Bigotry, Sexism, and Xenophobia: How Do They Manifest in Donald Trump's Discourse?

Taher Ben Khalifa

University of Sfax Faculty of Letters and Humanities Department of English Sfax, Tunisia
Corresponding Author: Taher Ben khalifa

Abstract: *The present paper seeks to determine the ways hatred attitudes and practices manifest themselves in Trump's language. It focuses mainly on the critical examination of sexism, bigotry, and xenophobia. Having determined the manifestation of these racist ideologies, our focus will shift towards finding the appropriate sociological and psychological interpretations for the obtained findings. To undertake this study, four speeches were selected for analysis: Trump's taped comments about women (the study of sexism), Trump's executive orders banning refugees and Muslim travelers (the study of bigotry), and Trump's speech on Jobs and the economy and Trump's immigration speech (the study of xenophobia). To analyze these texts, we used a combination between theories of discourse analysis (text analysis and context analysis), theories of sociology, and theories of psychology. The application of this combination consists in the use of a simple method of analysis summarized in three steps: collecting the data, analysing the data, and finding the right sociological and psychological interpretations. The obtained results showed that at a given social context where Trump seeks to highlight his personal proudness and his feeling of patriotism, he reveals his inner thinking about women, immigrants, and foreign nations. The attitudes he expressed to the outer world reflect his tendency to praise the in-group people and denigrate the out-group ones. The discussion of these findings showed that more details will be reported if we undertake the same study once Trump will finish one or two mandates in power.*

Keywords*: Trump, hate speech, bigotry, sexism, xenophobia, psychology, and sociology*

Introduction

With the raise of Trump as a campaigner for the US presidency, different issues were brought into discussion like his relations with women reported in his declarations to the media. His speeches about immigrants were also little bit strange, especially towards people who are coming from countries starving from wars and disasters like Syria and Iraq. His speeches on economy reflect a kind of egoism highlighted through his emphasis on self-interests and on the punishment of some countries he described as a threat to the US economy like China and Mexico. Indeed, Trump's strange language highlighted the existence of some features of hatred discourse the determination of which represents the main problematics standing behind undertaking the present research project. The determination of the manifestation of Trump's racist ideologies towards immigrants, nations of different orientations, and women will be undertaken through the scrutiny of the language patterns of some of his speeches and declarations.

People's inner thoughts, emotions, decisions, and future plans for action are carried out to the world by means of language. While speaking or writing, we always generate different patterns of language. These patterns come into existence through the different choices we make to give meaning to what we want to convey to our receivers. These linguistic choices serve for the evolution of discourse structure from simple units such as words (nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, and etc.) and phrases (nouns phrases, verb phrases, and etc.) through complex units like clauses and sentences to more complex blocks such as paragraphs and texts. The generation of these patterns server for the generation of meaning, the construction of ideologies, the shaping of power relations, and the formulation of the structure of the different decisions and plans for action. Thus, there exists a parallel evolution between discourse structure and meaning that we, as discourse analysis, seek to explore.

In fact, to study the way language users' feelings, ideologies, and arguments for action are being constructed in text and talk we need to carry on a reciprocal process of thinking about language. This process starts from the examination of the different linguistic units leading to the generation of the patterns constituting the piece of language under focus to decode the different messages language users sought to convey. In the case of my study, for instance, the determination of the way feelings of hatred and ideologies of racism are structured in Trump's language requires a well-established theoretical framework. This frame needs making several

theoretical combinations among different theories of discourse and language study. First, we need theories of linguistics like semantics, syntax, and etc. Second, theories of context are required due to the role context plays in decoding the meaning of language patterns. Third, we need to involve theories of stylistics and rhetoric due to their importance in revealing the deceptive nature of language. Fourth, a theory of pragmatics is required to infer what the speaker sought to imply. Finally, this theoretical combination is required for the approach to be used due to the nature of political language that is said to be highly figurative (Rista-Dema, 2008). This figurative nature gets its peak when the political agents are taking part in such political competitions like electoral campaigns.

However, we need more than theories of discourse and language study to understand how the unfavorable feelings of sexism, bigotry, and xenophobia manifest in Trump's language. On the one hand, we need a theory of sociology to understand how trump's social background, position, and class affect his way of dealing with women, foreigners (immigrants), and people of different thoughts and opinions. A theory of sociology is also required to understand the complex nature of these forms of racism as a socially constructed phenomenon marked by a binary system of ideology (positive self-representation vs. negative other-representation) and a bipolar system of power relations (superiority of the self vs. inferiority of the other). On the other hand, a theory of psychology is required to understand how racial prejudices and stereotypes affect trump's state of feeling and thinking about people from different racial groups. In fact, people's feelings and thoughts are not free from the impact of the psychological situations they live in. These situations are deeply affected by circumstances like the political, the social, the economic, and viz. Thus, both theories of sociology and psychology are required for the understanding and the discussion of the results of the linguistic analysis of the selected speeches.

Now, let's say that the multidisciplinary approach depicted in the above paragraphs will be used to answer three main research questions. These are related to the detection of the manifestation of racist ideologies of bigotry, sexism, and xenophobia in Trump's language.

1. How does the manifestation of bigotry trace at the level of Trump's speeches?
2. What are the discursive manifestations of Trump's sexist ideologies?
3. To what extent does the manifestation of xenophobia reflect the existence of racist ideologies in Trump's speeches?

These problematics will be explored using a CDA approach to the study of language and discourse focusing mainly on the critical investigation of the different language patterns constituting the structure of the selected texts. Then, the obtained results will be discussed within the theoretical framework that combines sociology and psychology. Thus, theories of social-psychology and discursive psychology will be involved to reach a detailed critique of hate in Trump's discourse.

Literature review

This section will be devoted to the review of data related to bigotry, sexism, and xenophobia as well as the major theoretical approaches used for their analysis. The theoretical concepts related to theory of ideology and hate discourse, theory of sociology, and theory of psychology will be also reviewed and discussed. The review of these theoretical conceptions seeks to build a unified and a multidisciplinary approach to the study of Trump's racist ways of thinking about and dealing with the other.

I. Sexism

The study of the manifestation of sexist ideologies in trump's language entails providing a workable definition of the term as well as reviewing the theoretical basis required for its detection. According to the Oxford English Dictionary (2006) sexism refers to "the unfair treatment of people, especially women, because of their sex". Wilson (1997) defines sexism as the set of expectations of women's appearance, actions, skills, emotions, and proper place in society. Glick (1997) argues that "the definitions of sexism generally emphasize two components: hostility towards women and the endorsement of traditional gender roles". Aliri and Garaigordobil (2013) define sexism as "a discriminatory attitude towards people because of their biological sex, as a function of which, diverse characteristics and behaviors are assumed". These definitions emphasize two features of sexism: the unequal treatments of women because of their sex and the different social traditions and norms monitoring them. Briefly, these attitudes and practices could be summarized into a bipolar system of power relations characterized by the dominance of men over women as well as a binary system of ideology marked by the superiority of men and the inferiority of women. These systems of power and ideology are proved to be traced at various levels of discourse structure.

Language is sexist (Litosselite and Sunderland, 2002). Sexist thoughts and practices were linguistically traced in many researches (Cameron, 1985 and 2005). Indeed, gender-based patterns of language were targeted (Tannen, 1994). The studies of language in use highlight that there exist variations across gender (Bell et al.,

2006). These variations are accompanied by a complex socio-political system of ideologies and power relations (Holmes and Marra, 2010). Feminist and gender studies (Gibbon, 1999, Lazar, 2005, 2007, and 2009) were interested in revealing the discursive manifestation of gender based ideologies and practices. Moreover, sexist ideologies and practices manifest in the way social actors (men and women) are represented in language. For instance, gender representation theories focused on the way gender and gender-based roles are represented to highlight both men's and women's position in society. The unequal representations of males and females were central for feminists who want more power to women. Thus, gender representation theory will be fruitful to trace the manifestation of sexism in Trump's language.

Despite the endeavors feminists and supporters of women's rights made, women are proved to agree with sexist ideologies toward their own gender. At this level, women agree once they are promised to be protected by men (Hammond et al., 2014). In fact, benevolent sexism is seen as an agreeable form of sexism whereas hostile sexism is not because it works to oppress women by men's power. Thus, women accept the non-hostile forms of sexism when they serve their interests and when they feel that the power men got serve women's interests within the intimate domains. In the present paper, both hostile sexism and benevolent sexism will be traced to reveal the way women are discriminated against in Trump's discourse and to highlight the moments in which they accept some kinds of his sexist practices. Once these agreements are detected, social and psychological theories will be involved to understand the situations leading to them.

Briefly, the provided definitions and the reviewed theoretical approaches made clear the scope of the term sexism, highlighted the distinction between both hostile sexism and benevolent sexism, and gave a clear map for the logical processing of data collection and analysis. Here, three steps will be followed in the determination of sexism in the texts under focus. First, forms of sexism will be revealed through the scrutiny of the texts. Second, these forms will be classified into benevolent and hostile sexism. Third, the obtained results will be analyzed and discussed with reference to both sociology and psychology. Finally, conclusions will be drawn to map Trump's representation of women.

