

*Us and Them:*

A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF  
DONALD TRUMP'S CAMPAIGN SPEECHES by

ROBERT MCCLAY

A dissertation submitted to the  
College of Arts and Law  
of the University of Birmingham  
in part fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of

**Master of Arts**  
**in**  
**Applied Linguistics**

This dissertation consists of approximately 14,300 words

Supervisor: Dr. Kyung Hye Kim

March 2017

## ABSTRACT

Donald Trump's emergence as a leading candidate before becoming the president of the U.S. has become an issue of debate and division in U.S. political sphere. Throughout the 2015-2016 presidential election races, Trump's speeches have been a source of outrage, controversy and enthusiasm across America and throughout the world. His rhetoric and discourse have separated him from as a singular political actor worthy of individual scrutiny. Yet, due to the nascence and of his political career, no studies in the field of linguistics that draw on critical discourse analysis could be found regarding Trump's use of language.

This study examines the discourse created in three of Trump's political speeches and involves discovering how Trump constructs discourse to present a reality for his audience that frames his ideology. The goal of this study is to reveal the ways that Trump constructs a reality for his audience through representations of social actors. The analysis shows that Trump's speeches reveal an ideology consistent with strategic patterns of *us vs them*. By identifying these explicit patterns, this study highlights the importance of understanding the underlying ideology of Trump's messages in the interpretation of the discourse he uses to frame it.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</b>	1
1.1 Rationale for Study	1
1.2 Aim and Objectives	2
1.3 Research Questions	2
1.4 Organization of Chapters	2
<b>CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK</b>	4
2.1 Language and Politics	4
2.2 Ideology	6
2.3 Systemic Functional Linguistics	9
2.4 Van Leeuwen's (2008) Social Network of Actors	11
2.4.1 <i>Representation of Social Actors</i>	12
2.5 Concluding Remarks	15
<b>CHAPTER THREE: DATA AND METHODOLOGY</b>	16
3.1 The Data	16
3.2 Context of the Speeches	17
3.3 Concluding Remarks	18
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION</b>	19
4.1 Representation of Social Actors in Donald Trump's Speeches	19
4.2 Inaugural Address	20
4.3 Announcement of Candidacy Speech	24
4.4 RNC Acceptance Speech	36
4.5 Concluding Remarks	48
<b>CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION</b>	49
5.1 Summary of the Results	49
5.2 Contributions and Limitations	50
5.3 Suggestions for Future Research	51
<b>REFERENCES</b>	52
<b>Appendix I:</b> Inaugural Address Transcript, January 20 <sup>th</sup> 2017	55
<b>Appendix II:</b> Transcript of Trump's Announcement Speech, June 16 <sup>th</sup> 2015	59
<b>Appendix III:</b> RNC Speech Transcript, July 21 <sup>st</sup> 2016	80
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	
<b>Figure 1.</b> Some Expressions of Ideology in Discourse	8
<b>Figure 2.</b> Categories of Social Actors in Donald Trump's Speeches	19
<b>Figure 3.</b> Appraisements Attributed to Them in Trump's Announcement Speech	35

## **CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION**

In 2016, the United States (U.S.) underwent a presidential campaign that left the world stunned as the last ballots were counted. This was due to the rise of Donald Trump, the showman/pundit/billionaire real estate mogul whose popularity derived from a penchant for “straight talk” and bucking the establishment. Trump raised eyebrows at home and abroad when he spoke of ripping up trade deals, criticized allies, and praised enemies, rhetoric that rarely pierces mainstream political discourse in the U.S. Moreover, he criticized opponents, religious groups, the disabled, women, and so on (Kow 2015), in ways for which any other politician would have been pilloried. Yet, despite his rhetoric, or perhaps because of it, his popularity grew. The peculiarity of this phenomenon gave rise to this study, yet when this study began Trump had not yet won, nor did his victory seem likely. This study began as an attempt to explain an anomaly, but may now represent a small glimpse into a fundamental shift in the way political discourse is created in the U.S.

### **1.1 Rationale for Study**

Since the 1970s, critical discourse analysis (CDA) has drawn from linguistic and social theory in an attempt to reveal the power structures that imbue all language (Fairclough 1995). It has branched into many sub-disciplines of which political discourse is just one of many. Though thousands of studies have been conducted in the field of CDA, the topic is far from being an exhausted research area. The impetus for this study in CDA arose from the unlikely appearance, popularity and triumph of Donald Trump during the 2016 U.S. presidential election. His rise and the language that he used throughout the campaign seemed to change the norms of acceptable political discourse. It also revealed stark differences in the values held by differing groups of Americans. Despite appealing to enough voters to elect him as President, many have interpreted his rhetoric as fear-mongering, xenophobic and narcissistic. Because of these differences, this study sets out to uncover the values that resonated with Donald Trump’s supporters that were anathema to so many during the election.

## **1.2 Aim and Objectives**

Given the different messages received by different groups of people in the U.S., the aim of this study is to reveal the strategies that Donald Trump utilizes in constructing a reality and legitimizing an ideology that resonates with a large portion of the electorate. Drawing on van Leeuwen's (2008) Social Actor Network as the framework, this study seeks to decontextualize the representations of social actors implemented by Donald Trump in creating a specific reality for his audience for establishing and legitimizing his own status and power through the interaction and production of the reality. The objective of this study to make explicit the values underlying Donald Trump's campaign discourse and the ways in which he employed the ideological strategy of *us vs them* to construct his speeches.

## **1.3 Research Questions**

This study addresses the following overarching research question:

*What are the ways that Donald Trump represents social actors and actions to frame an ideology of racism and fear to construct the United States of America as a victim of inept leadership and foreign powers and project Trump as its savior?*

The above broad research question can be further divided into a set of more specific and interconnected questions, as follows:

1. In what way does Donald Trump represent social actors and actions in terms of power and weakness?
2. How does this projection of strength and weakness legitimize and delegitimize social actors in the context of his speeches?
3. In what ways does Donald Trump fit social actors into the *us/them* binary?
4. In what ways does "othering" through in-grouping/out-grouping legitimize racism as a rational fear?

## **1.4 Organization of Chapters**

Following this brief introduction, Chapter two discusses CDA and the construction of ideology through discourse. It also outlines the principles of systemic functional linguistics (SFL), focusing on van Leeuwen's (2008) social network of actors. Chapter three presents the data to be analyzed and the context in which it was constructed. The bulk of this study consists of a

sustained textual analysis of three political speeches delivered by Donald Trump through the course of the 2016 U.S. presidential campaign from inception to its denouement. Chapter four is devoted to the analysis of these speeches. It seeks to answer the set of research questions that motivated this study and discusses the main findings. The goal is to reveal the specific ways in which Donald Trump represents the social actors to construct a reality viewed through an ideology of the *us/them* binary. Chapter five revisits the rationale and research objectives that guided this dissertation. The study is then assessed in the light of its limitations in terms of data selection and future research avenues in the field of political discourse analysis.

## CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter begins with a discussion of language and politics and how they relate to power and political discourse. The concept of ideology will be explored and the ways in which it is manifest in political discourse will then be discussed. This chapter will then explore the principles of SFL, which help to make explicit some of the ways in which ideology is realized in the construction of a text and in the construction of Donald Trump's speeches in particular. These principles of SFL have contributed to van Leeuwen's (2008) network of social actors, which serves as the main framework of analysis for this study. This chapter will conclude with a detailed explanation of this framework and how it relates to the Donald Trump's speeches.

### 2.1 Language and Politics

Language has been used since time immemorial to communicate ideas and actions to other individuals. It was not until the 1960s, though that it was revealed that language itself contributes to and is inextricably linked to what we know as culture. To date, several studies have discussed how its use encodes values and reinforces the power structures of a society (e.g. Lazar 2007; van Dijk 1989; Wodak 1989; Fairclough 1993). For instance, the existence of a standard American English bestows a prestige on a specific dialect of English and establishes a "standard" of vocabulary, grammatical correctness, and pronunciation by which all other dialects are compared (Kerswill 2001: 8). Another example could be feminist post-structuralism, which has highlighted the engrained male chauvinism of English (e.g. Lakoff 1973); a classic example of this is the lexical pairing of the male "bachelor" which holds a positive connotation and the female "spinster" which holds a negative connotation. The very existence of these studies also indicates an awareness and resistance to these inherent power structures. These examples, and the studies conducted to realize them, illustrate the overlap of discourse, power, resistance and subjectification (e.g. Foucault 1997; 1998; 2008).

In this light, it may be argued that all discourse is in turn political; an intimate conversation is both constrained by and subtly reinforces the existing power structure and is therefore as political as a presidential campaign speech. Unfortunately, an understanding of the depth in which language permeates and perpetuates existing power relations in everyday discourse does little to aid in the analysis of specific texts. Moreover, there are notable differences in the

discourse between lovers and the discourse of politicians that may be analyzed in different ways. Therefore, defining what constitutes “political discourse” as a genre, with its own relatively stable patterns of organization, style and compositional structure, is important when analyzing a presidential speech. For one, the discourse of politicians occurs in the domain of “politics”, a concept that encompasses all the social actors and social actions that involve the government and the implementation of policy (van Dijk 1997:15-16).

Van Dijk (1997), one of the leading scholars in this field, describes discourse as political “when it has a direct functional role as a form of political action in the political process” (23). Moreover, this political discourse is “contextualized in such communicative events such as cabinet meetings, parliamentary sessions, election campaigns, rallies, interviews with the media, bureaucratic practices, protest demonstrations, and so on” (ibid.: 14). This characterization contains an additional feature of being constructed for, constructed by or affecting the public at large. Moreover, political discourse is created for the purpose of argumentation (Fairclough & Fairclough 2009: 1). This purpose highlights the goal-oriented nature of political discourse and its purposes of decision-making, action and persuasion and has implications on the construction and presentation of ideology in political discourse, which will be discussed in detail in Section 2.2. Using these positions as basis, this paper adopts the view that *political discourse* is generated when a political actor in a political context attempts to prompt or influence social action through persuasion.

The argumentative nature of political discourse also implies another force at work beneath the discourse itself that reflects a power struggle in the ways that reality may be constructed and social actors may be represented: *ideology*. Since political discourse “deals especially with the reproduction of political power, power abuse or domination through political discourse” (van Dijk 1997: 11), analyzing this discourse critically may help to reveal these underlying ideologies about how political power should be structured. By making these ideologies explicit, it may be possible to describe how they contribute to and are influenced by the construction of discourse. The following section will expand on the concept of ideology.



## 2.2 Ideology

Ideology is a social construct, consisting of shared values within a group of people. More specifically, they are the socially shared representations of groups and “are the foundations of group attitudes and other beliefs” (van Dijk 2006: 138). As such, ideologies influence the ways that in which individuals experience the world and produce ideological discourse (ibid.). In this way, discourse reflects those ideological values held by those groups who create it. In the U.S., these groups are often placed in either the two major political parties Republican and Democrat. Even so, these parties comprise multiple ideological groups, such as conservative, moderate, progressive and so on, that overlap on certain key values, but not all. These groups are identified by their differences, often emphasizing their directly opposing views on issues such as gun rights, social welfare, international relations and so on, and hold differing views about reality and the future moving forward. This fact highlights the contrastive quality inherent in ideological values and how they express differing ideological social groups (van Dijk 2006: 117). As such, the argumentative nature of political discourse seems to be realization of the ideological struggle between different groups. In the cases where an ideology or ideological value prevails and becomes accepted by all ideological groups within a culture, it ceases to be ideological and becomes general cultural knowledge (ibid.:138).

Several studies have defined ‘ideology’ and discussed its major concepts (e.g. Thompson, J. 1984; van Dijk 1995; van Dijk 2006), and they can be summarised as follows. Firstly, ideologies consist of values (van Dijk 2006: 116), and these values are essentially evaluative and provide the basic guidelines for social perception and interaction. Secondly, ideologies are socially shared (ibid.). As such, they serve to define social identity. Thirdly, ideologies are abstract foundational beliefs that function to control and organize other socially shared beliefs and specify what cultural values are relevant to the group (ibid.). For each group, ‘values may be expected to constitute the basic evaluative criteria for the opinions that define ideological systems’ (van Dijk 1993: 248).

One important aspect of ideologies is that there are differing levels of “expertise” about the ideology and not all members of groups are equally able to articulate the group ideologies (van Dijk 2006: 119). This role is filled by “experts, leaders, and other ‘ideologues’ who teach, explain, inculcate and explicitly reproduce the group ideologies” (ibid.). As such, this power

to articulate, explain and reproduce ideology grants the “experts” considerable power in the interpretation and reinterpretation of an ideology and may have implication on the construction of political speeches, where a leader can communicate unmediated ideological messages directly to the public. This can allow for the strategic ideological organization of messages that manufacture a specific reality for the audience.

One such way common to political discourse is that of the “polarization defining in-group and out-group” or *us vs them* (van Dijk 2006: 248-249). This social cleavage is prominent throughout politics and is commonly coded in the pronouns “us” and “them” or possessives like “our country” or “their people”. Ideological political discourse is generally organized by positive self-representation and negative other-representation (van Dijk 2006: 126). Van Dijk (2006) identifies several categories organizing the interests of a group that are used to self-evaluate and self-define: *identity/membership, tasks/activities, goals, norms/values, position* (in relation to other groups), and access to *resources* (or lack thereof) (van Dijk 1993: 250). Figure 1 below shows some ways in which ideology may be expressed in political discourse.

As this figure shows, ideology may be expressed through a strategy of emphasis and de-emphasis that creates a positive self-representation and negative other-representation. In addition to the pronouns “we” and “they”, this strategy may be realized through choices in *meaning* and *form*. In the construction of *meaning*, topic, local meanings or lexis may be selected to highlight negative or positive qualities of *us* or *them*. For example, as will be discussed in more depth in section 4.3, Trump utilizes some of these strategies in the following line in reference to Mexico:

Speech delivered on June 16<sup>th</sup> 2015 in New York City

They are rapists.

Figure 1. Some Expressions of Ideology in Discourse

- **Context:** Speaker speaks as a member of a social group; and/or addresses recipient as a group member
  - **Text, discourse, conversation:**
    - Overall strategy: positive presentation/action of US
    - Negative presentation/action of THEM
  - Emphasize OUR good things, and Their bad things, and  
De-emphasize OUR bad things, and THEIR good things
- MEANING**
- **Topics**
    - Select/Change positive/negative topics about US/THEM
  - **Local Meanings**
    - Explicit versus Implicit
    - Precise versus Vague
    - Detailed versus Broad
    - General versus Specific
    - Disclaimers (denying OUR bad things)
  - **Lexicon**
    - Select Positive/Negative terms for US/THEM
- FORM**
- **Syntax:** (De)emphasize Positive/Negative Agency of US/THEM
    - Cleft versus Non-cleft Sentences
    - Active versus Passive
  - **Format:**
    - Argumentative Structures:
      - Fallacies that falsely conclude OUR/THEIR good/bad things
  - **Rhetorical Structures**
    - Forms: Repetition
    - Meanings: Comparisons, hyperboles irony, metaphors, metonymies, euphemisms, number games etc.

