



PROFANITY, ULTIMATUMS, AND IDEOLOGY: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE PERSPECTIVE ON TRUMP'S TRUTH SOCIAL POSTS CENTERED AROUND IRAN'S WAR WITH US-ISRAEL ALLIANCE

Qandeel Rana

ADP English Language and Literature Student, Govt. Associate College for Women Nawan
Jandanwala, Bhakar, Punjab, Pakistan

raoahsham973@gmail.com

Hafsa Bibi (Corresponding Author)

M.Phil Applied Linguistics, Department of Applied Linguistics, G C University Faisalabad,
Punjab, Pakistan

muhammadkhn5505@gmail.com

Iqra Hussain

Principal, Government Associate College for Women, Nawan Jandanwala, Bhakkar, Punjab,
Pakistan

ABSTRACT

The increasing use of social media by political leaders has transformed digital platforms into influential spaces for constructing political authority, ideological narratives, and international conflict. This study examines how profanity, ultimatum expressions, and ideological positioning are discursively constructed in Donald Trump's Truth Social posts related to the US–Iran conflict. Guided by Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis and Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory, the study employs a qualitative approach to analyze selected Truth Social posts. The findings reveal that profanity functions as a strategy for delegitimizing political opponents and reinforcing authority, while ultimatum expressions operate as mechanisms of coercive political communication through conditional demands and explicit consequences. These linguistic strategies collectively contribute to the construction and legitimation of hegemonic geopolitical authority by portraying military superiority, strategic control, and political dominance as justified and necessary. Unlike previous studies that have examined these linguistic features separately, this study demonstrates that profanity, ultimatum expressions, and ideological positioning operate as interconnected discursive strategies through which geopolitical authority is constructed and legitimized. By integrating Critical Discourse Analysis with Politeness Theory, the study offers a comprehensive framework for understanding how digital political discourse constructs power, legitimizes coercion, and shapes geopolitical realities in contemporary international conflict.

Keywords: Donald Trump; Truth Social; Critical Discourse Analysis; Politeness Theory; Profanity; Ultimatum Expressions; Ideology; Digital Political Discourse; US–Iran Conflict.

Introduction

1.1 Background of the study

The quick development of digital media has drastically changed political communication, with social media emerging as a key medium for spreading political knowledge, influencing public opinion, and encouraging civic engagement. Digital platforms, in contrast to traditional media, allow citizens and political leaders to engage directly and in real time, increasing the speed and participation of political communication. According to Stieglitz and Dang-Xuan (2013), social media greatly affects public discourse and makes it easier for political information to spread quickly. In a similar vein, Gilardi et al. (2022) point out that by encouraging ongoing communication between political players, the media, and the general public, digital platforms help shape political agendas. Social media has increased chances for political engagement beyond information exchange by offering easily accessible and affordable communication channels. Digital platforms boost political competition by increasing candidates' visibility and communication with voters, according to research by



Petrova, Sen, and Yildirim (2021). Similarly, Gil de Zúñiga, Molyneux, and Zheng (2014) show that greater civic engagement both online and offline is encouraged by online political expression. Additionally, Villaplana and Fitzpatrick (2024) stress that strategic digital communication and an active online presence are now crucial traits of modern political leadership. Therefore, studying political communication on social media provides important information about how digital platforms influence public opinion and political narratives during times of international crisis and political conflict.

1.2 Donald Trump's Use Of Truth Social

Donald J. Trump made Truth Social his main political communication platform after being banned from major social media sites following the Capitol events in January 2021. The platform, which was created by Trump Media & Technology Group (TMTG) and introduced in 2022, was intended to offer a different venue for political expression with fewer limitations on content moderation than traditional social media. Since its inception, Truth Social has emerged as Trump's primary platform for disseminating political statements, campaign messages, policy stances, and reactions to both domestic and global events. In contrast to traditional media, the platform facilitates direct communication with supporters without the need for editorial intervention, which speeds up the dissemination of political messages and supports a customized leadership style. Truth Social serves as a platform for communication as well as a place where political identities, ideological stances, and public narratives are deliberately created, according to Polak (2024). Truth Social is the main source of data for this study because of its crucial role in Trump's political communications. Using the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis, the platform offers real language data for analyzing how Trump uses profanity, ultimatum statements, and ideological representations in his speech on the 2026 US-Iran conflict.

1.3 Background Of US-Iran Conflict

Decades of political mistrust, divergent ideologies, and conflicting strategic interests are the main causes of the US-Iranian conflict. The establishment of the Islamic Republic and the ensuing US Embassy hostage crisis marked a turning point that ended bilateral cooperation and started a protracted period of political hostility, even though the two nations had close diplomatic ties prior to the 1979 Iranian Revolution (Hussain, 2015). Since then, the relationship has remained one of the most persistent geopolitical rivalries in the Middle East due to regional influence, national security, and competing foreign policy goals (Valizada, 2026). This conflict has been significantly shaped by Iran's nuclear program. The United States and its allies have voiced concerns about the possible development of nuclear weapons, despite Iran's constant insistence that its nuclear activities are meant for peaceful purposes. Due to these worries, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) was signed in 2015 after protracted diplomatic talks and economic sanctions. However, political tensions and confrontation between the two states increased dramatically after the US withdrew from the agreement in 2018 and implemented the "maximum pressure" policy (Hussain, 2015; Valizada, 2026). The crucial political background for comprehending current US-Iran relations is provided by this historical rivalry. It also provides the framework for analyzing how political leaders use language to represent opponents, create conflict, and express their ideologies. In light of this, the current study examines how language choices affect the formation of power, ideology, and political narratives by analyzing Donald Trump's remarks regarding the US-Iran conflict in 2026.

1.4 Key Concepts



1.4.1. Profanity

Profanity refers to the deliberate use of offensive or taboo language to express strong emotions or intensify a message. In political discourse, it functions as a rhetorical strategy to attack opponents, reinforce hostility, and shape public perception.

1.4.2. Ultimatums

Ultimatums are statements that impose demands accompanied by consequences for non-compliance. They are significant in political discourse because they communicate authority, pressure, and power in political interactions. Ideology is a system of beliefs and values that shapes how political realities are interpreted and represented. It influences the construction of identities, national interests, and the distinction between “us” and “them”.

1.4.3. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

CDA examines how language reflects and reproduces power, ideology, and social inequality. It enables researchers to uncover hidden meanings and persuasive strategies within political communication. Political discourse refers to language used by political actors to communicate ideas, justify policies, and influence public opinion. It is central to understanding how political realities and international conflicts are constructed through language.