II. Bigotry

To determine the manifestation of bigotry in Trump's language, we need to work out a precise definition of the term. We need to make clear what distinguish it from the concepts of sexism and xenophobia. In addition to the determination of the scope of the term, the review of the key theoretical approaches will be necessary for the establishment of the methodological framework required for its determination.

According to the Oxford English Dictionary (2006) bigotry refers to "the state of feeling, or the act of expressing, strong, unreasonable beliefs or opinions". Bigotry is defined as the "intolerant prejudice that glorifies one's own group and denigrates members of other groups" (NCCJ St. Louis, 1994). Jennings (1990) argues that "bigotry is any act of racially, ethnically, or religiously based prejudgment, harassment, or violence". Paulauskas (2013) defines a bigot as "Someone who is a sanctimonious self-righteous hypocrite, as a result of their prejudices, treats other people with fear, distrust, hatred, contempt, criticism, judgment or intolerance on the basis of a person's ethnicity, religion, lifestyle, national origin, gender, sexual orientation". These definitions highlight that bigotry refers to the intolerance of those who have different opinions from us. Also, they emphasize that the in-group/out-group division as well as the glorification of the self and the denigration of the other is based on the way people think or behave differently from us.

This sort of hate and intolerance of difference is treated by many researchers and scholars using different perspectives. Cohen-Almagor (2011) deals with the fighting of the issue of hate and bigotry from the perspective of applied ethics. He tried to show how the lack of an editorial filter or criticism on people's publication on the internet served for the proliferation of hate content. Paulauskas (2013) shows that racism and bigotry are much more prevalent and represent a larger problem that most would not expect. The author discusses also the ways to fight bigotry saying that "bigots will not change till we give them feedback". Stern (1991) focuses on the study of bigotry on talk radio seeking to highlight the harmful effects of some hosts' and callers' bigoted and hurtful opinions on the receivers, especially the young ones. While analysing some aired examples, he questions the way talk-show hosts should handle hatred and intolerance in order not to promote the airing of hate and racism, especially with the increasing number of stations in the US. Kates (1992) discusses the issues of Symbolism, bigotry, and ideology focusing on the bigoted and hateful attitudes and practices expressed and enacted on the part of the pro and the anti-gun ownership in the US. His paper shows that ideology has co-opted with bigotry in the rhetoric of pro and anti-gun ownership in the battle over gun control. The co-option of both ideology and bigotry makes clear the symbolic dimension of the discussed issue. Here, ideology and bigotry are politically defended in a democratic system through vote. However, the present paper will focus on the study of bigotry in the political context of campaigning to determine the manifestation of hatred in Trump's speeches to his public.

The America anti-defamation league (2008) deals with the ways to fight and reduce bigotry and inter-group strife at the level of the US campus. The campus represents a social context where both diversity (gender, language, thoughts, race, religions, etc.) and multi-culturalism (students from different cultural backgrounds) are at the crossroads. Indeed, the example of the campus is a narrowed sample from the broader multi-cultural American society, which is the context of my study. This paper focuses on the study of how bigotry manifests itself in the speeches of Mr. Trump, the 45th president of the multi-cultural US. Neumann (1987) deals with the investigation of the issue of bigotry from a philosophical perspective focusing on the intolerance at the level of the intelligentsia between the Nihilist, the conservative, and the liberal professors. He highlights the fear of liberals and conservatives towards his nihilist philosophy of nothingness. Here, the professors' intellectual and political orientations are the main sources of hatred, intolerance, and the rejection of the other. This sort of bigotry is central at the level of the present paper through seeking to show how Trump deals with those who are intellectually different from him. De Figueiredo and Elkins (2003) discuss the issue of bigotry at the level of the in-group/out-group attitudes of pride and hatred towards the coming immigrants through highlighting two dimensions of analysis: patriotism and nationalism. They find that nationalists have a strong prediction of hostility towards immigrants, which is not the case of patriots who have less prediction to practice hatred on the new coming people. In the present paper, the notions of patriotism and nationalism offer a good framework for the understanding of Trump's discursive hostility towards the coming immigrants, especially when it comes to the sociological and the psychological explanations of Trump's attitudes and behaviors.

Briefly, the reviewed literature shows that the issue of bigotry is a multi-dimensional and a complex social phenomenon the study of which requires the establishment of a multi-disciplinary framework. Thus, to understand the way bigoted attitudes and practices manifest themselves in Trump's language and find them the logical explanations, the present paper builds upon the combination of several theories as it is stated before.

III. Xenophobia

The term xenophobia comes from the association of the Greek words: a) the word "xenos" means foreigner or stranger and b) the word "phobos" means fear. According to the Oxford English Dictionary (2006) xenophobia refers to "a strong feeling of dislike or fear of people from other countries". This definition highlights that xenophobia is a kind of hate that is based on the notion of nationality: people may show hate towards each others because of their belonging to different nations, countries. Here, the feelings of hate and dislike reflect a sort of egoism and selfishness marked by the supremacy of the self and the denigration of the other. The online Thesaurus dictionary (2017) gives two brief definitions of the term xenophobia: a) "the fear or hatred of foreigners, people from different cultures, or strangers" and b) "the hatred or dislike of the customs, dress, etc., of people who are culturally different from oneself". These two definitions stress the notion of culture: people may express their feelings of hate and dislike towards others who are culturally different from them. These cultural differences are diverse and encompass various social features such as customs, traditions, ways of dressing, ways of thinking, etc. The definitions provided by the oxford and the thesaurus dictionaries prove that the notion of belongingness is at the cross-roads of the issue of xenophobia. This means that xenophobia can take place between social groups of the same country because they are culturally different. However, in this paper, the focus will be devoted to the inter-nations hatred trough the study of the manifestation of xenophobia in Trump's speeches.

In the current decades, many researches concerning xenophobia were undertaken seeking to show how feelings of hate and dislike operate in different social contexts. These studies seek also to determine the roots and the consequences of this social phenomenon – xenophobia – to clarify the way such racist attitudes and practices contribute to the suffering of foreigners. Harris (2002) discusses the ways xenophobia is being understood in South Africa through providing a brief history and critique of the term and how it evolves in relation with the evolution of discriminatory attitudes and practices across time. In this study, Harris uses real stories of racial violence that took place in South Africa in the post colonial era. With the analysis of these examples, Harris broadened the scope of the definition of xenophobia to encompass not only attitudes of hate and dislike, but also the violent practices resulting from them. Yakushko (2009) discusses the sufferance of foreigners in the US focusing on the examination of the roots and consequences of racist attitudes on the coming immigrants in the current US xenophobic cultural environment. To reach a comprehensive understanding of the issue Yakushko resorted to sociological, psychological, and multicultural research. Moreover, Neocosmos (2006) highlights that immigrants were criminalized through associating them with the illegal activities during the struggle against Apartheid in South Africa. The author shows that the increasing rate of the xenophobic practices in South Africa's public culture is politically and institutionally legalized. Here, the notion of xenophobia trespasses the scope of individual and group-based attitudes and practices of discrimination to reach the state of being legalized by social institutions and protected by the dominant political groups' ideologies of

self interests. Thus, xenophobia can be depicted as a social phenomenon that power groups use to serve their interests at the expense of groups who have less power.

Being legalized by the social and the political institutions, xenophobia becomes a complex social issue that we need to explore to determine the way it manifests at the level of language patterns. In the case of my study, for instance, the critical examination of the traces of the uttered xenophobic attitudes and practices in Trump's speeches seeks to highlight the linguistic manifestations of these racial thoughts and actions. Then, sociological and psychological explanations will be sought to find connection between Trump's social life, his psychological status, and his political interests, on the on hand, and the general socio-political context of campaigning, on the other hand. These connections will be established in order to find the logical explanations for Trump's explicit utterance of hate attitudes and action plans. In reality, these explanations will be sought because hate is the feeling that politicians usually seek to hide in that it is legally prohibited and it does not serve their public policies. So, how can we explain Trump's explicit utterances of xenophobic attitudes and future plans for action?

IV. Ideology and Hate Discourse

The two enigmatic questions at the level of this section and the paper in general are: "what is hate speech?" and "what is its logical connection to the concept of ideology?" Linguistically speaking, the compound noun 'hate speech' is composed of the noun 'speech' pre-modified by the noun 'hate'. This pre-modification by the noun 'hate' gives the term (noun) 'speech' such distinguishable features that differentiate it from other sorts of speech and discourse in general. So, it is not a peace discourse rather it is a discourse that promotes hate either by such prejudiced attitudes or practices. This means that any trial to understand how hate discourse operates at the level of any human society, we need to understand the structure of the attitudes of hate. Indeed, the determination of the structure of the attitudes of hatred and dislike serves to disambiguate the socio-cultural and the political construction of such individual and/or collective practices.

