

Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse

الاستراتيجيات العقائدية لتنميط الآخر وخلق الذعر الأخلاقي في الخطاب السياسي الاعلامي

أ.م.د. مروة كريم علي

كلية الاداب/ جامعة تكريت

marwakareem16@tu.edu.iq



الكلمات المفتاحية: استراتيجيات عقائدية، تنميط الآخرين، الذعر الأخلاقي، المخاتلة التداولية، أفعال الكلام

كيفية اقتباس البحث

علي , مروة كريم , الاستراتيجيات العقائدية لتنميط الآخر وخلق الذعر الأخلاقي في الخطاب السياسي الاعلامي، مجلة مركز بابل للدراسات الانسانية، آذار ٢٠٢٦، المجلد: ١٦، العدد: ٣.

هذا البحث من نوع الوصول المفتوح مرخص بموجب رخصة المشاع الإبداعي لحقوق التأليف والنشر (Creative Commons Attribution) تتيح فقط للآخرين تحميل البحث ومشاركته مع الآخرين بشرط نسب العمل الأصلي للمؤلف، ودون القيام بأي تعديل أو استخدامه لأغراض تجارية.

Registered في مسجلة في
ROAD

Indexed في مفهرسة في
IASJ



Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse

Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse

Asst. Prof. Dr. Marwah Kareem Ali

College of Arts, Tikrit University

marwakareem16@tu.edu.iq



Keywords : ideological strategies, other-stereotyping, moral panic, pragmatic maneuvering, speech acts

How To Cite This Article

Ali , Marwah Kareem , Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse , Journal Of Babylon Center For Humanities Studies, March 2026, Volume:16, Issue 3.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

[This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.](#)

Abstract

This study examines the ideological strategies in a political speech posted on social media platforms, with a focus on stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in relation to the immigration issue. The study investigates the shift in illocutionary force in political discourse, where certain expressions serve as a pragmatic cover to conceal exclusionary ideology and explicit threats of migration. Accordingly, the study aims to examine the linguistic structures that contribute to the demonization of immigrants and to turn social anxiety into an existential crisis that legitimizes radical decisions. This requires employing Fairclough's (2013) approach to critical discourse analysis (CDA) to analyze excerpts taken from Trump's speech on Thanksgiving loaded with expressions on immigration posted on X platform on Nov. 28, 2025. This approach involves coding speech acts (such as expressives, directives) and analyzing conceptual metaphors and exclusionary expressions to relate them to the overall ideological context. The study reveals that Trump's



speech relies on pragmatic maneuvering by exploiting a national occasion to reinforce the representation of US and THEM, and linguistically shifting migration from a legal issue into a biological disease that requires eradication. Moreover, it concludes that moral panic is linguistically constructed by depriving the other of their mental and cultural competence, depicting reverse migration as an act of national rescue rather than as a repressive measure. Therefore, the language transforms from a mere means of communication into an ideological weapon that reconstructs social and political reality.

Keywords:

المخلص

تبحث هذه الدراسة في الاستراتيجيات العقائدية في خطاب سياسي منشور في منصات التواصل الاجتماعي، مع التركيز على تنميط الآخر وخلق الذعر الأخلاقي فيما يتعلق بقضية الهجرة. تبحث الدراسة في الانزياح في القوة الانجازية في الخطاب السياسي، حيث تستخدم بعض التعبيرات كغطاء عملي لإخفاء عقيدة الاقصاء والتهديدات الصريحة بالتهجير. وبناء عليه، تهدف الدراسة إلى البحث في التراكيب اللغوية التي تساهم في شيطنة المهاجرين وتحويل القلق الاجتماعي إلى أزمة وجودية تشرعن القرارات الراديكالية. وهذا يتطلب استخدام نهج فيركلو (٢٠١٣) في تحليل الخطاب النقدي (CDA) لتحليل مقتطفات من خطاب ترامب في عيد الشكر الذي يحمل تعابير عن قضية الهجرة منشور على منصة X في ٢٨ نوفمبر ٢٠٢٥. يتضمن هذا النهج ترميز الأفعال الكلامية (مثل التعبيرات، والتوجيهات) وتحليل الاستعارات المفاهيمية والتعبيرات الإقصائية لربطها بالسياق العقائدي العام. تكشف الدراسة أن خطاب ترامب يعتمد على المخاتلة التداولية من خلال استغلال مناسبة قومية لتعزيز تمثيل نحن وهم، وتحويل الهجرة لغويا من قضية قانونية إلى مرض بيولوجي يتطلب القضاء عليه. علاوة على ذلك، تستنتج الدراسة أن الذعر الأخلاقي يبني لغويا من خلال حرمان الآخر من كفاءته العقلية والثقافية، بتصوير الانزياح العكسي كعمل إنقاذ قومي بدلا من كونه إجراء قمعيا. لذلك، تتحول اللغة من مجرد وسيلة تواصل إلى سلاح عقائدي يعيد بناء الواقع الاجتماعي والسياسي.