(Adapted from Van Dijk 2006: 125-126).

In this representation, Mexico is out-grouped by the pronoun “they” and labeled with negatively-charged lexis, “rapists”. Other ways that *meaning* may also be expressed include textual comparisons and ironic conflicts of meaning (Louw 1993). *Form* may be applied to emphasize or de-emphasize agency through syntactical choices. The agency of *our* negative actions may be backgrounded or excluded, while the agency of *their* negative actions is highlighted. In one extreme example, Trump suppresses the agency of one of *our* companies

by misattributing it to Mexico, a representative of *them* (see 4.3 for more details). Negative othering may also falsely represent *us/them* through logically fallacious arguments. Trump for instance, violates the post hoc fallacy in a characterization of Hillary Clinton's tenure as Secretary of State (see 4.4). Repetition is another means of emphasizing the actions of *us/them*.

As Figure 1 indicates, there are myriad ways that a speaker may present social actors to achieve ideological goals. The strategies employed in political speeches are important in CDA as they may contribute to a deeper understanding of how ideology manifests in political discourse "through the naturally biased view of reality presented in the speech" (Mason & Platt 2006: 154). Indeed, as will be discussed in section 2.4 below, the strategies for creating the "in-group/out-group" or "*us/them*" binary is realized in ways that can be made explicit through an examination of the representation of different social actors. In what follows, some of the principles of SFL and how they form the basis of van Leeuwen's (2008) framework will be discussed, before exploring van Leeuwen's Social Network of Actors in section 2.4.

### **2.3 Systemic Functional Linguistics**

Based on Halliday's (1994) functional grammar of modern English, systemic functional linguistics acts as a descriptive framework for viewing language as a social semiotic system (Egins 2004: 2). It considers language as having evolved to serve particular social functions. In order to serve these functions, language is embedded with a tripartite of meaning known as the textual, interpersonal and experiential metafunctions (Halliday & Matthiesson 2004: 29-30). The textual metafunction reflects those meanings created through the organization of the text and has a significant role in development and cohesion (ibid.: 100). Because this study focuses on the construction of reality and its representation of ideology, textual meanings are beyond the scope of this paper thus will not be further examined.

The interpersonal metafunction reflects the interactive meanings created between speaker and listener or audience. These meanings are realized through questions, demands, offers and statements and help the interactants offer or request information or goods and services. When creating a text, the speaker uses interpersonal meanings to adopt a particular speech role and give attention to the attitudes, social stance and identity of the audience (Traugott 2003: 128, cited in Thompson 2004). Interpersonal meanings can also be presented through evaluative

language either through modality or modulation as well as through lexical choice. What this means for representation of ideology will be further explored in as it relates to *Appraisal* in section 2.4.1.

Experiential meanings relate to the expression of the world and provide the basis for Transitivity, a system for describing the whole clause. Transitivity divides clauses into processes, participants, and circumstances (Eggins 2004: 249). Experiential meaning centers on the process of a clause and determines the types and relationships of the participants with each other and the process itself. The third unit, circumstance, offers “background” information (where, when, how, and so on) on the clause (Thompson 2004: 88). The following example from Trump’s announcement speech demonstrates these units:

Speech delivered on June 16<sup>th</sup> 2015 in New York City

I beat China all the time.

In this example, “beat” is the process by which the clause is centered. “I” and “China” fill the participant roles whereby “I” is the doer of the action and “China” is the receiver of the action. The circumstance “all the time” orients the clause temporally by indicating when the process occurs.

Participant roles can vary throughout a text and are based on the type of process in which the participant is engaged. Through a Transitivity analysis, these participant roles are determined based on six major classes of process: material, mental, verbal, relational, behavioral and existential. *Material* processes (i.e. do, make, punch) construe doing and are most often thought of as physical actions (Butt et al. 2000: 52). These actions may be either *creative*, where the actor or goal is brought into existence, or *transformative*, where an existing actor or goal interpreted as being changed as the process unfolds (Halliday & Matthiesson 2004: 184). *Mental* processes (i.e. think, know) relate to cognition, perception and affect and encode mental actions rather than physical ones (ibid.: 55). *Verbal* processes (i.e. say, ask) are verbs of actual speech, which may be presented as either direct or indirect speech (ibid.: 56-57). *Relational* processes (i.e. is, have) are separated into two types: *Attributive* and *Identifying*. *Relational attributive* processes apply attributes on their participants, which are called carriers. *Relative*

*Identifying* processes, place a value on a token, in effect relabeling a single participant in different terms (ibid.: 58-59). A fifth type, the *behavioral* process (i.e. laugh, cry), carries qualities of both mental and material processes and relates to human physiological processes (Thompson, 2004: 103). Finally, *existential* processes present something as existing or happening (Halliday & Matthiesson 2004: 257).

Experiential meaning is created through the allocation of the above process types and roles to different social actors and Transitivity patterns reveal how a world-view is constructed through discourse. By looking at all the representations of a single process type and comparing process type frequencies, one may uncover the way a text chooses to portray events and characters. For instance, a text that is heavy on material processes may be more focused on action of people and event whereas a text that favors mental and verbal processes might be more concerned with the reactions of people and their evaluations of events. By re-organizing the patterns of on individual or groups of social actors, other patterns may emerge. For instance, the portrayal of one social actor or group of socials may indicate ideological stances that might otherwise not be apparent. One such framework for understanding the ways in which social actors are presented is van Leeuwen's (2008) social network of actors, which allows social actors to be viewed in all their representations to elicit patterns that may not be apparent in transitivity. Through this framework, patterns may emerge with reveal the ways in which Donald Trump construct and presents his reality to his audience. Against this backdrop, the next section will review van Leeuwen's Social Network of Actors and the ways in which social positioning realizes ideology.

#### **2.4 Van Leeuwen's (2008) Social Network of Actors**

Van Leeuwen's (2008: vii) Social Network of Actors rests upon the principles of recontextualization which presume that all representations of the world and the events within it constitute representations of actual social practices. The reproduction of these representations in discourse is marked by a shift in semantics that is linked in part to social actors and their roles and identities as well as their actions and performance styles, and, in the process of recontextualization a speaker may exclude or transform social actors or add legitimations to them (ibid.). One possible result of recontextualization is the impregnation of intentions, values and biases into discourse that might reveal an underlying ideology of the speaker. In his

speeches, as will be discussed in more detail later in section 4.1, Donald Trump recontextualizes reality in a way that reinforces the “truth” of his ideology. In this study, van Leeuwen’s framework is used to decontextualize the recontextualized features of Trump’s constructed reality. The following section will explore some of the principles of recontextualization as they relate to the representation of social actors.

#### ***2.4.1 Representation of Social Actors***

In his framework, van Leeuwen (2008) identifies three ways relevant to this study in which social practices are transformed in discourse during recontextualization: deletions, substitutions and additions. In the broadest sense, deletion occurs when actors are removed from the discourse through selective inclusion or exclusion. Substitutions occur when semiotic elements replace elements of actual social practice and add elements of meaning to the text. This can occur through association, disassociation, nominalization, categorization, genericization and specification. Additions occur when elements are added to the recontextualized social practice. Repetitions and evaluation through appraisements are some of the ways in semantic meaning is imbued into social practice (van Leeuwen 2008: 17-20). These means of recontextualization will be further discussed below.

#### ***Exclusion: Suppression and Backgrounding***

The choice of inclusion or exclusion of social actors is an important element of political discourse analysis because it reflects the interests of the speaker and the intended audience. The choice of who is or is not included and to what degree may reveal certain values held by the speaker and audience and how patterns of selective inclusion/exclusion may function as part of an overall ideological strategy (van Leeuwen 2008: 28). There are different degrees by which exclusion can be represented. Discourse may *include* social actors by representing them as participating in their actions. It may also *background* them by separating them from their actions, but leaving a retrievable reference to them elsewhere in the text or actors may be *suppressed* and remain completely unassociated with their actions. Social actors may also be completely *excluded* from the text.

Though the aims of a speaker in choices may be difficult to discern, patterns of suppression and backgrounding revealed in CDA may suggest strategic and ideological rather than innocent

constructions. In political discourse, this may be used to express ideological positions that emphasize or deemphasize the actions of social actors and serve the interests of the speaker. For example, as will be discussed in section 4.3, Trump backgrounds Ford Motor Company in its decision to relocate a factory from the U.S. to Mexico in order to de-emphasize its agency in an action that is viewed negatively by his audience.

### ***Determination: Association and Disassociation***

While exclusion relates to who and how social actors will be represented in a text, *determination* relates to role allocation and ways in which social actors are specified in a text. One way that social actors may be represented is through *association* with other social actors or action (van Leeuwen 2008: 38-39). These associations represent an “alliance which exists only in relation to a specific activity or set of activities” and may be “formed or unformed as the text proceeds” (ibid.). Associations can be realized through possessive pronouns and possessive attributive clauses of having and belonging or they may be created through parataxis (ibid.). In one of Trump’s speeches, as will be shown in section 4.4, the association of Middle Eastern nations and ISIS is used to inflate the appearance of his political opponents’ diplomatic failures.

### ***Genericization and Specification***

*Genericization* and *specification* constitute another means of allocating roles and are important toward the representation and audience perception of the social actors. As the terms suggest, *genericization* allocates generic roles to social actors and reflects a perception of reality that places emphasis on the class of which specific social actors serve as examples (van Leeuwen 2008: 35-36). One possible purpose for *genericization* is the distancing of *others*, an act that “symbolically removes [*them*] from the readers’ world of everyday experience” (ibid.). In contrast, *specification* places greater importance on the individual social actor. Considering the use of *genericization* in distancing, the reverse might also be true whereby *specification* is employed to connect readers to specific social actors.

Another important implication of the choices of which actors are allocated generic or specific reference is the link to social class (e.g. Bordieu 1986). In newspapers, specification of individual people tends to occur in discourse addressing the working class, whereas people of



higher status, e.g. politicians, experts, tend to be specified in discourse addressing the middle class (van Leeuwen 2008: 35). This link may also reveal the ways in which political discourse views its audience and constructs ideological messages to appeal to them.

### ***Nomination and Categorization: Functionalization, Identification, and Appraisalment***

Similar to determination, genericization and specification, *nomination* and *categorization* are concerned with the ways in which roles are allocated to social actors. Social actors may be nominated by their unique identity or categorized by the identities and functions they share with others (van Leeuwen 2008: 40). It is worth looking at these choices in more detail because they allow the speaker to emphasize and de-emphasize the social roles and personally evaluate social actors and their actions and thus represent an important aspect of ideological construction.

*Categorization* can be further broken down into *functionalization*, where the social actor is referred in terms of what they do, and *identification*, where the social actor is referred to in terms of who they are (van Leeuwen 2008: 42). In certain discourses, such as stories and newspapers, functionalized characters are passed over and do not become points of identification (ibid.). This effect may also be true for political discourse. For example, in Trump's speech in section 4.3, Obama is functionalized as "negotiator" in the description of a bad deal made by his administration, allowing him to background Obama and emphasize the negative characteristics of the event in which he was involved.

*Appraisements*, unlike the other forms of categorization, refer to social actors in interpersonal terms (ibid.: 45). Through *appraisements*, often through lexical choice, a speaker may evaluate social actors as good or bad, effective or ineffective, and so on and "reflects and reinforces the ideological values of a culture" (Thompson 2004: 75). As such, appraisements may also be used in legitimation. In this study, *appraisements* are used negatively to delegitimize the current American leadership and positively to legitimize Trump and his accomplishments. At other times, Trump uses positive appraisalment ironically to highlight unfavorable attributes of the leadership. Section 4.3 further examines this phenomenon in some depth.

## **2.5 Concluding Remarks**

This chapter has discussed various approaches to understanding political discourse and attempted to show how it relates to ideology. The principles of SFL were discussed in relation to their realization of patterns in the representation of processes and participants. These principles provided a foundation for a discussion of Van Leeuwen's social network of social actors and the specific ways in which ideology is constructed and framed in the representations of these social actors. The next chapter will present the data set to be analyzed.

## CHAPTER THREE: DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Chapter three presents an explanation of the data set that consists of three of Donald Trump's political speeches. It first details the data and the collection methods used for acquiring the data set, followed by a description of the context in which the speeches were created and delivered. The description of context begins with a brief introduction to the US presidential election system and follows with a description of the individual local contexts of each speech.

### 3.1 The Data

The data set analyzed in this study includes three speeches delivered by Donald Trump during his run for and ascendency to the U.S. presidency. These speeches were delivered over the span of two and a half years and mark the beginning, middle and end of his presidential run. The selection criteria for the data were as follows: firstly, the speeches should mark central moments in his campaign and thus be intended for the largest audience. The purpose for the first criterion is to identify those values that are meant to appeal to the largest audience and thus reduce them to the lowest common denominator. That is, different regions of the US hold different values to different levels of importance, such as *jobs* in areas with high unemployment or *illegal immigration* in areas near the Mexican/American border. By selecting speeches directed at the national audience, it is hoped that those values most important to all of Trump's audience will be most pronounced, rather than those speeches tailored to highlight values of local importance. Secondly, they should encompass the breadth of his campaign from announcement to acceptance. The purpose of the second criterion is to identify the consistencies and differences in his representation throughout the course of his campaign. It is believed that those values most consistently expressed those that are most fixed in Trump and his audience's ideology.

In conducting this analysis, rather than moving from speech to speech chronologically, this study will begin with an analysis of Trump's inaugural address. The purpose for doing so is found in the context of the speech. This speech was given in the moments after he was sworn in as president. As such, this speech was no longer an argument for, but an expression of Trump's vision of the future of the United States. More specifically he no longer needed to justify and validate his ideology against that of his opponents'. Because of this, this speech

lacks many of the traits that might be expected in a campaign speech; appeals to emotion, pity and fear are no longer needed to sell his ideological values and drum up public support and action; delegitimation of his rival is no longer necessary because he no longer has rivals; legitimizing himself is no longer necessary because he has been legitimized in the ultimate way, the popular vote. The second speech in the analysis is the announcement of Trump's candidacy, which took place at Trump Tower in New York City on June 16<sup>th</sup> of 2015. It was chosen because it marked the beginning of his campaign during the presidential election. This speech marks the first public articulation of his values and representation of ideology that would define the rest of his campaign. The final speech in the analysis, his Republican National Convention (RNC) acceptance speech, was delivered in Cleveland, Ohio on July 21<sup>st</sup> 2016. This speech was chosen because it marks a turning point in his campaign from the primary election to the general election, which will be explained in the following section.

This data set comprises online transcriptions from reputable news sources – *The Wall Street Journal*, *Politico*, and *CNN* – and personally checked for accuracy by a comparison with video recordings of each speech. A transcript of the inaugural address was downloaded on January 22<sup>nd</sup> 2017 from a *CNN* article published online on January 21<sup>st</sup> 2017. A transcript of the announcement speech was downloaded on December 10<sup>th</sup> 2016 from a *Wall Street Journal* article published online on June 16<sup>th</sup> 2015. A transcript of the RNC acceptance speech was downloaded on October 7<sup>th</sup> 2016 from a *Politico* article published online on July 22<sup>nd</sup> 2016. The following section will provide the context in which each speech was delivered.

