي. وتسلط الدراسة الضوء أيضاً على الحاجة إلى مزيد من البحث في العناصر غير اللغوية لترامب، مثل لغة جسده وتعبيرات وجهه ونبرة صوته واتصاله البصري وإيماءاته، للحصول على فهم أكثر شمولاً لأسلوب تواصله. يساهم هذا البحث في فهم أوسع للتقاطع بين اللغة والقوة في الحملات السياسية، مما يوضح كيف تعمل التهكم كأداة فعالة للإقناع والتأطير الأيديولوجي.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** التهكم، التربيع الأيديولوجي، دونالد ترامب، الخطاب السياسي.

## 1. Introduction

As a social activity, language has the ability to shape and create its users' opinions and values. It not only makes it easier to convey thoughts, promises, and compliments, but it also helps to achieve other social objectives (Olimat, 2018). Understanding how individuals utilize language in speeches and debates is thus vital, especially in high-pressure situations. Politicians are trying an unprecedented reaction. During speeches and regular briefings, they often addressed methods of reducing global harm via preventive measures and activities.

Considering that Trump is the leader of the world's most powerful nation, this research is very important; not only does he speak directly to the American people, but his comments reach people all over the world via a number of media spots. There is a lot of debate in the media about Trump's character. Every time he engages with politicians, journalists, or utilizes social media, he makes a big impression. Trump, an influential figure in American history, is well-known for his extraordinary command of the English language and his time as president. He is well-known for his ability to capture an audience with the intensity of his impassioned speeches and a diverse set of language skills. Dochy (2018, p. 9) described him as a distinct personality who "consistently breaks taboos of traditional political speech." As a consequence, his choice of words and phrases provides researchers with a wide range of options to investigate. Numerous linguists have investigated Trump's social media use from various linguistic viewpoints (Ott, 2017).

In the field of political speech analysis, Trump's employment of metaphor and rhetorical methods has received a lot of attention (Amine, 2017; Dochy, 2018). Similarly, the current study investigates how Trump utilizes dysphemistic rhetoric. The goal of this study is to look at the techniques utilized to collect and analyze data on a subset of dysphemistic expressions found in public speech.

## 2. Problem Statement and Research Objectives

Linguistic study on dysphemism is still in its early stages due to social and cultural taboos. Political discourse, in contrast to other types of communication, often employs dysphemistic vocabulary when addressing sensitive and disputed issues. This demonstrates

how crucial it is to analyze dysphemism in politics via comprehensive linguistic research. Academics studying language have also failed to effectively examine the rhetorical and aesthetic applications of dysphemism in political discourse. In light of this, the current study examines and assesses Trump's employment of substantial dysphemistic idioms in his daily briefings to the American public on the war on election campaign rhetoric. Nonetheless, there has been no linguistic examination of Trump's use of metaphoric dysphemism. As a result, it becomes appropriate to examine some of Trump's campaign speeches including dysphemistic rhetoric through the lens of critical-political discourse. Amine (2017) said that Trump utilizes language in a certain manner. As a consequence, this research focuses on Trump's employment of dysphemistic rhetoric and techniques throughout his campaign. Its declared mission is to deconstruct Trump's speeches for American and international audiences in terms of content and intent, excluding the use of insulting language. It also examines the effectiveness with which Trump has used dysphemism. This is the first discourse analysis piece to look at Trump's use of dysphemism as a persuasive strategy.

Scholars like van Dijk (1997) have strongly advocated the use of discourse analysis in political discourse "to answer genuine and relevant political questions and deal with issues that are discussed in political science."(p. 12). This strategy has received significant appreciation from researchers. In light of this, this paper focuses on a recurrent political issue, arguing that Trump employed dysphemism on purpose to degrade and disgrace his opponents in order to win over people and earn their support for his US presidential campaign. To achieve these objectives, the ideas of Van Dijk on classification (1995), Allan and Burridge (2006) on dysphemism, and Fowler (1991) on categorization must be used.

