**Partisan Framing of Immigration in U.S. Presidential Speeches**

Immigration has been a long-standing issue in American political discourse, with both the Democratic and Republican parties approaching the topic from distinctly different perspectives. The rhetoric surrounding immigration is often used by political leaders to mobilize support, reinforce party ideologies, and frame public opinion. This analysis compares how U.S. presidents from the Democratic and Republican parties have discussed immigration in their speeches, revealing significant differences in the framing of the issue.

The analysis is based on a comparison of the frequency and context in which immigration-related terms (e.g., "immigration," "immigrants") appear in presidential speeches from both parties. Using cosine similarity—a method from natural language processing (NLP) to measure the semantic similarity between words—the study identifies the most distinctive words used by each party when discussing immigration. The results highlight the divergent linguistic strategies employed by Democrats and Republicans.

The Republican Party’s discourse around immigration, as evidenced by terms like "border," "enforcement," "patrol," and "aliens," suggests a framing focused on **security** and **law enforcement**. This reflects the party’s traditional stance of prioritizing border security and strict immigration controls, often positioning immigration as a threat to national security (Hajnal & Rivera, 2014). The use of terms like "border" and "enforcement" aligns with Republican policies that emphasize the construction of physical barriers, increased immigration law enforcement, and tighter restrictions on immigration, particularly from Mexico and Central America (Zolberg, 2006).

On the other hand, the Democratic Party’s rhetoric frames immigration in an **economic** context. Words like "spending," "taxes," and "economic" suggest a broader narrative that links immigration to issues of public finance and economic policy. Democrats often emphasize the economic benefits of immigration, highlighting the positive contributions of immigrants to the labor market and the economy at large (Peri, 2016). This reflects the party’s more inclusive stance, advocating for comprehensive immigration reform that includes pathways to citizenship for undocumented immigrants and the protection of immigrant rights (Wong, 2017).

The divide in partisan framing is consistent with broader ideological differences between the parties. Republicans typically adopt a more restrictive view of immigration, framing it as a security issue, while Democrats tend to frame immigration as an economic and humanitarian issue. These rhetorical strategies play a crucial role in shaping public opinion and the policy agenda. As past research has shown, framing effects in political discourse can influence how the public understands complex issues like immigration (Chong & Druckman, 2007).

In conclusion, U.S. presidents from both parties utilize distinctly different rhetorical frameworks when discussing immigration. While Republicans focus on border security and enforcement, Democrats frame immigration in terms of economic policy and public spending. These differences in discourse reflect broader ideological divides that continue to shape the politics of immigration in the United States.
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