### **3.2 Context of the Speeches**

Before discussing the context of the individual speeches, the U.S. presidential election process will be introduced in brief. The U.S. government is characterized by two major parties: Republican and Democrat. Prior to the general presidential election, each party holds an election within the party where multiple candidates appeal to members of their party to become the party's nominee for the general presidential election. This process is known as the "primary election". After securing a party nomination, the party nominees then contend for the presidency in the "general election". The data to be analyzed consists of three speeches, the chronological first occurs at the beginning of Trump's primary election campaign, the second at the end of the primary election/start of the general election and the final speech was delivered

after Donald Trump was sworn in as the 45<sup>th</sup> President of the United States of America. What follows will describe local contexts of each speech in chronological order.

Trump's announcement speech was delivered on the steps of Trump Tower in New York city. When he announced his candidacy, he was but one of eleven Republican candidates, a number that would grow to seventeen in the ensuing months. At the time, Marco Rubio and Jeb Bush, who had announced his candidacy the day prior, were favorites to win the nomination. Donald Trump, on the other hand, was considered an outsider to politics, given his leading role on the popular and longstanding reality show "The Apprentice", and thus was not considered a serious contender for the presidency. Even so, his status as a showman conferred newsworthiness on his announcement speech and so it was delivered on national television, giving him a broad audience for his message. This speech was directed at working class Americans to whom Trump sought to make a case for himself as a viable candidate, as will be discussed in section 4.3.

Trump's RNC acceptance speech was delivered in Cleveland, Ohio as he secured his spot as the Republican nominee for the presidential general election. This speech marks a shift in focus from his Republican rivals toward his Democratic opponent, Hillary Clinton. In this speech Trump set out to articulate and unify his ideology with that of the Republican party by contrasting it with that of Clinton and the Democratic party. This will be examined in section 4.4.

The final speech was delivered after Trump took the presidential oath of office. The nation had seen a particularly vitriolic and scandal-ridden presidential campaign and in this speech, Trump sought to express a sense of unity within the U.S. The ways that he does this will be analyzed in section 4.2.

### **3.3 Concluding Remarks**

This chapter has discussed the data set that will be analyzed. The next chapter will offer the analysis of the representation of social actors and actions and how they relate to the construction of textual personae and the framing of ideology. Moreover, it will provide a close examination of how the ideological positioning of *us* versus *them* is realized through the representations of social actors.

## CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Chapter four presents the analysis of the data set described in the previous chapter. Utilizing the principles of van Leeuwen’s (2008) Network of Social Actors, the data is analyzed in order to decontextualize the representations of social actors implemented by Donald Trump for the purpose of creating for his audience a specific reality of *us vs them* through legitimation and power. The goal of this analysis is to reveal the different ways in which the speeches portray the social actors as well as construct and frame his underlying ideology. The following sections provide a critical discourse analysis of the three speeches.

### 4.1 Representation of Social Actors in Donald Trump’s Speeches

When undergoing an analysis of the representations of social actors in Trump’s political speeches, it is important to find a common denominator by which to categorize those social in order to calibrate the analysis to a consistent set of references (van Leeuwen 2008: 31). For the purposes of this analysis, I have separated the social actors into four separate categories: *we/us*, *the Establishment*, *Trump*, and *foreigners* (See Figure 2).

Figure 2. Categories of Social Actors in Donald Trump’s Speeches

Category	Represents	Social Actors included
We/Us	Those to which the speech is directed ideologically; Trump’s audience	Trump’s audience. Referents include: <i>we, us, you, America, our country</i>
The Establishment	Institutional powers of society; those who represent Trump and his audience’s ideological opposition	Politicians, Media, Donors, Special Interests Referents include: <i>they, them, our leaders</i>
Trump	Direct self-reference to Trump as an individual	Trump Referents include: <i>I, me, Trump, we</i> (not inclusive of audience)
Foreigners	Foreign countries/entities and their people who represent threats to America	China, Mexico, Japan, ISIS, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Yemen Referents include: <i>they, them, the Middle East</i>

The first of these categories, which I refer to *we* or *us*, are those social actors that represent the audience of Donald Trump. These actors are often objectivated as “America”, “Our Country” as well as pronouns such as “we” and “us”. They are the people for whom Trump’s messages are directed and with whom he shares his ideology. The second group, *the Establishment*<sup>1</sup>, are those social actors that represent the institutional powers of society and include the government, politicians, donors, special interests and the media. In his speeches, they are presented as self-serving and as having led to the current state of *us*. This group is depicted as an ideological opponent of Trump and his supporters and was personally characterized as being against him and the American people (Trump 2016). *Trump* occupies a group of his own as he often represents himself as an individual entity in his speeches. Foreign countries and their people constitute the final group, which I have labelled *foreigners*. These *foreigners* are often presented in opposition to America and are portrayed negatively throughout his speeches. The following will analyze the texts based on these groups.

#### 4.2 Inaugural Address

The inaugural address of Donald Trump marks his first speech to the U.S. as president. In it two themes permeate his reality of America: firstly, that America is weak, secondly, that foreigners are strong. These two themes underscore the major messages of his political rhetoric: “Make America Great Again” and “America First”. It is through these messages that Trump represents all social actors as either *us* or *them* in terms of strength and weakness. Through this binary, Trump characterizes America (*us*) as weak, himself (*us*) as strong, *the Establishment* (*them*) as weak and *foreigners* (*them*) as strong. These representations allow Trump to delegitimize *them* and legitimize himself through the associations he creates in his speech. For one, America’s weakness results from *them* (*the Establishment* and *foreigners*). More specifically, Trump characterizes *the Establishment* as giving away to or allowing to be taken by foreigners those assets which made us strong (jobs, money, borders). The choice of agency between *the Establishment* and *foreigners* in the theft of our jobs shifts depending on

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Establishment* was a term heavily used during the presidential campaign to denote an entity that is powerful, rich, old, out of touch, secretive and self-interested. This epithet was often applied to politicians who were controlled by *the Establishment*, regardless of whether they were a part of it. It holds negative connotations of greed, corruption and self-interest when applied to candidates. In a video released on January 25, 2016 entitled “The Establishment”, Trump describes *the Establishment* as being against him and his campaign and includes in its ranks the media, the special interests, the lobbyists and the donors (Trump 2016).

Trump’s specific rhetorical goals. Trump uses this characterization to show the strength that America can and will have when *we* are allied with the strength of Trump.

### ***We Are Weak; They Are Strong***

In his vision, the problems that we have faced as a nation are the result of an alliance of the establishment and foreigners in pilfering and weakening America for their own self interests.

11. For too long, a small group in our nation's Capital *has reaped the rewards* of government while the people *have borne the cost.*<sup>2</sup>
12. Washington *flourished* – but the people *did not share in its wealth.*
13. Politicians *prospered* – but the jobs *left*, and the factories *closed.*
14. The establishment *protected itself*, but not the citizens of our country.
15. Their victories *have not been your victories;*
16. Their triumphs *have not been your triumphs;*
17. and while they *celebrated* in our nation's capital, there was *little to celebrate* for struggling families *all across our land.*

In these examples, the moral bankruptcy of *the Establishment* is highlighted through a juxtaposition of their fortunes and the American people’s misfortunes; *They* are characterized as having “flourished” “prospered” and “celebrated” while the American people have, at the same time, lost their money and their jobs. These contrasts present a dire portrait of America that resonates with many working-class Americans and had been a central theme of Trump’s campaign. During this time, many Americans lost their jobs as they watched the government bail-out of the banking industry, a decline in working class manufacturing jobs and an increase in a negatively perceived trade deficit.

In these examples Trump represents *the Establishment* in a variety of terms that create a composite representation as out-of-touch, self-interested and distant from the everyday lives of people. They are represented by location as in “Washington, D.C”, “Washington” and “our nation’s capital” that flourished in wealth not shared by the people. This characterization presents them as centralizing their wealth to benefit a select few in a specific area which, in the case of most of Trump’s ideological base, is far removed from them. They are generalized as “politicians” who prosper while jobs disappear from the US. This conveys a sense of disinterestedness on the part of politicians to the plight of the people they are meant to represent.

---

<sup>2</sup> The analyzed texts are numbered as they appear in the appendix so that the lines can be viewed in the context where the specific statement appears. All examples in section 4.2 are taken from Appendix I.



Finally, they are referred to as “the Establishment”. This characterization summarizes all the connotations of self-interest, corruption and greed. In addition to the self-interested characterization Trump presents of *the Establishment*, he also insinuates their complicity in the bettering of foreign countries.

39. For many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry; subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military;
40. We've defended other nation's borders while refusing to defend our own;
42. We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country has disappeared over the horizon.

In these lines, “we” is used in reference to the past to denote the American people under the leadership of *the Establishment*. Here, “we” are portrayed in negatively in contrast to an image of favoritism toward other countries. *We* have “enriched”, “subsidized”, “defended” and “made rich” foreigners, but have “allowed” our industry and our military to founder, our wealth, strength and confidence to disappear, and “refused” to defend our own borders. This characterization presents *us* as having valued the welfare of other nations over that of the U.S.

### ***With Trump, We are Strong***

In contrast to *our* past alliance with *the Establishment*, Trump’s vision of the future unites Trump and the American people in a promise of strength and accomplishment. Trump presents this construction of reality not just by what we will do together, but by representing himself as the embodiment of the will of the people. Indeed, he presents himself, not as the sole ascendant to the throne of power, but as one of the public, the voice of the people personified, come to bring prosperity to all of America.

10. Today we are not merely **transferring** power from one administration to another, or from one party to another – but we are **transferring** power from Washington, D.C. and giving it back to *you, the People*.
18. That all **changes** – starting right here, and right now, because this moment is your moment: it belongs to *you*.
20. It belongs to *everyone* gathered here today and everyone watching all across America. January 20th 2017, will be remembered as the day the people **became** the rulers of this nation again.

When referring to his election as president, Trump often characterizes it in terms of transformation, such as “transfer”, “become” and “change”, where the election marks not merely the election of a new president, but a turning point of the power structures within the

U.S. and a transformation of America. His ascendancy to the presidency is characterized as a symbolic rise of the people's voice and the people taking over the government.

38. The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans.
53. I will fight for you with every breath in my body – and I will never, ever let you down.
21. This is *your day*.
22. This is *your celebration*.
23. And this, the United States of America, is *your country*.

As shown above, Trump reinforces his representation by equating oath of office to an oath of allegiance to the American people. In characterizing his inaugural ceremony this way, his victory is not represented as one for Trump, but as a personal victory of the people. In lines 53, 21, 22, and 23, Trump uses the pronoun “you” to emphasize this fact. Through its use, Trump backgrounds his own involvement and creates an air of being a vessel of the people.

With Trump now as our leader, he confers his strength upon *us*, and presents an America that are strong, proud and competitive and that has good jobs, a solid infrastructure, strong police and is the envy of the world. The united strength of Trump and the American people is highlighted in his use of “we” to describe the future.

56. We will bring back our jobs.
57. We will bring back our borders.
58. We will bring back our wealth.
59. We will bring back our dreams.
98. Together, We will make America strong again.
99. We will make America wealthy again.
100. We will make America proud again.
101. We will make America safe again.
102. And yes, together, we will make America great again.

Here, Trump promises that together, we can restore America to its former glory. This presents a positive outlook on the future with him that provides a stark contrast to the negative current state of affairs in America. The themes of strength/weakness and *us/them* examined in this speech also pervaded Trump's campaign. The following section will present the analysis of Trump's announcement speech.

### 4.3 Announcement of Candidacy Speech

One of the common themes found in Trump's speeches is the clear dichotomy of winners and losers, strength and weakness. Every social actor in his speeches is framed in this light. In Donald Trump's announcement speech, role allocations are depicted as a means of presenting the realities of the state of America in terms of strength and weakness: *we are weak, foreigners are strong, the Establishment is weak, Trump is strong.*

#### *We are Weak*

At the beginning of this speech, role allocation describes *us* in terms of what we are, what we possess and what is done to us. Looking first at the how Trump characterizes *us* in terms of what we are, the following lines<sup>3</sup> were selected based on the relational processes in which *we* are allocated the role of carrier.

- 20. Our country is in **serious trouble**.
- 39. The U.S. has become **a dumping ground for everybody else's problems**.
- 126. We as a country are getting **weaker**.
- 676. We are **26th in the world** [in education].
- 679. We're becoming **a third world country**, because of our infrastructure, our airports, our roads, everything.
- 793. \$24 trillion [deficit] — we're **very close** — that's the point of no return. \$24 trillion. We will be there soon. That's when we become **Greece**. That's when we become **a country that's unsalvageable**.
- 887. We are **like a third world country**.
- 907. We're **in a[n]** [economic] **bubble**.
- 917. Sadly, the American dream is **dead**.

In these processes, America is defined by our attributes through the use of “in serious trouble”, “like a third world country”, “26<sup>th</sup> in the world”, “dead” and “a dumping ground for everyone else's problems”, terms that present America in a state of crisis. Other attributes such as “in a bubble” and “very close [to a \$24 trillion deficit]” and the intensive process verbs “are becoming” and “are getting” also contribute to the negative construction of America. Moreover, their conjugation in the present progressive adds element of transformation that America is undergoing temporally and implies that the course of America is changing for the worse. The pronoun “we” is also used to describe *us* by what *we* possess and what *we* don't possess.

- 21. We **don't** have **victories** anymore.
- 22. We **used to** have **victories**,

---

<sup>3</sup> The analyzed texts are numbered as they appear in the appendix so that the lines can be viewed in the context where the specific statement appears. All examples in section 4.3 are taken from Appendix II.

23. but we **don't** have **them**.  
 291. Our country has tremendous **potential**.  
 292. We have tremendous **people**.  
 293. We have **people that aren't working**.  
 294. We have **people that have no incentive to work**.  
 545. We got **\$18 trillion in debt**.  
 546. We got **nothing but problems**.  
 547. We got **a military that needs equipment all over the place**.  
 548. We got **nuclear weapons that are obsolete**.  
 549. We've got **nothing**.  
 550. We've got Social Security that's going to be **destroyed** if somebody like me doesn't bring money into the country.  
 781. We have **losers**.  
 782. We have **losers**.  
 783. We have **people that don't have it**.  
 784. We have **people that are morally corrupt**.  
 785. We have **people that are selling this country down the drain**.

These lines represent all the examples of possessive relational processes where “we” occupies the role of possessor. In these lines, *we* are most frequently described as possessing negative things such as “problems” and “debt”. This characterization represents the present state of America that is unfavorable and reinforces its characterized weakness. In the binary of *us/them*, this representation of *us* appears to run counter to the strategy of positive self-presentation in ideological discourse (van Dijk 2006: 126). However, the representation of America in lines 781-785 associates this weakness with the poor stewardship of *our* current leaders. *Our* only positive possessions in this speech function to present different characterizations of the past and present. *Our* past possessions, “victories”, are characterized as things that *we* “used to” possess but possess no longer, an indication of former strength. *Our* present possessions, in lines 291-292, are the intrinsic qualities that indicate the tools for possible strength, “tremendous potential” and “tremendous people”. The juxtaposition of weak country and strong people further bolsters Trump’s argument against the current leadership by implying that *we* are being improperly utilized. In contrast, *our* jobs and money are possessed by others.

