THE DEHUMANIZATION OF IMMIGRANTS AND REFUGEES:

A Comparison of Dehumanizing Rhetoric by All Candidates
in Three U.S. Presidential Elections

Student Author

Amanda Warnock is a senior studying political science and developmental and family science with a minor in human rights and a certificate in public policy. Her research with Dr. James McCann in the Department of Political Science focuses on

political rhetoric surrounding immigration. Warnock also works with Dr. Sharon Christ and PhD student Brittany Mihalec-Adkins in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies to develop resources for parents and advocates in the child welfare system and to investigate the state of sexual and reproductive health among youths in child welfare. In the fall of 2019, Warnock will begin her MPH at Columbia University studying population and family health with a concentration in sexual and reproductive health. She will be focusing on maternal and reproductive health issues, including parenthood during migration.

Mentor

James A. McCann (PhD, University of Colorado) conducts research and teaches classes on public opinion, elections, and representation in the United States and cross-nationally. McCann's work has appeared in many scholarly journals,

including the *American Political Science Review*, the *Journal of Politics*, and the *Latin American Research Review*. He is the coauthor, with Jorge Domínguez, of *Democratizing Mexico: Public Opinion and Electoral Choices* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996). McCann's research has been supported by the National Science Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and he is a principal investigator, with Michael Jones-Correa, of the 2012 and 2016 Latino Immigrant National Election Studies. McCann has been a guest scholar at the Brookings Institution, a visiting scholar at the Russell Sage Foundation, and a provost fellow at Purdue University. Currently, he is writing a book on incorporating immigrants into American democracy.

Abstract

This study contributes to contemporary dehumanization theory by tracking and comparing dehumanizing rhetoric used by all presidential candidates during the 2008, 2012, and 2016 campaigns. Using data hand-collected from all presidential speeches conducted during these periods, including accounting for ad-libbing by Donald Trump, I find that Trump was distinctive in his dehumanization of immigrants and refugees, far surpassing all other candidates. His language surrounding these groups focused heavily on (1) using nonhuman language to describe their actions and migrations, (2) assigning criminality and viciousness to immigrants, (3) repeating stories of the deaths of American citizens by immigrants, (4) saying that immigrants and refugees have values incongruent with Americans, and (5) emphasizing the idea that immigrants and refugees are a threat to the American way of life. Dehumanization is often used as justification for aggressive policies and behaviors, which has been demonstrated through the Trump administration's family separation policies. This essay adds to the conversation about dehumanization by providing evidence that Trump presents a major increase in dehumanizing rhetoric compared to previous candidates, which is important to note as new policies unfold. Additionally, the essay provides a foundation of collected data for future studies.

Warnock, A. (2019). The dehumanization of immigrants and refugees: A comparison of dehumanizing rhetoric by all candidates in three U.S. presidential elections. *Journal of Purdue Undergraduate Research*, 9, 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.5703/1288284316932>

Keywords

dehumanization, immigrants, refugees, gangs, 2016 presidential election, Donald Trump, family separation

INTRODUCTION

Presidential campaigns can be very telling of majority ideologies, and the rhetoric used during campaign speeches can be important for priming citizens to support or reject certain policies before the candidate takes office. Throughout the 2016 presidential campaign, people raised concerns that Donald Trump was engaging in dehumanizing language and fear-mongering tactics (Kteily & Bruneau, 2017a). Though disturbing to many, it did not seem to shake his base (Kteily & Bruneau, 2017a). But how did his use of dehumanizing rhetoric compare to other candidates in recent elections?

Before discussing Donald Trump's language, it is important to understand dehumanization and its consequences. Dehumanization is the likening of a group or an individual to something that is other than human. Throughout the course of history, it has been closely connected to discrimination, oppression, violence, and genocide (Goff, Eberhardt, Williams, & Jackson, 2008; Kelman, 1973; Haslam, 2006; Kteily & Bruneau, 2017a; Bruneau & Kteily, 2017). Dehumanization promotes a them-versus-us attitude that creates intentional separation between groups of people, closely tied to colonialism and imperialism (Bonds, 2009). Though subtle dehumanization can sometimes be subconscious, blatant dehumanization has been found to be a motivated phenomenon that leads to aggression and the shedding of moral convictions (Haslam, 2006).

Dehumanizing language is closely connected to societal factors taking place, such as political climate or economic stability (Haslam, 2006). Dehumanization has been shown to increase during times of economic crisis (Geschiera, as cited in Weiner, 2012). It is a precondition of violence, serving as a predictor and as a primer, warming people up to the idea of oppressing another group (Haslam, 2006). It is a consequence of and a justification for violence (Haslam, 2006).