1.5 Importance Of CDA

A useful method for analyzing how language, power, and ideology interact is critical discourse analysis, or CDA. CDA sees discourse as a social practice that shapes meanings, identities, and power relations rather than as a neutral form of communication (Fairclough, 1995). It makes it possible for scholars to investigate how linguistic decisions both reflect and replicate larger social and political structures. Language is frequently strategically employed in political communication to support policies, create identities, and sway public opinion. By connecting language to its social and political context, CDA aids in exposing the ideological presumptions and power dynamics present in political texts (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). The theoretical framework for analyzing Donald Trump's remarks regarding the US-Iran conflict is provided in this study by CDA. The study uses Fairclough's (1995) three-dimensional model to investigate how ideological representations, ultimatum statements, and profanity serve as discursive strategies to create power, mold perceptions, and support political narratives.

1.6 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to examine how Donald Trump employs language to construct political meanings in his discourse on the US–Iran conflict. Specifically, it investigates the use of profanity, ultimatum expressions, and ideological representations in his Truth Social posts. The study applies Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to examine discourse, power, and ideology, while Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory is used to analyse how profanity and ultimatum expressions function as face-threatening communicative strategies. Ultimately, the study seeks to explain how linguistic choices shape political narratives and influence digital political communication.

1.7 Significance of the study

This research advances our knowledge of how political discourse is used in the digital age to create meaning, ideology, and power. Linguistic decisions are vital in influencing public opinion and framing international conflicts as political communication takes place more and more on social media. This study illustrates how language is strategically employed to represent opponents, defend political stances, and sway public opinion by analyzing Donald Trump's posts regarding the US-Iran conflict. By examining the connection between language, ideology, and power in digital political communication, the study advances Critical Discourse Analysis from a linguistic standpoint. It sheds light on the persuasive and confrontational



nature of political language by concentrating on profanity, ultimatum statements, and ideological representations. The results are anticipated to enhance political discourse research and emphasize the expanding role of social media in shaping political narratives and perceptions of global conflicts.

1.8 Research Questions

1. How is profanity employed in Donald Trump's tweets related to the US–Iran conflict?
2. How are ultimatum expressions constructed linguistically in Trump's tweets?
3. How are ideological positions constructed through Trump's discourse on the US–Iran conflict?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Theoretical Frameworks

Theoretical frameworks provide the conceptual foundation for examining linguistic features and interpreting the underlying meanings embedded in discourse. They guide the analysis by offering systematic approaches for exploring language, power, ideology, and interpersonal communication. Accordingly, this study draws on Norman Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis (1995) and Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory (1987) to support the analytical process.

2.1.1. Norman Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis(CDA)

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) views language as a social practice that shapes and upholds power structures, ideologies, and social realities. Norman Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model (1995), one of the main approaches to CDA, provides a thorough framework for analyzing discourse from linguistic, interpretive, and social viewpoints. The model describes how texts interact with larger social structures and ideological processes rather than treating language as a separate system. Each dimension examines discourse from a distinct perspective while remaining closely connected to the others. Text, discursive practice, and social practice are its three interrelated dimensions illustrated below:

Text: The internal characteristics of a text and the ways in which language creates meaning are the focus of the textual dimension. In order to show how specific linguistic decisions influence messages, it examines components like vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, lexical selection, cohesion, modality, and rhetorical devices. Paying attention to these textual elements makes it easier to spot patterns that convey attitudes, create identities, and affect how discourse is interpreted.

Discursive Practice: The methods by which discourse is created, disseminated, and interpreted in a specific communicative context are the subject of the second dimension. It highlights how audiences' reactions to and interpretations of the text, as well as the circumstances surrounding its creation, all have an impact on meaning. The dynamic relationship between language, communication, and the social contexts in which discourse circulates is highlighted by this dimension.

Social Practice: Discourse is placed within broader political, cultural, historical, and institutional contexts by the social practice dimension. It investigates the ways in which language both reflects and reproduces societal norms, ideological presumptions, and power dynamics. This dimension explains how language contributes to upholding, contesting, or changing prevailing beliefs and systems of authority by tying discourse to larger social structures.

2.1.2. Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory

Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory (1987) explains how individuals use language to manage social relationships while maintaining mutual respect during interaction. The theory



is based on the concept of face, which represents an individual's public self-image and the desire to preserve it in communication. It examines the ways speakers minimize conflict, protect interpersonal relationships, and negotiate social interaction through different linguistic strategies. The framework has been widely applied to the analysis of everyday communication as well as political, institutional, and media discourse. Key components include:

Face: Face is the central concept of the theory and is divided into two complementary aspects: **(i)Positive face:** A person's desire to be respected, valued, and accepted by others is referred to as a positive face. It represents the need for social acceptance and the expectation that one's beliefs, behaviors, and opinions will be positively recognized in social situations. **(ii)Negative face:** The term negative face refers to a person's wish for independence and self-determination from outside influence. It stands for the expectation that people will respect one's autonomy and refrain from limiting one's own decisions or behaviors.

FTAs, or Face-Threatening Acts: The Face-Threatening Act (FTA), which describes any communicative act that has the potential to undermine or harm either the speaker's or the hearer's positive or negative face, is a key idea in the theory. Face-threatening behaviors include requests, criticisms, disagreements, accusations, warnings, and insults because they can cause interpersonal tension or jeopardize social harmony. A face threat's severity is determined by a number of variables, including social distance, relative power, and the gravity of the communication act.

Politeness Strategies: To reduce the potential impact of Face-Threatening Acts, Brown and Levinson propose four politeness strategies: **(i)Bald on-record:** The bald on-record technique entails communicating a point clearly and concisely without making an effort to lessen its impact on the listener. This strategy prioritizes efficiency and clarity ahead of courtesy, especially when prompt communication is deemed more crucial than maintaining face. **(ii)Positive politeness:** By demonstrating friendliness, gratitude, agreement, or solidarity, positive politeness seeks to improve social relationships. By fostering mutual understanding and acceptance, it aims to satisfy the hearer's positive face. **(iii)Negative politeness:** Negative politeness emphasizes minimizing imposition and honoring the hearer's individual autonomy. In order to respect the hearer's freedom of choice, speakers frequently use indirect language, formal expressions, or courteous wording. **(iv)Off-record strategies:** Instead of using direct statements, the off-record approach uses hints, suggestions, recommendations, or implied messages to communicate meaning. By doing this, the speaker can convey an intention without taking full responsibility for how the message is understood.