119. China has our jobs  
 120. Mexico has our jobs  
 121. They all have our jobs

This characterization presents an example of ideological in-group/out-group, whereby *foreigners* are represented by their negative actions with respect to *us* (van Dijk 2006: 125-126). In this light, a likely purpose for characterizing the movement of manufacturing jobs abroad, this representation of foreign countries possessing “our jobs” suggests that those jobs are

rightfully *ours* and were unjustly taken from *us*. By representing “our jobs” in this way, Trump may be suggesting that *we* have been unable to prevent *them* from taking our jobs, highlighting *our* weakness. America’s depiction as weak is also constructed by what is done to “us”.

25. [China] kill[s] us.
28. [Japan] send[s] their cars over by the millions, and what do we do?
32. [Japan] beat[s] us all the time.
34. [Mexico] [is] laughing at us, at our stupidity.
35. [Mexico] [is] beating us economically.
38. [Mexico] [is] killing us economically.
43. They’re not sending (us) their best.
46. They’re sending people (to us).
47. They’re bringing those problems with us.
48. They’re bringing drugs (to us).
49. They’re bringing crime (to us).
56. They’re sending us not the right people (to us).
313. [Foreigners] take our jobs,
314. they take our money,
315. and then they loan us back the money,

Throughout the speech, when *we* and *foreigners* share a process, *we* are frequently subjected in material processes where *foreigners* occupy the role of *agent*, which adds a third leg to the image of weakness presented in this speech. The lexical choices in which America is allocated the role of goal or range (kill, beat, take, bring, send, as found in above examples) create a textual persona of America as impotent in preventing the actions being done to us. Moreover, we are not just being beaten, we are being humiliated, a fact highlighted in the sole behavioral process where ‘Mexico is laughing at us, our stupidity’. This choice in lexis seems more directed at pathos than logic and appears intended to elicit a very visceral emotional response in his audience (Walton 2007: 186).

### ***Foreigners are Strong***

In contrast to America, foreign countries are presented as being strong. As shown in the previous section, this characterization is partially constructed by what foreign countries do to *us*, seemingly at will, as well as what they possess (e.g. our jobs). Trump attributes this strength to their leadership. This quality is established in relation to America and its leadership as exemplified in the following excerpts.

125. Our enemies are getting stronger and stronger by the way, and we as a country are getting weaker.
416. No, I love [China]. But their leaders are much smarter than our leaders and we can't sustain ourself with that. It's like take the New England Patriots and Tom Brady and have them play your high school football team. That's the difference between China's leaders and our leaders. They are ripping us. We are rebuilding China.
633. and the cartel (possible reference to OPEC) kept the price [of oil] up because, again, they were smarter than our leaders.

In each example, a textual persona of strong *foreign* leadership is constructed in relation to America through direct contrast. *Foreigners*, however, are characterized as possessing some inherently reprehensible qualities or deriving their strength from morally suspect actions.

454. Mexico takes a company, a car company that was going to build in Tennessee, rips it out.
50. They're rapists.
358. China comes over and they dump all their stuff...
363. [China] devalue[s] their currency so brilliantly...
366. [China] got away with it again.
396. They're not supposed to be doing that.
401. They wanted Boeing's secrets.
402. they wanted their patents and all their secrets before they agreed to buy planes from Boeing.
460. All of a sudden, at the last moment, this big car manufacturer, foreign, announces they're not going to Tennessee.

Through negatively connoted lexical choice, a nefarious element is added to the processes associated with *foreigners*. This negative appraisal reinforces the contrast of *us* and *them*, as Trump delegitimizes their actions as immoral (see Figure 1 on expressions of Ideology in discourse; see also section 2.4.1 on *Appraisal*). The derogation of *foreigner* is most apparent when Trump relates the story of the American car company Ford's decision to build a factory in Mexico that had initially been slated to be built in Tennessee (lines 453-463 in Appendix II).

I have another [story], Ford.

So Mexico takes a company, a car company that was going to build in Tennessee, rips it out. Everybody thought the deal was dead. Reported it in the Wall Street Journal recently. Everybody thought it was a done deal. It's going in and that's going to be it, going into Tennessee. Great state, great people.

All of a sudden, at the last moment, this big car manufacturer, foreign, announces they're not going to Tennessee. They're gonna spend their \$1 billion in Mexico instead. Not good.

Now, Ford announces a few weeks ago that Ford is going to build a \$2.5 billion car and truck and parts manufacturing plant in Mexico. \$2.5 billion, it's going to be one of the largest in the world. Ford. Good company.

In the beginning of this excerpt, Trump suppresses Ford's agency in the removal of the plant by misattributing agency to Mexico.

Mexico **takes** a company, a car company that was going to build in Tennessee, **rips** it out.

Trump further suppresses Ford's involvement by identifying them as "a car company that was going to build in Tennessee" rather than through nomination, despite having nominated Ford in the previous sentence. In doing so, Mexico is presented as being actively responsible for the removal of the "car company" from Tennessee. Moreover, the lexical choices of "take" and "rip out" add an element of hostility and coerciveness to the misallocated actions of Mexico. Having established Mexico's agency, Trump then reframes this event in different terms.

All of a sudden, at the last moment, this big car manufacturer, *foreign,* **announces** they're not going to Tennessee. They're gonna spend their \$1 billion in Mexico instead. Not good.

In this second characterization, Trump continues to background Ford by representing them as "this big car manufacturer". In conjunction with Ford's role allocation as speaker in the verbal process "announce" rather than as the agent of a material process, agency is further obscured. Given the previous utterance, this leaves open the interpretation that Mexico, not Ford, was responsible for the action. Finally, this characterization is punctuated with negative evaluation of the situation as "not good". Another point of note is the seemingly inexplicable attribution of "foreign" to the "big car manufacturer" which we already know refers to Ford. One possible explanation for this is that Trump misspoke. Another possibility is that he was referring to different car companies in a poorly worded example. However, it seems more likely, given the nature of his characterization of *foreigners* throughout the speech, that it was deliberate. As such, the association with "this big car manufacturer" with "foreign" fits with the narrative that *foreigners* do negative things like "not going to Tennessee". In the final reframing of the story, Ford is nominated and represented as speaker.

Ford **announces** a few weeks ago that Ford **is going to build** a \$2.5 billion car and truck and parts manufacturing plant in Mexico. Ford. Good company.

Here Ford is no longer backgrounded as a participant, but their role as speaker rather than as agent in their decision to move is still not made explicit. As a result, at this point in the narrative, Mexico's agency has been insinuated to the point that one may not blame Ford for their decision to move to Mexico. Instead, Ford is positively evaluated at the end of the utterance and Ford's agency is finally allocated to the creative process "build" which holds positive connotations

and present Ford as a creator. Furthermore, no mention of leaving Tennessee, previously evaluated as “not good”, is made in connection to Ford. The purpose for presenting Ford in this light is the symbolic nature of Ford to Trump’s audience. Ford was once a leading car manufacturer that struggled in recent years as more cars were manufactured abroad, and serves as an allegory to plight of the American working class and the movement of their jobs overseas. As such, Ford is symbolic of the intrinsic strength of *us*, the American working class.

In sum, this this representation of *us* and *them* underscores an ideology that *we* are morally good and *foreigners* are morally suspect. Through misrepresentation and lexical choice, Trump decontextualizes the decision of a profit driven American company to capitalize on cheaper foreign labor and reframes it in a way that demonizes the foreign country, but glorifies the company.

### ***Our Leadership is Weak***

In this speech roles are also allocated to attribute the weakness of America to that of its leadership. As shown in the following lines, *the Establishment* is characterized as weak, corrupt and inept.

- 226. I’ve **watched** the politicians.
- 227. I’ve **dealt** with them all my life.
- 228. If you can’t **make** a good deal with a politician,
- 229. then there’s something wrong with you.
- 234. **They’re controlled** fully—
- 235. **They’re controlled** fully by the lobbyists, by the donors, and by the special interests, fully.
- 236. Yes, they **control** them.
- 817. And we won’t be using a man like Secretary Kerry that has absolutely no concept of negotiation, who’s making a horrible and laughable deal, who’s just **being tapped along** as they make weapons right now, and then goes into a bicycle race at 72 years old.

Lines 226-236 above represent all the instances where *the Establishment* is the object of the clause and receiver of action. Apart from lines 226-227, which impart upon Trump an insight on the affairs of “politicians”, these representations characterize *the Establishment* as not acting in the interests of the people they represent. Lines 228-229 imply that making deals with politicians is easy. Given Trump’s status as a billionaire who has “watched” and “dealt with” politicians, a reasonable assumption is that they are motivated by greed. Lines 234-236 explicitly state that politicians “are controlled” by outside forces. In this sense, they are “puppets” to the greater powers of *the Establishment*: the lobbyists, the donors and the special



interests. Line 817, constructs an image of ineptitude whereby the Secretary of John Kerry, is “being tapped along” or being taken advantage of by the people with whom he is negotiating. The association of American weakness and that of its leadership is highlighted when *we* and *the Establishment* are represented as actors in the same process.

- 232. They will never make America great again.
- 319. How stupid are our leaders?
- 351. we have people that are stupid.
- 352. We have people that aren't smart.
- 353. we have people that are controlled by special interests.
- 620. How are these people gonna lead us?
- 625. They can't lead us.
- 780. We have the opposite thinking.
- 781. We have losers.
- 782. We have losers.
- 783. We have people that don't have it.
- 784. We have people that are morally corrupt.
- 785. We have people that are selling this country down the drain.

This relationship is most pronounced when *the Establishment* is represented as possessions of *us*. In these lines, he questions their abilities (lines 620 and 319) and defines them negatively by labelling them as “losers”, “stupid”, “not smart”, “controlled”, and “corrupt”. This reinforces the idea that what we possess is bad.

### ***Trump is a Winner***

A final theme that is established in this speech is Trump's strength as a leader, which is presented in several ways throughout this speech. One such way is through his representation as a sensor of cognitive mental processes (see section 2.3 for details).

- 18. I don't think it's gonna happen
- 51. Some, I assume, are good people.
- 259. I think he'll be a great cheerleader for the country.
- 260. I think he'd be a great spirit.
- 263. I really thought that he would be a great cheerleader.
- 471. I know the smartest negotiators in the world.
- 472. I know the good ones.
- 473. I know the bad ones.
- 474. I know the overrated ones.
- 481. I know the negotiators in the world...
- 652. I think I am a nice person.

The allocation of these roles confers upon Trump a status not rendered to other social actors by allowing him to react to events in a “cognitive and rational” manner (van Leeuwen 2008: 58).

In contrast, other actors are only able to react in a cognitively negative way or affectively by want or need. The following lines represent all the cognitive mental processes not associated with Trump.

60. We don't know.
63. We don't know what's happening.
433. We don't know how to use them [the cards].
434. We don't even know that we have the cards, because our leaders don't understand the game.
129. [The government] don't know if it worked.
162. [Republicans] don't know how to bring it [Trump support] about.
165. [Republicans] don't know —
612. [Bush] didn't know [the answer to the question].
618. [Rubio] didn't know [the answer to the question].
11. [The Republican candidates] didn't know the air-conditioner didn't work.
14. [The Republican candidates] didn't know the room was too big.

By dividing cognitive processes in this way, a pattern emerges about how each category of social actor is presented. In the above lines, *we* and *the Establishment* are represented through negative cognitive mental processes while *foreigners* remain unrepresented. The processes associated with these social actors are almost entirely coded as “don't know” with the one exception of “don't understand”. There is an additional pattern in the representation of what it is that is not known, or the phenomenon. In these lines, *the Establishment* is characterized as not knowing specific information such as “the answer” and somewhat trivial things like “that the room was too big”. These representations reinforce the idea that *the Establishment* is stupid and cognitively incapable of leading us properly. *We*, on the other hand, are characterized as not knowing vague generalities and concepts such as “what's happening” or “that we have the cards<sup>4</sup>”. This representation of *us* creates a sense of ignorance rather than ineptitude that may be attributed to the actions our leaders. Lines 434 makes this relationship explicit. The following will now examine all the affective “want” processes not associated with Trump.

401. [China] wanted Boeing's secrets.
402. [China] wanted [Boeing's] patents and all their secrets.
161. [The Republican candidates] all want me to support them.
551. All these other people want to cut the hell out of [Social Security].
878. The General Services ... wanted to do a great job.
879. [The General Services] wanted to make sure it got built.

---

<sup>4</sup> In this last example, what “the cards” exactly are remains unclear, though they seem to refer to the tools for making America great again.

In the above lines, China and *the Establishment* are represented as “wanting”. In lines 401-402, China is represented as wanting the American aeronautics company Boeing’s (and by extension, America’s) secrets. This representation of China reinforces Trump’s characterization of *foreigners* as immoral, explained earlier in this section. In lines 161, 878 and 879, *the Establishment* is described as wanting things in association with Trump. These characterizations generally portray Trump in a positive light and highlight his strengths. Line 161, shows that other candidates want Trump’s support. Lines 878-879 were delivered in reference to General Services selection of Trump to build on a historically important site. By characterizing high-status officials and government bodies as wanting Trump, Trump is legitimizing himself as a candidate. In line 551, “all these other people”, a reference to his Republican rivals, are portrayed negatively by what they would do to a presumably popular social program if they become president, this representation is bolstered by the negatively connoted adverbial phrase “the hell out of”. Finally, *we* are allocated all the subject roles in affective “need” processes.

249. Our country **needs** a truly great leader,  
250. and we **need** a truly great leader now.  
251. We **need** a leader that wrote “The Art of the Deal”.  
252. We **need** a leader that can bring back our jobs, can bring back our manufacturing, can bring back our military, can take care of our vets.  
253. And we also **need** a cheerleader.  
273. We **need** somebody that can take the brand of the United States and make it great again.  
277. We **need** somebody that literally will take this country and make it great again.

In doing so, Trump highlights a lack in leadership that only he can fill. In these examples, Trump frames *our* needs in a way that obliquely demonstrates characteristics that he possesses, which are implied by his position as a presidential candidate. This implication is less subtle in line 3 where he references a book that he wrote in characterization of the kind of leader that *we* need.

In addition to using mental processes to construct a textual persona of greater power, Trump also defines himself by what he does. Trump frequently allocates himself as the agent in material processes and rarely as the goal. In this way, he presents himself as a man of action that is independent from the actions of others. The processes associated with Trump bestow upon him qualities of strength in different spheres that legitimize him as a candidate: as a businessman, as a political outsider and as an expert. The following are examples that show

some actions that legitimize him as a businessman:

149. I hire people, they do a website  
693. I've done an amazing job.  
695. I started off in a small office with my father in Brooklyn and Queens.  
712. And after four or five years in Brooklyn, I ventured into Manhattan  
713. and [I] did a lot of great deals — the Grand Hyatt Hotel.  
715. I did a lot of great deals,  
716. and I did them early and young.  
717. And now I'm building all over the world.  
730. I've employed tens of thousands of people over my lifetime.  
750. I made it the old-fashioned way.