Hate speech is a racist discourse that is built upon a binary structure marked by the in-group/out-group division of a given human community. This sort of division is based on the way people of different social groups, religions, cultures, ethnicities, etc. think about each others as well as the way they behave towards each others. For instance, the pride and the superiority of the in-group in parallel with the denigration and the inferiority of the out-group reflect the rejection and the intolerance of the other who is supposed to be different from us. In reality, the intolerance and the denigration of the other is monitored by a well-structured social ideology that people learn at the early years of their lives through exposure to the social environment in which they live. This social ideology is binary in terms of structure in that it allows the division of people into the in-group and the out-group communities, which is at the heart of the emergence of hatred and dislike between people who belong to different social groups. Thus, hate speech is the embodiment of such racist ideologies at the level of people's communicative practices of language where the exercise of power by one group over another represents the real materialization of the attitudes of hate.

Attitudes of hate proliferate in such fertile social situations where power is asymmetrically distributed among social groups. This unequal distribution of power allows some groups to dominate others, which leads to the oppression of those who have less access to power. Here, the notion of power is supposed to be 'bipolar' in terms of structure where the notion of bipolarity is determined by the interaction between the dominant groups and the dominated ones. This means that, to work out the manifestation of the 'bipolar structure' of power at the level of discourse analysis we need to determine: a) the social groups presented in text and talk; b) the dominant groups and the dominated groups; and c) the way power works between these different groups. Indeed, the determination of the 'bipolar structure' of power is required for the demystification of the way attitudes of hate and the practices associated with them are coded in text and talk in that power relations are monitored by people's thinking about the other. In other words, the way people from different social groups think about each other (ideology) plays a significant role in the determination of the ways power operates between them. When it comes to hate speech, the revelation and the analysis of hate attitudes is crucial for the clarification of the way power works among the represented social groups. Thus, hate speech becomes such a complex discourse where a 'bipolar system' of power relations (dominant vs. dominated) is monitored by a 'binary system' of thoughts (thinking about the self and the other).

Regarding the features of hate speech I stated in the above paragraphs, the present paper will focus on the analysis of some speeches by the 45th US president, Donald Trump, to show how hate attitudes and practices manifest themselves in trump's language. While analyzing the selected speeches the bipolar structure of power

relations and the binary structure of attitudes of hatred will be traced at three different levels: a) Trump and women (the study of sexism); b) Trump and the other countries who are in competition with the US (the study of xenophobia); and c) Trump and the immigrants (the study of bigotry). Thus, the study of the manifestation of bigotry, sexism, and xenophobia will be grounded within the understanding of hate speech as a cooperation of sets of bipolar systems of power relations and binary systems of attitudes (ideologies). Then, sociological and psychological explanations will be sought to understand the social and psychological factors standing behind Trump`s explicit utterance of hate attitudes and practices.

V. The Sociology of Hate Discourse

The term 'sociology' refers to the scientific study of the human society focusing mainly on the patterns of social realities, social relations, social interactions, culture, etc. The oxford dictionary (2006) defines sociology as "the scientific study of the nature and the development of society and social behavior". In the Thesaurus online dictionary (2017), sociology is referred to as "the science or study of the origin, development, organization, and functioning of the human society; the science of the fundamental laws of social relations, institutions, etc". Browne (1992) refers to sociology as "the Systematic (or planned and organized) study of the human groups and social life in modern societies". These definitions determine the scope of the term and highlight that the human society, the social behavior, the social relations, and the functioning of the social agents are at the crossroads of sociology as the 'science of society'. Within the realm of these definitions, the present paper will seek to find such adequate and logical explanations for the different manifestations of attitudes of hate in Trump's speeches. Thus, the main objective of this paper is to find connection between what is discursive (what is said by Trump?) and what is social (what constitutes Trump's social environment?). However, this sort of connection entails establishing theoretical connections between discourse analysis (DA) and sociology.

Discourse is produced by individuals who have the intension to transform what is going on in a given social reality into meaning and it is analyzed by individuals who seek to decode the coded meaning in order to understand that social reality. This means that discourse, which is produced in a given social context, entails being contextualized during the analysis process. Here, the analysis of both the text and its context serve to understand the meaning of what is linguistically structured through the analysis of the context in which the text is produced. However, this bi-dimensional analysis may not reach a deep understanding of the social factors affecting the communicative agents' production of discourse. This theoretical limitation will find its remedy in the addition of a third dimension, which is interpretation. What this interpretative section adds to textual analysis and contextual analysis is the explanation of what discourse addresses as sociological aspects of text and talk by considering discourse as a social product where information and ideology are produced, circulated, and transformed by social actors (Ruiz, 2009). In the case of the present paper, for instance, the integration of sociology within the discipline of discourse analysis is required to find the logical explanations for Trump's explicit utterance of hate in his speeches. Indeed, the attitudes of hate and the unequal distribution of power they monitor between the in-group and the out-group individuals could not be isolated from the impact of such factors that constitute any social reality such as religion, social class, culture, etc. For instance, the sociology of hate speech was central for the examination of the issue of hatred in text and talk in different social contexts where diversity and multi-culturalism are stressed like; in America (Schauer, 1992), in India (Shankar, 2014), etc. Thus, sociological concepts are required for the explanation of the results of discourse analysis in that they aim at dismantling the way society operates and how hate is produced and practiced by social groups.

Briefly, the present paper seeks to find explanations for the manifestations of sexist, bigoted, and xenophobic attitudes in Trump's speeches. These explanations will be sought via the establishment of some logical connections between Trump's attitudes and practices that are discursively uttered and the characteristics of the social environment leading to their utterance. These connections will be established through adopting the three-level analysis model reviewed by (Ruiz, 2009): a textual level, a contextual level, and an interpretative level. These levels of analysis will be applied in respect to the properties of hate speech I determined in the above section: the 'bipolar structure' of power relations and the 'binary structure' of hate attitudes. Though the three-level analysis model highlighted the need for a sociological approach to understand the social implications of Trump's hatred, an in-depth comprehension of Trump's strange utterances is still not guaranteed. However, it needs the integration of another theory of analysis that is adequate to enable us to understand Trump's complex personality. Thus, a psychological analysis will be required to complete the limitations of sociological analysis. The need for this psychological analysis in the study of hatred in Trump's speeches will be discussed in the following section.

VI. The Psychology of Hate Discourse

The term psychology gets back to Greek origins; the association of the term "psyche" which means 'soul, breath, and spirit' and the suffix "logia" meaning 'study or research'. It becomes later on a whole established paradigm (science) interested in the study of the human mind and behavior encompassing all aspects of conscious and unconscious experiences and thoughts. Woodworth (1921) argues that psychology is "a science … the science of what shall we say? … the science of the mind … the science of consciousness … and the science of behavior". According to him psychology is "distinctly a study of actions rather than of things". What captured my attention in Woodworth's definitions are the following two statements: (1) 'the science of what shall we say?' and (2) 'the study of actions rather than things'. These two statements are appropriate to the context of my work in that it focuses on the investigation of the manifestation of hate attitudes at two different levels: a) at the level of "what Trump says?" and b) at the level of "what plans he makes to put in practice his political attitudes of hatred and segregation?" seeking to find logical and psychological explanations for what is discursively uttered by him. The Openstax College (2014) enlarges the scope of the definition of the term psychology – the scientific study of the mind – to encompass the 'scientific study of mind and behavior' because science deals with observable phenomenon and the mind is not directly observed. This enlargement, indeed, stresses a clear connection between the in-side mechanism of thinking (at the level of the mind) and the out-side manifestations of this mechanism (behaviors and actions). This means that people's ways of thinking, thoughts, and ideologies can be studied through the examination of people's behaviors and actions. For instance, the present paper seeks to understand how Trump thinks about the other through the study of the manifestation of bigotry, sexism, and xenophobia in his speeches. However, this study entails making connection between discourse analysis and psychology.

The combination of discourse analysis and psychology resulted in the establishment of a new approach to the study of language in use, which is discursive psychology. This approach is based on the view of discourse as the mirror of people's attitudes, thoughts, intensions, feelings, etc. This means that it offers its practitioners a chance to read the inner life of the mind via the investigation of what is said or written. Indeed, the critical analysis of text and talk entails focusing on the investigation of the language patterns that can serve to highlight the manifestation of ideologies and power and to explain how they work in discourse to serve agent's interests. Taking into consideration the important role discourse plays in the (re) construction of social reality, a psychological study of the way people think about each other and the way they treat each others might start from the linguistic investigation of the different discursive choice they make like syntax, semantics, etc. Then, psychological interpretations will be carried to find such logical connections between people's inner states of feeling and their social behaviors in the context of study. Edwards and Potter (1992) argue that psycho-logical issues are constructed and deployed in the discourse itself. This means that discourse is the means through which we can read psychological status; like happiness, distress, love, hate, and viz. According to Molder (2015) discursive psychologists focus on the way people do psychology in their use of language rather than considering psychological thesaurus to be the starting point of analysis. Thus, to determine the psychological factors standing behind people's explicit and implicit expression of hatred in language use we need to undertake some psychological interpretations in addition to the analysis of the text and its context.