2.2 Review of Relevant Studies

Social media's explosive growth has significantly changed political communication by allowing political leaders to interact directly with the public without depending on traditional media channels. Social media sites are now crucial venues for forming political narratives, influencing public opinion, and forming ideological identities. The highly personalized, combative, and emotionally charged nature of Donald Trump's online political communication has drawn a lot of scholarly attention. In order to comprehend how language serves as a tool of power, persuasion, and ideological construction in digital political communication, researchers have increasingly studied his online discourse using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and related linguistic approaches. Trump's tweets consistently create ideological meanings by presenting social and political realities through a polarized framework, according to a sizable body of literature. His messages strategically represent political actors, nations, and institutions in ways that support specific ideological positions rather than serving as impulsive personal opinions. Research based on Critical Discourse Analysis shows that his discourse



often supports particular interpretations of both domestic and international affairs, strengthens national identity, and justifies political actions. For example, Nourani et al. (2020) showed that Trump's tweets about the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), which portrayed Iran as a persistent security threat and the agreement as fundamentally dangerous, legitimized the United States' withdrawal from the nuclear agreement. The tweets promoted public acceptance of a specific ideological narrative while simultaneously justifying foreign policy decisions through moral evaluation and discursive legitimization techniques.

Likewise, Ahmad et al. (2025) discovered that Trump's rhetoric on the Iran-Israel conflict consistently portrayed Iran as an aggressive and destabilizing actor while presenting the US as a rightful protector of world peace and security. Their analysis demonstrates how social media discourse goes beyond information exchange to serve as a tool for upholding national authority and geopolitical ideologies. Studies looking at domestic political communication also show how Trump's discourse is organized ideologically. Rather than focusing solely on policy issues, Trump repeatedly constructs political identity through a systematic distinction between allies and opponents. According to Luo et al. (2022), Trump's tweets during the COVID-19 pandemic blamed China, the World Health Organization, Democrats, and mainstream media outlets while portraying the United States and his administration as capable and resilient. Van Dijk's ideological framework is closely aligned with this tactic of positive self-representation and negative other-representation, which shows how language is used to bolster political legitimacy while delegitimizing opposing groups.

According to Obeid and Abbas (2023), Trump's immigration-related tweets also heavily relied on ideological polarization through lexical choices, hyperbole, modality, irony, and metaphor, portraying political opponents as reckless and unreliable while positioning himself as a defender of national interests. When taken as a whole, these studies show that one of the distinctive features of Trump's Twitter communication is ideological polarization. Beyond ideological stance, academics consistently point to language as a key tool for the exercise of social and political power. Trump's speech often uses persuasive language techniques to sway public opinion and mold societal attitudes rather than presenting objective facts. Also, Al Dilaimy, Al-Rawe, and Suleiman (2022) showed that while portraying immigrants and minority groups as possible threats, Trump's speeches heavily rely on emotionally charged vocabulary, repetition, personal pronouns, rhetorical appeals, and narratives of national superiority to reinforce authority.

In a similar vein, Kadim (2022) discovered that Trump's campaign rhetoric consistently employed metaphor, hyperbole, pronoun manipulation, fear appeals, and numerical arguments to create a stark ideological divide between "Us" and "Them." These rhetorical decisions presented Trump as the only political figure capable of reestablishing national security while simultaneously portraying Native Americans as helpless victims in need of protection. These results support the claim that political discourse actively creates ideological realities through carefully chosen linguistic techniques rather than being merely descriptive. Research using stylistic perspectives strengthens the connection between ideology and linguistic construction. Further, Alaghbari (2022) used Jeffries' Critical Stylistics framework to investigate the textual mechanisms through which ideology is embedded in Trump's Twitter discourse rather than focusing solely on larger sociopolitical contexts. Evaluative vocabulary, transitivity choices, modality, presupposition, negation, and deictic expressions all work together to affect audience interpretation and normalize particular political points of view, as the analysis showed. Labels like "Sleepy Joe," "China Virus," and "Islamist Winter" demonstrate how lexical selection goes beyond straightforward naming conventions to become an ideological tool for both



legitimizing Trump's political position and delegitimizing opponents. The results also imply that Twitter's character restrictions promote succinct but extremely strategic language, enabling the effective communication of ideological meanings within constrained textual space. Additionally, researchers have noted that Twitter plays a major role in the creation and propagation of political discourse. Twitter's technological features actively influence language practices by rewarding immediacy, emotional expression, and confrontation rather than acting as a neutral communication platform.

Moreover, according to Ott (2017), Twitter promotes quick, impulsive, and highly personalized communication, which makes sensational and emotionally charged content more visible than thoughtful political discourse. Trump frequently uses simplified vocabulary, repetition, capitalization, catchphrases, insults, and emotionally charged remarks, all of which are examples of these affordances in his communication style. increase political division while decreasing chances for thoughtful democratic discourse. Elayan, Sykora, and Jackson (2020) supported this viewpoint by showing that Trump's Twitter activity regularly displayed high levels of negativity and emotional expression. Stronger emotional content in tweets led to significantly higher public engagement through likes, re-tweets, and media attention, according to their computational and discourse analyses. This suggests that emotionally charged political communication is especially successful in modern digital environments. The deliberate creation of national identity through discourse is another recurrent theme in the literature. Research repeatedly shows that Trump's political messaging fosters unity among supporters by highlighting shared identities while simultaneously marginalizing opponents.

Obasi and Etike (2023), analyzing political interactions between Iranian and American officials after Qasem's murder Soleimani discovered that while pronouns referring to opposing groups increased ideological division, both sides heavily relied on collective pronouns like we and our to strengthen national unity. Similarly, Ahmad et al. (2025) noted that Trump frequently invoked American exceptionalism in his speech, portraying the US as morally superior and adversarial states as existential threats necessitating swift political action. Together, these results show that identity construction plays a major role in digital political discourse, where linguistic choices are constantly used to negotiate national belonging and ideological commitment. There is a significant point of convergence between these various analytical techniques. Researchers consistently conclude that Trump's social media discourse is highly strategic rather than spontaneous, regardless of whether they use computational linguistic methods, Van Dijk's socio-cognitive model, Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis, Critical Stylistics, or Systemic Functional Linguistics. His language choices frequently support the use of symbolic power, political polarization, ideological persuasion, and identity construction. Together, these studies show that Trump's Twitter communication serves as a sophisticated political tool through which language shapes public perception, legitimizes authority, and reinforces ideological worldviews, despite differences in theoretical orientations and datasets. One of the most important aspects of Trump's online communication, according to this corpus of research, is hate speech. Studies already conducted consistently show that hateful discourse functions through deliberate language choices that normalize exclusion, create enemies, and defend unfair social relationships.

