Words as Weapons: A Discourse Analysis on the Weaponization and Mobilization of Language

Richard R. Cavazos and Bridget Drinka, Ph.D
Department of English
University of Texas of San Antonio

Abstract

Within the past hundred years, rhetoric has been often used to push agendas that can become divisive and dangerous. Such was the case with Adolf Hitler in Nazi Germany, Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines (RTLM) in the Rwandan genocide, and former U.S. President Donald J. Trump. While all agents utilized numerous rhetorical strategies, a close analysis of speeches, transcripts, and broadcasts reveal language styles and rhetoric had implicit meanings that influenced audiences/supporters and resulted in direct ramifications. Built on a Burkeian framework of rhetoric, this analysis argues that the previously mentioned agents weaponized language as well as mobilized their audiences into action. The analysis focuses on both complex and simple styles of language not focused on in previous literature.

Keywords: rhetoric, rhetorical strategy, linguistic styles, discourse analysis, Rwandan Genocide, RTLM, Adolf Hitler, Nazi Germany, Donald J. Trump, January 6th

Introduction

It is frequently said that words matter, and they have effects. The power of rhetoric, words used by human agents to induce actions in others, is complex; if this power falls into the wrong hands, it is a dangerous force (Burke 41). Throughout history, certain conditions and patterns have demonstrated that language can be easily weaponized against others and mobilized to incite followers into action. In the early 20th century, Adolf Hitler quickly rose to power in Europe, swaying and manipulating millions of Germans to turn against the Jewish people and support his plans of domination. Several decades later, in Rwanda, a radio station known as Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines (RTLM) broadcast rhetoric that fueled the genocidal extermination of thousands of Rwandans. Within the United States, certain words have become charged with an atmosphere of hate and division, as demonstrated by the language of the former President of the United States Donald J. Trump.

The path to understanding rhetorical and linguistic styles is not simple, and certain questions have arisen: what rhetorical strategies and styles were utilized? Are there implicit meanings to the language used that might trigger mobilization? How did this language have real world ramifications? This study will seek to answer these questions through a discourse analysis of primary sources, as well as the existing secondary and tertiary sources of rhetorical criticism and other analyses and will assess how language can be used to incite violence, and call others to action.

Literature Review

Rhetoric has many strategies and features that can be integrated to achieve the overall goal. This literature review will seek to examine techniques and recurring themes focusing on the chosen case studies of Hitler, RTLM, and Trump.

Rhetoric in Hitler's Germany

In the 1920's, Hitler quickly rose to power as the leader of the Nazi Party and then moved on to control Germany in the 30's and 40's. Before he began addressing masses via speeches, Hitler first laid out his plans for the nation in his book, *Mein Kampf,* in which he addressed his vision of domination and extermination of the Jewish people. Burke argues that Hitler's rhetorical approach is unique in that rather than first blaming the Jewish people and "undesirables" for Germany's troubles, he blames Germans for allowing themselves to become "poisoned" (41). Burke goes on to state that Hitler found a "'cure for what ails you'" through projecting one's problems onto another party; the Jewish person (2). Burke claims that Hitler first blamed Germany and positioned the population as a victim who was at fault for allowing this to happen to themselves, then collectively unifying the masses by saying the poison needed to be purged. This rhetorical strategy of infestation is noted by several scholars, including Steven Perry who agrees with Burke, with one caveat. Perry posits that Hitler does indeed use the Jewish people as a metaphor of infestation in speeches and writings, referring to them as a cancer, but that this is the sole basis for his rhetoric with no other argument (230). Perry argues that "the strategy of rhetorically renaming one's enemies in a conflict situation is a common one"

and that it is done to dehumanize the opponents or enemies more effectively, to thus "ameliorate the prospect of extreme action against that enemy" (232). Citing Edwin Black, Perry also notes the cancer/infestation metaphor is primarily seen by those on the extremist Right side of the spectrum, by figures such as Hitler who seek to blame widespread failures on a specific party (230-231).