Psychologically speaking, the direct or indirect expression of hate represents the culmination of people's denigration and rejection of the other (out-group). The culmination of the feelings of hate and dislike highlights that bias, stereotypes, and attitudes of discrimination reached their peak. This means that we, as discourse analysts, need to find: a) the moments (when does hatred get its top?); b) the causes leading to the top of hatred (why does hatred get its top at these moments and not at other ones?); c) the interests it serves (what are the different interests it serves?); and d) the reality of the in-group/out-group relations (how will the in-group/out-group relations be affected?). These questions are designed to understand why people tend to express such feelings of hatred and dislike while they are taking apart in a communicative interaction. Indeed, hatred as a feeling might exist in parallel with that of love; however, the direct or indirect expression of hate is not socially and legally permitted due to its negative consequences on the order of our societies such as the increase of inter-group violence and the spread of hate crimes. The dangerous impacts of the expression of hate needs a careful psychological examination of the minds and the behaviors of those who perform this non-polite and non-civilized act of revealing their segregationist thoughts. This examination should start from the critical investigation of language as the tool through which people's inner feelings of hate and dislike are expressed to the outer world. Thus, any attempt to fight the spread of hate and to reduce hate crimes should start from the fight of hate at the level of discourse and language in use.

The speeches and the press statements of Mr. Trump, who is campaigning for the presidency of the US, are proved to be full of hatred that is expressed either implicitly or explicitly. A brief reading in his speeches before and during the campaign reflects that sexist, bigoted, and xenophobic attitudes are there. The presence of these sorts of hate attitudes raised the need for the psychological investigation of Trump's strange way of speaking about the out-group people. So, how can we explain Trump's resort to the denigration and the devaluation of the other? What are the psychological factors standing behind his extremist thinking about the out-group individuals? These questions will be answered through the analysis of the selected speeches where psychological interpretations will be sought to get logical explanations for the results obtained from the linguistic investigation of the corpus. As far as politics is concerned, does the triumph of Trump, who showed hate and extremism in his language, reflect the use of out-group hatred to serve personal interests?

Methodology

This section seeks to provide a brief description of the selected corpus and to give its readers a detailed idea about the method to be used for the processing of the collected data.

1. Corpus

The selected corpus consists of four speeches taken from different moments of Trump's life: 1) Trump the business man; 2) Trump the campaigner for the 2016 US presidency; and 3) Trump the president. These speeches are classified into three categories on the basis of the three themes to be under focus: a) the study of sexism; b) the study of bigotry; and c) the study of xenophobia.

1.1. The study of sexism:

To study the manifestation of sexism in Trump's language, I selected "Donald Trump's Taped Comments about Women". It is a tape in which Trump repeatedly made vulgar comments about women. He was filmed talking to Billy Bush, the television personality of "Access Hollywood" on the set of "Days of Our Lives". Here, Trump was making a cameo appearance. Trump and Bush were later on joined by the actress Arianne Zucker. The tape was recorded in 2005. The transcript is taken from: https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/08/us/donald-trump-tape-transcript.html.

1.2. The study of bigotry

The study of how bigoted attitudes manifest themselves in Trump's language will be under-taken through the analysis of "Trump's Executive Order Banning Refugees and Muslim Travelers". This speech is delivered in the White House on 17th January, 2017. The manuscript of the speech is retrieved from: http://www.haaretz.com/us-news/1.767964.

1.3. The study of xenophobia

To study the manifestation of xenophobia in Trump's language, two speeches are selected for analysis. These speeches are selected among others in that they reflect Trump's xenophobic attitudes towards foreign nations whom he saw as the real threat to the US economy. The first text is "Trump's Speech on Jobs and the Economy". It is delivered on 15th September, 2016. The transcript of this speech is retrieved from: http://time.com/4495507/donald-trump-economy-speech-transcript/. The second text is entitled "Donald Trump's Full Immigration Speech". It is delivered on 31st August, 2016. The transcript of this speech is retrieved from: http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-donald-trump-immigration-speech-transcript-20160831-snap-htmlstory.html. These two speeches will be analyzed to highlight economic xenophobia and the interests it serves in Trump's political rhetoric of campaigning.

2. Method

A simple method of textual analysis will be used in the critical examination of the selected speeches. It is based on the critical scrutiny of the text by moving through each of the selected texts seeking to highlight the items, phrases, expressions, clauses, and sentences that signal the existence of attitudes of hate and dislike: bigotry, sexism, and xenophobia. The application of this method, at the level of the present paper, follows three successive steps of data processing to reach: a) an in-depth understanding of the way attitudes of hatred manifest themselves in Trump's language and b) a detailed critique of the social and psychological factors leading to

Trump's explicit utterances of hate towards the others: women, immigrants, and competitive economic powers. These steps are summarized in the following three paragraphs:

1. Collecting the data: This step consists in gathering textual indices highlighting Trump's direct or indirect expression of hate. Then, the collected indices will be categorized to facilitate their analysis in the following step.
2. Analysing the data: In this second step, the collected and categorized indices will be linguistically explored. The linguistic investigation of these data will be contextualized where the investigation of circumstantial information is required for the disambiguation of what is linguistically uttered. This means that textual analysis and contextual analysis will be carried simultaneously.
3. Undertaking sociological and psychological interpretations: After analysing the collected data, sociological and psychological approaches will be used to find logical explanations to the obtained results. These explanations are meant to understand how both sociological and psychological factors contribute to the (re)shaping of Trump's strange utterances.

Finally, conclusions will be drawn. The conclusions of this three-step method of data processing will be formulated to highlight the theoretical and the practical contributions of this research paper as well as to set clear its limitations.

Findings and discussion

This section is devoted to the analysis of the data collected from the selected texts. Moreover, it seeks to make connection between the social, the discursive, and the psychological through finding the logical explanations to Trump's direct and indirect utterance of hate. This part consists of three analytical sections: sexism, bigotry, and xenophobia.

I. The manifestation of Sexism

The ways sexist ideologies and practices manifest themselves in Trump's taped comments about women are summarized and explained in the following six points:

a. Physical harassment: Trump's sexual harassment of the woman he is speaking about, Zucker, manifests through his physical endeavor 'to move on her'. This aggressive physical pressure is directly stated in his statement "I moved on her". This statement is repeated more than twice which means that Trump highlights his pressure on the woman. He is the dominant party and he can do whatever pleases him while being with this pretty lady. He is proud of what he did. The feeling of proudness he has and the power he seeks to stress might be good signs for Trump's struggle to show his manhood.

b. Sexual abuse: Trump's sexual abuses of Zucker and other women are traced at the level of his struggle to satisfy his sexual desire. This sort of abuse is detected though his explicit statements: "I did try and fuck her" and "I just start kissing them". His repetitive acts of abuse are the immediate result of his inability to resist beautiful ladies that is justified by his statements: "… I am automatically attracted to beautiful …" and "… It is like a magnetic …". He does not even wait for their agreement to have these intimate moments, which is revealed in his declaration "… Just kiss. I don't even wait …". He explained his ability to abuse women sexually by the power he has as a star "… and when you are a star, they let you do it. You can do everything". Thus, sexual abuse – both in thought and in action – is put into practice due to the power of fame Trump has.

c) Mental deception: Trump deceived Zucker by changing her destination and her desired goal (getting furniture) towards the destination he wanted to reach the goal he planned for (satisfying his sexual desire). He expresses his manipulation of her by saying "She wanted to get some furniture … I took her out the furniture … I moved on her …". Here, Trump's knowledge of where there exists nice furniture gives him the power to control this woman and lead her to the place where he can find pleasure with her. This power becomes more effective with the desire this woman has to get nice furniture in that it facilitates Trump's manipulation of his prey. Thus, this woman's eagerness to have nice furniture makes her fall in Trump's trap to get pleasure with beautiful ladies.

d) Insulting: After deceiving his prey (taking her out furniture) and abusing her sexually (moved on her), Trump abuses Zucker verbally by depicting her as an immoral woman (a bitch). This sort of humiliation is expressed through a statement of comparison in which Trump equated his abuse of Zucker to the pleasure man

can get with bitches "I moved on her like a bitch …". This statement highlights Trump's devaluation of women: at first he uses the power of his mind to deceive her and get his intimate moments with her as a pretty lady. Then, he humiliated her after satisfying his sexual desire. This implies that the great value (sexiness) a pretty woman might have before you engage with her in such intimate moments could be transformed into humiliation (no value) once these moments of pleasure are left. Thus, woman is sexually objectified.

e) Mockery: Having satisfied his sexual desire, Trump gets back to his experience to blame Zucker for having sex with him though she has her own husband. In reality, Trump's blame is a sort of humiliation to a woman who had betrayed her husband. By saying "she was married", Trumps mocks at Zucker. In addition, the repetition of this statement later on in the transcript is a good proof to highlight the sarcastic style Trump used while talking about his experience with Zucker. Here, the use of mockery might be ideologically monitored to emphasize the guilt Zucker committed on the right of her husband. Thus, she is not loyal to her conjugal partner, she is a traitor.

f) Physical description: While depicting Zucker, Trump focuses on her sexual organs 'tits'. By saying "she has now got the big phony tits …", he highlighted the sexiness of his lady. This statement, indeed, reflects his full admiration of her. This feeling of admiration is emphasized by his expression of his amazement towards the beauty of her legs detected through his use of interjection "Oh, it looks good. … Ooh nice legs, huh?". The interjection used in these two statements shows that Zucker is sexually evaluated. Thus, she has become a commodity for male sexual gratification.