1. Introduction

Political discourse is a field highlighting the power of language and its ability to shape social reality. It is a fertile field for contemporary linguistic studies, as the political text is no longer just a tool for the transmission of ideas, but has become an act aimed at making change,



Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse



Journal of Babylon Center for Humanities Studies: 2026, Volume: 16, Issue: 3

influencing convictions and forming collective consciousness. In this regard, media political discourse in the digital age is a fertile linguistic field for studying how public convictions are shaped and how public opinion is directed. In this context, language does not only serve as a mirror that reflects reality, but also as a tool to reconstruct and shape this reality in order to serve the interests of the dominant political forces (Austin, 1962). Hence, pragmatics emerges as a pivotal analytical framework for understanding this discourse, focusing on meaning in use and how language can be adapted for ideological purposes. It represents a cognitive framework that studies the relationship between linguistic signs and their users. It seeks to reveal the intentions behind utterances, where the focus is on the speech act and its illocutionary force capable of bringing about change in the world of the recipient (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969).

With the increasing waves of digital populism, there is an urgent need to examine the ideological strategies employed by political leaders. Hence, linguistic ideology is defined as a system of representations that serves the interests of a particular group through language. It is built through the ideological square that maximizes the positives of the self and amplifies the negatives of the other (Van Dijk, 1998). Fairclough (2013) argues that ideology does not always appear as explicit ideas but is concealed within presuppositions that lead recipients to accept claims without requiring evidence, for example, treating immigration as an indisputable invasion. Fairclough (2013) adds that ideological strategies are manifested through specific linguistic characteristics, such as linguistic bias and presuppositions that make ideological claims as innate and



Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse



incontrovertible truths, paving the way for stereotyping the other and reducing it to static negative stereotypes.

This stereotyping is closely related to moral panic, which represents a state of collective hysteria that is linguistically triggered toward certain social groups (e.g., immigrants) and portrays them as folk devils who threaten the values and security of society (Cohen, 1972). This phenomenon is manifested linguistically through rhetoric of fear represented by using linguistic structures that suggest imminent danger, such as acts of violent movement (roving, taking over, destroying) and names associated with crime (gangs, cartels), as well as catastrophic metaphor which indicates the representation of social phenomena in the form of natural or biological disasters (e.g., describing migration as a flood or epidemic), transforming language from an instrument of understanding into an instrument of emotional mobilization (Charteris-Black, 2011). Wodak (2015) asserts that these linguistic structures ultimately aim to legitimize radical exclusionary policies by convincing the public of an imminent existential threat that requires immediate deterrence. The connection between these concepts explains the so-called pragmatic maneuvering, in which discourse shifts from peaceful social contexts (such as congratulations on national occasions) to provoking and exclusionary contexts (e.g., threats).

The problem of this study lies in investigating the functional shift of speech acts in a political speech, where certain speech acts are transformed from a social act into an offensive act that paves the way for what Cohen (1972) calls moral panic. The study thus stems from this main question: What ideological strategies have turned certain speech





Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse

acts into a strategy to stereotype immigrants and create moral panic? In addition, the following sub-questions are derived from this question, as follows:

- a. How did expressive and directive acts combine to build the threat structure?
- b. What metaphors did Trump use to portray immigration as an invasion or a disease?
- c. How does the social media context contribute to the pragmatic impact of fear discourse?

This research seeks to identify speech acts in the text to reveal the illocutionary intentions of the threat, define strategies of stereotyping the other as an ideological strategy for defining national identity, determine the mechanisms of creating moral panic and employing the language of fear as a persuasive tool in populist discourse, and analyze the role of linguistic maneuvering in justifying radical political actions (reverse migration).