Rhetoric promoting dehumanization can be observed in countless intergroup atrocities across time, ranging from discrimination to genocide. The Holocaust is a clear hallmark of dehumanization. Jews and other targeted groups were blatantly dehumanized by being called savages, vermin, and many other animal-based names (Smith, 2011). A study reviewing firsthand accounts of Holocaust survivors shows that they were dehumanized through physical abuse, insults, the denial of emotions, the denial of food and hygiene, animalistic

physical conditions, and constant observation (Luna, 2018). Luna's study also established a category called "cultural dehumanization" in which dehumanization permeates a culture so deeply that it becomes a way of "seeing, sensing, experiencing, and behaving" (Luna, 2018). This was a key factor in the perpetration of mass atrocities against Jews and other targeted groups (Luna, 2018) and shows the potential magnitude and consequences of dehumanizing rhetoric.

Slavery in the United States was also enabled by dehumanization. Not only were slaves called animal names and confined to animal-like conditions, but they were also stripped of their families, their pasts, and their futures (Smith, 2011). They experienced inhuman working conditions with no opportunity for recourse as well as rampant sexual abuse and exploitation (Foster, 2011). Attempts to strip them of their languages and cultures were forms of blatant dehumanization, as these are uniquely human aspects of life (Mitchell, 2008). Frederick Douglass wrote about his experiences being psychologically conditioned and repeatedly beaten at the hands of his oppressors, saying that he experienced "beast-like" conditions (Douglass, 1818–1895). Slavery also resulted in one of the more obvious and blatantly dehumanizing laws in the history of the United States—the Three-Fifths Compromise, which counted these individuals as less than fully human.

Dehumanization is both a precondition and a long-lasting effect of slavery. These long-lasting effects have echoed loudly throughout American history, from segregation to Jim Crow, and are present today. African Americans are compared to apes, denied housing, and murdered for their race, all dehumanizing acts. They are often ignored in health care settings or denied equal access health care, a sign of dehumanization (Ross, Lypson, & Kumagai, 2012). This has resulted in generational, chronic, and deadly health conditions such as disproportionately high rates of infant and maternal mortality (Villarosa, 2018). Furthermore, studies have shown that people who have dehumanizing attitudes toward Black Americans are more likely to support harsh criminal justice measures that disproportionately affect Black people, such as the Three Strikes Law and inequitably high prison sentences for crack cocaine use (Jardina & Piston, as cited in Kteily & Bruneau, 2017b). Racism and dehumanization are inextricably linked and persist in White American culture today. Dehumanization has always been a way to gain and maintain supremacy (Bar-Tal, as cited in Haslam, 2006).

Many other groups throughout the course of history have experienced dehumanization. Native Americans faced extreme dehumanization through colonization, mass atrocities, relocation, and forced assimilation (Smith, 2011). The Roma experienced verbal animalistic degradation as well as educational and housing discrimination and were labeled as subhuman (Smith, 2011). Labeling the Tutsis as "vermin" created the environment for mass extermination (Smith, 2011). A study of Iraqis and peace workers during the Iraq War showed that Iraqis were dehumanized by the American government and media, which helped enable the war to continue (Bonds, 2009). This study reports that referring to Iraqis as "casualties" rather than individuals and as "enemy combatants" and "religious zealots" made it possible for Americans to "only imaginatively" view the Iraqis as "sentient beings" (Bonds, 2009).

Clearly, dehumanization has played a major role in atrocities of the past. However, it is still very present today and is far from rare or inconsequential (Kteily & Bruneau, 2017b). One of the most foundational studies in dehumanization theory is the Ascent of Man study by Kteily, Bruneau, Waytz, and Cotterill (2015). Participants rated various groups on a scale of how evolved they perceive the groups to be (see Figure 1). This study discovered that blatant dehumanization is associated with more support for an oppressive hierarchy and aggressive actions as well as showing that those with authoritarian attitudes are more likely to participate in blatant dehumanization (Kteily et al., 2015). Interestingly, the study also found that having a dehumanizing attitude toward one group is predictive of having the same attitude toward other groups and that these attitudes get stronger after instances of intergroup violence (Kteily et al., 2015).

Figure 1. The ascent measure of blatant dehumanization. Responses were made for each target group using the sliders next to the groups. Target group order was randomized across participants. The Ascent of Man study measure. Source: Kteily, Bruneau, Waytz, and Cotterill (2015).