The analysis of the six points above shows that Zucker is fully dominated by her patriarch: she was manipulated, abused, and insulted. The critique of this sort of domination highlights that Trump's attitudes towards women and his treatment of the opposite sex are monitored by patriarchal ideologies in that they lead to the denigration and the objectification of that woman. According to him, woman is the source of pleasure and sexual gratification. This sort of thinking culminates in his denial of her ability to resist him as a man of power. Indeed, to make of these conclusions more concrete and accurate, we need to find some sociological and psychological interpretations for Trump's ways of thinking about women and his strange practices while he is interacting with the opposite sex. These interpretations will be based on the features of the context in which the talk took place.

The sexist comments Trump articulated about women and the different gender-based practices he revealed took place in a context that is characterized by three main features. First, it is a man-to-man meeting (Donald Trump and Billy Bush). Second, it is a comic situation where Trump was 'making a cameo personality'. Third, it is a filmed situation where Trump might not be aware that his comments will be taped and published. These three features are of crucial significance to find such psychological interpretations to Trump's sexist thoughts and practices.

Psychologically speaking, the reading of Trump's inner mind through what is linguistically articulated in his comments leads to three major interpretations. On the one hand, within pure male meetings, men speak about their love and sexual adventure to show their masculinity, their attractiveness to woman, and their power to have intimate moments with beautiful ladies. This means that Trump's comments came as the result of his mental desire to prove his masculinity and his power to control pretty ladies to the man he is sitting with, Billy Bush. On the other hand, performing a cameo appearance Trump tries to make fun with what he did during his meeting with Zucker. Here, Trump's comments could be interpreted by the mental desire he has to re-live the moments of pleasure through re-stating the facts. This means that Trump is living the experience the moment of his cameo through the state of imagination. In this case, imagination plays two complementary functions: first, it is a tool to narrate the old story Trump lived where narration is the means by which he created comic. Second, it is a tool to re-live the state of joy and pleasure. Thus, the moment narration and emotions dominated the mind, Trump revealed his sexist thoughts and practices. Then, Trump's unawareness about being recorded makes him speaks at ease, without boundaries. Indeed, when people find themselves in such a free situation and out from the control of the media, they speak frankly. They might reveal secrets and personal information that they cannot deliver in front of the media or large audience. This means that away from audience and unaware about being reported to the public, Trump revealed what is going on in his inner mind to the out-side world via the story he narrated to Billy Bush. Finally, the context in which Trump speaks makes him feel free to reveal what he thinks and what he does, as practices, to Billy Bush in a sarcastic way. This sort of sarcasm revealed valuable information due to the unawareness of Trump's being recorded and his desire to show his masculinity in a purely male meeting.

Sociologically speaking, Trump's direct articulation of sexist thoughts and practices gets its logical explanation in two interpretations of his social context. First, the state of fame he has, as a business man, makes him feel socially superior to the women he is addressing. Indeed, women are always attracted by famous men. This sort of attractiveness facilitates their domination and their abuse. For instance, Trump said it explicitly that when you are famous they (women) let you do it. Second, Trump's belongingness to the upper class, as a man of wealth, gives him the power to be socially admired by women, especially those who are in need for financial support. The admiration he might have in such social situation – like in his meeting with Zucker – makes him feel socially superior. This sort of superiority is associated with the feeling of treating the other with inferiority. So, the other is denigrated and socially reduced to lower positions. This means that this asymmetrical distribution of wealth, as one of the source of power one can have in his society, is a good explanation for Trump's explicit utterance of sexist thoughts and practices. In brief, Trump's explicit articulation of the denigration of the woman he met and women in general gets its sociological explanations deeply rooted in his position: a famous guy in and out-side the US and a wealthy man who has a large fortune. So, he felt powerful and able to use his status to satisfy his desires.

These sexist statements and others were denied later on due to the occurring changes at the level of both the social and the psychological (the cognitive) factors constituting Trump's new situation, campaigning for the 2016 presidential elections. For instance, In October 2016, Trump expressed his regret for the vulgar words he uttered in his 2005 video with Billy Bush. First, he confessed that he said what is reported in the tape affirming: "I said it". Second, he declared that he was wrong the moment he spoke negatively about women saying: "I was wrong". Third, he asked for apologize saying: "… I apologize" (Fahrenthold, 2016). These three steps reflect Trump's desire to express publically his regret towards what he had said during that meeting. This regret might be explained by a change at the level of his desired goals from the desire of having pleasure to the desire of sitting upon the throne of power in the US white house. Thus, Trump seeks forgiveness to hide his sexist ideologies and practices in order not to negatively affect his run for the US presidency.

II. The Manifestation of Bigotry

The ways bigoted attitudes and practices manifest themselves in Trump's executive orders banning refugees and Muslim travelers are traced at the level of four different discursive strategies. These are explained in the following four paragraphs:

a. Analogy: To highlight the danger of welcoming more immigrants into the US, Trump makes comparison between what is going on in the present time and what happened in September 11, 2001. For instance, his statement – "the visa-issuance process plays a crucial role in detecting individuals with terrorist ties … Perhaps in no instance was that more apparent than the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001" – shows that history repeats itself via the use of comparison. This sort of comparison is meant to stress the higher degree of similarity existing between the two situations. This similarity lies in the infiltration of agents with terrorist ties into the US to plan for terrorist attacks that will harm the Americans' lives. Thus, immigration is one of the main causes leading to the infiltration of terrorists inside of the US. This implies that welcoming more immigrants means facing more threats. In other words, having a higher level of security in the American territory entails reducing the number of immigrants. In reality, not all immigrants to the US are associated with terrorist ties; however, the majority of them are innocent civilians who are seeking shelter due to the war that has damaged their lives. So, by making this sort of analogy, Trump shows a high degree of intolerance towards the immigrants who are coming to the US seeking for better lives. This degree of intolerance culminates in his refusal to welcome immigrants from war torn countries like Syria and Iraq. This is detected in his statement "I hereby proclaim that the entry of nationals of Syria as refugees is detrimental to the interests of the United States …". Briefly, the high degree of intolerance Trump shows to immigrants traced through the analysis of his analogy becomes more apparent with the analysis of the generalizations he made to refuse welcoming more people.

b. Generalization: While speaking about the harmful effects immigrants might have on the security of the US citizens, Trump falls in the bias of formulating a collective evaluation of the coming immigrants. The general statements he made condemned not only the illegal immigrants but also the applicants for legal visas to the US. First, he argues that a big number of foreigners who came to the US are 'convicted' or 'implicated' in terrorist acts saying: "numerous foreign-born individuals have been convicted or implicated in terrorism-related crimes since September 11, 2001". This statement highlights the huge number of foreigners who joined the US territory which might imply that there will be a high level threat if the US will welcome more refugees and immigrants. So, no more immigrants will be welcomed to the US. Second, he stressed that even those who entered the US with legal visa are proved to be involved in terrorist acts saying: "… including foreign nationals who entered the

United States after receiving visitor, student, or employment visas, or who entered through the United States refugee settlement program". This statement shows that even the visa does not prevent terrorists from entering the US and threat its internal security. Here, Trump might imply that how could we (Americans) promote our internal security with the coming of illegal immigrants since even the legal ones are involved in terrorist acts? Thus, Trump's statements are built upon the logic of moving from what is individual to what is collective. This means that once terrorism is committed by one member of the group all the other members are accused of being terrorists. This generalization reflects a high degree of intolerance towards immigrants culminating in Trump's struggle to enforce anti-immigration laws.

c. Stigmatization: According to Trump, immigrants will not be allowed to enter the US territory for two main reasons: first, these are violent agents who do not respect the US principles "… the US cannot and should not admit those who do not support the constitution or those who would place violent ideologies upon its laws". This statement is rhetorically effective to convince the American public that the US will not allow the entry of refugees because they do not respect the US values. It might also manipulate those who have sympathy towards starving people to make them defend the prevention of the entry of more refugees. Second, these are agents who have the intension to exploit the US immigration laws for the sake of malevolent purposes "… to prevent the admission of foreign nationals who intend to exploit the United States immigration laws for malevolent purposes". By this statement Trump might imply that though the US have made just immigration laws to rescue the most harmed nationals, these people exploited its hospitality to reward its nation with terror and death. Here, implicitness is rhetorically effective to manipulate the public that Trump's plan for action to enforce immigration laws is the right choice for the current situation to prevent America from the terror of the coming nations. Briefly, the stigmas Trump made to mark the people seeking for shelter and protection in the US shows his political struggle to increase the Americans' intolerance towards immigrants and immigration laws. This means that stigmatization is another strategy the study of which revealed Trump's bigoted thoughts and practices.