### 3. Literature Review

This section provides a short overview of recent research on the use of linguistic techniques as well as other topics relevant to the discussion. Allan and Burridge (2006) utilized Lakoff's (1973) theory of politeness to define dysphemism. They define dysphemism as a word or phrase having negative implications for people who are addressed or overhear the speech. It refers to disrespectful and unpleasant words. They asserted that dysphemism is "characteristic" of political groups when referring to their opponents. The results of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness research give the most possible explanation for this; the

speaker could harm the interlocutors' image by performing positive face-threatening activities that offend. This category encompasses dysphemism. As a result, dysphemism is an effective instrument for political propaganda. According to O'Shaughnessy (2004, p. 39), "emotion is the core of propaganda." Using dysphemism, one side may harm the "other" side's reputation and self-image by explicitly criticizing them and appealing to their emotions (van Dijk, 1995).

According to Allan and Burrige (2006), the usage of dysphemism is context-dependent. They claimed that dysphemism is not a part of the term, but rather in how it is employed. Words like "Asian" may be neutral or dysphemistic, depending on the context and the persons using them, and "affects the perception of both the denotatum and the speaker" (Bagasheva, 2012, p.158), indicating a purposeful act, especially in political discourse. Advertising is an intentional, systematic attempt to change perceptions. The claimed purpose of this study is to demonstrate how Trump attacked politicians using dysphemism as a communication strategy to injure his opponents and gain followers.

By studying dysphemism in Trump's language, this study sheds light on his ability to win over supporters despite widespread criticism. Furthermore, it explains why dysphemism is such a sensitive issue; according to Allan and Burrige (2006, p. 458), it is "at the top of the scale of severity" among racist terminology. Dysphemism, unlike euphemism, has received minimal attention in political language research, and the word "rarely appears in everyday English" (Allan and Burrige, 2006, p.29). Scholars who address actual and relevant political challenges and concerns, such as van Dijk (1997) argue that Trump intentionally used dysphemism as a marketing tool to make fun of and disgrace his opponents in order to acquire votes for his presidential campaign.

Political discourse has an important role in sociocultural administration, growth, and organization. As stated by Dylgjeri (2017), political speech serves as a means of creating and maintaining social bonds, expressing opinions, and selling ideas, policies, and political goals in every society. According to Crespo-Fernández (2013), political speech is a sort of political activity that performs intellectual labor relevant to the sociopolitical situation, imposes social control, and legitimizes power. There is a lot of metaphorical language and linguistic strategies used for certain objectives throughout. Politicians often use convincing arguments to persuade the public on certain subjects. When politicians deliver speeches, they utilize

forceful language as propaganda to promote their ideological goals and pretend to persuade the audience. Dysphemism is the employment of numerous figures of speech and rhetorical utterances with varying semantic, syntactic, and stylistic constructs by political leaders to achieve a variety of objectives. These objectives may include organizing support for a certain party, persuading the public, debating a political topic, avoiding accountability, and even assaulting opponents or enemies.

Political speech often employs metaphors, rhetoric, and persuasive language. Politicians use methods and tactics like these to influence the public's ideas and attitudes. Van Dijk (2000) defines critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a sort of discourse analysis study that examines how language and text are used in social and political settings to enact, continue, and oppose abuses of social power, dominance, and inequality. Critical discourse Analysis (CDA) is concerned with the reproduction, misuse, or supremacy of political power via political speech (Van Dijk, 1997).

Based on Crespo-Fernández (2013), this method examines the intentional use of language patterns or words to achieve certain political ends. Politicians depend on language to communicate their objectives and comprehend the sociocultural patterns of the people they represent. Thus, Critical-Political Discourse Analysis is used to study effective communicators and compelling speeches. The purpose of this research is to look at Trump's persuasion and effect campaign methods, as well as his knowledge of the English language and the intensity of his verbal arguments.

Politicians often utilize dysphemism, a kind of linguistic disguise, while discussing sensitive matters or softly criticizing their opponents. This demonstrates how politicians may use heated language to mislead the public or fabricate facts when they are unhappy with or sensitive about major topics. Allan and Burrige (2006) define dysphemism as a word or phrase having offensive overtones for the speaker or those to whom the term or phrase is intended. They characterized dysphemism as a speaking aggressively method. Dysphemism is described as "the process wherein the most negative aspects of the taboo are stressed with an offensive goal to the addressee or the notion itself" (Crespo-Fernández, 2013, p. 2). For Crespo-Fernández, using dysphemism is an efficient technique to influence political discourse and shift ideological perspectives. To summarize, politicians often criticize, blame, and

persuade people in speeches that employ harsh or furious language. Linguists have long been interested in the language usage of politicians, public figures, and diplomats. The goal of this study is to look at how people reacted to and understood Trump's use of dysphemistic language in certain speeches.