Here, when referring to his role as a businessman, he regularly positions himself as the agent of creative material processes through the processes “do” and “make” (Halliday & Matthiesson 2004: 185-186). The transformative processes “employ” and “hire” also imply Trump’s role as a job creator. This presents Trump as not only a man of action, but a man who creates. These qualities of strength are also represented by what he possesses. The things Trump possesses and with which he surrounds himself are exceedingly positive and frequently qualified by words like so, many, best, wonderful, and great.

147. I have so many websites,  
148. I have [websites] all over the place.  
201. I have the best [golf] courses in the world,  
204. I have [a golf course] right next to the White House, right on the Potomac.  
757. I have assets — big accounting firm, one of the most highly respected — 9 billion 240 million dollars.  
758. And I have liabilities of about [\$]500 [million].  
770. I have a total net worth and now with the increase, it'll be well-over \$10 billion.  
163. I own a big chunk of the Bank of America Building at 1290 Avenue of the Americas, that I got from China in a war.  
866. We got [the Old Post Office] from the General Services Administration in Washington. The Obama administration.  
870. We got [the Old Post Office from General Services].  
872. Trump got it.  
873. Well, I got [the Old Post Office from General Services] for two reasons.  
875. Number Two, we had a really good plan.  
877. we had a great financial statement.  
164. [Republicans] come up to my office.  
198. [Obama] might even be on one of my courses.

213. I have a friend who's a doctor,  
237. Hey, I have lobbyists  
239. I have lobbyists that can produce anything for me.  
281. I have a wonderful family.  
356. A friend of mine is a great manufacturer.

The possessions that Trump talks about occupy two different groups (separated above, i.e. lines from 147 to 198, and lines from 213 to 356): physical capital such as “net worth over \$10 billion”

and “assets over 9 billion 240 million dollars” and symbolic capital such as “a friend who’s a doctor” and “lobbyists”. By talking about his physical capital in his speech, he is demonstrating value to his audience; the physical things that he possesses are the result of his success as a businessman and thus reflect intrinsic features of strength and acumen. Trump’s symbolic capital, on the other hand, signifies a particular level of access that Trump possesses, access to exclusive locations and powerful people. In lines 164 and 198 he conflates the two, suggesting that his material successes have granted this access. Symbolic capital is also presented in material processes:

164. I’m meeting with three of [politicians] in the next week.  
227. I’ve dealt with [politicians] all my life.

Here, he shows his access to politicians through an active participation in the affairs of politicians. These examples also demonstrate Trump’s expertise through inside knowledge of and familiarity with the way things get done in politics. Taken together, this access also indicates that Trump has the power and position to ‘control’ information.

Another demonstration of his possession of symbolic capital comes through the use of dialogue. In these cases, Trump details personal conversations to his audience. One of the distinctive characteristics of these dialogues is that social actors in which Trump engages are functionalized symbols of everyday people. For instance, in the sentence shown below, the doctor friend serves as an expert testifying that the Affordable Care Act, a product of the Obama administration is a ‘disaster and must be repealed.

Doctors are quitting. I have *a friend who’s a doctor*, and he said to me the other day, “Donald, I never saw anything like it. I have more accountants than I have nurses. It’s a disaster. My patients are beside themselves. They had a plan that was good. They have no plan now.” We have to repeal Obamacare.  
(Lines 212-221 in Appendix II)

In this example, the existence of his “friend who’s a doctor” is questionable as he provides no thread from which to verify his friend nor do the facts support his assertion that “doctors are quitting” (Diamond 2015). Even so, this doctor friend serves as an expert opinion meant to legitimize his ideological position on universal healthcare through its representation as a conversation with a real person. This use of dialogue serves as a vehicle for supporting his argument that Obamacare must be repealed.

Finally, Trump uses appraisal of social actors to elevate his personal status. *The Establishment* and *foreigners* are positively appraised when they interact with Trump the businessman.

Figure 3. Appraisements Attributed to Them in Trump’s Announcement Speech

	Positive Appraisal
Republicans	I hear my fellow Republicans. <u>And they’re wonderful people. I like them.</u> They all want me to support them. They don’t know how to bring it about. They come up to my office. (Lines 158-163 in Appendix II)  I’m meeting with three of them in the next week. And they don’t know— “Are you running? Are you not running? Could we have your support? What do we do? How do we do it?” <u>I like them.</u> (Lines 164-170 in Appendix II)
Obama Administration	We’re building on Pennsylvania Avenue, the Old Post Office...We got it from the General Services Administration in Washington. The Obama administration... Because the General Services, <u>who are terrific people, by the way, and talented people,</u> they wanted to do a great job. And they wanted to make sure it got built. (Lines 863, 866, 878 in Appendix II)
China	<u>I like China.</u> I just sold an apartment for \$15 million to somebody from China. (Lines 405-407 in Appendix II)  <u>I love China.</u> The biggest bank in the world is from China. You know where their United States headquarters is located? In this building, in Trump Tower. <u>I love China.</u> (Lines 410-413 in Appendix II)
Saudi Arabia	I love the Saudis. Many are in this [Trump’s] building. (Lines 572-573 in Appendix II)

These positive appraisements stand out because they conflict with the greater message of negative other-presentation in the rest of the speech. This conflict of meaning has the effect of insincerity and irony (Louw 1993). Through this ironic positive appraisal acts to delegitimize *the Establishment* and *foreigners*, Trump suggests that they act in the interest of money. Trump, on the other hand, is exempt from outside critiques as he presents himself as merely a businessman acting in the interest of his business, which in turn elevates Trumps status as a savvy businessman and as an expert in the activities of *the Establishment* and *foreigners*, and legitimizes his position as a political candidate.

The discourse analysis of Trumps' announcement speech revealed several patterns relating to trumps construction of reality and the presentation of it toward his audience. In it he presents his case to America about his perception of the world. His characterization reveals and in-group outgroup ideological division, where *we* and *Trump* constitute the ingroup and the establishment and foreigners make up the outgroup. Here trump presents a case that portrays them as being responsible for all the problems that we face today. This picture is created through narratives involving China and Mexico, descriptions and evaluations of the current state of the nation, negative appraisements and so on. Within the outgroup there is also a dynamic at play that contrasts the establishment with foreigners. The establishment is portrayed as stupid and weak while foreigners are portrayed as strong and wicked. Furthermore, foreigners are presented as preying off America and taking advantage of it due to the ineptitude of the establishment.

#### 4.4 RNC Acceptance Speech

At this point in the campaign, Trump has just secured the Republican nomination for the US general presidential election. Rather than legitimizing his position as in the first speech, his main purposes in this speech are to distinguish himself from his opponent and articulate the dangers posed by *foreigners*. One notable difference in this speech is Trump's representation of Republicans, or lack thereof. In this speech, Trump suppresses the roles of Republican politicians and highlights the roles of the Democrats and Hillary Clinton. For their part, Republican politicians are only briefly mentioned in relation to Trump. Generalized members of *the Establishment*, on the other hand, are only characterized negatively and with respect to *us*.

12. Any **politician** who does not grasp this danger is not fit to lead our country.<sup>5</sup>
85. The problems we face now – poverty and violence at home, war and destruction abroad – will last only as long as we continue relying on the same **politicians** who created them in the first place.
86. A change in **leadership** is required to produce a change in outcomes.
90. As long as we are led by **politicians** who will not put America First, then we can be assured that other nations will not treat America with respect.
110. I have embraced crying mothers who have lost their children because our **politicians** put their personal agendas before the national good.
113. I have no patience for injustice, no tolerance for government incompetence, no sympathy for **leaders** who fail their citizens.

---

<sup>5</sup> The analyzed texts are numbered as they appear in the appendix so that the lines can be viewed in the context where the specific statement appears. All examples in section 4.4 are taken from Appendix III.

114. When innocent people suffer, because our **political system** lacks the will, or the courage, or the basic decency to enforce our laws – or still worse, has sold out to some corporate lobbyist for cash – I am not able to look the other way and I won't look the other way.
207. Tonight, I want every American whose demands for immigration security have been denied – and every **politician** who has denied them – to listen very closely to the words I am about to say.
271. The **politicians** have talked about this [eliminating wasteful spending] for years, I am going to do it.
305. America is a nation of believers, dreamers, and strivers that is being led by **a group of censors, critics, and cynics**.
309. No longer can we rely on **those same people** in the media, and politics, who will say anything to keep our rigged system in place.

Because the Establishment is generalized exactly who is responsible for the agency of the processes remains up to the interpretation of the listeners. The fact that this speech was delivered at the RNC suggests that the audience would interpret these lines as throwing blame upon the democratic rivals. This may in fact be the intention of Trump as specification and nomination only occurs with the opposition. However, Republicans are neither represented negatively nor positively and their absence may suggest their inclusion in the generalized representations of *the Establishment*. This implication is also suggested by the political context of the speech. At the time, though the presidency was occupied by a Democrat, a highly unpopular Congress had been under Republican leadership for the previous two years.

With regards to his political opposition, Trump begins his speech with a critique of the current state of the U.S. under the leadership of the then-President Obama and his administration. In this critique, Trump associates Obama and his policies, through nominalized processes and circumstances, with the decline in America, through nominalized facts. These facts highlight some of Trump's main talking points: crime, immigration, jobs, trade and international trade. The selected text below on crime exemplifies this effect.

27. Decades of progress made in bringing down crime are now being reversed by **this Administration's rollback of criminal enforcement**.
28. *Homicides* last year increased by 17% in America's fifty largest cities.
29. That's *the largest increase* in 25 years.
30. In our nation's capital, *killings* have risen by 50 percent.
31. *They* are up nearly 60% in nearby Baltimore.
32. In **the President's hometown of Chicago**, more than 2,000 have been *the victims of shootings this year alone*.
33. And more than 3,600 have been killed in the Chicago area since **he** took office.

In this example, Trump is attempting to demonstrate a correlation between rising crime and Obama's leadership. The closest he comes to defining this cause and effect relationship occurs in line 27 where he associates the abstract concept of "decades of progress made in bringing



down crime” with the equally vague “this administration’s rollback of criminal enforcement”. The use of nominalization has obscured exactly what “progress” was made and what the “rollback” constituted and in what way the “rollback” reversed this “progress”. Though failing a logical connection between Obama and the decline in America, the use of parataxis associates the two to create the feeling of a logical connection. Following Trump’s critique of Obama, he appraises Clinton’s former role as Secretary of State in a similar vein.

67. Hillary Clinton’s] bad instincts and her bad judgment – something pointed out by Bernie Sanders – are what caused so many of the disasters unfolding today.
68. Let’s review the record.
69. In 2009, pre-Hillary, ISIS was **not even on the map**.
70. Libya was **stable**.
71. Egypt was **peaceful**.
72. Iraq was seeing **a really big big reduction in violence**.
73. Iran was being **choked by sanctions**.
74. Syria was somewhat **under control**.
75. After four years of Hillary Clinton, what do we have?
76. ISIS has **spread across the region, and the entire world**.
77. Libya is in ruins, and **our Ambassador and his staff were left helpless to die at the hands of savage killers**.
78. Egypt was **turned over to the radical Muslim brotherhood**, forcing the military to retake control.
79. Iraq is **in chaos**.
80. Iran is **on the path to nuclear weapons**.
81. Syria is **engulfed in a civil war and a refugee crisis that now threatens the West**.
82. After fifteen years of wars in the Middle East, after trillions of dollars spent and thousands of lives lost, the situation is worse than it has ever been before.
83. This is the legacy of Hillary Clinton: death, destruction, terrorism and weakness.

In this example, Hillary Clinton centers in a before and after characterization of the Middle East. The comparison illustrates Trump’s appraisal of her “instincts” and “judgement” as bad in line 67 above. In lines 69 and 75, through circumstantialization, Trump associates Clinton temporally to events in the Middle East as they stood “pre-Hillary” and “after four years of Hillary Clinton”. Here, a “pre-Hillary” snapshot of the Middle East is presented as devoid of the terrorist group ISIS, “stable”, “peaceful” and relatively under (*our*) control. This characterization is followed by a post-Hillary snapshot representing a region that is overrun with terrorism, “in-ruins” and out of (*our*) control. Finally, in line 83, Trump uses this comparison to characterize Clinton’s legacy. By framing these events in such a way, Clinton is constructed as directly contributing to the developments in the Middle East.

In both cases, regardless of whether these representations are warranted, the analysis revealed that Trump is utilizing logically unsupported if not fallacious association to characterize

correlation of the states of America, in the case of Obama, and the middle east, in the case of Clinton, with causation. In doing this, Trump utilizes ideological strategies to delegitimize his political opposition by an account of their failures (see section 4.2 for details). Lines 67, 69, 75 and 83 above also demonstrate how Hillary Clinton is nominated in clauses where she does not act as a participant to the main process. By characterizing her “bad instincts” and “bad judgement” in line 67, Trump is able to evaluate specific qualities of Clinton. This evaluation is also present in other clauses where nominalized actions are presented as Hillary Clinton’s possessions as in the following lines.

164. We must abandon the failed *policy* of nation building and regime change that Hillary Clinton pushed in Iraq, in Libya, in Egypt and in Syria.  
212. My plan is the exact opposite of the radical and dangerous *immigration policy* of Hillary Clinton.

In these examples, Hillary Clinton’s policies are evaluated by pre-modifying adjectives as “dangerous” and “failed”. This roll allocation of Clinton serves to define and evaluate the actions for which she is responsible. Another purpose for nominating Clinton as a possessive pre-modifier is to define Clinton’s “legacy” and “message”:

83. This is the legacy of Hillary Clinton: death, destruction, terrorism and weakness.  
102. That is why Hillary Clinton’s *message* is that things will never change, never ever.

In line 83 above, Trump defines her in terms of her legacy, imbuing it with catastrophic qualities of “death” and “destruction”, and associating it with “weakness” and “terrorism”, which is a charged and oblique reference to her failed policies in the Middle East. In line 102, he is referencing Hillary Clinton’s embrace of then-President Obama’s ideologies and reframes her message as “never chang[ing]”. Here, he draws a connection between her message and the bleak state of America that he has constructed (see section 4.2 for details) in order to reframe it in negative terms. The times in which Clinton is nominated as the subject of a clause are in policy comparisons between Trump and Clinton.

*Yet Hillary Clinton is proposing mass amnesty, mass immigration, and mass lawlessness. Her plan will overwhelm your schools and hospitals, further reduce your jobs and wages, and make it harder for recent immigrants to escape from the tremendous cycle of poverty they are going through right now and make it almost impossible for them to join the middle class. I have a different vision for our workers. (Lines 215-217 in Appendix III)*

*While Hillary Clinton plans a massive tax increase, I have proposed the largest tax reduction of any candidate who has run for president this year – Democrat or Republican. (Line 242 in Appendix III)*

In these examples, Clinton’s plans are characterized in hyperbolic terms like “mass lawlessness” and “massive tax increase” and serve a foil to make Trump’s plans appear more reasonable. This pattern of comparison occurs more frequently, when Hillary Clinton is referred to as “my opponent” as illustrated in the following lines.