d. Threat: Seeking to convince his public that his immigration policies are the ones the US people should defend to prevent danger from getting into America, Trump used statements of warning to highlight the potential threat they might face. First, he insisted on the need to enforce immigration laws such as 'screening' to prevent the infiltration of foreign terrorists and criminals "… to ensure that adequate standards are established to prevent infiltration by foreign terrorists and criminals". This statement highlights that immigration is the main cause of having terrorism in the US, which implies that reducing the rate of immigration is reducing the degree of threat. Second, he ordered to suspend the entry of Syrian refugees because they represent a threat to the US interests saying: "… the entry of nationals of Syria is detrimental to the interests of the United States thus suspend any such entry …". In this statement, Trump justifies his refusal to welcome Syrian refugees to the US in the near future by highlighting their intension to harm the Americans. Third, he enumerated the different terrorist activities foreign nationals were charged with in the US by affirming: "… Foreign nationals … charged with terrorism-related offenses … support terrorism-related organizations … engaged in terrorism-related acts … and types of acts of gender-based violence …". These extracts reflect Trump's struggle to emphasize the danger welcoming more refugees and immigrants pose to the US to convince his public that there will be no room for immigrants and refugees who proved to threat the US security and interests. To sum up, Trump's use of the notion of threat, as a discursive strategy to persuade his audience to stop immigration to the US, is rhetorically manipulated to serve the public adoption of his policies.

The analysis of the four points before reveals that Trump's language is highly bigoted. His bigoted attitudes and practices towards refugees and immigrants culminate in his use of implicitness and rhetoric to convince his follow citizens to defend his plan for action, which is based on the prevention of the entry of more refugees and immigrants. He used rhetoric to manipulate his public and show that even people from starving countries are charged with terrorism. This sort of manipulation might change the opinions of those who show sympathy towards refugees from countries like Syria to make them defend Trumps' anti-immigration policies. Also, he resorted to implicitness to show to his followers that the reduction of the rate of violence and terrorism in the US entails the prevention of the entry of more refugees. Thus, Trump's intolerance of immigrants and refugees is linguistically proved through the analysis of the discursive strategies (analogy, generalization, stigmatization, and threat) he resorted to aiming to persuade his administration to put in practice his anti-immigration laws. However, for these conclusions to be authentic, closely related to the social context in which Trump's speech took place, and reflect the way his personal philosophy of dealing with the other affect his policy-making, sociological and psychological interpretations will be undertaken. These interpretations will be sought based on the feature of the circumstances in which Trump articulated his speech.

The bigoted thoughts and practices Trump articulated in his executive order to ban the entry of refugees and Muslim travelers to the US took place in a context that is characterized by two major features. First, these orders are delivered one week after Trump takes office in 20 January, 2017. Second, these are signed the moment in which the world faces the worst refugee crisis since World War II (Greenblatt, 2017). These two features will be explored to find such logical interpretations to the detected bigotry in Trump's language at both levels: the sociological and psychological.

At the psychological level, the investigation of Trump's inner thoughts through the study of the discursive strategies he used while delivering his anti-immigration orders leads to the formulation of two main interpretations. First, signing these orders after victory could be interpreted by Trump's mental desire to show to his people that he is still stick to his electoral promises and he is able, as a president, to materialize what he claimed to achieve once being in office. It might also be explained by Trump's desire to highlight his patriotic feelings. By emphasizing his strong care about the US and its security, Trump might seek to distinguish himself from the former presidents to the US, especially Obama and his administration, for having no clear immigration laws to prevent danger. According to him the Obama and Clinton administration's lack of transparency when it comes to the issue of immigration lead to the increase of violence in the US. Second, taking these 'heartless decisions' in such a situation where millions of displaced people traveled hundreds of miles to seek for a secure shelter, might be a good expression of his internal cruelty. Also, it might be the translation of an internal failure on how to manage the situation what pushes Trump to use national security, as a pretext, to order the prevention of the entry of refugees. Lowkell (2017) argues that Trump's decisions represent a mixture of cruelty and desperate incompetence. As far as cruelty is concerned, man's inner tendency to violence and intolerance or the opposite – peace and tolerance – could be easily expressed to the out-side world when he is in a position of power. Thus, Trump's articulation of anti-immigration orders has two different but complementary interpretations. They are different in that they reflect strong patriotic emotions on the one hand and they are the expression of an inner cruelty to deal with the other on the second hand. However, these are complementary because both of them reflect the proudness of the speaker and his followers and the denigration of those seeking for their sympathy.

At the sociological level, Trump's articulation of bigoted thoughts and practices might get its logical explanations in two possible interpretations of his social context. On the one hand, the power he has, as an elected president, enables him to put into practice his policies and his plans for action "by the authority vested in me as president by the constitution and laws of the United States …". With reference to speech act theories, this statement has 'an illocutionary force' where members of Trump's administration have heard and understood that he intends to put into practice these orders. In Reality, Trump might not produce such heartless decisions if he is an ordinary citizen, who has no power to change the state's immigration policies, because he will not find the legal pretext that will help him materialize his plans. However, his social position gives him the authority to produce these cruel orders because he might feel secured, powerful, and has the legal pretext to defend his choices. On the other hand, the general context of violence, war, terror, and displacement of millions of people offered Trump the pretext to articulate such bigoted orders. This means that though these orders reflect a high level degree of intolerance towards persecuted and starving nations, the rhetoric of 'national security' makes of them rhetorically acceptable claims for action. Here, Trump explored the social context in which he is acting to sign his anti-immigration policies because he might know that the Americans will not accept his extreme intolerance towards starving nations out of these circumstances. Thus, to manipulate his public Trump focused on national security to raise on them the strong feeling of patriotism so that his intolerance will not be detected. In brief, Trump's social position as a leader of the US gives him the power to explore the existing social context to sign his anti-immigration orders where the rhetoric of national security plays a crucial role in manipulating the public.

III. The manifestation of xenophobia

The critical investigation of Trump's speech on jobs and economy and his speech on immigration shows that xenophobic attitudes and practices manifest themselves at various levels. The traced manifestations are summarized under the labels of four main discursive strategies that I analyzed in the following paragraphs.

a. Supremacy of self interests: The superiority of the self is reflected in Trump's language at two different levels. First, he claimed to deal with the NAFTA in the way that serves the US interests or it will be determined until signing a new deal saying: "… we will entirely renegotiate NAFTA into a deal that will be either good for us or will be determinate until a brand new and productive deal can be signed". This statement is built upon a binary structure where only two choices are outlined: serving self interests or suspending the agreement. Here, stating a third choice – serving shared interests – is also possible because agreements should normally serve the

common good of all parties. However, Trump's marginalization of the US's partners' interests might be a good indicator for his denigration of the other and his emphasis on the priority of the self. Second, he declared that he will keep the US out of the Trans-pacific Partnership "we are also going to keep America out of the Trans-Pacific Partnership". Trump's claim to withdraw from the TPP is justified by his 'America first' rhetoric arguing that this agreement is a 'potential disaster' to his country. The analysis of this statement and its supporting details reveals that Trump is not willing to discuss the issue with the US's partners; however, he runs towards taking unilateral decisions that he justified by the rhetoric of the superiority of the US interests. In Brief, Trump's emphasis on the supremacy of the self and his denigration of the others is manipulated through the highly patriotic messages he delivered to his audiences. Thus, he used the 'America first' rhetoric to convince his nation that his plans to re-deal with NAFTA agreement and to withdraw from the TPP agreement are the appropriate choices for the current circumstances.

b. Abusing power: Trump uses his position of power, as a campaigner and later on as an elected president to the US, to address other nations aggressively. His aggressive ways of addressing the others (foreign nations) can be traced at two different levels. On the one hand, he addressed the Gulf States with inferiority ordering them to pay for the safe zones he decided to build for refugees in their homeland affirming: "… we have to build safe zones and we will get the money from the Gulf states …". In this statement, Trump decides not only what the Americans should do, but also what the Gulf states should do. This sort of behavior shows that Trump is the dominant party and the Gulf States are the dominated one. He treats these nations with a sort of inferiority reflected in his superiority to decide in their places though they are independent states with full sovereignty. So, deciding in the place of these autonomous states is an unacceptable humiliation on the right of millions of people. On the other hand, Trump claims to build a wall between Mexico and the US to stop illegal immigrants from coming into his country and he affirms that Mexico will pay for its construction saying: "… yes we will build the wall, Mexico will pay". This statement shows that Trump decides not only about his state's internal policies, but also about his neighbors' policies. Indeed, Trump trespasses the boundaries of his country to rule over nearby sovereign states, which is legally unjust according to the UN laws. So, by deciding in the place of the Mexicans, Trump humiliated an entire nation, where humiliation represents the highest degree of denigrating the other and highlighting one's own power to dominate. Briefly, Trump's abuse of power to decide what other independent nations should do reflects that his practices are monitored by such xenophobic attitudes culminating in the humiliation of neighbors and allies.