#### 4. Methodology

This study focuses on Political Discourse Analysis (PDA). Based on Van Dijk (1997), (PDA) responds to real and important political concerns while also engaging with subjects explored in political science. This research aims to examine Trump's use of dysphemism as a compelling rhetorical weapon during the most unpleasant US presidential campaign in history.

As stated by Van Dijk (1997), "dealing with the reproduction of political power, power abuse, or dominance through political discourse" is the primary purpose of CDA studies, which refers to political discourse (p. 11). It examines how politicians employ rhetorical methods to split people, influence the masses, and deliver concealed messages in political contexts. This research uses a word-by-word evaluation of nouns, adjectives, and verbs to look into how Trump utilized dysphemistic language throughout his campaign to deceive voters and criticize opponents.

Using the paradigm given by Allan and Burridge (2006), this essay looks for dysphemistic terms in Trump's political statement. The exact opposite of euphemism, or nice language, is dysphemism, which is simply described as criticizing words. Dysphemistic expressiveness may manifest as profanity, insults, and criticizing statements. These words are often used in political propaganda. For example, they define "readily determined" as being assertive and direct. This relates to Fowler's (1991) idea of categorization, which is ideologically defining objects or persons using terminology that are close to or even identical to one another. According to Van Dijk's notion of "ideological squaring," in which politicians use insulting phrases to delegitimize and dehumanize their opponents, dysphemism is an example of how unpleasant emotions may drive political conduct. Context, time, and location are other important considerations. This study looks at Trump's use of these idioms in his speeches, demonstrating his deliberately split political propaganda strategy while

campaigning for president.

The information gathered is not based on a single speech, but rather on topics or issues. Politically incorrect remarks were a popular strategy in Trump's campaigns. Throughout his campaign, he gave several interviews and speeches, but what made him famous was his frequent criticism of his opponents. Trump regularly mentioned his political opponents throughout his presidential campaigns (2016 and 2024), therefore we picked his speeches on these subjects to investigate his usage of dysphemistic vocabulary. These criteria guided the selection of two speeches for evaluation. The discourses selected for consideration are Trump's candidacy speech (June 16, 2015), and the Harris-Trump presidential debate (September 11, 2024).

As a consequence, the project's scope is limited. Trump delivered multiple speeches throughout his presidential campaign. This research does not give an exhaustive look of Trump's rhetoric since it focuses on just a few speeches that cover the most of his concerns. Because of the small number of samples, a quantitative analysis is not available. This means that qualitative analysis is the most often employed approach. As Creswell (2014) notes, qualitative research has a history of working with little data. Despite this, the study sample clearly shows how Trump employed dysphemistic discourse as a campaign weapon, which helped him win. In contrast to quantitative research, qualitative research may utilize purposeful sampling to acquire a deeper knowledge of the issue and respond to research questions.

This article explores the chosen speech groups via the perspective of microanalysis. Micro-analysis, like dysphemism and advertising, is based on the speaker's purposeful choice of words to communicate the desired message. Fairclough (1995) defines picking one piece of language as eliminating others. We used speeches as a typical example to evaluate Trump's usage of dysphemism. Transcriptions of the selected speeches were already accessible online. We used Allan and Burrige's (2006) theories and Van Dijk's (1995) "ideological squaring" to investigate and emphasize the role of nouns, adjectives, and verbs in dysphemistic language. The research looks at Trump's use of dysphemism as a persuasive method and appealing message, with a focus on its role in inducing fear in voters.

## 5. Data Analysis of Dysphemistic Expressions in Trump's speech

A right-wing populist group uses fear to attract support (Wodak, 2016). It might be fear of the unknown, strangers, or even corrupt politicians. Trump's use of dysphemistic terminology is consistent with populist right-wing rhetoric. His use of emotionally charged negative language in portraying issues such as a crumbling America, corrupt political opponents Barack Obama, Biden, Harris, and others is obvious in the subsequent investigations. We look for dysphemistic adjectives, verbs, and nouns. Thus, the researchers will choose selected speeches that has dysphemistic expressions which focus on issues related to describing or critiquing America, the ex-president of America Barack Obama, the current vice-president Harris, and the current president and his vice-president Biden and Harris.