Using Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis, Khoshnaw and Moheddin (2025) highlight how Trump's immigration-related tweets frequently employ imperative expressions, repetition, capitalization, and emotionally charged vocabulary to create narratives of urgency, fear, and national crisis. Their research also shows that discourse operates concurrently at the textual, discursive, and sociocultural levels, where linguistic



structures support the propagation of discriminatory depictions of political opponents and immigrants as well as nationalist ideologies. Correspondingly, Suhailli et al. (2024) illustrate that Trump's rhetoric on Iran deliberately presents Iranian citizens as oppressed victims while simultaneously portraying the Iranian government as a dangerous and repressive political actor. The study demonstrates how ideological meanings are ingrained in seemingly straightforward linguistic choices, supporting specific geopolitical narratives and influencing public perception through lexical patterns found using Corpus-Assisted Critical Discourse Analysis. These results are consistent with more extensive studies that look at the normalization of hate speech in online political contexts. Political communication often creates exclusion by repeatedly linking specific social groups to unfavorable characteristics rather than relying only on overt insults. Hate speech, according to earlier research reviewed in the literature, increasingly uses metaphorical representation, indirect ideological framing, and emotionally charged narratives rather than just overtly abusive expressions. As a result, by frequently portraying specific identities as dangers to public order, national security, or cultural values, digital political discourse progressively normalizes discriminatory attitudes. Researchers have focused more on impoliteness as a characteristic of Trump's communication style in addition to hate speech. Trump frequently uses confrontational language, personal attacks, and face-threatening acts in his online interactions with opponents, in contrast to traditional political discourse, which typically emphasizes diplomatic language and institutional courtesy.

Furthermore, using Culpeper's Impoliteness Framework and Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory, Al-Shaikhli and Al-Santareesi (2021) observe that Trump frequently uses positive impoliteness techniques in his tweets, such as mockery, insults, sarcasm, and disparaging assessments. In addition to portraying Trump as a powerful political figure unwilling to adhere to traditional norms of political civility, these linguistic choices purposefully jeopardize the public perception of political rivals, journalists, celebrities, and media organizations. Rather than functioning as accidental emotional reactions, the study concludes that such face-threatening behaviour represents a calculated rhetorical strategy aimed at strengthening confrontation and reinforcing political identity. Su and Lee (2022), despite conducting their research outside of the American political context, further broaden our understanding of impoliteness by showing that offensive language in online interactions is inextricably linked to ideology and identity construction. Their analysis of YouTube comments identifies that assessments of rudeness rely on underlying ideological beliefs, social identities, and power dynamics in addition to lexical offensiveness. Because they simultaneously delegitimize opposing viewpoints and strengthen group cohesion, offensive expressions take on significance. These results demonstrate that verbal aggression often serves broader ideological purposes beyond interpersonal conflict, providing significant theoretical insight for research on Trump's political discourse. As a result, rudeness should be viewed as a strategic discursive tool that can uphold ideological boundaries and strengthen political identities rather than just as rude behavior. Studies looking at speech acts and communicative intentions also show how strategic Trump's discourse is. Trump's tweets frequently perform actions like threatening, persuading, legitimizing, blaming, or asserting authority rather than restricting political communication to information sharing.

Zheni(2020) ,discovered that Trump's tweets about the US-Iran nuclear crisis are dominated by assertive and expressive speech acts. Through these speech acts, Trump portrayed Iran as a destabilizing international actor, defended confrontational foreign policies, and legitimized American political authority. The researchers also contend that direct and indirect speech acts work in tandem to uphold political dominance and strengthen ideological



influence. Their findings suggest that political discourse extends beyond linguistic form, operating as purposeful social action intended to shape both public attitudes and international political narratives.

The reviewed literature as a whole shows that a variety of theoretical frameworks and methodological approaches, such as Critical Discourse Analysis, corpus linguistics, stylistics, sentiment analysis, Systemic Functional Linguistics, and Speech Act Theory, have been used to analyze Trump's digital political discourse. The studies consistently demonstrate that Trump's language is deliberately crafted to sway public opinion, strengthen ideological polarization, validate political authority, and create in-group and out-group identities on a variety of topics, including immigration, elections, public health, foreign policy, and international conflict, despite these methodological variations. While pointing out the need for more research into particular linguistic aspects of Trump's conflict-oriented discourse, the body of existing scholarship provides a solid basis for comprehending the relationship between language, ideology, and political communication in digital spaces.

2.3. Research Gap

Although Donald Trump's digital political discourse has been extensively studied through Critical Discourse Analysis and related linguistic approaches, existing research has primarily focused on ideological construction, political polarization, hate speech, identity formation, legitimization, impoliteness, and persuasive discourse across various political contexts. Studies addressing the US–Iran conflict have largely explored foreign policy narratives, power relations, national identity, and ideological representation, while investigations of Trump's impoliteness have mainly concentrated on face-threatening acts and offensive communication in broader political interactions. Likewise, research on hate speech has generally emphasized discriminatory discourse, immigration, and political polarization rather than conflict-specific communication. Despite these valuable contributions, limited scholarly attention has been given to the integrated relationship between profanity, ultimatum expressions, and ideology in Donald Trump's truth social posts concerning the US–Iran conflict. Existing studies have typically explored these linguistic features independently, without investigating how they operate collectively as interconnected discursive strategies for constructing political authority, intensifying conflict, legitimizing ideological positions, and influencing public perception. Moreover, no study has comprehensively combined Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis with Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory to reveal how ideological meanings are simultaneously produced through discourse while being reinforced by face-threatening communicative strategies in Trump's conflict-oriented truth social posts. Therefore, the present study addresses this gap by examining the interrelationship between profanity, ultimatum expressions, and ideology in Donald Trump's truth social posts related to the US–Iran conflict through the complementary application of Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis and Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory, providing a more comprehensive understanding of how linguistic aggression, ideological positioning, and impoliteness converge within contemporary digital political discourse.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The linguistic elements and underlying meanings present in Donald Trump's posts on truth social regarding the US-Iran conflict were investigated using a qualitative research design. The study is grounded in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which emphasizes the interpretation of language within its social and political context rather than the measurement of numerical data. This design allows for a thorough investigation of the profanity, ultimatum expressions,



ideology, and power relations as constructed through discourse. As a result, a qualitative approach is thought to be the most suitable for accomplishing the study's goals.

3.2 Research Approach

Fairclough's Three-Dimensional CDA (1995) is the main analytical method used in this study to look at the linguistic and ideological aspects of the chosen posts. By linking textual elements to larger social contexts and power dynamics, the model facilitates a methodical interpretation of discourse. Furthermore, the interpersonal aspects of language are examined using Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory (1987), specifically the use of face-threatening acts and politeness strategies. By making it easier to interpret language choices that represent confrontation, authority, and interpersonal interaction, the framework enhances discourse analysis.