While these infestation metaphors are certainly well analyzed, there seems to be a missing element that emerges in Hitler's rhetorical strategy: the power of repetition. Fred L. Casmir is one of the few researchers who mentions the rhetorical use of repetition by Hitler, stating that the "repetition of fear-arousing messages, supported by a variety of information sources in addition to the speaker, strengthens the impact of his message" (16). Burke notes that Hitler uses repetition of slogans, such as 'Jews not admitted' and 'War victims free'" to build propaganda but mentions nothing about how it creates atmospheres of fear or anger (19).

On the topic of propaganda, I only discovered one outlying criticism, from David Deutsch; Deutsch posits that Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's minister of propaganda, helped spearhead this rhetorical strategy of dehumanization in Nazi Germany. Deutsch asserts that Goebbels "regarded the term "Jew" to be a clinical rather than a human concept, and likewise the essence of Jewish entity could not be properly comprehended" (11). In unique criticism and analysis, Deutsch focuses heavily on Goebbels' involvement in the dehumanizing rhetoric, rather than Hitler.

Rhetoric in the Rwandan Genocide

In 1993, a radio station went live in the country of Rwanda; known as Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines (RTLM), they broadcast "inflammatory rhetoric and extremist views" to the thousands of Rwandans, more specifically the Tutsis, a group of Rwandan people. In a similar theme compared to Hitler's strategies, Kellows and Steeves analyzed the use of dehumanizing rhetoric on RTLM's part. In the weeks surrounding the genocide, Kellows and Steeves noted the increasing reference to Tutsi people as *inyenzi,* a derogatory term meaning cockroach; additionally, they note that RTLM used the word "work", or *akazi* in Kinyarwanda, as code for killing, like Perry's analysis that Hitler never blatantly said that Jews were like cancer, but rather referred to them as tumors (Kellows and Steeves 120; Perry 233). Kellows and Steeves also argue that RTLM used a call-to-action rhetorical technique, in which they broadcast that it was either "'kill or be killed'" to incite the genocidal killings (124). In agreement with the previous scholars is Imbleau, who asserts that RTLM used dehumanizing rhetoric such as telling the Hutu population to identify Tutsis via physical appearance, such as small noses (861). One tactic Imbleau took note of was RTLM's use of historical precedent or allusion, using past events of "Tutsis' domination over the Hutus" to instigate violence and mobilize the Hutus (861).

While most scholars recognize a connection between RTLM and the Rwandan Genocide, some approach the subject with hesitancy. For example, Charles Mironko argues that while RTLM was in a position to spread dangerous and extremist rhetoric to the entire country of Rwanda, the rhetoric was not the direct cause. Citing anthropologist and linguist Debra Spitulnik, Mironko contends that "language broadcast on the radio is not passively consumed by listeners, but is actively re-centered, reinterpreted and re-circulated…" (129). After interviewing many perpetrators involved in the genocide, Mironko takes the stance that while some Rwandans did listen to the broadcasts, many did not; he closes out his criticism and analysis with the idea that

the rhetoric alone did not cause them to kill and there are other reasons that should be studied (134).

Trumpian Rhetoric

Over the past several years, much as been said and analyzed about Trump's rhetorical strategies and techniques. In one study, it was argued that one of Trump's key rhetorical and linguistic strategies is to name groups of people, such as calling journalists scum or Hillary Clinton "the devil", making it easier for his supporters to chant and scream "Lock Her Up!" (Nacos et al. 4). The study notes that on his now banned personal Twitter, Trump excessively used adjectives and nouns such as but not limited to: "corrupt", "nasty", "failing", as well as "bimbo", "stupid" and "unattractive" when referring to women (Nacos et al.)