### 5.1. Dysphemism in the United States

In the opening comments of his formal campaign announcement for the Republican presidential nomination, Trump expresses worry about the United States' decline. Trump used a litany of harsh, emotionally charged rhetoric to portray the United States as a dying country, appealing to patriotism and wrath of those responsible for its collapse. "Kill, beat, and lose" are only a handful of the expressive verbs used to demonstrate this. These verbs depict the United States as a defeated nation, blaming foreign sources for its decline. As a result, Americans increasingly look down on these operators and this can be shown in the following samples:

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- When was the last time anybody saw us beating, let's say, China in a trade deal? They kill us. I beat China all the time".</li> <li>2- When was the last time you saw a Chevrolet in Tokyo? It doesn't exist, folks. They beat us all the time".</li> <li>3- "When do we beat Mexico at the border? They're laughing at us, at our stupidity. And now they are beating us economically. They are not our friend, believe me. But they're killing us economically".</li> <li>4- "We lost thousands of lives".</li> </ol>	Presidential Announcement 2016
---	--------------------------------------

<p>5- "Our country is in serious trouble Our country is in serious trouble. We don't have victories anymore".</p> <p>6- " Our labor participation rate was the worst since 1978. But think of it, GDP below zero, horrible labor participation rate".</p> <p>7- " You come to back to this country and you have LAX, disaster. You have all of these disastrous airports. We have to rebuild our infrastructure".</p>	
---	--

The use of the emotive transitive word "kill" in instances (1) and (3) demonstrates how Trump uses it to threaten people's lives. It highlights how other nations are blocking America's efforts. The subject position and active voice plainly accuse China and Mexico of threatening Americans' lives, and the verb serves to generate alarm among voters. According to Fowler (1991), writing in the active voice holds a person accountable for their actions, while writing in the passive voice hides responsibility, and use a transitive verb to identify the impacted item or patient. To demonstrate continuity, Trump accuses China and Mexico of attacking the United States by using the active voice and present tense. Both the literal and metaphorical interpretations of the word "kill" (to punish brutally) instill dread and rage in the agents from China and Mexico, respectively, making it difficult to determine which is more deadly. The choice of the word "beat" (*to strike repeatedly, defeat, or punish*) in example (2) also instills negative sentiments in the audience, particularly against Japan. As seen in Example (4), the use of the past tense expressive word "lost" confirms that the Americans were already destroyed. As a consequence, Trump's use of dysphemistic emotional verbs supports his propaganda strategy of promoting fear and hate in people in order to persuade them to support him for election. Trump's campaign speeches continue to portray the United States as a failing country, utilizing a pattern of loaded adjectives followed by nouns. 'Serious problem' defines the United States, 'terrible' describes its labor participation rate, and 'disaster' describes its airports.

The examples (5), (6), and (7) portray a negative perspective of America via the use of emotional language. People who hear this false portrayal of America as a dying country will feel horrible about themselves. Van Dijk (2000, p. 34) emphasizes this, claiming that "negative topics have negative consequences in the minds of the recipients." Here, the receivers, or

voters, are aware of the risks that their country confronts. A scapegoat, or someone or something to blame, is required for this kind of hate (Wodak, 2016). Trump blames the Democrats and the media in order to undermine their legitimacy and get support. The section that follows examines Trump's usage of dysphemistic language aimed toward his opponents.

## 5.2. Dysphemism at Obama

Trump accuses Obama of being to blame for America's failure in dysphemistic terms. Trump refers to President Obama as negative, stupid, and bad. These remarks convey a negative message to the voters by portraying President Obama as bad and stupid. Because these adjectives are so biased, the audience member is obliged to react negatively to them.