To achieve its aims and answer its questions, this study analyses Trump's congratulatory speech on the Thanksgiving occasion on November 28, 2025 posted on X platform, revealing how pragmatics and ideology have combined to produce a discourse of moral panic that paves the way for the idea of reverse migration, transforming language from a means of communication into a weapon to restructuring the national identity. In this speech, there is an extensive use of speech acts and conversational implicature, where sharp political messages are concealed under social or religious occasions. The linguistic transition from, for example,



Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse



congratulations to threats is not just a shift in tone, but a deliberate pragmatic strategy aimed at constructing the identity of the self (national) by stereotyping the other (immigrant) as an existing enemy, which is known in linguistic sociology as the moral panic industry. Finally, the importance of the study lies in the fact that it applies CDA and pragmatic theories to a contemporary material, which contributes to understanding how language functions as a tool for domination in modern international politics, and understanding the rhetoric of populism in dealing with issues of identity.

2. Literature Review

This section reviews the literature on the main concepts related to this study, with reference to previous studies on topics relevant to the issue under study.

2.1 Pragmatics and Political Discourse

Pragmatics is based on the idea that any speech is an act that performs a social or political function. Pragmatics is the basic field for understanding how meaning is produced within political discourse, where analysis goes beyond the lexical connotation of a sentence to convey communicative intentions of the speaker. In media political discourse, language not only acts as an informing means, but also as an action aimed at changing the balance of power. This means that language is used not only to inform, but also to perform an act, as the political text is no longer just a tool for the transmission of ideas, but has become an act aimed at change and influence (Austin, 1962). Pragmatics focuses on the purposes that the speaker conceals behind his/ her speech (Searle, 1969). It is defined as the study of language in use, and hence it is not concerned with the dictionary





Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse

meaning of words, but with what the speaker means in specific contexts. In political discourse, pragmatics is manifested through the use of exclusionary pronouns (US vs. THEM), and presuppositions that set facts without providing evidence, thus giving the discourse absolute epistemic authority (Levinson, 1983). The risk here lies in so-called indirect speech acts, where certain acts, e.g., congratulating (representing an expressive act), are used to conceal directives, e.g., threatening. This type of shift, which is known as pragmatic maneuvering/ disposition/ deception, aims to lessen the psychological impacts on the recipient before conveying the sharp ideologically loaded expressions (Levinson, 1983).

Pragmatics studies so-called discursive maneuvering/ disposition/ deception, which is a strategy that relies on the exploitation of presuppositions. For example, initiating a ceremonial speech with an expressive act (such as a congratulation) aims to build a shared background with the audience and open channels of communication, before moving on to directive acts that are loaded with warning or threatening. This functional shift is studied under conversational implicature developed by Grice (1975), where the threat is understood through the context and the pressures exerted by the speaker on the recipient's mind. Media political discourse is based on the principle of flouting Gricean maxims. When discourse combines congratulations and threats, it violates the quality and manner maxims (Grice, 1975), forcing the recipient to evoke ideological backgrounds to understand the underlying message.

This draws on the theory of speech acts set by Austin (1962) and developed by Searle (1969), which divides speech into three levels:



locutionary act (utterance/ expression), illocutionary act (intention), and perlocutionary act (the effect on the recipient). Accordingly, the structure of speech acts is not understood in isolation from its context; it is the illocutionary force that determines the type of speech. This indicates that expressive acts are used, but they structurally act as a pre-sequence for directive or commissive acts that carry a promise. Therefore, pragmatics is not studied here as a general science, but as a tool for analyzing the implicit intentions in political speeches posted on social media platforms. It studies the indirect speech acts found in Trump's speech on Thanksgiving, as he uses expressive acts with a directive/ warning/ threatening illocutionary force.

2.2 Ideological Strategy of Stereotyping the Other

Stereotyping is a cognitive linguistic strategy used to simplify the image of a particular group by attaching fixed and negative features to it. In CDA, Van Dijk (1998) argues that stereotyping is an ideological tool that aims to create a Self-Other Binary/ Dichotomy, emphasizing the positive traits of the Self while stripping the Other of their positive attributes, thus facilitating the justification of exclusion or discrimination against them linguistically and socially (Van Dijk, 1998).

Van Dijk (1998) defines stereotyping as a social cognitive structure used to negatively represent others to justify dominance. Linguistically, this is done through an ideological square based on affirming the positive aspects of US and emphasizing the negative aspects of THEM. Thus, stereotyping is not just a mental image, but a complex linguistic structure that limits the OTHER to fixed negative attributes. Van Dijk (1998)



Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse

argues that racist or exclusionary discourse relies on the ideological square that is syntactically represented by:

- a. Adjectives and Categorization: The frequent use of a structure (negative adjective + noun) that transforms the other into a fixed essence (Essentialism). For example, the use of criminal or mental descriptions to describe entire human groups strips them of individual differentiation.
- b. Grammatical structure and attribution: Acts of violent movement are assigned to THEM group (e.g., immigrants) as a permanent actor, while the act of victim or anxious bystander is assigned to SELF (e.g., citizens). This distribution of grammatical roles establishes the image of the other as a permanent source of danger (Fowler, 1991).
- c. Linguistic marginalization: This is achieved through the use of the passive voice when talking about the rights of the other, and the active voice when talking about his crimes.