In another study analyzing his linguistic usage on Twitter, several scholars examined his tweets for deliberative, forensic, and epideictic rhetoric. Watt et al. argued that many of his tweets follow the deliberative rhetorical mode, whereupon Trump makes several vague claims but only reiterates and repeats them, rather than giving hard facts (4). One tweet that was examined stated, "'MAKE AMERICA SAFE AND GREAT AGAIN'"; Watt et al. asserted that while "no one would argue with the desire to make America great and safe," Trump sees that values like this need to be at the forefront of the audience's minds since his supporters compete with opposing values (5). In their final assertion, similar to Nacos et al., Watt et al. claimed that the rhetoric of "lock her up" is triple modal: "deliberative in form, nominally recommending an action; forensic in implication, asserting that criminal offenses have been committed; but ultimately epideictic in spirit, marking tribal identity among Trump's true believers" (6).

Further tackling the vast rhetoric that creates Trump, Jennifer Mercieca argues that he uses six rhetorical techniques: *ad populum*[1], American exceptionalism[2] and paralipsis[3] to unify, *ad hominem*[4], *ad bacalum*[5] and reification[6] to divide. Mercieca's prime argument is that Trump weaponizes rhetoric to make others bend to his will and to prevent himself from being held accountable. In one example, Mercieca analyzes Trump's anti-Mexican rhetoric, which she claims is reification, signaling that an enemy or opponent is not a person, but a thing or object that is unworthy of fair treatment. Mercieca asserts that he portrays immigration as a "hostile and damaging infestation of the pure nation," a similar rhetorical tactic utilized by both Hitler and RTLM in Rwanda.

Mercieca also analyzes Trump's rhetoric against Megyn Kelly, then FOX News reporter who moderated the first Republican primary debate in 2016 and acknowledged Trump's use of derogatory words against women. In this instance, Trump labeled Kelly as the following: 'angry… hostile… bimbo…'" before claiming that Kelly had "'blood coming out of her eyes, blood coming out of her wherever…'" Mercieca argues that this is another example of reification, whereas Trump retaliated Kelly's confrontation by attacking her and making her seem like nothing more than an inferior female. In agreement with Mercieca is linguist Sylvia

---

[1] "Used by a demagogue to praise his or her supporters as wise, good, and knowledgeable."
[2] "Used by a demagogue to motivate audiences to support the demagogue's policies."
[3] "Used by a demagogue to circulate rumors and accusations, to ironically say two things at once, and to build a relationship with supporters."
[4] "Used by a demagogue to misdirect the audience's attention and attack the character of their opponents."
[5] "Used by a demagogue to attack and overwhelm opponents.
[6] "Used by a demagogue to signal that a demagogue's designated enemies are unworthy of fair treatment."

Shaw, who analyzed Trump's 2016 claim that Hillary Clinton did not have the look or stamina to be president; Shaw noted that Trump's use of "look" and "stamina" make them appear to be interchangeable, and that a woman cannot run the United States, therefore making Clinton appear as if she cannot compete with him and therefore deserving less than him (230).

While many authors and scholars have carried out convincing analyses and observations, there are gaps in the literature regarding focus on certain words that evoke emotion, or how the rhetoric can be implicit. These gaps will be further explored in my own discourse analysis and study.

Methods/Methodology

The methodology for the project is qualitatively based, with the primary method of analysis being a discourse analysis with a focus on rhetorical strategies and linguistic styles. My research examines directly what was said and which rhetorical and linguistic structures were used and examines the ramifications of these words and structures. The analysis centers on Burke's definition of rhetoric, as words used by human agents to mobilize other agents (41). The specific "agents" studied were Adolf Hitler, Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines in Rwanda, and lastly former President of the United States Donald J. Trump. I utilized online databases and search engines to collect my primary data, consisting of direct quotations, recordings, written texts, and tweets. Alongside these primary sources, I analyzed several secondary sources, consisting of scholarly books, articles, and critical journalistic analyses. One obstacle encountered in the search for sources and materials was a lack of results in English-centric databases; I came to realize that I would need to rely more fully on translated texts.