3.3 Data Source

The data for this study were obtained from Truth Social, a social media platform launched in 2022 by Trump Media or Technology Group. The platform is primarily used by Donald Trump and his supporters as a channel for sharing political opinions, public statements, and policy-related messages. Since this study examines Donald Trump's discourse on the US–Iran conflict, Truth Social was considered the most appropriate source for collecting the required data. 20 publicly accessible posts published by Donald Trump were selected for analysis based on their relevance to the research objectives.

3.4 Sample and Sampling Technique

Twenty truth social posts made by Donald Trump on truth social constituted the research corpus. Purposive sampling, a non-probability sampling method in which data are chosen based on their significance to the study's objectives rather than at random, was used in this investigation. Because the investigation required posts that specifically addressed the US-Iran conflict, this method was deemed appropriate. As a result, only posts with profanity, ultimatums, or ideological content were chosen for in-depth analysis.

3.5 Data Collection

The data were collected by looking through Donald Trump's posts about the US-Iran conflict on truth social. Truth social Posts published between March and April 2026 were the main focus of the search, with special attention paid to content that contained profanity, ultimatum expressions, threats, offensive language, and ideological content. Only 20 posts that closely matched the research objectives were kept for analysis, although a greater number of pertinent posts were found. To preserve the dataset's relevance and consistency, posts that were not relevant to the research topic or didn't have the necessary linguistic characteristics were eliminated.

3.6 Data Analysis Procedure

The analysis was conducted through a series of systematic stages. The chosen truth social posts were carefully reviewed and coded based on the presence of profanity, ultimatum statements, and ideological markers after data collection. Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis (1995) was subsequently used to analyze the coded data in order to look at discursive practices, textual characteristics, and wider social meanings. The discourse's face-threatening behaviors and politeness techniques were finally identified using Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory (1987). In order to provide a thorough understanding of the linguistic and ideological patterns found in the chosen posts, the results were ultimately interpreted in relation to the research objectives.

3.7 Ethical Considerations



Ethical standards were maintained throughout the research process to ensure the integrity and credibility of the study. The analysis relied exclusively on publicly accessible posts from Truth Social, thereby eliminating the need to access private information or interact with individuals. The collected data were used only for academic purposes, and the interpretation of the findings was carried out objectively without altering the original content of the posts.

4. Results

4.1 Profanity as a Strategy of Discursive Aggression

The analysis of the selected tweets demonstrates that profanity is employed as a strategic discursive resource rather than as spontaneous emotional expression. Across the dataset, offensive lexical choices consistently function to delegitimize Iranian political actors, intensify military threats, and reinforce the authority of the speaker. Rather than operating in isolation, profane expressions co-occur with threats, coercive language, and assertions of military superiority, indicating that profanity contributes to a broader strategy of political confrontation. Four dominant patterns emerged from the data: (1) derogatory labelling, (2) threat intensification, (3) humiliation and delegitimization, and (4) projection of political and military dominance.

Table 4.1

Major Patterns of Profanity in Trump's Tweets on the US–Iran Conflict

Pattern	Representative Expressions	Discursive Function
Derogatory labelling	<i>deranged scumbags, crazy bastards</i>	Delegitimizes political actors and constructs moral inferiority
Threat intensification	<i>back to the Stone Ages, ELIMINATED</i>	Reinforces coercive military threats and deterrence
Humiliation and delegitimization	<i>complete and total mess</i>	Damages the opponent's credibility and competence
Projection of Profanity dominance	of Profanity combined with references to military retaliation	Constructs authority, power, and strategic superiority

The first pattern involves the use of derogatory labels to portray Iranian political actors as irrational, immoral, and incapable of legitimate political leadership. Expressions such as *deranged scumbags* and *crazy bastards* function not merely as insults but as linguistic strategies that deny political legitimacy and reduce the target to an object of ridicule. By repeatedly associating Iran with irrationality and incompetence, the discourse establishes a polarized representation in which the United States occupies the position of the rational and authoritative actor.

A second recurring pattern is the integration of profanity with explicit military threats. Offensive expressions frequently accompany references to retaliation, destruction, or military intervention, thereby strengthening the coercive force of the message. Statements invoking outcomes such as being sent "back to the Stone Ages" or being "ELIMINATED" extend profanity beyond personal abuse and transform it into a mechanism for communicating deterrence and strategic resolve. In this way, offensive language contributes to the construction of an uncompromising stance toward the perceived adversary. The analysis also identifies humiliation as a central discursive strategy. Evaluative expressions portraying Iran as a "complete and total mess" diminish the state's political competence and institutional credibility. Rather than criticizing isolated actions, these descriptions construct a generalized image of



national failure, thereby reinforcing negative perceptions of Iran's political identity and weakening its symbolic legitimacy within the discourse.

Finally, profanity consistently supports the projection of political and military dominance. Offensive language rarely appears independently; instead, it is embedded within statements emphasizing military capability, retaliation, and presidential authority. This combination transforms profanity into an instrument for asserting superiority rather than merely expressing hostility. Consequently, the discourse presents aggressive language as part of a broader communicative strategy through which authority, control, and national strength are projected.

Overall, the findings indicate that profanity performs functions extending well beyond interpersonal insult. Across the selected tweets, offensive language systematically contributes to the construction of an escalating discursive sequence in which derogatory labelling develops into explicit threats, progresses to public humiliation, and ultimately reinforces claims of political and military dominance. This progression demonstrates that profanity serves as an integral component of strategic political communication within Trump's discourse on the US–Iran conflict.

4.2 Ultimatums as a Strategy of Coercive Political Communication

The analysis of the selected tweets indicates that ultimatum expressions constitute a central strategy in Trump's discourse on the US–Iran conflict. Rather than functioning as ordinary diplomatic demands, these expressions systematically combine conditional propositions, temporal constraints, and explicit consequences to pressure Iran into compliance. Across the dataset, ultimatums are consistently framed as non-negotiable directives that position the United States as the authority determining both the conditions and outcomes of political engagement. Four recurring patterns emerged from the analysis: (1) conditional demands, (2) temporal pressure, (3) escalation through consequences, and (4) institutionalized coercion.

Table 4.2

Major Patterns of Ultimatum Construction in Trump's Tweets on the US–Iran Conflict

Pattern	Representative Expressions	Discursive Function
Conditional demands	<i>If... then..., unless...</i>	Links compliance to political concessions
Temporal pressure	<i>48 hours, immediately, before it is too late</i>	Creates urgency and limits the target's decision-making time
Escalation through consequences	<i>or face severe consequences, too late</i>	Reinforces coercion through anticipated punishment
Institutionalized coercion	References to military capability, sanctions, and presidential authority	Legitimizes demands through institutional power

The first pattern involves the use of conditional constructions to establish political demands as mandatory requirements rather than negotiable proposals. Expressions introduced through conditional markers such as *if* and *unless* consistently connect Iran's future political or military outcomes to its willingness to comply with U.S. demands. By presenting compliance as the only acceptable course of action, these constructions transform diplomatic engagement into a discourse of controlled choice in which alternatives are systematically restricted. A second recurring pattern is the strategic use of temporal pressure. The discourse frequently incorporates explicit deadlines, immediate directives, and time-sensitive expressions such as



48 hours, immediately, and before it is too late. These temporal markers intensify the coercive force of the ultimatum by reducing opportunities for negotiation and presenting political action as both urgent and unavoidable. Consequently, time itself becomes a linguistic resource through which pressure is exerted upon the target state.