The Ascent of Man study has been adapted and used in many other studies with important results. Kteily and Bruneau (2017a) used the Ascent of Man scale to test present attitudes in the United States toward Muslims and Mexican immigrants. They also used a feelings thermometer. The authors found that Americans rated Muslims 50 points below the thermometer's maximum and 30 points below the maximum on the Ascent of Man scale (Kteily & Bruneau, 2017a). For Mexican immigrants, Americans rated them an average of 40 points below the thermometer's maximum and 25 points below the Ascent of Man maximum (Kteily & Bruneau, 2017a). The study shows that majority Americans view these two groups with blatant dehumanization, which is linked to more support for aggressive, violent, and oppressive policies. It is likely that blatant dehumanization has created space for policies such as the Muslim ban and immigrant family separation to find enough support to be put into action.

One important thing that this study shows is that people do not actually need to dislike or feel hostile toward the person or group they are dehumanizing (Crawford, Modri, & Motyl, 2013). Bruneau, Jacoby, Kteily, and Saxe (2018) created a study in which they had different slides for (de)humanization, (dis)similarity, (homo)heterogeneity, and (dis)like. The tops of the slides were labeled with various groups (Muslims, Americans, etc.), while the bottoms had a scale from low to high (Bruneau et al., 2018). The slides quickly flashed in front of participants, who rated the groups using the scale. The researchers watched how participants rated different groups while also simultaneously using neuroimaging to see what was happening to their brains (Bruneau et al., 2018). The study found that blatant discrimination affected the brain quite differently than the other ratings, even when participants were rating the same groups. The study also found that both the left inferior parietal cortex and the left inferior frontal cortex were particularly affected by dehumanizing thoughts, making dehumanizing thoughts distinct from thoughts of dislike, dissimilarity, or heterogeneity (Bruneau et al., 2018).

Dehumanization has two categories based on distinct aspects of being human. The first is human uniqueness, which focuses on aspects of humanness that separate people from animals. The second is human nature, which focuses on aspects of humanness that are core to being human but may not necessarily distinguish humans from certain animals. Aspects of human uniqueness include moral sensibility, logic, and civility, while aspects of human nature include agency, depth, and emotional

responsiveness (Haslam, 2006). Dehumanizing rhetoric usually is a negation of one or more of these qualities—for example, calling someone an animal denies their human uniqueness, which is called animalistic dehumanization (Haslam, 2006). Denying someone emotional depth separates them from human nature, which is called mechanistic dehumanization (Haslam, 2006). Interestingly, much of the rhetoric that is considered exclusively fear-mongering actually falls into the category of dehumanization through the denial of human uniqueness. Focusing on danger and criminality of certain groups, as was common in rhetoric during the 2016 election about Muslims and immigrants, is a form of dehumanization.

A key to resolving the inevitable empathetic dissonance that comes with oppressive dehumanization is taking away the out-group's feelings and emotions (Bandura, as cited in Haslam, 2006). If a group is able to strip others of their hopes, fears, joy, and pain, it is much easier to be aggressive toward them and to get others to come on board and support the aggression (Kelman, 1973). Dehumanization also generally goes a step further and uses rhetoric that replaces the out-group's emotions with a void of prosocial values and an excess of violence and criminality (Struch & Schwartz, as cited in Haslam, 2006; Jahoda, as cited in Haslam, 2006). Painting others as savage, criminal, and primitive is key in conquering other groups. Just like colonization, dehumanization creates the notion that it is not only morally justifiable for the in-group to be aggressors toward the out-group, it is also their moral responsibility.

Nationalism, racism, and dehumanization are closely connected (Brubaker, 2009; Huggan, as cited in Weiner, 2012; Mignolo, 2002; Mosse, 1995). What is particularly insidious about blatant dehumanization in particular is that it is more likely that those pushing the rhetoric are cognizant of what they are doing. It is a mechanism for moving forward with oppressive policies. It is neither an accident nor subconscious but instead is an active decision with long-lasting, widespread consequences. One such consequence is the effect of the rhetoric on the out-group. People know when they are being dehumanized, which is demoralizing. It creates a great deal of negativity toward the in-group. Dehumanization is bidirectional; those who are the victims of it are also more likely to respond to the in-group with dehumanization, which also leads to more aggression and conflict (Bradner, 2016). Though many who spout such rhetoric try to justify it by saying they are promoting policies that make Americans safer,

Dehumanization

A motivated pre-condition and consequence of violence

Figure 2. Further examples, explanations, and outcomes of dehumanization.

this bidirectionality proves that false. It in fact fosters more retaliatory aggression back toward the in-group, so this excuse for dehumanization is not backed by reality (Bradner, 2016).