This linguistic division transforms the migrant, for example, from a human actor to a problematic issue or burden (Fairclough, 2013). In media political discourse, it is clear that stereotyping relies on descriptive structures and intense adjectives, such as the use of declarative sentences that suggest stability and permanence (e.g., immigrants are a burden), or ontological metaphors that dehumanize the human being.

2.3 The Mechanism of Moral Panic

Moral panic is defined as a state of mass anxiety that is fabricated or amplified by discursive forces (whether media or political) toward a group or phenomenon portrayed as a threat to the values and security of



Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse



society (Cohen, 1972). This concept represents the culmination of intimidating political discourse, being a linguistic process aimed at transforming mere anxiety into an existential crisis. It relies on the so-called Threat Structure. Structurally, punitive conditional sentences (e.g., if we don't do that, we will be destroyed) and acts of possession and control (Cohen, 1972) are frequently used as a manifestation of this concept.

Linguistically, this mechanism relies on the rhetoric of fear and the use of metaphors associated with danger and invasion to turn a particular subject into a folk devil against which exceptional action is required. Conceptual metaphors are used as cognitive tools that represent violence against the other as a self-defense mechanism or a necessary treatment (Charteris-Black, 2011). Cohen's (1972) concept of moral panic is related to how a particular group is portrayed as folk devils. This is done through depicting immigration metaphorically as a flood, disease, or criminal invasion. These metaphors create a state of mass anxiety that causes the recipient to accept eradication solutions (e.g., reverse migration) as a moral necessity to protect society. The ultimate goal of this linguistic structure is to reach a state of consensus on exclusion, where radical decisions (such as migration or marginalization) are legitimized linguistically before they are legally implemented, by charging the recipient with an emotion of fear that disrupts logical thinking (Wodak, 2015).

Therefore, this concept is studied as a sociolinguistic phenomenon aimed at creating a state of mass hysteria. It depends on exaggeration devices, superlatives, and threat-oriented verbs. These structures do not convey





Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse

information, but rather their function is to generate a sense of existential danger.

2.4 Previous Studies

This section presents the previous studies relevant to the topic under study to support the problem statement and research gap aimed to be bridged in this study. These studies are presented chronologically from the oldest to the newest ones, as follows:

In 2010, KhosraviNik studied discursive strategies employed by various British newspapers between 1996–2006 to represent refugees, asylum seekers and immigrants using CDA. The author discussed some of the salient issues on the representation of these groups in British newspapers and showed that despite differences in ideological viewpoints and their types, in some important ways, all the newspapers contribute to constructing refugees, asylum seekers and immigrants in similar ways.

Ott's (2017) study on Trump and the politics of debasement explored the changing character of public discourse, highlighting how Twitter privileges discourse that is simple, impulsive, and uncivil. It concluded that Trump has debased the level of political discourse and utilized social media platforms to create polarization.

Arcila-Calderón et al. (2022) studied hate speech and social acceptance of migrants in Europe. They stated that the growth of this type of discourse is supported by the expansion of social media, particularly Twitter (the X platform), proving to act as a mechanism for the propagation of crimes against such targets as migrants and refugees. They found that in regions



Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse



where the support for foreigners was higher, there was a lower level of hate speech on Twitter.

In their study, Cervi et al. (2023) examined the discursive construction of political opponents in two populist radical right parties. Based on the analysis of selected tweets by the two party leaders, this study applied clause-based semantic text analysis to detect the main discursive representations of political opponents. They concluded that the discursive construction of the enemy is based on two main strategies: demonization, the framing of opponents as enemies of the people who, along with dangerous Others like immigrants, conspire against the people and are blamed for everything wrong in society. Moreover, character assassination of individual politicians through personal attacks aims to undermine their reputation and deflect attention from the real issues towards their personal traits and actions.

Aboud (2024) examined manipulation from a critical-pragmatic perspective. The study included ten of Trump's political speeches and examined how Trump constructs ideological discourse to present reality to his audience, thereby framing his ideology through manipulative strategies. The study found that Trump employs manipulative strategies to promote his agenda, ideology, and program to his audience.