In this project, it was imperative that I find direct words and quotes from the selected agents, then follow up with secondary literature that offers complementary assessments. However, more critical to my analysis were tertiary sources from newspapers or forum websites; while these may not be of scholarly and academic nature, in my proving that language can be weaponized and used to mobilize audiences, their inclusion was valid to show real world effect and immediate responses to language. This approach helped with answering research questions of what words were used, understanding the implications of language, and how the real world reacts to rhetoric. I organized the material chronologically, to show that continuously over time, chosen rhetoric has been integrated into agendas of divisiveness and extremism, and can be used as a means of mobilizing supporting bases into action or control.

Analysis

The power of repeating oneself as a way of manipulation and control was not unknown to the Führer; in fact, it became one of his prime methods in his rhetorical strategy to manipulate and deploy the German people into backing his agenda of dominating Europe and purging the Aryan race of defects. In his 1925 manifesto, *Mein Kampf,* Hitler explicitly stated:

> It is not the purpose of propaganda to create a series of alterations in sentiment with a view to pleasing these blase gentry. Its chief function is to convince the masses, whose slowness of understanding needs to be given time in order that they may absorb

information; and only constant repetition will finally succeed in imprinting an idea on the memory of the crowd (Hitler 151).

Knowing the effectiveness of manipulating an audience through repetition, Hitler made great use of this in multiple speeches to not only attack opponents but unify the masses. In his January 30, 1939, speech to the Reichstag, the word "Volk" or some form of it, such as "Volksgenossen" or "Volksstaat" was repeated 45 times (Hitler, *Reichstag*). The constant use of "Volk", which translates literally to folk, gives a sense of unity, as if Hitler was addressing himself to be one with the people and that there was no difference between the two. The easier it was to make his supporter feel one and the same with him, the easier it was for Hitler to mobilize and call them to carry out his plans of domination and genocide.

Another rhetorical method Hitler used to both unify and mobilize his audience was the was weaponizing of noun and pronoun usage. In *Mein Kampf,* Hitler describes the Jewish people at almost any opportunity as a "parasite"; in one excerpt from the manifesto, he begins ambiguously referring to "people who can sneak their way, like parasites, into the human body politic", then revealing that he means "the Jews" (127). The continuous, dehumanizing naming of the entire Jewish people enforces the concept that they are a disease that is vile, or that they are creatures beneath the German folk or Hitler, in agreement with Smith's earlier-mentioned analysis. Supplementary to establishing the Jewish people as a parasitic enemy, the use of pronouns reinforced these feelings of segregation and hostility. For example, in a speech given on May 4th, 1923, the pronoun "we" is used 21 times; the application of this word reenforces the atmosphere of unity, but at the same time creates a climate of division and othering (Hitler, *Munich,* [May 4]). The collective "we" refers to Hitler, as well as his audience members—commanders, German citizens, etc. – but does not extend to the outliers: the Jews, the homosexuals and disabled.

In an emotional appeal to the masses, Hitler frequently used allusion in his rhetoric. The Führer would refer to historical precedent, of "German Volk of earlier decades, politically and socially disorganized…" (Hitler, *Reichstag,* 535). In a ploy to stir feelings of anger, resentment, shame, etc., Hitler would often call back to the First and Second Reichs (the Holy Roman Empire and the German Empire), recalling how "It was nearly two thousand years before the scattered Germanic tribes emerged as one people; before the countless lands and states forged one Reich" (*Reichstag,* 551). Reminding the German people of fallen Reichs and how the "Volk" had previously been plagued by turmoil stirred strong feelings of frustration and anger, which made it easier to then shift those deep resentments by projecting them onto an enemy and blaming this new scapegoat for previous errors (Burke 9). Thus, by dredging up images of past empires and civilizations through his rhetoric, Hitler was able to create an atmosphere that the current, Third Reich was susceptible to failure from threats such as the Jewish people—and thus, reinforced the necessity to eliminate them to ensure a successful Nazi takeover.