Citizenship has been a factor frequently exploited by dehumanizing rhetoric. The likelihood of in-groups

targeting noncitizens increases during times of economic distress or hardship (Geschiere, as cited in Weiner, 2012). Noncitizens are a particularly easy group to target because it is not possible to be legally both a citizen and not a citizen, making it far easier for in-groups to define the bounds, creating a wall between those who belong and those who do

not (Bar-Tal, as cited in Haslam, 2006). Citizenship dehumanization is closely tied to nationalism, racism, and state control (Seymour, Coture, & Nielsen, as cited in Weiner, 2012; Bonilla-Silva, 2007; Goldberg, as cited in Weiner, 2012). One recent example of this from the United States is SB 1070, an Arizona law sanctioning police to investigate the immigration status of anyone arrested or detained whom they suspect to be undocumented (ACLU, 2012). This continues to be highly contested, as it promotes racism and the criminalization of immigrants, a subset of dehumanization. The dehumanizing rhetoric surrounding citizenship and immigration tends to include words such as “invasion,” “infestation,” “flooding,” and “overrun.” The rhetoric frames immigrants as a danger and a security threat, bringing crime and violence into the country. This language promotes fear in the in-group and encourages them to cling to their perceived supremacy and control (Bar-Tal, as cited in Haslam, 2006) by rejecting immigrants and promoting aggressive anti-immigrant behavior (Kteily et al., 2015).

Regardless of the specific dehumanizing tactic used to “other” immigrants, any form of dehumanization excludes immigrants from full social, political, and civic involvement (Calhoun, as cited in Weiner, 2012; Geertz, as cited in Weiner, 2012). Equal power and access are necessary for full participation in civic and social life (van den Berghe, as cited in Weiner, 2012; Smootha, 2002). There are significant barriers to full participation for immigrants in the United States, particularly for those who are undocumented. Even for the highly educated, there are barriers to getting jobs, as the othering of immigrants has contributed to the devaluing of overseas education (Rios, 2016). There are impediments to housing through barriers to public housing, difficulty getting loans, or racism barring people from living in certain housing units or neighborhoods (Madrighal, 2014). Access to education, social welfare, and health care are all particularly difficult or impossible for undocumented immigrants to access, depending on the location (Weiner, 2012). It has been shown that conforming to the majority brings more access to these opportunities (Essed & Trienekens, as cited in Weiner, 2012; Stewart & Dixon, 2010). Assimilation is often a rallying cry among some political leaders and was very common during the Trump campaign. During a speech in August 2016 Trump said, “Assimilation is not an act of hostility, but an expression of compassion” (Trump, 2016). However, requiring people to conform and assimilate is a subset of dehumanization because of its denial of culture.

In the context of the 2016 presidential election, Mexican immigrants reported that they felt dehumanized by majority Americans and the Republican Party but felt particularly dehumanized by Donald Trump (Kteily & Bruneau, 2017a). Given this feeling, it is important to examine whether Trump was actually distinctive in using dehumanizing rhetoric or if there is another underlying reason why Mexican immigrants felt particularly othered by him. See Figure 2 for further examples, explanations, and outcomes of dehumanization.

METHODS

This essay looks into the question of whether Trump participates in dehumanizing rhetoric significantly more than other candidates across time. It also looks at which types of dehumanization are utilized and which groups are targeted. The essay uses qualitative content analysis of speeches delivered on the campaign trail by all of the presidential candidates from the 2008, 2012, and 2016 elections. All speeches were found on the American Presidency Project website, which is a leading archival resource run out of the University of California, Santa Barbara (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/index.php>). This website primarily contains scripts for speeches, not the transcripts of what was actually said, though it does have direct transcripts available for some speeches. Because Donald Trump has been known to go off script more than other candidates (Harrington, 2018; Kosoff, 2017), his speeches were analyzed by comparing the scripts found on the American Presidency Project to full recordings found on YouTube, and variations were noted. For speeches by all other candidates, only the scripts were analyzed. The following words were searched for: immigrant, migrant, Dreamer, alien, gang, cartel, refugee, asylee, and asylum seeker. Each mention of these words was counted. If a sentence used a pronoun to refer to these topics, it too was counted. Compound sentences containing distinct thoughts about these topics were counted separately for each thought.