Although many studies have examined ideological strategies in relation to the immigration issue, there is a dearth of studies that examine the functional-pragmatic paradox, i.e., how a short, condensed text is used as a means for conveying moral-panic and the threat of exclusion? This study then aims to examine a complex linguistic strategy linking speech acts to the psychology of panic in the social media environment.





3. Research Methodology

This section clarifies the research methodology, focusing on research design, procedure and data collection, research sample and its categorization, unit of analysis, and analytical model.

3.1 Research Design

The study adopts a descriptive qualitative method, employing Fairclough's (2013) approach to CDA as a main analytical tool. This approach does not study language as an isolated structure, but rather as a social practice that reflects power, control, and ideology relations. It aims to uncover the linguistic structures of ideology, and to link the text to its social and political context to show how meaning is formed and its impact on the public (Fairclough, 2013; Wodak, 2015).

3.2 Research Sample

The sample is represented by Trump's speech published on November 28, 2025 on the social media (X platform) (a full version of this speech is provided under appendix A with its URL). This sample was chosen precisely because it represents the peak of pragmatic intensification, combining a social occasion (Thanksgiving) with radical political decisions (reverse migration), making it a purposive sample rich in the data required for the research. The selection of this sample is in line with the goals of CDA, as it embodies the discourse of power that seeks to reshape national identity by excluding and stereotyping the other in an intensive social media context.

3.3 Unit of Analysis

In this study, the unit of analysis is the contextual sentence, speech acts and metaphors, which are highlighted by bold. The text is not treated as



individual words, but rather as integrated semantic units that perform a specific pragmatic function within the context of the overall speech (Levinson, 1983). Based on the CDA model, the text is divided into discursive units that are symbolized by their ideological function, through extracting charged vocabulary, highlighting shifts in the text, and extracting metaphors that create moral panic.

3.4 Procedure of Data Analysis

The analysis will be carried out through the following procedural steps:

- a. Textual analysis: Divide the speech into different locutionary acts.
- b. Discursive practices: Explain how expressive speech acts shift into directives (Searle, 1969) and explain the relationship between this shift and the panic structure (illocutionary force).
- c. Ideological Interpretation: Linking linguistic results to Trump's political ideology and explaining the ultimate perlocutionary effect on the target audience (Austin, 1962).

3.5 Analytical Model

Fairclough's (2013) approach to CDA is applied to analyze the data, which connects three interrelated levels, as follows:

Level 1: Text Analysis (Description): In which the purely linguistic characteristics of the research sample are described, with a focus on speech acts and grammatical structures (adjectives and stereotypes).

Level 2: Discursive Practice (Interpretation): This dimension focuses on the process of production and consumption, i.e., how X platform is used





Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse

as a means to convey moral panic, and how the public receives this shift from peace to threat.

Level 3: Social Practice (Explanation): Here linguistic outcomes are linked to political and ideological reality, i.e., how linguistic stereotyping of others serves the larger political agenda (populist ideology) and prepares society to accept such decisions as reverse migration.

4. Results and Discussion

This section analyzes the research data represented by Trump's speech on Thanksgiving loaded with expressions on immigration issue. The analysis is based on Fairclough's (2013) approach to CDA, following his three dimensions, namely describing textual characteristics, interpreting discursive practices and explaining social practices.

4.1 Textual Analysis

This is the first level of analysis, describing the linguistic characteristics that form the structure of the text. It consists of analyzing speech acts, epithets, pronouns and Pseudo-Statistics, as clarified below:

a. Speech Acts

The text begins with this nominal phrase "**happy thanksgiving**", which represents an expressive act, but quickly deviates through the use of "declarative acts" loaded with absolute facts, such as "**The official US foreign population stands at 53 million**". The goal here is to build cognitive authority before shifting to the directive and commissive acts at the end of the text represented by these examples: **I will permanently pause migration..., remove anyone...** This shift turns the



congratulations from an act of affection into a pragmatic concealment of threats.

b. Epithets

Trump uses the strategy of negative attribution extensively. Noting that the descriptions attributed to immigrants include **Failed, Prisons, Mental institutions, Gangs, and drug cartels**. These grammatical structures (criminal adjective + noun) are intended to dehumanize the other and turn them into a dangerous entity. He also uses epithets undermining the eligibility of individuals and refugees, as in this example: "**Seriously retarded governor**". The use of this adjective "**retarded**" to describe a state governor is a pragmatic shift from political criticism to delegitimization or defamation. The goal is to convince the recipient that the danger is not just from the immigrant, but from the mentally incompetent leadership that allows it.