8- "He (Obama) was actually a negative force". 9- "How stupid are our leaders?" 10- "He's (Obama) a bad negotiator". 11- "We have a disaster called the big lie: Obamacare". 12- "It's (Obamacare) a complete disaster".	Presidential Announcement  2016
--	---------------------------------------

These examples are so severe and prejudiced that they make viewers dismiss Democrats as foolish and push them to vote for Trump, a Republican with more experience and knowledge. Obamacare is another target of Trump's inflammatory remarks. According to Claridge (2011), presenters utilize exaggeration to emphasize their points and show how devoted and concerned they are. According to Bolinger (2014, p.77), "overtly biased nouns" offend in the same way as adjectives do. Trump used strong language to emphasize his anti-Obamacare sentiment. As a result, Trump's emotionally driven assaults are more powerful and persuasive. Trump also regularly uses dysphemistic adjectives like "big lie" and "complete disaster" to emphasize the hyperbolic nouns and, so, the gravity of his assertions. The dysphemistic use of intensifying adjectives in instances (11) and (12) heightens Trump's emotional impact and persuades the listener.

Trump employed a sequence of overstated nouns mixed with harsh adjectives to increase the harm in his speech and create a dysphemistic impact on the public's perception of Obamacare. Despite Obamacare's good intentions, Trump sees it as a danger to Americans' health and lives. He intends to convince voters to remove it by presenting it in a negative way

and drawing this parallel.

### 5.3. Dysphemism at Harris

During their first and most likely only debate in Philadelphia, Harris and Trump exchanged insults. Trump, as he often does, looked for to turn Biden's "threat to democracy" argument against him into an attack on Harris. He called her a "radical left liberal" and a Marxist who was ruining America. He predicted that she will be remembered as "the worst vice president in our country's history."

He's also alluding to Harris' "opportunity economy" concept, but the phrase is disrespectful and exemplifies Trump's theme of linking Harris to Biden while also making her look likely to modify her policy promises. In a disastrous speech packed with personal attacks against President Joe Biden, including ridiculing his stutter, he warned that the influx of migrants over the southern border would result in the robbery of US communities and the abuse of their citizens.

<p>13- "She (Harris) is a radical-left lunatic who will destroy our country."  14- "They (Biden) (Harris)'re the threat to democracy."  15- "She (Harris) 's destroying this country."  16- "That's because she (Harris) knows what a bad job they've done."  17- "She (Harris) goes down as the worst vice president in the history of our country."  18- "She (Harris) is a horrible negotiator."  19- "She (Harris) doesn't have a plan. She copied Biden's plan, and it's like four sentences like, Run Spot, Run."</p>	<p>Presidential debate 2024</p>
---	-------------------------------------

Trump attacks Harris \_in instances (13), (16), and (18)\_ by using emotional words like (awful, dreadful, and radical). Trump's remarks during the debate were part of a bigger campaign strategy to portray Harris as a far-left "radical" Democrat. Experts feel that this technique is aimed to dissuade independent voters from supporting her. Trump's use of emotionally charged words creates a negative view of America. People who hear this misleading depiction of America as a fading nation will feel terrible about themselves. According to Van Dijk (2000) claiming that unpleasant issues have negative implications in the thoughts of their recipients.

#### 5.4. Dysphemism at Biden and Harris

In answer to a question on immigration, Trump claimed—without offering any supporting evidence—those thousands of criminals from other countries had crossed the border. He said, "Crime is down everywhere except here." Trump argued that immigration are to blame for the increase in violence. When one of the debate moderators brought up the numbers, which show a countrywide decrease in violent crime, Trump said they were incorrect. He continued, maintaining an offensive style that implies his campaign speeches. They pose a threat. We must remove them from the highest echelon of criminality.

<p>20- "They (Biden) (Harris) allowed criminals. Many, many millions of criminals. They allowed terrorists. They allowed common street criminals. They allowed people to come in, drug dealers, to come into our country ... And I think they probably did it because they think they're going to get votes. But it's not worth it. Because they're destroying the fabric of our country by what they've done".</p> <p>21- "They (Biden) (Harris) 're dangerous. They're at the highest level of criminality".</p> <p>22- "Their (Biden) (Harris) economy was terrible".</p> <p>23- "They (Biden) (Harris) have to hate our country".</p>	<p>Presidential debate 2024</p>
---	-------------------------------------

Trump uses terms like "criminals", "dangerous", and "awful" to attack Biden and Harris in instances (20), (21) and (22) to undermine their credibility. Frightening voters is an established tradition in American politics. Furthermore, Trump was elected in 2016 on a wave of fear and dissatisfaction. When Trump was beaten by President Joe Biden in 2020, it was unsuccessful. The Republican candidates, however, hasn't let that stop him from following the same playbook this year.