When I came across each mention of these words, I asked two questions: (1) Does this sentence use language primarily associated with humans or with objects and/or animals? (2) If so, under which category of dehumanization does it fall? If sentences used words or phrases that are commonly used to describe nonhuman entities (example: “pouring” and “flooding” generally refer to water, not people), then that mention was counted as dehumanizing, and the sentence or phrase was separately noted. If a sentence focused on criminality, danger, or fear, it was counted and noted as well.

2008		
Candidate	Total Number of Speeches	Total Uses of Dehumanizing Language
Joseph Biden	12	0
Hillary Clinton	107	1
Christopher Dodd	3	0
John Edwards	28	0
Rudy Giuliani	38	0
Mike Huckabee	15	1
John McCain	174	0
Barack Obama	227	4
Bill Richardson	31	8
Mitt Romney	34	0
Fred Thompson	16	1

2012		
Candidate	Total Number of Speeches	Total Uses of Dehumanizing Language
Michele Bachmann	8	0
Herman Cain	3	0
Newt Gingrich	16	0
Jon Huntsman	6	0
Barack Obama	103	0
Ron Paul	11	0
Tim Pawlenty	3	0
Rick Perry	11	0
Mitt Romney	100	2
Rick Santorum	17	0

RESULTS

Table 1 shows how many times the candidates in the 2008, 2012, and 2016 elections used dehumanizing language surrounding immigrants/aliens, migrants, refugees, gangs, cartels, and asylum seekers. It also includes a count of how many campaign speeches they delivered for context on the frequency of dehumanizing language.

To help make sense of this data, Table 2 lists each candidate who engaged in dehumanizing rhetoric and puts the frequency in the context of the number of speeches given. (Total number of mentions/ Total number of speeches, rounded to the nearest hundredth). Table 3 breaks down each mention to show trends in which groups are dehumanized more than others. Immigrants and refugees are more frequently dehumanized than the other groups observed.

I also looked at Trump's rates of ad-libbed dehumanizing comments. I wanted to investigate how many of his comments were planned and put on the teleprompter versus how many he said in the moment. Table 4 shows a breakdown of how many ad-libbed dehumanizing comments he made about each observed group. As the table shows, his ad-libbed comments primarily center around immigrants and refugees, but the vast majority of his dehumanizing comments were indeed scripted.

2016		
Candidate	Total Number of Speeches	Total Uses of Dehumanizing Language
Jeb Bush	6	0
Ben Carson	2	0
Lincoln Chafee	3	0
Chris Christie	2	0
Hillary Clinton	90	1
Ted Cruz	6	1
Carly Fiorina	1	0
Lindsey Graham	3	2
Mike Huckabee	1	0
Bobby Jindal	1	1
John Kasich	2	1
Martin O'Malley	12	0
Rand Paul	2	0
George Pataki	1	0
Rick Perry	5	0
Marco Rubio	4	0
Bernie Sanders	61	1
Rick Santorum	3	4
Donald Trump	74	464
Scott Walker	3	0
Jim Webb	1	0

Table 1. Total use of dehumanizing language from each presidential candidate.

Candidate	Frequency
Clinton (2008)	0.01
Clinton (2016)	0.01
Obama (2008)	0.02
Romney (2012)	0.02
Sanders (2012)	0.02
Thompson (2008)	0.06
Huckabee (2008)	0.07
Cruz (2016)	0.17
Richardson (2008)	0.26
Kasich (2016)	0.50
Graham (2016)	0.67
Jindal (2016)	1.00
Santorum (2016)	1.33
Trump (2016)	6.27

Table 2. Frequency of mentions (mentions over total number of speeches), lowest to highest.

DISCUSSION

Clearly, Trump is distinctive in his frequency of dehumanizing language. He far surpasses all other candidates in the past three elections. This study builds on past research reporting that immigrants felt particularly dehumanized by Trump by quantitatively supporting that feeling. Immigrants are right to feel singled out and dehumanized by Trump compared to all other candidates in either party in the past three election cycles.

It is also important to take a look at how Trump frames each of the observed groups in his speeches (Table 5). (1) He discusses immigrants primarily through the lens of danger and violence, employing animalistic dehumanization. (2) He frames refugees as a threat and describes them using language primarily associated with nonhuman entities, such as describing their migration as “pouring,” “flowing,” and “infiltrating.” (3) He describes gangs and cartels using a fear-based model but also lumps them together with drugs and crime, which results in inert verb usage similar to that for refugees. (4) Though he rarely mentions asylum seekers, he focuses on fear and danger, once again using animalistic

Candidate	Year	Total Dehumanizing Mentions	Immigrant ^b	Dreamer	Gang	Cartel	Refugee	Asylee ^c
Clinton	2008	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Clinton	2016	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Cruz	2016	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Graham	2016	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Huckabee	2008	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Jindal	2016	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Kasich	2016	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Obama	2008	4	0	0	1	1	2	0
Richardson	2008	8	1	0	0	0	7	0
Romney	2012	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Sanders	2016	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Santorum	2016	4	4	0	0	0	0	0
Thompson	2008	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Trump	2016	464	267	0	47	20	142	6

^aThese counts include all mentions of the word, including multiple mentions in a single sentence, and all pronouns referring to that word.