I am going to bring our jobs back to Ohio and Pennsylvania and New York and Michigan and all of America – and I am not going to let companies move to other countries, firing their employees along the way, without consequence. Not gonna happen anymore. My opponent, on the other hand, has supported virtually every trade agreement that has been destroying our middle class. (Lines 224-226 in Appendix III)

We are going to lift the restrictions on the production of American energy. This will produce more than \$20 trillion in job creating economic activity over the next four decades. My opponent, on the other hand, wants to put the great miners and the great steel workers of our country out of work and out of business—that will never happen with Donald J. Trump as President. Our steel workers and our miners are going back to work again. (Lines 251-254 in Appendix III)

These lines further highlight the contrast that Trump is illustrating with Clinton. The added characterization as “my opponent” has the additional effect of othering Clinton. As discussed earlier in section 2.2, this characterization is a strategy for out-grouping which portrays Hillary as one of *them*. When isolating those lines where “my opponent” is the subject of the clause, patterns emerges about how Clinton is characterized.

- 176. My opponent has called for a *radical 550% increase in Syrian refugees* ... on top of existing massive refugee flows coming into our country already under the “leadership” of President Obama.
- 188. My opponent will *never meet with [parents of murdered kids], or share in their pain.*
- 190. Instead, my opponent wants *Sanctuary Cities.*
- 226. My opponent, on the other hand, has *supported virtually every trade agreement* that has been destroying our middle class.
- 253. My opponent, on the other hand, wants to put *the great miners and steel workers of our country out of work* – that will never happen with Donald J. Trump as President.
- 260. My opponent would rather *protect bureaucrats than serve American children* and that’s what she’s doing and that’s what she’s done.
- 269. My opponent *dismissed the VA scandal* – one more sign of how out of touch she really is.
- 275. My opponent wants to essentially *abolish the 2nd amendment.*
- 315. My opponent asks her supporters to recite a three-word *loyalty pledge.*

In most of the lines where Trump refers to Clinton as his opponent, he presents her most frequently as the subject of verbal and mental processes. In doing so, he creates a portrait of what Hillary wants and believes and draws a distinction of her ideological opposition to his own on specific topics, particularly on trade and jobs, education, immigration, gun rights and the military. Part of this choice in representation makes sense in that, accepting the nomination

as the Republican nominee, he is using it to distinguish his policies from his political opponent. This is also true when Clinton is functionalized in terms of her former position as “Secretary of State”:

- 115. When a Secretary of State illegally stores her emails on a private server, deletes 33,000 of them so the authorities can't see her crime, puts our country at risk, lies about it in every different form and faces no consequence – I know that corruption has reached a level like never before in our country.
- 116. When the FBI Director says that the Secretary of State was “extremely careless” and “negligent,” in handling our classified secrets, I also know that these terms are minor compared to what she actually did.
- 119. When that same Secretary of State rakes in millions of dollars trading access and favors to special interests and foreign powers I know the time for action has come.

In lines 115-116, Trump is referring to an FBI investigation of Hillary Clinton’s use of private email servers during her tenure as Secretary of State. Eventually cleared of charges, Clinton was accused of mishandling classified government documents using unauthorized private computer servers. One particularly damning revelation of this investigation is the disappearance of several tens of thousands of emails. This fact was used by her opponents to insinuate nefarious intent and question her intelligence, judgement and honesty. In line 115, Trump is capitalizing on these questions in line 1 by associating her actions with “corruption”. Here Trump functionalizes Clinton to her former position and anonymizes her with an indefinite article as “a Secretary of State”. However, the actions he describes in conjunction with the possessive pronoun “her” clearly implicate her as the person involved in the action. Lines 116 and 119 build on this image through repetition, adding qualities of negligence (line 116) and greed (line 119), as well as emphasis on general malfeasance with each repetition. This strategy of suppression and insinuation draws a sketch of Clinton as a corrupt politician and allows the audience to draw the conclusion (Walton 2007: 186). By allowing the audience to take an active role in constructing this image Trump has plausible deniability. The purpose of presenting Clinton in this manner is that levels a damaging blow to his opponent while granting Trump plausible deniability (ibid.). In contrast to Hillary, Trump frequently identifies himself as one with the American people. Lines 1-5 shown below represent all the instances where Trump represents himself in relational processes in this speech.

- 109. I AM YOUR VOICE.
- 318. My pledge reads: “I’M WITH YOU – THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.”
- 319. I am your voice.
- 321. I am With You.
- 141. In this race for the White House, I am the Law And Order candidate.

Lines 109 and 319 represent Trump and *our voice* as two semiotically identical descriptions (Halliday & Mathiesson 2004). Symbolically, this characterizes Trump as the suitable, and possibly the only suitable candidate to become President. Lines 318 and 321 position him circumstantially as one of *us*. Line 141 describes him in terms of what he stands for, Law and Order, a value that Trump implies America lacks and is essential for *our* future success as a nation, as shown in the lines below.

- 9. But we will also be a country of law and order.
- 94. There can be no prosperity without law and order.
- 137. When I take the oath of office next year, I will restore law and order our country.

Trump also uses the pronoun “we” to define and present what a unified Trump and the American people can achieve together. Trump explicitly states this at the beginning of his speech:

- 2. Who would’ve believed that when we started this journey, June 16<sup>th</sup> of last year... we and I say we, because we are a team.

By unifying *us* with *Trump* in discourse, the relationship between the two is strengthened and provides a launching pad for Trump’s characterization of the US in the past, in the present and in the future.

- 60. We all remember the images of our sailors being forced to their knees by their Iranian captors at gunpoint.
- 131. Immediately after Dallas, we have seen continued threats and violence against our law enforcement officials.
- 182. On Monday, we heard from three parents whose children were killed by illegal immigrants Mary Ann Mendoza, Sabine Durden, and my friend Jamiel Shaw.

References to the past, as shown above, involve mental processes that evoke memories of negative past events and threats to security. Each example relates visceral feelings through these mental processes and connects those events to Trump’s theme of “law and order” (see above). Moreover, these examples highlight the state of America under *the Establishment* and his Democratic opposition. This idea is further highlighted by two questions that Trump poses:

- 56. And yet, what do we have to show for it [our \$19 trillion national debt under Obama]?
- 75. After four years of Hillary Clinton, what do we have?

These rhetorical questions serve to highlight the inadequacy of Obama and Clinton by their lack of results. Trump answers the question in line 56 with a criticism of the poor state of the U.S. infrastructure and line 75 with a critique of the poor state of affairs in the Middle East. When allied with Trump, however, what “we” will do in the future is presented in terms of action. The following is a selection of what “we” will do.

- 7. Together, we will lead our party back to the White House, and we will lead our country back to safety, prosperity, and peace.
- 53. We're gonna fix that [\$800 billion dollar trade deficit].
- 123. But [Bernie Sanders'] supporters will join our movement, because we will fix his biggest single issue: trade deals that strip our country of its jobs and strip us of our wealth as a country.
- 124. Millions of Democrats will join our movement because we are going to fix the system so it works fairly and justly for each and every American.
- 166. We're going to win.
- 167. We're going to win fast.
- 198. are going to build a great border wall to stop illegal immigration, to stop the gangs and the violence, and to stop the drugs from pouring into our communities.
- 257. We will build the roads, highways, bridges, tunnels, airports, and the railways of tomorrow.
- 259. We will rescue kids from failing schools by helping their parents send them to a safe school of their choice.
- 263. And we will fix TSA at the airports, which is a total disaster!
- 264. We will completely rebuild our depleted military, and the countries that we are protecting, at a massive cost to us, will be asked to pay their fair share.
- 325. We Will Make America Strong Again.
- 326. We Will Make America Proud Again.
- 327. We Will Make America Safe Again.
- 328. And We Will Make America Great Again.

These examples are characterized by actions that will be taken when *we* ally with *Trump*, such as “make”, “build”, “win”, “fix” and “rescue”. These words all embody a sense of renewing a broken America and restoring it to some former glory. Moreover, Trump talks about how quickly these things will be done when “we” do them.

- 152. We are going to defeat the barbarians of ISIS and we're going to defeat them fast.
- 165. Instead, we must work with all of our allies who share our goal of destroying ISIS and stamping out Islamic terrorism and doing it now and doing it quickly.
- 167. We're going to win fast.
- 193. Where was the sanctuary for all the other... ahh its so sad to even be talking about it, cause we could solve this problem [of illegal immigration so quickly.
- 250. Excessive regulation is costing our country as much as \$2 trillion a year, and we will end [excessive regulation] very very quickly.

By characterizing our problems as being solved very easily, Trump achieves several things. First, he appeals to a sense of immediacy that Americans seem to value in their lives. For instance, things like fast food, fast weight loss, get rich quick, and so on pervade American

society, and anything that Americans perceive as being easy and quick they want to believe will work. Second is that since these problems may be dealt with quickly, they are inherently easy to deal with and because they are easy but have not been dealt with by our current leadership, *the Establishment* must be acting out of some other interest or are unable to solve them due through some intrinsic lacking. Finally, he presents a sense of strength that Americans will have when we are united with Trump. Something that, when the American people are characterized without Trump, cannot achieve alone.

104. Every day I wake up determined to deliver a better life for the people all across this nation that have been neglected, ignored, and abandoned.
105. I have visited the laid-off factory workers, and the communities crushed by our horrible and unfair trade deals.
110. I have embraced crying mothers who have lost their children because our politicians put their personal agendas before the national good.
184. Of all my travels in this country, nothing has affected me more nothing even close, I have to tell you, than the time I have spent with the mothers and fathers who have lost their children to violence spilling across our border which we can solve.

In these lines, *we* without Trump is generalized, functionalized and identified as “factory workers”, “communities”, “mothers” and “fathers”. These social roles are presented through adjectives and post modifiers as living in a dismal state of affairs such as “neglected”, “crushed” by trade deals, “crying”. Line 1 above generalizes the public to distill certain qualities that are experienced by different affected groups, those victimized by trade deals and those by illegal immigration and unite them.

### ***The Rest of the Out-Group***

Through out-grouping, Trump characterizes *the Establishment* as one of “them” who does or cannot serve the interests of “us”. This strategy of out-grouping extends to other social actors. The out-grouping of *foreigners* is also a major theme of this speech. Though it is spread throughout different foreign nations, this theme is largely directed at Mexico to the ease with which they can be conflated with Trump’s association of American problems and illegal immigration: jobs, crime terrorism. Before moving on to Mexico, let us first look at how Trump represents non-Mexican Foreigners. One common association that Trump makes is that of his representation of the Middle East and its constituent entities as viewed by Donald Trump. What constitutes the Middle East according to Trump can be found in the following passage (lines 69-82 in Appendix III):

In 2009, pre-Hillary, ISIS was not even on the map. Libya was stable. Egypt was peaceful. Iraq was seeing a really big big reduction in violence. Iran was being choked by sanctions. Syria was somewhat under control. After four years of Hillary Clinton, what do we have? ISIS has spread across the region, and the entire world. Libya is in ruins, and our Ambassador and his staff were left helpless to die at the hands of savage killers. Egypt was turned over to the radical Muslim brotherhood, forcing the military to retake control. Iraq is in chaos. Iran is on the path to nuclear weapons. Syria is engulfed in a civil war and a refugee crisis that now threatens the West. After fifteen years of wars in the Middle East, after trillions of dollars spent and thousands of lives lost, the situation is worse than it has ever been before.

As shown in this example, the Middle East, according to Trump comprises ISIS, Libya, Egypt, Iraq, Iran and Syria. This passage was delivered as a critique of Hillary Clinton's handling of international affairs as the Secretary of State, as discussed earlier in this section. The before and after presentation of these affairs is meant to suggest that Clinton's handling of the Middle East led to "the situation [being] worse than it has ever been before", yet one more example of *the Establishment's* mishandling of a situation. Through lexical coding such as "choked by sanctions", "under control", "turned over" and "retake control", this passage characterizes the Middle East as something that needs to be controlled. Moreover, the lexis connotes a sense of violence and struggle such as "in ruins", "left helpless", "engulfed" and "savage killers". Moreover, he claims the connection of ISIS and terrorism of the Middle East and Islam; so, religion is briefly introduced in the previous passage with mention of "the radical Muslim Brotherhood", a group that was democratically elected in Egypt but was vilified in the west and eventually overthrown by the military, an event referenced by Trump. This association with the Middle East and Islam is reinforced in another passage (lines 164-165 in Appendix III):

We must abandon the failed policy of nation building and regime change that Hillary Clinton pushed in Iraq, in Libya, in Egypt and in Syria. Instead, we must work with all of our allies who share our goal of destroying ISIS and stamping out Islamic terrorism and doing it now and doing it quickly.

In this passage, Iraq, Libya, Egypt, Syria are grouped by association and ISIS and Islamic terrorism are linked textually through the conjunction "instead". This textual connection also connects the social actors in terms of logical relevance. At this point, it is of note that the term "Islamic terrorism" was and is a hotly contested partisan issue, with critics of its use arguing that it unfairly conflates the Islamic religion as a whole with the terrorist acts of a small group of radicalized individuals. Proponents of its use, on the other hand, argue that its use is necessary to accurately identify those perpetrators and that refusing to do so is too "politically correct" and thus limiting our abilities to defend ourselves. By characterizing the Middle East



as something that needs to be dealt with and connecting it to ISIS and terrorism, Trump is utilizing the *us/them* binary to delegitimize other Middle Eastern countries. The reason for conflating the Middle East, ISIS and “Islamic” terrorism and characterizing them negatively is that it underscores and dramatizes one of Trumps major issues, demonstrating strength and dealing with Terrorism. In addition, other *foreigners* are also presented in a negative way.

169. Recently, I have said that NATO was **obsolete**, because it **did not properly cover** terror.  
170. And also that many of the member countries [of NATO] were **not paying their fair share**.  
171. As usual, the United States has been picking up the cost.  
172. Shortly thereafter it was announced that NATO was setting up a new program in order to combat terrorism.  
228. She supported the **job killing trade deal** with South Korea.  
235. This includes stopping China's **outrageous theft** of intellectual property, along with their **illegal product dumping**, and their **devastating currency manipulation**.  
236. They are the greatest that ever came about.  
237. They are the **greatest currency manipulators**, ever.  
238. Our **horrible** trade agreements with China and many others, will be totally renegotiated.

Lines 169-172 above portray NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) as “obsolete” and “not paying their fair share”. These characterizations represent NATO as possessing qualities of similar to *the Establishment* by being ineffective and *foreigners* by taking advantage of us (see section 4.2). Similarly, line 228 describes a trade deal with South Korea that is described as “job-killing”. This construction, while not positive for South Korea, seems more directed at the trade deal itself rather than South Korea. Finally, lines 235-238 demonstrate an adversarial characterization of China as thieves, illegal product-dumpers, and currency manipulators. This projection is exacerbated through qualifiers like, “outrageous”, “devastating”, “greatest” and “horrible”. The reason for characterizing China in this way is that China represents an enemy in one of Trump’s major issues: trade. These examples further characterize the strategy of out-grouping employed by Trump. Interestingly, but perhaps not surprisingly, immune to this out-grouping is Israel.