c. Threatening raising powers: Trump argued that China's entry to the World Trade Organization caused a great economic trouble to the US leading to the reduction of the US's average growth rate to only 2 percent saying: "… after China joined the WTO, our average growth rate has been reduced to only 2 percent". This statement represents Trump's accusation of China to be the guilty party who stands behind the US's annual trade deficit. Then, he charged China with 'predatory trade practices', 'product dumping', 'currency manipulation' and 'intellectual property theft' to highlight that China is the main cause of America's loss of millions of jobs. At the level of these expressions, Trump resorted to the rhetoric of the 'guilty' to legalize the direct threats he claimed to make China surrender and stop the practices that he described as 'illegal'. First, he ordered to label China a "currency manipulator". Second, he claimed to "instruct the US Trade Representative to bring trade cases against China". Third, he threat to "apply tariffs to any country that devaluates its currency to gain an unfair advantage over the US". Finally, Trump justifies sanctions against China and any other nation who seeks to get unfair advantage over the US by the rhetoric of 'creating more jobs' in the US affirming: "… improved protection of America's intellectual property in China would add 2 million jobs". This means that enforcing China to stop its 'illegal' practices is necessary to save the US economy as well as its job market. To sum up, Trump's xenophobic attitudes and practices manifest themselves linguistically through his direct threat to a competitive world power, China. Seeking to make of his threats acceptable on the part of his followers, he resorted to the rhetoric of the 'supremacy of the US interests'.

d. Isolation: By claiming to build a wall between the US and Mexico, Trump shows a political desire to separate his country from its neighbors affirming: "… yes, we will build the wall …". In this statement, Trump insists on the building of the wall that he declared before. Indeed, the building of the wall can be seen at the surface level of analysis as a form of territorial separation between the US and Mexico to prevent the entry of illegal immigrants and drugs into the US. However, at the deep level of analysis it can be understood as a desire to separate America from foreign nations that Trump think they benefit from the US economy. This deep level comprehension reflects a political tendency towards isolation. To justify his choices and hide his desire towards isolation and his anti-foreign attitudes and practices, Trump resorted to the rhetoric of 'saving America' from the potential danger foreigners causes to the US society and economy. This means that Trump's claim to build a wall between the US and Mexico might not be articulated if there is no noticeable threat coming from the US-

Mexican borders. Thus, Trump's use of 'saving America' rhetoric served to mystify his anti-foreign attitudes for the sake of convincing his audiences that his choices are the most appropriate for the existing threat. However, the deep level analysis of the claim uncovered these xenophobic attitudes and practices.

The analysis of these two speeches shows that Trump's xenophobic attitudes and practices manifest themselves linguistically at the level of the four discursive strategies analyzed before. However, for these findings to be more reliable, more convincing, and deeply rooted in their socio-political context, sociological and psychological interpretations will be undertaken. These interpretations will be carried on the light of the main features of the circumstances in which these two speeches took place.

These two speeches took place during Trump's campaigning for the US presidency, few months before the Election Day. Indeed, these moments are characterized by a fierce struggle over power where a candidate's success depends on his ability to convince the public to vote for him to be the coming president. This struggle for power is necessary for the underpinning of such logical interpretations for the ways Trump's xenophobic attitudes and practices manifest themselves linguistically at both levels: the sociological and the psychological.

Psychologically speaking, what is linguistically expressed at the level of Trump's speeches could be interpreted on the basis of the states of mind he lived during these competitive circumstances. First, Trump's insistence on the supremacy of the US interests can be interpreted by his mental desire to highlight his feelings of patriotism. It is a personal desire to show that he cares for the US interests more than any other candidate. This uncontrollable desire towards showing his patriotic attitudes and practices led him to the denigration of the other (the foreigners). This means that in such a moment of showing one's strong ties towards his society, one might fall in the minimization of the out-group people. Second, Trump's abuse of power to decide what other states should do could be interpreted by his mental desire to reign over and to show to his public that he has the power to lead, he has the power to affect world politics for the sake of serving the US interests, and he has the power to change the world reality. This desire to highlight his power as a US president to save the US world position has led to the humiliation of the out-group nations. In other words, one might fall in the minimization and the humiliation of the other while seeking to emphasize the in-group superiority. Third, Trump's threat to the competitive world powers like Chine highlights a personal desire towards the use of power in the resolution of such misunderstanding. This mental desire could be interpreted by his will to show to his public that he is able to impose sanctions on those who might harm the US prosperity while the previous presidents like Obama did not defend the US interests. Here, Trump's proudness to show his ability to protect the US economy from illegal practices affected his way of addressing the others culminating in verbal threats. Fourth, Trump's run towards the isolation of the US from its neighbors might be interpreted by his inner state of feeling threatened and his desire to show to his public that the US is threatened and should stop this disaster as he called it. These inner feelings of fear might reflect an egoist economic policy on the part of Trump who seeks to make the US benefit from the neighbors while refusing to let them benefit from their neighborhood with the US. To sum up, the xenophobic attitudes and practices Trump articulated in these two speeches are the result of the inner states of mind he lived in his campaign. These states represent a mixture of feelings of proudness and superiority.

Sociologically speaking, the ways Trump's xenophobic attitudes and practices manifest them-selves discursively might get its logical explanations in the US's general socio-political context. Indeed, the power the US has to affect its regional and its international contexts might give Trump the necessary power to address the US's allies and partners with inferiority due to the over sensation of the superiority of the self. Here, two main examples can justify this interpretation. On the one hand, the US as a permanent member in the SC has the power to impose sanctions on the states that harm its interests by convincing its allies in the council to vote for these sanctions and this happened before against states like Iraq and Iran. On the other hand, the US as a military power took in charge to protect some nations in the world; like the Gulf monarchies, Japan, and others. This means that it has the power to make them pay for its policies nevertheless there will be no protection. In brief, these socio-political realities offered Trump the occasion to denigrate his allies and partners and to emphasize the superiority of the US nations. Once these feelings of supremacy become uncontrollable in such a situation where the desire of showing patriotism and the desire of showing the ability to lead, people might be found guilty treating the others with a sort of inequality.

Conclusion

The study of the manifestation of hatred in Trump's language revealed that sexist, bigoted, and xenophobic attitudes and practiced are linguistically traced at various levels of his speeches. The sociological and psychological interpretations of these findings showed that Trump's racist ideologies and the practices they

monitor are deeply rooted in their context of articulation. In other words, the theoretical combination between discourse analysis theories (textual analysis and contextual analysis) with theories of sociology and theories of psychology is proved to be fruitful for the understanding of Trump's strange attitudes towards woman, immigrants, and foreign nations. This combination has led to the formulation of the following three main conclusions.

First, Trump's articulation of such sexist beliefs and behaviors detected via the examination of the employed discursive strategies (physical harassment, sexual abuse, mental deception, insulting, mockery, and physical depiction) gives us a detailed idea about his ways of thinking about women as well as how he is used to treat his female partners. With the use of sociological and psychological interpretations we noticed that: On the one hand, Trump's social status, as a star and a wealthy man, gives him the power to reign over his female partners, especially the ones who are in need for material support. On the other hand, Trump's psychology is proved to be governed by two main factors: being in a pure masculine meeting and performing a cameo appearance. With the presence of these two factors, Trump finds himself speaking easily away from any sort of control to highlight his masculinity and narrate his personal adventure. Thus, the context in which Trump's acting makes him unable to control himself to keep his secrets what pushes him to deliver to the outer world his inner thinking about the opposite sex.

Second, Trump's anti-immigration claims for actions and the discriminatory practices ac-companying them showed that bigotry is there and its manifestation is linguistically detected via the analysis of such strategies. Indeed, Trump's resort to the use of analogy, generalization, threat, and stigmatization highlights his extreme hatred of the other even those who are in such harsh conditions like war. The psychological interpretations of Trump's refusal to give a helping hand by claiming not to welcome more refugees reflects his inner cruelty and his lack of human sympathy to rescue such harmed people. Also, it highlights his incompetence to deal with the current situation what pushes him to claim the banning of the entry of refugees. However, the sociological interpretations of these bigoted attitudes and practices showed that Trump's election as a president to the US gives him the power to put into practice his bigoted ideas since he can defend his plans by the legal status he owned while this cannot happen when he is out of power. In addition, the world's social context of war, terror, and violence offered Trump the pretext to claim anti-immigration policies and to defend his policies to save his nation due to his responsibility as president. Thus, under the pretext of saving his nation from the dangers caused by immigration in such a global context of unrest, Trump expressed his inner thoughts of hatred and dislike to the outer world.