A major factor in how Hitler vigorously used words as weapons was his use of linguistic styles. The Führer implemented vivid imagery and concepts for the minds of his supporters and members of the Nazi Party. For example, in his earlier mentioned Reichstag speech, Hitler imbued his corpus with phrases such as "streams of German blood flow together therein…" to aid the audience in visualizing all Germans becoming united, as if their pure blood was all merging together. His vivid language comes full circle with thoughts that he had shared years prior, in a May 1st, 1923, speech in Munich, that one day "there shall be no Soviet star, no Jewish star of David, but that Reich there shall be the symbol of German labor – the Swastika" (Hitler, *Munich,* [May 1]). In his quest to garner support and admiration from the German people, it was

vital that Hitler make them feel as if they were on the brink of greatness; only through his language was he able to stir such powerful scenes that resonated deeply within the German nation—the "Aryan race".

Almost in parallel fashion to the rhetoric used in Nazi Germany, RTLM used extreme, dehumanizing speech as a prime rhetorical strategy to portray the Tutsi people as threats to Rwanda. The Hutu-led radio station deemed the Tutsi people as subhuman and would actively refer to them on air as "cockroaches"; in a broadcast from April 6th, 1994 (the eve of the genocide), a radio DJ called to Hutu listeners, telling them to beware of their surroundings for "*Inyenzis*", the Kinyarwanda word for cockroach (RTLM, *Tape 122*). For the duration of the genocide, RTLM continuously referred to them in such manner. For example, on a May 16th, 1994, broadcast, the Tutsis were again referred to as "cockroaches" 6 times, and that they were "[hunting] moles, partridges and cicadas" to survive, giving listeners the impression that these citizens were less than human, behaved like animals, and that Hutu soldiers were "hunting them in order to kill them all" (RTLM, *RTLM/2*). In the same manner that Hitler referred to Jewish people as "parasites" or "the Jews", RTLM also referred to Tutsis—fellow Rwandans—as some sort of infestation or bug needing to be exterminated.

In one interesting point, it should be noted that RTLM used implicit linguistic phrasing that created major division and hostility through even just the simplest words, such as use of the determiner "the". Hitler denoted Jewish people as "*the* Jews", like how RTLM referred to the Tutsis as "*the* cockroaches", "*the* Inyenzis" and fellow Hutus as "*the* Hutu" (Hitler, *Reichstag,* 1939; RTLM, *Tape 134, RTLM/2*). Through one simple article, RTLM had the ability determine who was *the* opponent and who was not; additionally, the use of "the" enabled the RTLM to unify themselves with their listeners to linguistically position themselves and fellow Hutus as *the* "good guys" and the Tutsis as *the* "bad guys". Another word that had major implicit meanings was "work"; in a broadcast from June 4th, 1994, an unknown radio DJ called out to the listeners, advising them to "work… come and work with your Army, come to work with your government…" (RTLM, *Tape 134*). The word "work" was taken almost as code, to mean violence or murder, as if it were a signal word that only listeners knew the meaning of (Kellows and Steeves 120; Mironko 133-134). Words that may seem as ordinary as "work" can call to action, or mobilize, audience members.

Finally, it is important to note the knowledge RTLM possessed to deliberately manipulate their audience through the radio format. The population in Rwanda was significantly illiterate, and radio was the more effective form of widespread communication over newspaper or television (Clark 95; Imbleau 860). By knowing that their audience was uneducated, RTLM pushed their derogatory and vicious rhetoric on masses who did not know the difference between facts or falsehoods; having the upper hand on their audience put them in a position of authority when issuing calls to action of violence and murder against Tutsi people, similar to Hitler's knowledge of manipulation tactics on his audience.

Before any analysis can be done on the last agent of focus, Donald J. Trump, it must be said that his rhetoric and linguistic phrasings, while extreme, derogatory, and alienating, are not on the same magnitude as the other case studies—Hitler and RTLM. There are no insinuations of Trump attempting to commit genocide or force the United States into a dictatorship; his rhetoric and language are solely being analyzed for recurring patterns and themes.