168. This includes working with our greatest ally in the region, the State of Israel.

In this line, Trump creates a rather positive representation of Israel by referring to them as “our greatest ally”. In contrast to other foreign entities, the use of the possessive pronoun “our” ally and positions Israel as a member of the in-group. This portrayal has roots in the long-standing relationship between the U.S. and Israel. Israel receives more cumulative aid since World War II from the U.S. than any other country (Sharp 2016) and in the UN over half of the U.S. vetoes

used have been used in resolutions related to Israel (Okhovat 2011). This also has strategic and ideological implications which views the Jewish nation Israel as an island of support in an otherwise hostile Muslim region.

Mexico, on the other hand, is often conflated with illegal immigration. Illegal immigration in turn is represented as vector for many of the problems afflicting America, namely crime, terrorism and unemployment. One of the main themes of his platform is the threat of illegal immigration. In this speech, Trump highlights the menace of ‘illegal immigrants’

35. *Nearly 180,000 illegal immigrants* with **criminal** records, ordered deported from our country, are tonight roaming free **to threaten peaceful citizens**.
36. The number of new illegal immigrant families who have crossed the border so far this year already *exceeds* the entire total from 2015.
37. They are being released by *the tens of thousands* into our communities with no regard for **the impact on public safety or resources**.
182. On Monday, we heard from three parents whose children **were killed** by illegal immigrants Mary Ann Mendoza, Sabine Durden, and Jamiel Shaw.
198. We are going to build a great border wall to stop illegal immigration, to stop **the gangs** and **the violence**, and to stop **the drugs** from *pouring* into our communities.

In these lines, trump repeatedly pre-modifies immigrants or immigration with the word “illegal”. Though the use of “illegal” to describe immigrants and immigration may seem innocuous and aptly allocated, Trump also creates an association with safety that may be less warranted. In lines 35-37, illegal immigrants are associated with crime, safety and resources. Line 182 continues this theme by associating illegal immigration with gangs, violence, and drugs. In doing so, Trump conflates the lesser crime of illegal immigration with more serious crimes of violence and drug smuggling. Moreover, these 35-37 and 198 add a sense of overwhelming to the influx of illegal immigration through the numbers “nearly 180,000” and “the tens of thousands” and the terms “pouring” and “exceeds”. The argument against immigration is punctuated by personal stories related throughout the speech.

38. One such border-crosser was released and made his way to Nebraska.
39. There, he ended the life of an innocent young girl named Sarah Root.
40. She was 21 years-old, and was killed the day after graduating from college with a 4.0 Grade Point Average. Number one in her class.
41. Her killer was then released a second time, and he is now a fugitive from the law.
42. I’ve met Sarah’s beautiful family.

As exemplified in 38-42 above, these stories present instances where illegal immigrants are

responsible for the deaths of American citizens. In their portrayal, the immigrants are backgrounded and generalized through references such as “one such border-crosser” and “her killer”. The victims, on the other hand, are nominated and foregrounded. In this example, Trump nominates Sarah Root and describes her in details that embody a sense of virtue such as “innocent”, “21 years-old” and “number one in her class”. In doing so, Trump distances immigrants from his audience and connects them to the victims. By juxtaposing the nominated and personalized victims with the dehumanized and faceless perpetrator positions the audience to put themselves in the victims’ shoes and presents a threat unknown providence and therefore fear.

#### **4.5 Concluding Remarks**

This section has discussed the analysis of three of Donald Trump’s speeches throughout his quest to become the next president of the United states. At the heart of Trump’s speeches lies the perception of power and the world is organized through its representation. The next chapter will provide a summary of the results before discussing limitations of this study. Finally, it will conclude with suggestions for future research.

## CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

This chapter presents a summary of the results. This is followed by a discussion of the contributions and limitations of this study and conclude with suggestions for future research.

### 5.1 Summary of the Results

This study has found that Trump uses the strategy of *us vs them* as a means of distancing and delegitimizing *the Establishment* and *foreigners*. Moreover, by appropriating and misappropriating power to the different categories of social actor, Trump legitimizes his ideology and right to the presidency. This has been done through a combination of appraisements, backgrounding and suppression, and misallocation of roles. Throughout his campaign, Donald Trump has created and maintained a consistent worldview and underlying ideology that asserts that America has become weak due to the benign ineptitude and, at times, outright malicious corruption and greed of *the Establishment*. In contrast, *foreigners* are growing stronger at the expense of the American people. As such countries like Mexico and China are represented as duplicitous and clever, at times outwitting and at times colluding with *the Establishment* to contribute to the deterioration of jobs, wealth, safety and respect once possessed by America. The purpose of this strategy is to appeal to the fear, anger and other emotions of the American public and rally support for policies that emphasize America first.

These results have both confirmed and contradicted different presumptions about the election that prompted this study. This study has revealed Trump to be intelligent person who is attuned to many of the unmet needs of many Americans. He has addressed many of their concerns in words that both resonated with their personal situations and appealed to their emotions. However, in doing so, he has expressed an appalling ideology of racism, paranoia and xenophobia that unfairly and dishonestly draws false connections with immigrants, foreigners, and his political opposition, and the very real problems that Americans face with respect to jobs and crime. In doing so he appears to have blended fact with fiction to create a representation of reality that many of his constituency take for truth.

## 5.2 Contributions and Limitations

Since the events that took place within this study occurred recently, very little research has been done on the political discourse of Donald Trump leading up to his inaugural speech. In examining these speeches, this study contributes to a greater understanding of the discourse and strategies of *us vs them* employed by Donald Trump in order to legitimize his ideological positions and delegitimize those of his opponents. Moreover, it may contribute to understanding the subtle ways in which language plays a vital role in constructing or manipulating reality while consolidating inequality and power struggle in society. Given Trump's utilization of xenophobic discourse generally absent in mainstream politics, this study may also represent the beginning of a body of CDA research regarding a shift in political discourse in the U.S. and the world at large. Finally, this study has helped to enhance our understanding of how language can be used in the ideological positioning presented by previous research (e.g. van Dijk 2006; van Leeuwen 2008).

One major limitation of this study is the time needed to properly analyze a larger data set. This study was initially slated to analyze six speeches; however, time and space constraints have limited this research to the three speeches delivered to the largest audiences. As such, this study provides a narrow window into the strategies and presentations used in Donald Trump's campaign speeches. In a broader sense, there is a dearth of transcripts available online of Trump's speeches during the primary leg of the election. Thus, much of the *us vs them* organization of the ideology of the speeches is focused on Trump's democratic opponent Hillary Clinton, rather than his Republican opponents during his primary campaign.

Another limitation of this study is the absence of phonological information regarding the speeches. Phonological factors contribute a lot of information about which words are meant to be emphasized and which were not and would have helped to create a more complete picture about Trump's intentions were and what he believed was important. As a campaign speech, the way that the speaker deliver's a speech can be just as important as the words that he say. In analyzing transcripts, all words hold equal value, but when they are listened to they come alive and tone and rate of speech can influence the way in which discourse is received by the audience. In order to accommodate this, I made an effort to familiarize myself with the speeches as they

were delivered as well as their transcripts, however, phonological analysis and consideration remains absent from this analysis.

### **5.3 Suggestions for Future Research**

The limitations of this study indicate some areas for possible future research. First, a critical discourse analysis into a larger data set may reveal more information about the ideological strategies utilized by Trump in his campaign speeches. This may yield a more precise description of the presentation of *us* vs *them* as well as reveal changes in messages over time and between audiences. The breadth of the data set also suggests future avenues of research in a corpus-based methodology, which researchers to use a software dedicated for this type of linguistic research and to obtain patterns. This may result in a richer mining of the data set to find patterns that are less easily revealed by human analysis. Another possible line of research may consider how phonological features of Trump's speeches contributed to the persuasiveness of his campaign speeches and messages.

## REFERENCES

- Bourdieu, P. (2011). 'The Forms of Capital'. (1986). *Cultural theory: An anthology*, 81-93.
- Butt, D., et al. (2003) *Using Functional Grammar: An Explorer's Guide*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Sydney, N.S.W: National Centre for English Language teaching and Research.
- Diamond, D. (2015, June 2). 'Why Doctors Really Quit'. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/dsites/dandiamond/2015/06/02/why-doctors-really-quit/#1b23a9147621>
- Donald Trump Transcript: Our Country Needs a Truly Great Leader (2015, June 16) Retrieved from <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2015/06/16/donald-trump-transcript-our-country-needs-a-truly-great-leader/>
- Eggins, S. (2004) *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London, England: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Fairclough, N. (1993) 'Critical Discourse Analysis and The Marketization of Public Discourse: The Universities'. *Discourse & Society* 4:2: 133-168.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2013). *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1997). 'Sex, Power, and the Politics of Identity'. *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, 1, 163-73.
- Foucault, M. (1998). *The History of Sexuality. Vol. 1: The Will to Knowledge*. Penguin Books Limited.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*. Springer.
- Halliday, M. A. (1994). *Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Oxford University Press.
- Inaugural Address: Trump's Full Speech (2017, January 21) Retrieved from <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/20/politics/trump-inaugural-address/>
- Kerswill, P. (2001), 'Mobility, Meritocracy and Dialect Levelling: The Fading (and Phasing) Out of Received Pronunciation'. in P Rajamäe & K Vogelberg (eds), *British Studies in the New Millennium: The Challenge of the Grassroots*. University of Tartu, Tartu, pp. 45-58.

- Kow, T. (2015, November 9) '10 Groups Donald Trump Offended Since Launching His Campaign'. Retrieved from <http://edition.cnn.com/2015/11/27/politics/donald-trump-insults-groups-list/>
- Lakoff, R. (1973) 'Language and Woman's Place'. *Language in society* 2:1: 45-79.
- Lazar, M. (2007) 'Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Articulating a Feminist Discourse Praxis 1'. *Critical Discourse Studies* 4:2: 141-164.
- Louw, B. (1993) 'Irony in the Text or Insincerity in the Writer? The Diagnostic Potential of Semantic Prosodies', in Baker, M., Francis G., and Tognini-Bonelli E. (eds) *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 157-76.
- Mason, O., Platt, R. (2006) 'Embracing a New Creed: Lexical Patterning and The Encoding of Ideology'. *College Literature* 33:2: 154-170.
- Okhovat, S. (2011) 'The United Nations Security Council: Its Veto Power and Its Reform'. *CPACS working paper* 15:1: University of Sydney: Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies.
- Politico Staff (2016, July 21) 'Full Text: Donald Trump 2016 RNC Draft Speech Transcript' Retrieved from <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/07/full-transcript-donald-trump-nomination-acceptance-speech-at-rnc-225974>
- Sharp, J. (2016) 'U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel'. *CRS Report* prepared for Members and Committees of Congress. Retrieved from <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL33222.pdf>
- Thompson, G. (2004) *Introducing Functional Grammar*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York, New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Thompson, J. (1984). *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. University of California Press.
- Traugott, E. (2003). 'From Subjectification to Intersubjectification'. In: Hickey, R. (ed.) *Motives for Language change*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 124-139.
- Trump, D. [Donald J. Trump] (2016, January 25). The Establishment [Video file]. Retrieved March 9, 2017 from <https://www.facebook.com/DonaldTrump/videos/10156563265515725/>
- Van Dijk, T. (1989) 'Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power'. *Annals of the International Communication Association* 12:1: 18-59.
- Van Dijk, T. (1993) 'Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis'. *Discourse and Society* 4:2: 249-283.
- Van Dijk, T. (1995) 'Discourse Semantics and Ideology'. *Discourse and Society* 6:2: 243-289.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). 'What is Political Discourse Analysis'. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 11:1: 11-52.



Van Dijk, T. (2006) 'Ideology and Discourse Analysis'. *Journal of Political Ideologies*. 11:2: 115-140.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2008) *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Walton, D. (2007). *Media argumentation: dialectic, persuasion and rhetoric*. Cambridge University Press.

Wodak, R. (ed.) (1989) 'Language, Power and Ideology'. *Studies in political discourse*. Vol. 7. John Benjamins Publishing.

## Appendix I: Inaugural Address Transcript, January 20<sup>th</sup> 2017

1. Chief Justice Roberts, President Carter, President Clinton, President Bush, President Obama, fellow Americans, and people of the world: Thank you.
2. We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country and to restore its promise for all of our people.
3. Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for years to come.
4. We will face challenges.
5. We will confront hardships.
6. But we will get the job done.
7. Every four years, we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power, and we are grateful to President Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama for their gracious aid throughout this transition.
8. They have been magnificent.
9. Today's ceremony, however, has very special meaning.
10. Because today we are not merely transferring power from one administration to another, or from one party to another – but we are transferring power from Washington, D.C. and giving it back to you, the People.
11. For too long, a small group in our nation's Capital has reaped the rewards of government while the people have borne the cost.
12. Washington flourished – but the people did not share in its wealth.
13. Politicians prospered – but the jobs left, and the factories closed.
14. The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country.
15. Their victories have not been your victories;
16. their triumphs have not been your triumphs;
17. and while they celebrated in our nation's capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land.
18. That all changes – starting right here, and right now, because this moment is your moment:
19. it belongs to you.
20. It belongs to everyone gathered here today and everyone watching all across America.
21. This is your day.
22. This is your celebration.
23. And this, the United States of America, is your country.
24. What truly matters is not which party controls our government, but whether our government is controlled by the people.
25. January 20th 2017, will be remembered as the day the people became the rulers of this nation again.
26. The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer.
27. Everyone is listening to you now.
28. You came by the tens of millions to become part of a historic movement the likes of which the world has never seen before.
29. At the center of this movement is a crucial conviction: that a nation exists to serve its citizens.
30. Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves.
31. These are just and reasonable demands of righteous people and a righteous public.