c. Pronouns

They represent the interpersonal function. There is a sharp contrast between **US** represented by this nominal phrase "**Patriotic American Citizens**" attached with "**beautiful hearts**" and **THEM** represented by **Immigrants** who "**steal and kill.**" This linguistic division reinforces the consolidation of the national community by creating a shared enemy.

d. Pseudo-Statistics

In this example, "**53 million... most of which are on welfare**", Trump uses the structure of "**most of which**" without specifying an exact percentage. Pragmatically, the word (most) acts as a cognitive generalization; It constructs an imagery of vast multitudes without adhering to scientific accuracy, thus entrenching a stereotype of the





Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse

immigrant as an economic parasite. Moreover, using opposite numbers, as in this example: "\$30,000 vs \$50,000", is a linguistic technique called mathematical arguments, indicating that his speech is rational and based on accurate calculations, when in fact he uses this technique to incite class hatred (or class resentment) among impoverished citizen.

4.2 Discursive Practice

This section discusses how stereotyping and moral panic are produced and how the audience consumes the text. This includes metaphor, intertextuality, and passive structures, as clarified below:

a. Metaphor

The text is based on the rhetoric of fear. The use of such phrases as "**Roving the streets looking for 'prey'**" deprives the text of its political debate context and relates it to the context of horror movies. Linguistically, this is called dramatization of reality, in which the Somalian migrant is depicted as a predator and the citizen as a trapped victim, generating an immediate emotional response (i.e., fear) that eliminates the reader's logical reasoning. In addition, Trump uses structures depicting immigrants as a foreign body that devours the State's body. For example, this metaphor "**Eating them alive**" moves the conflict from a political disagreement to a struggle for survival. It portrays the American citizen as a victim to be eaten, legitimizing any backlash as a self-defense strategy. In these metaphors, "**fully recover**" and "**Cure this situation**", Trump describes the strategies of stopping migration and reverse migration as a cure, which necessarily means that migration is a disease. Linguistically, this is termed a medical metaphor. This represents the most dangerous form of stereotyping, as it suggests



that dialogue is not the solution, but the solution involves eradicating this foreign body represented by Somalian migrants.

b. Intertextuality

Trump invokes the issues of inability to "**marry a brother**" and "**hijab**" when he talks about **Ilhan Omar**. For example, the "**Swaddling hijab**" description is not innocent; here, "Swaddling" suggests restriction or ambiguity. He uses a piece of clothing (a religious symbol) to reduce a political figure (**Ilhan Omar**) to her cultural appearance. In CDA, this is called cultural objectification to strip her of her citizenship. This strategy is one of the most prominent tools of politicization of appearance in CDA, where the characters' political notions are ignored, focusing more on their cultural symbols (such as hijab or costume) to transform them into an alien entity (OTHER). This intertextuality aims to undermine the cultural values of the American audience, portraying the other as incompatible with Western civilization. This represents a linguistic mechanism for legitimizing the cultural exclusion before having a legal exclusion. When talking about Minnesota and Somalis, he uses this expression "**Completely taking over**", representing migrants as occupiers. Linguistically, this feeds into the great replacement theory, in which the migrant is not portrayed as an individual looking for work, but is depicted as an occupier who changes the identity of the place.

c. Passive Structures

Trump focuses on passive and spatial structures suggestive of invasion. For example, these passive-based verbs, "**divided, disrupted, carved up, murdered, beaten, mugged, and laughed at**", are used in relation to a spatial context (**Our Country**) to suggest that the Earth itself has been





Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse

attacked. This accumulation of violent acts creates a mental image of a geographically torn homeland.

4.3 Social Practice

This section links the text to ideology and power. It reveals the ideological strategies of representing reverse migration, hegemony, stereotyping as a means of control, and threats.

a. Reverse Migration

The text reaches its peak when the term "**reverse migration**" is introduced. From a critical perspective, the term is not a mere policy, but it is a linguistic demographic reengineering. Trump is trying to normalize the notion of mass expulsion by portraying it as a "**cure**" for a disease that has afflicted the State.

b. Hegemony

The text enshrines the power of the savior president. By attacking the "**retarded Governor of Minnesota, Tim Walz**" and "**the worst 'Congressman/woman' in our Country, Ilhan Omar**" representing her as the country-hating immigrant, Trump presents himself as the only alternative with the power to stop this collapse. The language here serves as a tool to impose a linguistic emergency that justifies disregarding the constitution or international laws under the pretext of protecting national citizens.

c. Stereotyping as a Means of Control

By declaring that immigrants are "**the leading cause of social dysfunction in America... (Failed schools, high crime, urban decay, overcrowded hospitals, housing shortages, and large deficits, etc.)**",



Trump is practicing a process of conflict transformation. Instead of critiquing economic policies, public anger is directed toward the easier target (immigrant), which CDA calls the discursive scapegoat.

d. The Ultimate Threat

At the end of his speech, Trump says, "**You won't be here for long!**" This concluding sentence is an explicit threatening speech act. The shift here is shown by addressing the speech to the third party (immigrants/ traitors). It is not just a sentence, but Trump declares a judgment that ends the debate, confirming that the congratulations he began with were a strategic luring (or baiting) of the citizens to watch the final scene of expulsion.