The analysis further demonstrates that ultimatum expressions are consistently reinforced through explicit or implied consequences. Rather than relying solely on requests or warnings, the selected tweets repeatedly associate non-compliance with military retaliation, economic sanctions, or irreversible political outcomes. This pattern establishes a causal relationship between refusal and punishment, thereby strengthening the persuasive force of the ultimatum while simultaneously legitimizing coercive measures as predictable responses to resistance. Finally, ultimatum discourse is embedded within a broader framework of institutional authority. References to presidential leadership, military capability, sanctions, and state institutions repeatedly accompany conditional demands, portraying coercive communication as an official exercise of governmental power rather than an individual expression of political preference. The integration of institutional actors with ultimatum language reinforces the perception that compliance is expected not only because of the content of the demands but also because of the authority from which they originate.

The findings demonstrate that ultimatum expressions operate as a systematic mechanism of coercive political communication. Across the selected tweets, conditional demands are intensified through temporal pressure, reinforced by explicit consequences, and legitimized through institutional authority, producing a recurring discursive progression from condition, deadline, consequence, compliance. This pattern indicates that ultimatums function not merely as diplomatic warnings but as strategic linguistic devices through which political pressure and asymmetrical power relations are constructed and maintained. While profanity primarily intensifies verbal aggression, the ultimatum expressions identified in the present analysis demonstrate how linguistic aggression develops into structured forms of coercive political communication. The following section examines how these linguistic strategies collectively contribute to the construction of ideological positions within Trump's discourse on the US–Iran conflict.

4.3 Ideological Construction through Trump's Discourse on the US–Iran Conflict

The analysis demonstrates that ideological positions are constructed through a combination of evaluative representations, legitimizing narratives, and militarized portrayals of geopolitical authority. Rather than presenting the conflict as a series of isolated political events, the selected tweets establish a polarized discursive framework in which the United States is represented as the legitimate guarantor of international order, while Iran is repeatedly portrayed as an irrational, destabilizing, and subordinate actor. This ideological polarization is reinforced through recurring patterns of othering, self-legitimation, strategic militarization, and geopolitical control. Four major patterns emerged from the analysis: (1) ideological polarization through othering, (2) self-legitimation and leadership construction, (3) militarized geopolitical dominance, and (4) normalization of hegemonic authority.

Table 4.3

Major Patterns of Ideological Construction in Trump's Tweets on the US–Iran Conflict

Pattern	Representative Expressions	Discursive Function
Othering	References portraying Iran as irrational, dangerous, or incapable	Constructs ideological opposition and delegitimizes the adversary



Pattern	Representative Expressions	Discursive Function
Self-legitimation	First-person authority, presidential references, claims of success	Establishes political legitimacy and leadership
Militarized geopolitical dominance	<i>Naval blockade, total control, approval of the United States Navy, Strait of Hormuz</i>	Represents strategic space as an instrument of political authority
Hegemonic authority	Military superiority, sanctions, institutional control, conditional access	Naturalizes U.S. leadership and asymmetrical power relations

The first pattern involves the systematic construction of ideological polarization through othering. Across the selected tweets, Iran is consistently represented as politically unstable, irrational, aggressive, and incapable of responsible governance. Such representations extend beyond criticism of specific policies by assigning enduring negative characteristics to the state itself. Through this recurring portrayal, the discourse establishes a binary opposition in which Iran embodies disorder and threat, while the United States is implicitly positioned as the defender of stability and legitimacy. The repeated use of negative evaluations therefore transforms political disagreement into a broader ideological distinction between a legitimate Self and an illegitimate Other.

A second pattern concerns the construction of political legitimacy through self-representation. The discourse repeatedly foregrounds presidential authority, institutional capability, and successful decision-making through first-person references and assertions of executive leadership. Claims of military preparedness, diplomatic effectiveness, and policy success collectively reinforce the image of decisive governance. Rather than functioning as isolated self-promotional statements, these representations contribute to an ideological narrative in which political authority is portrayed as both justified and indispensable for maintaining regional security and international order.

The analysis further reveals that ideological positioning is reinforced through representations of militarized geopolitical dominance. Strategic locations such as the Strait of Hormuz are not presented merely as geographical spaces but as symbolic sites through which political authority is exercised. References to naval blockades, maritime restrictions, sanctions, and military operations consistently portray control over movement and access as legitimate expressions of state power. Consequently, military capability is represented not only as an instrument of warfare but also as a mechanism for regulating political behaviour, economic activity, and diplomatic engagement. Strategic space therefore functions as a discursive resource through which geopolitical authority is both exercised and justified.

A fourth recurring pattern is the normalization of hegemonic authority through institutional discourse. References to the United States Navy, sanctions, military operations, and executive decision-making repeatedly construct institutional power as lawful, rational, and necessary. Access to strategic waterways, political negotiations, and regional stability is consistently represented as contingent upon compliance with conditions established by the United States. By portraying such arrangements as expected and legitimate, the discourse normalizes asymmetrical power relations and reinforces the perception that American leadership constitutes the natural framework for managing regional security and international affairs.

The findings demonstrate that ideological positions are constructed through interconnected discursive processes rather than isolated linguistic choices. Across the selected tweets, negative representations of Iran establish ideological polarization, self-legitimizing



narratives reinforce political leadership, militarized discourse extends authority into strategic geopolitical space, and institutional representations normalize hegemonic power. These recurring patterns collectively produce an ideological progression in which othering, self-legitimation, and militarized geopolitical dominance, hegemonic authority, illustrating how discourse functions to construct, justify, and sustain particular political realities within the context of the US–Iran conflict.