## 6. Conclusion

Examining dysphemism in political campaign speeches, particularly Trump's campaign, reveals his expert use of harsh vocabulary as a clear advertising technique to discredit and eliminate those who opposed him, allowing him to gain the presidential election. Trump, a reality television star, clearly understands how to use words to affect people. He employs dysphemism to generate an emotional reaction from voters and encourage them to take action. Recent media studies have revealed that Trump is skilled at manipulating the media, and our findings confirm that conclusion (Dubrofsk, 2016).

This research demonstrates how right-wing populist leaders, such as Donald Trump, use fear to attain political goals and deliver impressive speeches. When Trump wants to disparage or undermine his adversaries, he uses dysphemistic language. They are also good evaluative and persuasive strategies when used on purpose, which is why they are known as insults. Finally, Trump criticizes his opponents and influences the audience using strong, emotionally charged words. Nonetheless, he has been criticized for pushing political correctness and using dysphemistic language from wartime propaganda. Burrige's statement (2006, p. 461) best captures this. People who lack "natural cover" (euphemisms) who express themselves in a "incorrect" fashion risk being seen as biased by others who have talked similarly, including malevolent misogynists, real racists, and homophobes.

Many respondents indeed perceive Trump to be a "racist and bigot" (Milbank, 2015, p.1). Given the recent rise in extremist organizations and Nazi slogans in the United States and Europe, it becomes fair to believe that racist representations of the president would simply exacerbate public divide and encourage even more extreme responses. Despite the fact that Trump effectively exploited dysphemism as an electoral tool to win the presidency, his approach has resulted in the emergence of extreme beliefs that might have far-reaching consequences and disappear in an unknown time period.

## References

- Allan, K., & Burrige, K. (2006). *Forbidden words: Taboo and the censoring of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Amine, D. (2017). *Interpretation of discourse markers in Trump's political speeches. Case study: The function of the markers so, anyway, you know in Trump's selected speeches*.

- M.A thesis, University of Mostaganem, Algeria.
- Bagasheva, A. (2012). The tastes and distastes of verbivores-some observations on X-phemisation in Bulgarian and English. *Lexis*, 7, 157-191. doi: /10.4000lexis.390
- Bolinger, D. (2014). *Language - the loaded weapon: The use and abuse of language today*. London: Routledge.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S., C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Claridge, C. (2011). *Hyperbole in English. A corpus-based study of exaggeration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crespo-Fernandez, E. (2013) Words as weapons for mass persuasion: dysphemism in Churchill's wartime speeches. *Text& talk*, 33(3), 311-330. doi/10.1515text-2013-0014
- Creswell, J., W. (2014). *Research design qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods Approaches* (4th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Dochy, A. (2018). *Speaking "transgressive truth": Assessing the political extremism of Donald Trump's campaign discourse during the 2015/2016 US presidential pre-primaries and primaries*. M.A thesis, Utrecht University, Netherlands.
- Dubrofsky, R., E (2016). Authentic Trump: Yearning for civility. *Television& New Media*, 17(7), 663-666. doi: 10.1177/1527476416652698
- Dylgjeri, A. (2017). Analysis of speech acts in political speeches. *European Journal of Social Sciences Studies*.2(2), 19-26.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. London: Routledge.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). *The logic of politeness: Or, minding your p's and q's*. In C. Corum, T. Cedric.
- McAdams, D., P. (2016, June). The mind of Donald Trump. narcissism, disagreeableness, grandiosity extraordinary personality might shape his possible presidency. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/>
- Olimat, S. N. (2018). Developing a model for translating euphemism in the Qur'an: An intratextual- and contextual-based approach. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*. 9(6), 101-111.

- O' Shaughnessy, N. (2004). *Politics and propaganda and persuasion: Weapons of mass seduction*. UK: Manchester University Press.
- 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.
- Van Dijk, T., A. (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. Retrieved from <http://occupytampa.org>
- Van Dijk, T., A. (1997). What is Political Discourse Analysis. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 11(1), 11-52.
- Van. Dijk, T., A. (2000). New(s) racism: A discourse analytical approach", in *Ethnic Minorities and the Media: Changing Cultural Boundaries*. S. Cottle (Ed). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Wodak. R. (2016). *The politics of fear: what right- wing populist discourse mean*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.