A deep investigation into these structures reveals that Trump is linguistically reconfiguring the American social contract; he is making 'loyalty to the president and hostility to immigrants' the only criterion for citizenship. The text is not just an attack on immigrants, but rather a linguistic cleansing that precedes physical purification, where the other is stripped of his/ her mind, religion, loyalty, and right to exist before enacting the decision to deport them. Trump's speech is a perfect example of the pragmatics of fear. Linguistically, he has succeeded in transforming the Thanksgiving occasion from a symbol of coexistence into a baseline for ethno-cultural categorization. The speech text does not aim to persuade migrants to leave, but rather to charge the national citizen with a terrifying stereotype vision that makes him/ her demand – and even hasten – mass expulsion and exclusion measures, shifting the language from a means of communication into an effective ideological weapon.





4.4 Discussion of Findings

Through applying Fairclough's approach to CDA, the study found the following results:

- a. The effectiveness of the pragmatic maneuvering strategy: The analysis proved that Trump did not use congratulations as an innocent social act, but rather as a lure threshold to reduce the psychological resistance of the recipient before spreading panic messages. This shift from expressive to threatening acts achieved a pragmatic shock, focusing attention on the political agenda.
- b. The emphasis of bio-stereotyping: The results revealed that stereotyping not only conveyed the criminal aspect, but also went beyond medical and biological reporting (through the metaphors of disease, cure and recovery), shifting the issue of migration from the realm of human rights to the realm of healthy cleansing of society, which is the most dangerous level of ideological stereotyping.
- c. The production of moral panic: The speech succeeded in transforming the migrant from an individual into a threatening phenomenon through the rhetoric of numbers and pseudo-statistics, creating a state of mass anxiety that legitimized exceptional measures (such as reverse migration) that might not be acceptable under normal circumstances.
- d. Politicization of cultural symbols: The attack on symbols (such as hijab) is a tool of national de-eligibilization, where a political opponent is portrayed not as a dissident, but as a culturally alien entity that does not belong to Western civilization.

5. Conclusions



Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse



The study concluded that Trump's speech is a linguistic document that represents the rhetoric of digital populism in its most extreme manifestations. The language of this speech is no longer a means of understanding, but has shifted into an exclusionary configuration that redefines citizenship based on loyalty and hostility. The most important conclusion is that reverse migration is linguistically depicted by stripping migrants of their humanity, mental capacity, and right to shelter, making mass expulsion seem like an act of rescue rather than an act of coercion. The study addressed the fundamental problem of how a speech act (congratulations) is shifted into a threat. The study concluded that this shift was not spontaneous, but rather an intentional ideological strategy to break the recipient's psychological defenses. The analysis proved that Trump used the act of congratulations (**happy Thanksgiving**) as a threshold to establish a close connection with the national public (Great American Citizens), paving the way for the acceptance of shocking directive acts (e.g., **I will permanently pause**). This shift made the threat speech seem like a logical conclusion to protect the values of Thanksgiving and the nation. The study also revealed the ideological strategy of stereotyping the other that transformed the migrant from a human to a biological and security threat. This strategy relied on exclusionary epithets; when Trump described Somalis as "**roving the streets looking for prey**", he categorized them as predators. This linguistic stereotyping was the main tool for creating moral panic, as these horrific images led to the legitimization of **reverse migration** as the only rescue solution. Fairclough's three dimensions of analysis proved to be effective in revealing contents that would not have been possible in traditional linguistic analysis. Hence, the third dimension (social practice)





Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse



linked the hijab of Ilhan Omar or the retarded governor of Minnesota, Tim Walz, to the ideology of cultural hegemony. The description is no longer just a personal critique, but a national de-eligibilization. The results showed that the rhetoric of numbers (**53 million, 30,000 vs. 50,000**) was not statistics, but emotional charging tools aimed at creating class and economic hatred toward immigrants.