5. Discussion

5.1 Strategic Use of Linguistic Aggression

The findings demonstrate that profanity in Trump's Truth Social posts functions as a strategic political resource rather than as spontaneous emotional expression. Offensive language consistently operates alongside threats, evaluative judgments, and assertions of institutional authority to delegitimize Iran while reinforcing the speaker's authority. These findings support previous studies (Al-Shaikhli & Al-Santareesi, 2021; Su & Lee, 2022), which argue that impoliteness strengthens ideological boundaries and political identity. However, the present study extends this literature by demonstrating that profanity in interstate conflict is integrated with military threats and ideological positioning, transforming verbal aggression into a mechanism for legitimizing geopolitical confrontation. The findings also corroborate Khoshnaw and Moheddin (2025), Ott (2017), and Elayan et al. (2020), showing that emotionally charged language, repetition, and platform affordances amplify ideological persuasion and political engagement. From Fairclough's perspective, profanity reproduces ideological meanings by constructing negative representations of the opposing actor and legitimizing coercive political responses. Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory further reveals that repeated Face-Threatening Acts and bald-on-record strategies maximize communicative coercion while denying opportunities for diplomatic reciprocity. Collectively, these findings suggest that profanity represents the initial stage of a broader discursive process through which political opponents are delegitimized and ideological confrontation is established.

5.2 Ultimatums as Coercive Political Communication

The findings indicate that ultimatum expressions function as structured mechanisms of coercive political communication rather than isolated diplomatic threats. Through conditional constructions, temporal deadlines, and explicit consequences, the discourse repeatedly presents compliance as the only acceptable outcome while associating resistance with military retaliation, sanctions, or political isolation. These findings support Zheni's (2020) observation that Trump's discourse performs political action through language, while extending previous research by demonstrating that ultimatum expressions constitute recurring discursive patterns that institutionalize political coercion rather than merely functioning as speech acts.

Consistent with Ott (2017) and Elayan et al. (2020), the concise and immediate nature of Truth Social facilitates highly explicit coercive communication that reinforces perceptions of decisiveness and political authority. Fairclough's framework illustrates how conditional constructions, institutional references, and assertive modality normalize coercive diplomacy, whereas Brown and Levinson's theory demonstrates that bald-on-record strategies and repeated Face-Threatening Acts systematically restrict the target state's autonomy. Rather than inviting negotiation, ultimatum discourse presents political compliance as inevitable, thereby bridging linguistic aggression with broader processes of ideological domination.

5.3 Ideological Construction of Geopolitical Power

The findings demonstrate that ideological construction extends beyond representing political identities to legitimizing geopolitical authority. Building upon linguistic aggression



and ultimatum discourse, the posts progressively construct a narrative in which military capability, strategic space, and institutional authority become central resources for justifying American geopolitical dominance. Thus, ideology is produced through interconnected discursive strategies rather than isolated evaluative representations. These findings support earlier studies that identified ideological polarization and positive self-representation in Trump's discourse (Nourani et al., 2020; Ahmad et al., 2025; Luo et al., 2022; Abbas & Obeid, 2023). However, the present study advances this literature by demonstrating that ideological authority is constructed not only through representations of political actors but also through the discursive regulation of strategic geographical space. References to the Strait of Hormuz, naval blockades, sanctions, and military operations transform strategic geography into a symbolic resource through which political authority and international legitimacy are asserted.

Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis demonstrates that these linguistic choices reproduce hegemonic geopolitical power across textual, discursive, and social dimensions, while Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory explains how repeated Face-Threatening Acts and bald-on-record strategies linguistically enact political dominance by restricting sovereign autonomy and legitimizing coercive authority. Together, the findings reveal that ideological discourse functions as a mechanism through which political realities are organized, normalized, and sustained.

Collectively, the study demonstrates that profanity, ultimatum expressions, and ideological positioning should not be viewed as independent communicative phenomena. Instead, they constitute successive stages within a unified process of geopolitical meaning-making in which profanity initiates delegitimization, ultimatum expressions institutionalize coercion, and ideological narratives legitimize hegemonic authority through the regulation of strategic space. This integrated progression represents the principal theoretical contribution of the study and extends existing scholarship by providing a comprehensive explanation of how conflict-oriented political discourse constructs and legitimizes geopolitical power in contemporary digital communication. Methodologically, the study further demonstrates the value of integrating Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis with Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory. While Fairclough explains how discourse reproduces ideology and geopolitical power, Brown and Levinson illuminates how Face-Threatening Acts and impoliteness enact authority at the interpersonal level. Their combined application provides a more comprehensive analytical framework for examining digital political discourse than either approach independently.

6. Conclusion

This study examined how profanity, ultimatum expressions, and ideological positioning are discursively constructed in Donald Trump's Truth Social posts related to the US–Iran conflict through the integrated application of Fairclough's (1995) Three-Dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis and Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory. The findings demonstrate that these linguistic strategies operate as interconnected components of a broader discourse of political authority. Profanity functions to delegitimize political opponents, ultimatum expressions institutionalize coercive political communication through explicit conditions and consequences, and ideological discourse legitimizes geopolitical authority by constructing military superiority, strategic control, and American leadership as rational and justified.

The study contributes to existing scholarship by demonstrating that profanity, ultimatum expressions, and ideology should not be viewed as separate linguistic phenomena. Instead, they operate sequentially as complementary discursive strategies through which political opponents



are delegitimized, coercive authority is established, and hegemonic geopolitical power is normalized. In addition, the combined application of Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis and Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory provides a comprehensive analytical framework for examining the interaction between ideological construction and interpersonal power in contemporary digital political discourse. Although the study focuses specifically on Trump's Truth Social posts concerning the US–Iran conflict, its findings have broader relevance for understanding conflict-oriented political communication in digital environments. Future research may extend this analysis to other political leaders, international conflicts, and social media platforms or combine qualitative discourse analysis with corpus-based methods to examine larger datasets. Such research would further enhance understanding of how digital political discourse constructs power, ideology, and international relations in contemporary communication.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, Y., Nazim, M., & Nijabat, A. (2025). Framing power and conflict: A critical discourse analysis of Donald Trump's posts on the Iran–Israel war. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL*, 8(3), 1256–1264. <https://doi.org/10.63878/jalt1105>
- Alaghbary, G. S. (2022). Ideological manipulation in Twitter communication: A critical stylistic analysis of Donald Trump's tweets. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*, 22(1), 291–312. <https://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes2000.22.1.16>
- Al Dilaimy, H. H., Al-Rawe, M. F. A., & Suleiman, S. H. (2022). Donald Trump's aggressive and offensive language before and after his inauguration speeches: A critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 3(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlts.v3i1.200>
- Al-Shaikhli, K. A., & Al-Santareesi, M. (2021). Politeness violated: A study of selected tweets by Donald Trump. *Jerash for Research and Studies*, 22(1), 557–571. <https://doi.org/10.36091/0550-022-001-024>
- Elayan, S., Sykora, M., & Jackson, T. (2020). "His tweets speak for themselves": An analysis of Donald Trump's Twitter behaviour. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Civic and Political Studies*, 15(1), 11–35. <https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-0071/CGP/v15i01/11-35>
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258–284). Sage Publications.
- Gil de Zúñiga, H., Molyneux, L., & Zheng, P. (2014). Social media, political expression, and political participation: Panel analysis of lagged and concurrent relationships. *Journal of Communication*, 64(4), 612–634. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12103>
- Gilardi, F., Gessler, T., Kubli, M., & Müller, S. (2022). Social media and political agenda setting. *Political Communication*, 39(1), 39–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2021.1910390>
- Hussain, N. (2015). US–Iran relations: Issues, challenges and prospects. *Policy Perspectives*, 12(1), 29–55. <https://www.ipripak.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/art2nazia15.pdf>
- Kadim, E. N. (2022). A critical discourse analysis of Trump's election campaign speeches. *Heliyon*, 8(4), e09256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09256>
- Khoshnaw, B. A. A., & Moheddin, K. R. (2025). A critical discourse analysis of online hate speech in Donald Trump's tweets. *Twejer*, 8(3), 417–442. <https://doi.org/10.31918/twejer.2583.17>