As the last agent of focus, former U.S. President Donald J. Trump was widely known for attacking opponents, enemies, or groups of people with derogatory rhetoric to destroy credibility or make groups appear dangerous. On June 16th, 2015, Trump announced his presidential

campaign at his Trump Tower in New York City. There, Trump set the tone for his future presidency by stating that Mexican immigrants had "lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems [to] us"; with no information or evidence at hand, Trump explicitly opined that Mexican immigrants were "bringing drugs… bringing crime… they're rapists" (Trump). Three days later, Trump reenforced those sentiments on the social media platform Twitter, affirming again that people coming to the U.S. southern border were "druggies, drug dealers, rapists and killers…" (@realdonaldtrump). These explicit statements on a group of people fostered a wave of anti-immigrant hate; for example, in a June 2018 video posted to Twitter, a Mexican American man and his mother working were the victims of a vicious anti-Mexican tirade, in which a white woman accused them of being "rapists and animals" then backed her claim by stating, "even the President of United States thinks so" (@KenidraRWoods_). The woman providing evidence through Trump's claims shows a direct link between one agent's sentiments and how their rhetoric can be used to induce actions in others and mobilize them.

Continuing in the spirit of degradation, Trump continuously used nouns, verbs, and adjectives such as "loser", "corrupt", "crooked" to refer to people he deemed opponents or enemies. For example, following a Republican primary debate with then FOX News reporter Megyn Kelly, Trump responded on his Twitter account, calling her a "bimbo" and retweeting others who accused Kelly of being a "loser" (@realdonaldtrump). These comments about Kelly were enough to garner vicious social media attacks directed towards her, as well as death threats from Trump supporters. In another instance, Trump's 2016 presidential run against Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton was marked by much hostility. A quick search of archived tweets from January 1, 2016, to November 8, 2016 (election day), showed that Trump had tweeted the moniker "Crooked Hillary" a total of 200 times. The repetitive nickname of "Crooked Hillary" on Twitter as well as constantly vilifying her in public speeches made it all the easier for his supporters to chant, "Lock her up!" and harbor deep anger towards the Democratic presidential nominee, damaging her credibility as a potential president. While these instances are not on the same magnitude of dehumanizing another person or people, the repetition and constant discrediting of Trump's opponents were still divisive and derogatory enough to mobilize his base into action.

One major factor in the manner Trump's supporters register his words and act, is how implicit his linguistic styles and rhetoric are. In a Tweet from December 19th, 2020, Trump referred to new evidence about the 2020 election that would garner him a win, then said "Big protest in D.C. on January 6th. Be there, will be wild!" (@realdonaldtrump). Immediately following, Trump supporters took to online forums to post their reactions; one replied, "He can't exactly openly tell you to revolt. This is the closest he'll ever get" with another stating that "'will be wild'" was a secret message to Trump supporters to be "prepared… as in armed" and another online user posted that "the objective is Congress. We make it so they can either leave in one of two ways: 1. dead 2. certifying Trump the rightful winner" (SITE Intelligence Group). Three weeks later, on January 6th, 2020, Trump gave a speech in front of the White House, in which he proclaimed:

> Now, it is up to Congress to confront the egregious assault on our democracy. And after this, we're going to walk down, and I'll be there with you, we're going to walk down, we're going to walk down… Because you'll never take back our country with weakness. You have to show strength and be strong (Trump).

Shortly after this speech, a large group of audience members marched to the U.S. Capital; in the following hours, dozens of rioters and perpetrators stormed the building, attacking capital police,

damaging government property and even attempting to take hostage U.S. politicians. In one video from inside the insurrection, perpetrators were heard chanting "Hang Mike Pence!" after repeated pressure from Trump to not certify the 2020 election results; Trump had stated earlier that day in his speech that he "[hoped] Mike is going to the right thing" and if Pence did not deliver as Trump and his supporters expected, they were going to be "very disappointed in [him]" (Trump). These linguistic insinuations of being disappointed or doing the right thing, as well as being wild, were all implicitly understood by supporters as calls to action to help take back the United States and take out anyone in the way.