In brief, it can be said that the language in Trump's speech is a proactive discursive construction of reality. The use of such expressions as "**eating them alive**" and "**failed nations, or from prisons, mental institutions, gangs, or drug cartels**" is intended to linguistically destroy the other before deporting them. Language has become a tool to disrupt the principles of cooperation (Gricean Maxims) and replace them with the logic of survival conflict, where every linguistic tool (including pronouns and metaphors) has been employed to serve a purpose, that is to convince the American citizen that his immigrant neighbor is the enemy who lives next to him, and that reverse migration is the only cure for the disease of immigration.

References

Abood, A. (2024). A Critical Pragmatic Analysis of Manipulation in Trump's Political Speeches. *Thi-Qar Arts Journal*, 2 (45), 115-138.

Arcila-Calderón C, Sánchez-Holgado P, Quintana-Moreno C, Amores J, Blanco-Herrero D (2022) Hate speech and social acceptance of migrants in Europe: analysis of tweets with geolocation. *Comunicar* 71:21–35. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C71-2022-02>



Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse



Austin, J. L. (١٩٦٢). How to do things with words. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cervi, L., Tejedor, S., & and Villar, M. (2023). Twitting Against the Enemy: Populist Radical Right Parties Discourse Against the (Political) “Other”. *Politics and Governance*, 11(2), 235–248. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v11i2.6391>

Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor* (2nd Edition). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cohen, S. (1972). *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (٢٠١٣). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Routledge.

Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.

Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. London: Harvard University Press.

KhosraviNik, M. (2010). The representation of refugees, asylum seekers and immigrants in British newspapers: A critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 9(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.9.1.01kho>

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.





Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse

Ott, B. L. (2017). The age of Twitter: Donald J. Trump and the politics of debasement. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 34(1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2016.1266686>

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage Publications.

Wodak, R. (2015). *The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean*. London: Sage Publications.



Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse



Appendix A: Full Version of Trump's Speech
(<https://x.com/realDonaldTrump>)

A very Happy Thanksgiving salutation to all of our Great American Citizens and Patriots who have been so nice in allowing our Country to be divided, disrupted, carved up, murdered, beaten, mugged, and laughed at, along with certain other foolish countries throughout the World, for being “Politically Correct,” and just plain STUPID, when it comes to Immigration. The official United States Foreign population stands at 53 million people (Census), most of which are on welfare, from failed nations, or from prisons, mental institutions, gangs, or drug cartels. They and their children are supported through massive payments from Patriotic American Citizens who, because of their beautiful hearts, do not want to openly complain or cause trouble in any way, shape, or form. They put up with what has happened to our Country, but it’s eating them alive to do so! A migrant earning \$30,000 with a green card will get roughly \$50,000 in yearly benefits for their family. The real migrant population is much higher. This refugee burden is the leading cause of social dysfunction in America, something that did not exist after World War II (Failed schools, high crime, urban decay, overcrowded hospitals, housing shortages, and large deficits, etc.). As an example, hundreds of thousands of refugees from Somalia are completely taking over the once great State of Minnesota. Somalian gangs are roving the streets looking for “prey” as our wonderful people stay locked in their apartments and houses, hoping against hope that they will be left alone. The seriously retarded Governor of Minnesota, Tim Walz, does nothing, either through fear, incompetence, or both, while the worst “Congressman/woman” in our Country, Ilhan Omar, always wrapped in her swaddling hijab, and who





Ideological strategies of stereotyping the other and creating moral panic in media political discourse



probably came into the U.S.A. illegally in that you are not allowed to marry your brother, does nothing but hatefully complain about our Country, its Constitution, and how “badly” she is treated, when her place of origin is a decadent, backward, and crime ridden nation, which is essentially not even a country for lack of Government, Military, Police, schools, etc. Even as we have progressed technologically, Immigration Policy has eroded those gains and living conditions for many. I will permanently pause migration from all Third World Countries to allow the U.S. system to fully recover, terminate all of the millions of Biden illegal admissions, including those signed by Sleepy Joe Biden’s Autopen, and remove anyone who is not a net asset to the United States, or is incapable of loving our Country, end all Federal benefits and subsidies to noncitizens of our Country, denaturalize migrants who undermine domestic tranquility, and deport any Foreign National who is a public charge, security risk, or non-compatible with Western Civilization. These goals will be pursued with the aim of achieving a major reduction in illegal and disruptive populations, including those admitted through an unauthorized and illegal Autopen approval process. Only REVERSE MIGRATION can fully cure this situation. Other than that, HAPPY THANKSGIVING TO ALL, except those that hate, steal, murder, and destroy everything that America stands for — You won’t be here for long!