^bThis category includes related words such as migrant and alien.

^cThis category includes related words such as asylum seeker and asylum.

Table 3. Dehumanizing language by group^a.

dehumanization. Included in Table 5 are examples of quotes representative of his rhetoric around each group. Ad-libbed quotes are noted as such.

There were two additional quotes that are important to highlight in this discussion.

1. “When Mexico sends its people, they’re not sending their best. They’re not sending you. They’re not sending you. They’re sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists. And some, I assume, are good people.”

Trump’s othering of Mexican immigrants is clear. He points to audience members and differentiates them from immigrants, creating an early divide between his camp and the immigrant others. Trump’s rhetoric also contains his common framing of immigrants as insatiable, dangerous criminals. Finally, he attempts to duck blame for his generalizations by qualifying that some immigrants are probably good people, but this was not the part of the quote most focused on upon reception.

2. “You look at these thugs, these animals—nobody had guns on the other side. It would have been a different story.”

Trump often discussed the role of immigrants and their children in mass violence, such as the San Bernadino and Orlando shootings. This quote is particularly interesting because it provides a crossover between the issues of immigration and gun control, and he spins both into one issue to gain more support from his base. It is important to note that he uses the most blatant form of dehumanization here, directly equating immigrants to animals. The separation of families in Trump’s zero-tolerance policy toward people who crossed the border is very reminiscent of other periods of dehumanization throughout history. Though Secretary of Homeland Security Kirstjen Nielsen says that this family separation is no different than the separation that occurs every time an American citizen commits a crime and goes to jail, this is not actually the case. In most cases in which a family member goes to jail, the remaining family members get to stay together and continue living where they had been living, at least for a while. The separation implemented by this administration is far more reminiscent of separation through slavery and concentration camps than that of a family member spending time in prison.

Immigrant ^a	22
Dreamer	0
Gang	6
Cartel	1
Refugee	29
Asylee ^b	0

^aThis category includes related words such as migrant and alien.

^bThis category includes related words such as asylum seeker and asylum.

Table 4. Trump’s ad-libbed dehumanizing comments by group

It is feasible that Trump’s use of dehumanization while on the campaign trail led to the separation policy. He prompted audiences to associate criminality with immigrants, which would likely make people much more willing to think they belong in detention. He also spent the campaign building fear around the children of immigrants, which he almost exclusively mentioned through the lens of mass violence. This would also likely have made the children of immigrants less sympathetic to his base.

Though this essay contributes to the discourse around dehumanization by political leaders, it has multiple limitations. First, without using a computer-based counter such as NVivo, the author’s judgments about whether to count a sentence as dehumanization may have fallen to inconsistency or bias at times. However, choosing to hand-count rather than using an electronic system was essential to catch pronouns, euphemisms, and ad-libbed comments. Additionally, a major limit to these kinds of studies is the issue of causation and intent. It is impossible to know which comments were intended to dehumanize out-groups and for what purpose. Finally, this study did not look at the dehumanization of Muslims. Dehumanization of Muslims was widespread even among otherwise neutral candidates in their speeches. It is essential for a study to be conducted of how Muslims are discussed by candidates, presidents, and other government representatives.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated reports that Mexican immigrants felt particularly dehumanized by Donald Trump by comparing dehumanizing comments toward immigrants, refugees, gangs, and asylum seekers spoken by all presidential candidates during the 2008, 2012, and 2016 elections. The findings