- Luo, X., He, M., & Yu, Z. (2022). An ideological analysis of the former President Donald Trump's tweets during COVID-19. *Corpus Pragmatics*, 6(1), 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-021-00113-4>
- Nourani, H., Danesh, A., Nouri, M. R., & Latifi, F. (2020). Discursive (de)legitimization of the Iran nuclear deal in Donald Trump's tweets. *Strategic Analysis*, 44(4), 332–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09700161.2020.1809205>
- Obasi, J. C., & Etike, V. E. (2023). Representation of power relations in Twitter feud between the US and Iranian politicians after the killing of Qasem Soleimani. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 34(5), 477–499. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10646175.2023.2212615>
- Obied, A. H., & Abbas, H. A. (2023). Polarization in Trump's tweets: A critical discourse analysis study. *Kufa Journal of Arts*, 15(55), 616–640. <https://doi.org/10.36317/kaj/2023/v1.i55.11221>
- Ott, B. L. (2017). The age of Twitter: Donald J. Trump and the politics of debasement. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 34(1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2016.1266686>
- Petrova, M., Sen, A., & Yildirim, P. (2021). Social media and political contributions: The impact of new technology on political competition. *Management Science*, 67(5), 2997–3021. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2020.3769>
- Polak, S. (2024). Donald Trump and Truth Social: Media platforms making exclusionary worlds. In M. Kreitler & G. Olson (Eds.), *Diversity issues in the USA: Transnational perspectives on the 2024 presidential elections* (pp. 165–176). Transcript Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839474730-009>
- Ross, A. S., & Caldwell, D. (2020). "Going negative": An APPRAISAL analysis of the rhetoric of Donald Trump on Twitter. *Language & Communication*, 70, 13–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2019.09.003>
- Stieglitz, S., & Dang-Xuan, L. (2013). Social media and political communication: A social media analytics framework. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 3(4), 1277–1291. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13278-012-0079-3>
- Su, H. Y., & Lee, W. H. (2022). Metadiscourse of impoliteness, language ideology, and identity: Offense-taking as social action. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 18(2), 227–255. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2019-0013>
- Suhaili, A., Suganda, D., Darmayanti, N., & Yuliawati, S. (2024). A corpus-assisted critical discourse analysis of the Iranian people in the corpus of Donald Trump's social media texts. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(1), 88–97. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1401.10>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, March 11). If Iran has put out any mines in the Hormuz Strait, and we have no reports of them doing so, we want them removed, IMMEDIATELY! [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116206683370194686>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, March 13). We are totally destroying the terrorist regime of Iran, militarily, economically, and otherwise... [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116219996530067941>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, March 22). If Iran doesn't FULLY OPEN, WITHOUT THREAT, the Strait of Hormuz, within 48 HOURS... [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116269822349947644>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, March 22). Now with the death of Iran, the greatest enemy America has is the Radical Left... [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116272810363139207>



- Trump, D. J. (2026, March 26). The Iranian negotiators are very different and “strange.” They are “begging” us to make a deal... [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116295045718240014>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 1). Iran’s new Regime President, much less radicalised and far more intelligent than his predecessors, has just asked the United States of America for a CEASEFIRE! [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116329512466946656>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 2). The biggest bridge in Iran comes tumbling down, never to be used again—Much more to follow! [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116336091138489301>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 4). Remember when I gave Iran ten days to MAKE A DEAL or OPEN UP THE HORMUZ STRAIT. Time is running out... [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116346816254869135>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 5). Tuesday will be Power Plant Day, and Bridge Day, all wrapped up in one, in Iran. [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116351998782539414>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 7). A whole civilization will die tonight, never to be brought back again. [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116363336033995961>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 10). Iran’s Military is a complete and total mess. Much of it, like their Navy and Air Force, doesn’t even exist anymore... [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116725476229257491>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 10). The Iranians don’t seem to realize they have no cards, other than a short-term extortion of the World by using International Waterways. [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116381352865496679>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 11). The Fake News Media is CRAZY, or just plain CORRUPT! [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116386735130758581>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 13). Iran’s Navy is laying at the bottom of the sea, completely obliterated—158 ships. [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116397847496142849>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 13). The United States to Blockade Ships Entering or Exiting Iranian Ports on April 13 at 10:00 A.M. ET. [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116395566253303665>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 17). THE STRAIT OF HORMUZ IS COMPLETELY OPEN AND READY FOR BUSINESS AND FULL PASSAGE, BUT THE NAVAL BLOCKADE WILL REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT... [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116420275523158052>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 20). I’m winning a War, BY A LOT, things are going very well, our Military has been amazing... [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116438577686057718>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 20). Today, an Iranian-flagged cargo ship named TOUSKA, nearly 900 feet long and weighing almost as much as an aircraft carrier... [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116433000897070863>
- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 22). Iran doesn’t want the Strait of Hormuz closed, they want it open so they can make \$500 Million Dollars a day... [Truth Social post]. Truth Social. <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116445555373723862>



- Trump, D. J. (2026, April 23). Iran is having a very hard time figuring out who their leader is! [Truth Social post]. Truth Social.
<https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/116454200707517482>
- Valizada, K. (2026). Iran–United States relations: Historical dynamics, strategic rivalry, and prospects for diplomacy. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum*, 3(1), 198–215.
<https://doi.org/10.69760/aghel.026001018>
- Villaplana, F. R., & Fitzpatrick, J. (2024). Digital leaders: Political leadership in the digital age. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 6, Article 1425966.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2024.1425966>
- Zheni, T. (2020). Speech acts and hegemony in discourse: Donald Trump's tweets on the US–Iranian nuclear crisis. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 2(4), 215–235. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v2i4.476>