Finally, it should be of noted that parallel to Hitler's knowledge of repetition on people with a "slowness of understanding" (Hitler, *Mein Kampf,* 151), and RTLM using the radio format to manipulate uneducated and poverty-stricken Rwandans, Trump knew the demographics of his audience very well. In a video from February 24, 2016, Trump stated a rally that he won Nevada's Republican primary caucus with votes from the "poorly educated…" before boldly proclaiming, "I love the poorly educated!" In should be taken into consideration that knowing the demographics of his audience would then make it easier for Trump to push his agenda against immigration, or to destroy the credibility of fellow politicians by having a base who shares these ideologies.

Discussion and Conclusion

This analysis of the rhetoric and linguistic styles of all three case agents – Hitler, RTLM, and Trump—allows us to draw several significant inferences and conclusions. All three studies found recurring rhetorical strategies such as repetition, allusion, metaphors, as well as dehumanizing and derogatory language, or reification as Merceica would say; linguistically, pronoun and noun usage were used to both unify audiences and differentiate outlying groups, as well as the determiner article "the" to denote enemies/opponents. Implicit meanings within the analyzed language showed direct links to real world consequences, such as Trump's speech and Tweets leading up to the January 6th, 2021, U.S. Capital insurrection or RTLM's 1994 broadcasts inciting violence and genocide against the Tutsi people in Rwanda.

The analysis further demonstrates how language can be weaponized against another person and/or people. Hitler's metaphors of infestation and need to restore Germany to full glory made Jutta Ruediger fully support him, as she recollected that "'Hitler with his statements seemed to be the bringer of salvation… here was a man who did not think about himself and his own advantage, but solely about the good of the German people'" (qtd. in Rees). In Rwanda, the language was repetitively used to mobilize citizens, or call them to action, with one witness recollecting how "when the government radio continued to broadcast that they were coming to our land, were coming to kill the Hutus—when this was repeated over and over—[he] began to feel some kind of fear" (qtd. in Kellow and Steeves 123). Lastly, the analysis of Trump demonstrated several times how language was both weaponized and mobilized, with both attacks on opponents, ordinary citizens, as well as the previously mentioned Capital insurrection.

In future studies, I plan to expand on this analysis, seeking out additional data through corpus linguistic analyses as well as the inclusion of several tertiary sources that demonstrate connections to real world consequences of language. At present, the discourse analysis presents recurring strategies over time used to enforce agendas and call others to action. The project has conveyed how language, both explicitly and implicitly, has had real world ramifications in the

both the past and the present; future work will focus on how language can be mitigated to prevent further violence or disarm hostilities between peoples.

References

Associated Press. *Trump in Nevada: "I Love the Poorly Educated." YouTube*, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vpdt7omPoa0. Accessed 28 July 2021.

Burke, Kenneth. "The Rhetoric of Hitler's Battle." *The Southern Review*, vol. 5, Louisiana State University Press, 1939, p. 1. Periodicals Archive Online, 1291577066.

---. "The Rhetoric of Motives." University of California Press, 1969.

Casmir, Fred L. "NAZI RHETORIC: A RHETORIC OF FEAR." *Today's Speech*, vol. 16, no. 3, Eastern Communication Association, Sept. 1968, pp. 15–18. Communication & Mass Media Complete.

Aaron Copeland. *Trump Supporters Threaten to Hang Mike Pence at Capitol. YouTube*, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fag0aC_M0_U. Accessed 13 Aug. 2021.

Deutsch, David. *Antisemitism and Intimacy in the Writing of Goebbels*. p. 30.

Hate Radio Prepared the Rwandan People for Genocide by Demonising the Tutsi. http://www.rwandanstories.org/genocide/hate_radio.html. Accessed 11 June 2021.

Hitler, Adolf. *Mein Kampf*. Hurst and Blackett Ltd, 1925.

---. "Speech in Munich." May 1, 1923, Munich, Germany. Address.

---. "Speech in Munich." May 4, 1923. Munich, Germany. Address.