Immigrants	Refugees	Gangs/Cartels	Asylum Seekers
<p>Criminality: Trump focuses on crimes by immigrants, repeating stories of a few murders and rapes. He says that immigration will cost Americans their lives.</p> <p>Example: <i>"As secretary of state, Hillary Clinton allowed thousands of criminal aliens to be released because their home countries would not take them back. They were too evil. They were too evil drug lords, heads of gangs. I mean these people were evil."</i> (partially ad-libbed)</p> <p>Danger: He frames immigrants as a threat to the lives of Americans and American culture. He discusses other countries that have accepted large numbers of immigrants, saying that the countries have lost their culture.</p> <p>Example: <i>"We will terminate the Obama administration's deadly, and it is deadly, non-enforcement policies that allow thousands of criminal aliens to freely roam our streets, walk around, do whatever they want to do, crime all over the place."</i> (partially ad-libbed)</p> <p>Values: He frequently repeats that immigrants don't share American values.</p> <p>Example: <i>"They don't have our values."</i> (ad-libbed)</p>	<p>Numbers: Trump focuses heavily on the numbers of refugees coming into the country, implying or stating that the country is becoming overrun with thousands of refugees.</p> <p>Example: <i>"Thousands of refugees are being admitted, with no way to screen them, and are instantly made eligible for welfare and free healthcare – even as our own Veterans die waiting for the medical care they need."</i></p> <p>Crises: Trump frames the "refugee crisis" as a crisis created by refugees.</p> <p>Example: <i>(Discussing Syrian refugees): "And you know what a disaster this massive immigration has been to Germany and the people of Germany. Crime has risen to levels that no one thought they would ever, ever see. It is a catastrophe. We have enough problems in our country. We don't need more."</i></p> <p>Terror: He often says that ISIS is infiltrating refugee intake. He says that accepting Syrian refugees will be the next "Trojan Horse."</p> <p>Example: <i>"We know that ISIS is trying to infiltrate refugee flows. No question about it – there's proof."</i> (partially ad-libbed)</p>	<p>Death: Trump focuses heavily on deaths caused by gangs and cartels, though he never discusses any specific instances. He promotes the idea that without a wall, gangs and cartels from Mexico are and will be rampantly killing people in the United States.</p> <p>Example: <i>"Our open border has allowed drugs and crime and gangs to pour into our communities. So much needless suffering, so much preventable death."</i></p> <p>Drugs: He often blames the opioid crisis solely on Mexican gangs and cartels, a point he pushes especially hard when traveling to the states that have been the most hard hit by drugs.</p> <p>Example: <i>"This will keep out the violent cartels and gangs, as well as their drugs that are poisoning our youth."</i></p> <p>Sanctuary Cities: He uses the conversation about gangs and cartels to justify shutting down sanctuary cities and blocking funding.</p> <p>Example: <i>"Americans whose loved ones were killed by the open borders and Sanctuary Cities that Hillary Clinton supports."</i></p>	<p>Danger: Though he rarely mentions asylum, he frames it almost exclusively from the point of view that asylum has introduced danger into the states. He does this by referencing the Boston bombers, who were on asylum. He almost never mentions asylum without mentioning the Boston bombers.</p> <p>Examples: <i>"Or look at cases like the Boston bombers, here an asylum, or the San Bernadino Shooter, here on a fiance visa from Saudi Arabia."</i></p> <p><i>"The Boston bombers – remember those horrible, disgusting people? The Boston bombers arrived through the political asylum process."</i> (partially ad-libbed)</p>

Table 5. Trump's framing of the observed groups.

revealed that Trump was quite distinctive in his use of dehumanization. All other candidates ranged from 0 to 8 dehumanizing comments over the total election cycle, while Trump had 464. This is important to note, as dehumanization leads to aggression toward out-groups and is used as justification for violence. We see this playing out in real time through the separation and detention of immigrant families at the border, which continues to be an issue as the government struggles to reunite families.

Future research is needed to continue tracking the use of dehumanizing rhetoric of any out-group by political leaders and the public. Dehumanization toward one group is predictive of the dehumanization of other marginalized groups, and we must be vigilant about this issue. Dehumanization is accompanied by danger and violence, and ending it is imperative before it becomes a culturally ingrained attitude toward a group.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to extend her gratitude to Dr. James McCann, the Department of Political Science, and the College of Liberal Arts for their support of this research as well as Brittany Mihalec-Adkins and Dr. Sharon Christ for their continued mentorship.