Third, the investigation of the manifestation of xenophobic ideologies in Trump's language proved that Trump's denigration of the foreigners (partners and allies) is associated with the articulation of such egoist feelings culminating in the superiority of the self (Americans). Trump's unfair treatment of the other is detected via the analysis of such discursive strategies like the supremacy of self interests, the abusing of power, the threatening of the raising powers, and isolation. The psychological interpretation of the findings of the analysis of these strategies revealed that Trump's hatred of foreigners culminates in: a) his desire to highlight his patriotic feelings; b) his desire to dominate and to show to his public that he has the ability to lead; c) his tendency to the use of power in the resolution of misunderstanding; and d) his fear of being threatened. Whereas, the sociological interpretations proved that the power the US has to affect both its regional and its international contexts gives Trump the power to address the US's allies and partners with inferiority. So, Trump's proudness of heading a powerful county that has its power to change the world makes him articulate such political claims the analysis of which unveiled his hatred of foreigners (the non-American).

In such moments of praising the self, Trump revealed the inner side of his character. What he thinks the others are, how they behave, how they think about the Americans, and how they should be dealt with is employed to emphasize that they are inferior. This emphasis on inferiority is rhetorically manipulated to legalize the US domination. Thus, feelings of hatred and dislike are proved to manifest themselves at various levels of the selected texts. Though the analysis of the selected corpus served to answer the problematics of the paper, the addition of more texts might give more in-side critique of Trump's character. In addition, the inner personality that we studied via the critical investigation of Trump's language might become more obvious in terms of characteristics if we will make a similar study after Trump will have may be one or two mandates in power because his policies as president will give more about his person. Briefly, the limited number of the texts constituting the corpus can be seen as a major limitation of the paper though it did not affect its research quality. However, more can be said about Trump's hate discourse, which makes the topic is open for further debate.

References

[1]. Aliri, J. & Garaigordobil, M. (2013). "Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Standardization and Normative Data in a Sample of the Basque Country". Behavioral Psychology, 21(1), 173-186.
[2]. Anti-Defamation League. (2008). Responding to Bigotry and Inter-Group Strife on the Campus. Retrieved from: https://www.adl.org/sites/default/files/documents/assets/pdf/education-outreach/Responding-to-Bigotry-and-Intergroup-Strife-on-Campus.pdf
[3]. Bell, M., McCarthy, M., & McNamara, S. (2006). Variations in Language Use across Gender. Retrieved from: http://csep.psyc.memphis.edu/mcnamara/pdf/Bellgender28CogSci.pdf
[4]. Browne, K. (1992). An Introduction to Sociology. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
[5]. Cameron, D. (1985). Feminism and Linguistic Theory. Macmillan: Basingstoke.
[6]. Cameron, D. (2005). "Language, Gender and Sexuality: Current Issues and New Directions". Applied Linguistics.
[7]. Cohen-Almagor, R. (2011). "Fighting Hate and Bigotry on the Internet". Policy and Internet, 3(3), 1-26.
[8]. De Figueiredo, R. J. P. Jr. & Elkins Z. (2003). "Are Patriots Bigots? An Inquiry into the Vice of In-Group Pride". American Journal of Political Science, 47(1), 171-188. Midwest Political Science Association: US. DOI: 10.1111/1540-5907.00012
[9]. Definition of Xenophobia. In Thesaurus Online. Retrieved September 23, 2017, from http://www.dictionary.com/browse/xenophobia
[10]. Definition of Sociology. In Thesaurus Online. Retrieved September 06, 2017, from http://www.dictionary.com/browse/sociology
[11]. Edwards, D. & Potter, J. (1992). Discursive Psychology. London, England: Sage.
[12]. Fahrenthold, D. A. (2016). Trump recorded having extremely lewd conversation about women in 2005. Retrieved from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-recorded-having-extremely-lewd-conversation-about-women-in-2005/2016/10/07/3b9ce776-8cb4-11e6-bf8a-3d26847eeed4_story.html?utm_term=.62b76d3a8e59
[13]. Gibbon, M. (1999). Feminist perspectives in language. New York: Pearson Education.
[14]. Glick, P. (1997). "Hostile and Benevolent Sexism: Measuring Ambivalent Sexist Attitudes toward Women". The Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21, 119-135.
[15]. Greenblatt, J. A. (2017). Opinion// ADL Chief: History Will Frown on Trump's Heartless Attack on Refugees. Retrieved from: https://www.haaretz.com/opinion/1.767914
[16]. Hammond, M. D., Sbley, C. G. & Overall, N. C. (2014). The Allure of Sexism: Psychological Entitlement Fosters Women's Endorsement of Benevolent Sexism over Time. Social Psychology and Personality Science, 5(5), 422-429.
[17]. Harris, B. (2002). "Xenophobia: A new Pathology for a New South Africa". In Hook, D. and Eagle, G. (Eds.) Psychopathology and Social Prejudice, pp. 169-184. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
[18]. Holmes, J. & Marra, M. (Eds.). (2010). Femininity, Feminism and Gendered Discourse. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
[19]. Jennings, J. (1990). "The Foundation of American Racism: Defining Bigotry, Racism, and Racial Hierarchy". Trotter Review, 4(3), 11-16.
[20]. Lazar, Michelle M. (2005). Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis. New York: Macmillan.
[21]. Lazar, Michelle M. (2007). Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Articulating a Feminist Discourse Paraxis. Critical Discourse Studies, 4 (2), 141-164.
[22]. Lazar, Michelle M. (2009). Entitled to Consume: Post-feminist Femininity and a Culture of Post-critique. Discourse and Communication, 3 (4), 371-400.
[23]. Litosselite, L. & Sunderland, J. (2002). Gender Identity and Discourse Analysis. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
[24]. Lowkell (2017). Wednesday News: "Trump's Heartless Decision," "Mix of Cruelty and Desperate Incompetence" on DACA; Koch [Hearts] Gillespie. Retrieved from: https://bluevirginia.us/2017/09/wednesday-news-trumps-heartless-decision-mix-of-cruelty-and-desperate-incompetence-on-daca-koch-hearts-gillespie
[25]. Kates, D. B. Jr. (1992). "Bigotry, Symbolism and Ideology in the Battle over Gun Control". National Legal Center for the Public Interest. Retrieved from: www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/54bigsym.pdf
[26]. Molder, Te H. (2015). "Discursive psychology". The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction, 1-11. DOI: 10.1002/9781118611463
[27]. National Conference for Community and Justice - St. Louis Region (1994). Unpublished handout used in the Dismantling Racism Institute program. Retrieved from: http://www.racialequitytools.org/glossary#bigotry
[28]. Neocosmos, M. (2006). From Foreign Natives to Native Foreigners: Explaining Xenophobia in Post-Apartheid South Africa. Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa: Senegal.
[29]. Neumann, H. (1987). "What is Bigotry?" Modern Age, 31(1), 45-51. Retrieved from: https://search.proquest.com/openview/fc796b7975e93b136eb0d65cb21fa207/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=1819501
[30]. Openstax College (2014). Psychology. Rice University: Houston, Texas.
[31]. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2006). New York: Oxford university press.
[32]. Paulauskas, J. (2013). Bigotry, Still the Biggest Problem of the World. Retrieved from: http://www.downloads.imune.net/medicalbooks/Bigotry,%20Still%20the%20Bigges %20Problem%20of%20the%20World.pdf
[33]. Rista-Dema, M. (2008). Language Register and the Impacts of translation: Evidence from Elbanian Political Memoirs and their English Translations. In Hartford, Beverly A. S. & Obeng Samuel Gyasi (Eds.), Political Discourse Analysis (pp. 1-22). New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
[34]. Ruiz, J. R. (2009). "Sociological Discourse Analysis: Methods and Logic". Forum Qualitative Social Research, 10(2). Retrieved From: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1298/2882
[35]. Schauer, F. (1992). The Sociology of the Hate Speech Debate. Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository: US, 37(4). Retrieved from: http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/vlr/vol37/iss4/5
[36]. Shankar, P. (2014). "Inter-Religious Hate Speech in India: A Sociological Study on the Ambiguous Terminology of Secularism". Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 19(1), 148-155. Retrieved from: www.iosrjournals.org
[37]. Stern, K. S. (1991). "Hate on Radio Talk". The American Jewish Committee. Retrieved from: https://www.ajc.org/atf/cf/%7B42D75369-D582-4380-8395-D25925B85EAF%7D/HateTalkRadio.pdf
[38]. Tannen, Deborah (1994). Gender and Discourse. New York: Oxford University Press.
[39]. Wilson, J. G. (1997). "Sexism, Racism and Otherism". In Biagi, S and Kern-forxworth, M. (Eds.) Facing Difference: Race, Gender and Mass Media. California Pine Forge Press.
[40]. Woodworth, R. S. (1921). Psychology: A study of Mental Life. Henry Holt and Company: US.
[41]. Yakushko, O. (2009). "Xenophobia: Understanding the Roots and Consequences of Negative Attitudes toward Immigrants". The Counseling Psychologist, 37(1), 36-66. DOI: 10.1177/0011000008316034