---. "Reichstag." January 30, 1939. Berlin, Germany. Address.

"How a Trump Tweet Sparked Plots, Strategizing to 'Storm and Occupy" Capitol with 'Handcuffs and Zip Ties.'" *SITE Intelligence Group*, https://ent.siteintelgroup.com/Far-Right-/-Far-Left-Threat/how-a-trump-tweet-sparked-plots-strategizing-to-storm-and-occupy-capitol-with-handcuffs-and-zip-ties.html. Accessed 15 June 2021.

Imbleau, Martin. "Radio Télévision Libre Mille-Collines." *Encyclopedia of Genocide and Crimes Against Humanity*, edited by Dinah L. Shelton, vol. 2, Macmillan Reference USA, 2005, pp. 860–62. Gale eBooks, *Gale*, http://link.gale.com/apps/doc/CX3434600282/GVRL?sid=bookmark-GVRL&xid=1ece1d6c.

Kellow, C. L., and H. L. Steeves. "The Role of Radio in the Rwandan Genocide." *Journal of Communication*, vol. 48, no. 3, 1998, pp. 107–28. *Wiley Online Library*, doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1998.tb02762.x.

Mercieca, Jennifer. *Demagogue for President: The Rhetorical Genius of Donald Trump*. Texas A&M University Press, 2020.

Mironko, Charles. "The Effect of RTLM's Rhetoric of Ethnic hatred in Rural Rwanda." *The Media and the Rwanda Genocide*, edited by Allan Thompson, 2007, pp. 125-135.

Nacos, Brigitte L., et al. "Donald Trump: Aggressive Rhetoric and Political Violence." *Perspectives on Terrorism*, vol. 14, no. 5, Terrorism Research Initiative, 2020, pp. 2–25.

Perry, Steven. "Rhetorical Functions of the Infestation Metaphor in Hitler's Rhetoric." *Central States Speech Journal*, vol. 34, no. 4, Dec. 1983, pp. 229–35. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, doi:10.1080/10510978309368147.

Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines. "RTLM/2." *Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines,* 16-17 May 1994, https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/bitstream/handle/2152/7182/unictr_rtlm_0002_eng.pdf?sequence=2.

---. "Tape 122" 6 April 1994, https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/7264.

---. "Tape 134" 04-05 June 1994, https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/7276.

@Realdonaldtrump. "Druggies, drug dealers, rapists and killers are coming across the southern border. When will the U.S. get smart and stop this travesty?" *Twitter,* 16 June 2015, 10:22 p.m., https://www.thetrumparchive.com/?searchbox=%22rapists%22.

@Realdonaldtrump. "Peter Navarro releases 36-page report alleging election fraud 'more than sufficient' to swing victory to Trump https://t.co/D8KrMHnFdK. A great report by Peter. Statistically impossible to have lost the 2020 Election. Big protest in D.C. on January 6th. Be there, will be wild!" *Twitter,* 19 Dec. 2020, 1:42 a.m., https://www.thetrumparchive.com/?searchbox=%22january+6th%22&results=1.

Rees, Laurance. "Viewpoint: His Dark Charisma." *BBC News*, 12 Nov. 2012. *www.bbc.com*, https://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-20237437.

Shaw, Sylvia. *Women, Language, and Politics.* Cambridge University Press, 2020.

Sherman, Gabriel. *Megyn Kelly Got Death Threats From Trump Supporters*. 11 Aug. 2015, https://www.businessinsider.com/megyn-kelly-death-threats-trump-supporters-2015-8.

Trump, Donald J. "Presidential Campaign Announcement." 16 June 2015, New York, NY. Speech.

---. "Save America Rally Speech." 6 January 2021, Washington D.C., District of Columbia. Speech.

Watt, Anneliese, et al. "Trump Typhoon: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Donald's Twitter Feed." *2017 IEEE International Professional Communication Conference (ProComm)*, 2017, pp. 1–7. *IEEE Xplore*, doi:10.1109/IPCC.2017.8013976.