REFERENCES

- ACLU. (2012). Arizona's SB 1070. *American Civil Liberties Union*. Retrieved from <https://www.aclu.org/issues/immigrants-rights/state-and-local-immigration-laws/arizonas-sb-1070>
- Bonds, E. (2009). Strategic role taking and political struggle: Bearing witness to the Iraq War. *Symbolic Interaction*, 32(1), 1–20.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2007). "This is a White country": The racial ideology of the Western nations of the world-system. *Sociological Inquiry*, 70(2), 188–214.
- Bradner, E. (2016). Obama: Trump "is ultimately helping do ISIL's work for us." *CNN Politics*. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.com/2016/07/24/politics/obama-trump-nato-isis/index.html>
- Brubaker, R. (2009). Ethnicity, race and nationalism. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35, 21–42.
- Bruneau, E., Jacoby, N., Kteily, N., & Saxe, R. (2018). Denying humanity: The distinct neural correlates of blatant dehumanization. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 147(7), 1078–1093.
- Bruneau, E., & Kteily, N. (2017). The enemy as animal: Symmetric dehumanization during asymmetric warfare. *PLoS ONE*, 12(7), 1–20.
- Crawford, J. T., Modri, S. A., & Motyl, M. (2013). Bleeding-heart liberals and hard-hearted conservatives: Subtle political dehumanization through differential attributions of human nature and human uniqueness. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 1(1), 86–104.
- Douglass, F. (1818–1895). Narrative of the life of Frederick Douglass, an American slave. Public domain.
- Foster, T. A. (2011). The sexual abuse of Black men under American slavery. *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 20(3), 445–464.
- Goff, P. A., Eberhardt, J. L., Williams, M. J., & Jackson, M. C. (2008). Not yet human: Implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 292–306. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.2.292
- Harrington, R. (2018, April 28). Trump goes off-script at wild rally in Michigan, while the press party at the White House Correspondent's Dinner in DC. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <https://www.businessinsider.com/trump-rally-white-house-correspondents-dinner-2018-4>
- Haslam, N. (2006). Dehumanization: An integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(3), 252–264.
- Kelman, H. C. (1973). Violence without restraint: Reflections on the dehumanization of victims and victimizers. *Journal of Social Issues*, 29(4), 25–61.
- Kosoff, M. (2017, August 22). Trump goes off-script in hour-long public meltdown. *Vanity Fair*. Retrieved from <https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2017/08/trump-goes-off-script-in-hour-long-public-meltdown>
- Kteily, N., & Bruneau, E. (2017a). Backlash: The politics and real-world consequences of minority group dehumanization. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(1), 87–104.
- Kteily, N. S., & Bruneau, E. (2017b). Darker demons of our nature: The need to (re)focus attention on blatant forms of dehumanization. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26(6), 487–494.
- Kteily, N., Bruneau, E., Waytz, A., & Cotterill, S. (2015). The ascent of man: Theoretical and empirical evidence for blatant dehumanization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109(5), 901–931.
- Luna, A. M. (2018). Cultural dehumanization in Holocaust testimonials. *American Psychological Association*, 24(2), 250–254.
- Madrigal, A. (2014, May 22). The racist housing policy that made your neighborhood. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2014/05/the-racist-housing-policy-that-made-your-neighborhood/371439/>
- Mignolo, W. D. (2002). The geopolitics of knowledge and the colonial difference. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 101(1), 57–96.
- Mitchell, A. B. (2008). Self-emancipation and slavery: An examination of the African American's quest for literacy and freedom. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 2(5), 78–98.
- Mosse, G. L. (1995). Racism and nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism*, 1(2), 163–173.
- Rios, S. (2016, September 30). For doctors trained abroad, challenges to practicing medicine often insurmountable. *WBUR*. Retrieved from <http://www.wbur.org/common-health/2016/09/30/foreign-trained-doctors-challenges>
- Ross, P. T., Lypson, M. L., & Kumagai, A. K. (2012). Using illness narratives to explore African American perspectives of racial discrimination in health care. *Journal of Black Studies*, 43(5), 520–544.
- Smith D. L. (2011). *Less than human: Why we demean, enslave, and exterminate others*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Smith, G. (2007). The ethnic democracy thesis and the citizenship question in Estonia and Latvia. *Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, 24(2), 199–216.
- Smootha, S. (2002). The model of ethnic democracy: Israel as a Jewish and democratic state. *Nations and Nationalism*, 8, 475–503.
- Stewart, Q. T., & Dixon, J. C. (2010). Is it race, immigrant status, or both? An analysis of wage disparities among men in the United States. *International Migration Review*, 44(1), 173–201.
- Trump, D. (2016). "Remarks at Youngstown State University in Youngstown, Ohio." *The American Presidency Project*, August 15.
- Villarosa, L. (2018, April 11). Why America's Black mothers and babies are in a life-or-death crisis. *New York Times Magazine*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/11/magazine/black-mothers-babies-death-maternal-mortality.html>
- Weiner, M. F. (2012). Towards a critical global race theory. *Sociology Compass*, 6(4), 332–350.