32. But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities; rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation; an education system flush with cash, but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of all knowledge; and the crime and the gangs and the drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential.
33. This American carnage stops right here and stops right now.
34. We are one nation – and their pain is our pain.
35. Their dreams are our dreams;
36. and their success will be our success.
37. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny.
38. The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans.
39. For many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry; subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military;
40. we've defended other nation's borders while refusing to defend our own;
41. and spent trillions of dollars overseas while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay.
42. We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country has disappeared over the horizon.
43. One by one, the factories shuttered and left our shores, with not even a thought about the millions upon millions of American workers that were left behind.
44. The wealth of our middle class has been ripped from their homes and then redistributed across the world.
45. But that is the past.
46. And now we are looking only to the future.
47. We assembled here today are issuing a new decree to be heard in every city, in every foreign capital, and in every hall of power.
48. From this day forward, a new vision will govern our land.
49. From this day forward, it's going to be only America First. America First.
50. Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families.
51. We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs.
52. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength.
53. I will fight for you with every breath in my body –
54. and I will never, ever let you down.
55. America will start winning again, winning like never before.
56. We will bring back our jobs.
57. We will bring back our borders.
58. We will bring back our wealth.
59. And we will bring back our dreams.
60. We will build new roads, and highways, and bridges, and airports, and tunnels, and railways all across our wonderful nation.
61. We will get our people off of welfare and back to work -- rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor.
62. We will follow two simple rules:
63. Buy American

64. and hire American.
65. We will seek friendship and goodwill with the nations of the world –
66. but we do so with the understanding that it is the right of all nations to put their own interests first.
67. We do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone, but rather to let it shine as an example, we will shine, for everyone to follow.
68. We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones -- and unite the civilized world against radical Islamic terrorism, which we will eradicate completely from the face of the Earth.
69. At the bedrock of our politics will be a total allegiance to the United States of America,
70. and through our loyalty to our country, we will rediscover our loyalty to each other.
71. When you open your heart to patriotism, there is no room for prejudice.
72. The Bible tells us,
73. "How good and pleasant it is when God's people live together in unity."
74. We must speak our minds openly, debate our disagreements honestly, but always pursue solidarity.
75. When America is united, America is totally unstoppable.
76. There should be no fear –
77. we are protected,
78. and we will always be protected.
79. We will be protected by the great men and women of our military and law enforcement
80. and, most importantly, we will be protected by God.
81. Finally, we must think big and dream even bigger.
82. In America, we understand that a nation is only living as long as it is striving.
83. We will no longer accept politicians who are all talk and no action -- constantly complaining but never doing anything about it.
84. The time for empty talk is over.
85. Now arrives the hour of action.
86. Do not let anyone tell you it cannot be done.
87. No challenge can match the heart and fight and spirit of America.
88. We will not fail.
89. Our country will thrive and prosper again.
90. We stand at the birth of a new millennium, ready to unlock the mysteries of space, to free the Earth from the miseries of disease, and to harness the energies, industries and technologies of tomorrow.
91. A new national pride will stir our souls, lift our sights, and heal our divisions.
92. It's time to remember that old wisdom our soldiers will never forget: that whether we are black or brown or white, we all bleed the same red blood of patriots, we all enjoy the same glorious freedoms, and we all salute the same great American Flag.
93. And whether a child is born in the urban sprawl of Detroit or the windswept plains of Nebraska, they look up at the same night sky, they fill their heart with the same dreams, and they are infused with the breath of life by the same almighty Creator.
94. So to all Americans, in every city near and far, small and large, from mountain to mountain, from ocean to ocean, hear these words:
95. You will never be ignored again.
96. Your voice, your hopes, and your dreams will define our American destiny.

97. And your courage and goodness and love will forever guide us along the way.
98. Together, We will make America strong again.
99. We will make American wealthy again.
100. We will make America proud again.
101. We will make America safe again.
102. And yes, together, we will make America great again.
103. Thank you.
104. God bless you.
105. And God bless America.
106. Thank you.
107. God bless America.

## Appendix II: Transcript of Trump's Announcement Speech, June 16<sup>th</sup> 2015

1. Wow. Whoa. That is some group of people. Thousands.
2. So nice, thank you very much.
3. That's really nice. Thank you.
4. It's great to be at Trump Tower.
5. It's great to be in a wonderful city, New York.
6. And it's an honor to have everybody here.
7. This is beyond anybody's expectations.
8. There's been no crowd like this.
9. And, I can tell,
10. some of the candidates, they went in.
11. They didn't know
12. the air-conditioner didn't work.
13. They sweated like dogs.
14. They didn't know
15. the room was too big,
16. because they didn't have anybody there.
17. How are they going to beat ISIS?
18. I don't think
19. it's gonna happen.
20. Our country is in serious trouble.
21. We don't have victories anymore.
22. We used to have victories,
23. but we don't have them.
24. When was the last time anybody saw us beating, let's say, China in a trade deal?
25. They kill us.
26. I beat China all the time. All the time.
27. When did we beat Japan at anything?
28. They send their cars over by the millions,
29. and what do we do?
30. When was the last time you saw a Chevrolet in Tokyo?
31. It doesn't exist, folks.
32. They beat us all the time.
33. When do we beat Mexico at the border?
34. They're laughing at us, at our stupidity.
35. And now they are beating us economically.
36. They are not our friend,
37. believe me.
38. But they're killing us economically.
39. The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems. Thank you.
40. It's true,
41. and these are the best and the finest.
42. When Mexico sends its people,
43. they're not sending their best.
44. They're not sending you.
45. They're not sending you.
46. They're sending people that have lots of problems,

47. and they're bringing those problems with us.  
48. They're bringing drugs.  
49. They're bringing crime.  
50. They're rapists.  
51. And some, I assume, are good people.  
52. But I speak to border guards  
53. and they tell us what we're getting.  
54. And it only makes common sense.  
55. It only makes common sense.  
56. They're sending us not the right people.  
57. It's coming from more than Mexico.  
58. It's coming from all over South and Latin America,  
59. and it's coming probably— probably— from the Middle East.  
60. But we don't know.  
61. Because we have no protection  
62. and we have no competence,  
63. we don't know what's happening.  
64. And it's got to stop  
65. and it's got to stop fast.  
66. Islamic terrorism is eating up large portions of the Middle East.  
67. They've become rich.  
68. I'm in competition with them.  
69. They just built a hotel in Syria.  
70. Can you believe this?  
71. They built a hotel.  
72. When I have to build a hotel,  
73. I pay interest.  
74. They don't have to pay interest,  
75. because they took the oil that, when we left Iraq, I said we should've taken.  
76. So now ISIS has the oil,  
77. and what they don't have, Iran has.  
78. And in 19— and I will tell you this,  
79. and I said it very strongly, years ago,  
80. I said—  
81. and I love the military,  
82. and I want to have the strongest military that we've ever had,  
83. and we need it more now than ever.  
84. But I said,  
85. "Don't hit Iraq,"  
86. because you're going to totally destabilize the Middle East.  
87. Iran is going to take over the Middle East,  
88. Iran and somebody else will get the oil,  
89. and it turned out that Iran is now taking over Iraq.  
90. Think of it.  
91. Iran is taking over Iraq,  
92. and they're taking it over big league.  
93. We spent \$2 trillion in Iraq, \$2 trillion.  
94. We lost thousands of lives, thousands in Iraq.

95. We have wounded soldiers, who I love, I love —  
96. they're great — all over the place, thousands and thousands of wounded soldiers.  
97. And we have nothing.  
98. We can't even go there.  
99. We have nothing.  
100. And every time we give Iraq equipment, the first time a bullet goes off in the air, they  
leave it.  
101. Last week, I read 2,300 Humvees— these are big vehicles— were left behind for the  
enemy. 2,000?  
102. You would say maybe two, maybe four? 2,300 sophisticated vehicles,  
103. they ran,  
104. and the enemy took them.  
105. Last quarter, it was just announced our gross domestic product— a sign of strength,  
right?  
106. But not for us.  
107. It was below zero.  
108. Whoever heard of this?  
109. It's never below zero.  
110. Our labor participation rate was the worst since 1978.  
111. But think of it, GDP below zero, horrible labor participation rate.  
112. And our real unemployment is anywhere from 18 to 20 percent.  
113. Don't believe the 5.6.  
114. Don't believe it.  
115. That's right.  
116. A lot of people up there can't get jobs.  
117. They can't get jobs,  
118. because there are no jobs,  
119. because China has our jobs  
120. and Mexico has our jobs.  
121. They all have jobs.  
122. But the real number, the real number is anywhere from 18 to 19 and maybe even 21  
percent,  
123. and nobody talks about it,  
124. because it's a statistic that's full of nonsense.  
125. Our enemies are getting stronger and stronger by the way,  
126. and we as a country are getting weaker.  
127. Even our nuclear arsenal doesn't work.  
128. It came out recently they have equipment that is 30 years old.  
129. They don't know if it worked.  
130. And I thought it was horrible  
131. when it was broadcast on television,  
132. because boy, does that send signals to Putin and all of the other people that look at us  
and they say,  
133. "That is a group of people,  
134. and that is a nation that truly has no clue.  
135. They don't know what they're doing.  
136. They don't know what they're doing."  
137. We have a disaster called the big lie: Obamacare. Obamacare.



138. Yesterday, it came out that costs are going for people up 29, 39, 49, and even 55 percent,  
139. and deductibles are through the roof.  
140. You have to be hit by a tractor, literally, a tractor, to use it,  
141. because the deductibles are so high,  
142. it's virtually useless.  
143. It is a disaster.  
144. And remember the \$5 billion website?  
145. \$5 billion we spent on a website,  
146. and to this day it doesn't work. A \$5 billion website.  
147. I have so many websites,  
148. I have them all over the place.  
149. I hire people,  
150. they do a website.  
151. It costs me \$3. \$5 billion website.  
152. Well, you need somebody,  
153. because politicians are all talk, no action.  
154. Nothing's gonna get done.  
155. They will not bring us— believe me— to the promised land.  
156. They will not.  
157. As an example, I've been on the circuit making speeches,  
158. and I hear my fellow Republicans.  
159. And they're wonderful people.  
160. I like them.  
161. They all want me to support them.  
162. They don't know how to bring it about.  
163. They come up to my office.  
164. I'm meeting with three of them in the next week.  
165. And they don't know—  
166. "Are you running?  
167. Are you not running?  
168. Could we have your support?  
169. What do we do?  
170. How do we do it?"  
171. I like them.  
172. And I hear their speeches.  
173. And they don't talk jobs  
174. and they don't talk China.  
175. When was the last time you heard China is killing us?  
176. They're devaluing their currency to a level that you wouldn't believe.  
177. It makes it impossible for our companies to compete, impossible.  
178. They're killing us.  
179. But you don't hear that from anybody else.  
180. You don't hear it from anybody else.  
181. And I watch the speeches.  
182. I watch the speeches of these people,  
183. and they say  
184. the sun will rise,

185. the moon will set,  
186. all sorts of wonderful things will happen.  
187. And people are saying,  
188. “What’s going on?  
189. I just want a job.  
190. Just get me a job.  
191. I don’t need the rhetoric.  
192. I want a job.”  
193. And that’s what’s happening.  
194. And it’s going to get worse,  
195. because remember,  
196. Obamacare really kicks in in ’16, 2016.  
197. Obama is going to be out playing golf.  
198. He might be on one of my courses.  
199. I would invite him,  
200. I actually would say.  
201. I have the best courses in the world,  
202. so I’d say, you what,  
203. if he wants to—  
204. I have one right next to the White House, right on the Potomac.  
205. If he’d like to play,  
206. that’s fine.  
207. In fact, I’d love him to leave early and play,  
208. that would be a very good thing.  
209. But Obamacare kicks in in 2016.  
210. Really big league.  
211. It is going to be amazingly destructive.  
212. Doctors are quitting.  
213. I have a friend who’s a doctor,  
214. and he said to me the other day,  
215. “Donald, I never saw anything like it.  
216. I have more accountants than I have nurses.  
217. It’s a disaster.  
218. My patients are beside themselves.  
219. They had a plan that was good.  
220. They have no plan now.”  
221. We have to repeal Obamacare,  
222. and it can be— and—  
223. and it can be replaced with something much better for everybody.  
224. Let it be for everybody. But much better and much less expensive for people and for  
the government.  
225. And we can do it.  
226. So I’ve watched the politicians.  
227. I’ve dealt with them all my life.  
228. If you can’t make a good deal with a politician,  
229. then there’s something wrong with you.  
230. You’re certainly not very good.  
231. And that’s what we have representing us.

232. They will never make America great again.  
233. They don't even have a chance.  
234. They're controlled fully—  
235. they're controlled fully by the lobbyists, by the donors, and by the special interests,  
fully.  
236. Yes, they control them.  
237. Hey, I have lobbyists.  
238. I have to tell you.  
239. I have lobbyists that can produce anything for me.  
240. They're great.  
241. But you know what?  
242. it won't happen.  
243. It won't happen.  
244. Because we have to stop doing things for some people, but for this country,  
245. it's destroying our country.  
246. We have to stop,  
247. and it has to stop now.  
248. Now, our country needs—  
249. our country needs a truly great leader,  
250. and we need a truly great leader now.  
251. We need a leader that wrote "The Art of the Deal."  
252. We need a leader that can bring back our jobs, can bring back our manufacturing, can  
bring back our military, can take care of our vets.  
253. Our vets have been abandoned.  
254. And we also need a cheerleader.  
255. You know,  
256. when President Obama was elected,  
257. I said,  
258. "Well, the one thing, I think he'll do well.  
259. I think he'll be a great cheerleader for the country.  
260. I think he'd be a great spirit."  
261. He was vibrant.  
262. He was young.  
263. I really thought  
264. that he would be a great cheerleader.  
265. He's not a leader.  
266. That's true.  
267. You're right about that.  
268. But he wasn't a cheerleader.  
269. He's actually a negative force.  
270. He's been a negative force.  
271. He wasn't a cheerleader;  
272. he was the opposite.  
273. We need somebody that can take the brand of the United States and make it great  
again.  
274. It's not great again.  
275. We need—  
276. we need somebody—

277. we need somebody that literally will take this country and make it great again.  
278. We can do that.  
279. And, I will tell you,  
280. I love my life.  
281. I have a wonderful family.  
282. They're saying,  
283. "Dad, you're going to do something that's going to be so tough."  
284. You know,  
285. all of my life, I've heard that a truly successful person, a really, really successful  
person and even modestly successful cannot run for public office.  
286. Just can't happen.  
287. And yet that's the kind of mindset that you need to make this country great again.  
288. So ladies and gentlemen... I am officially running... for president of the United States,  
289. and we are going to make our country great again.  
290. It can happen.  
291. Our country has tremendous potential.  
292. We have tremendous people.  
293. We have people that aren't working.  
294. We have people that have no incentive to work.  
295. But they're going to have incentive to work,  
296. because the greatest social program is a job.  
297. And they'll be proud,  
298. and they'll love it,  
299. and they'll make much more than they would've ever made,  
300. and they'll be—  
301. they'll be doing so well,  
302. and we're going to be thriving as a country, thriving.  
303. It can happen.  
304. I will be the greatest jobs president that God ever created.  
305. I tell you that.  
306. I'll bring back our jobs from China, from Mexico, from Japan, from so many places.  
307. I'll bring back our jobs,  
308. and I'll bring back our money.  
309. Right now, think of this:  
310. We owe China \$1.3 trillion.  
311. We owe Japan more than that.  
312. So they come in,  
313. they take our jobs,  
314. they take our money,  
315. and then they loan us back the money,  
316. and we pay them in interest,  
317. and then the dollar goes up  
318. so their deal's even better.  
319. How stupid are our leaders?  
320. How stupid are these politicians to allow this to happen?  
321. How stupid are they?  
322. I'm going to tell you— thank you.  
323. I'm going to tell you a couple of stories about trade,

324. because I'm totally against the trade bill for a number of reasons.  
325. Number one, the people negotiating don't have a clue.  
326. Our president doesn't have a clue.  
327. He's a bad negotiator.  
328. He's the one that did Bergdahl.  
329. We get Bergdahl,  
330. they get five killer terrorists that everybody wanted over there.  
331. We get Bergdahl.  
332. We get a traitor.  
333. We get a no-good traitor,  
334. and they get the five people that they wanted for years,  
335. and those people are now back on the battlefield trying to kill us.  
336. That's the negotiator we have.  
337. Take a look at the deal he's making with Iran.  
338. He makes that deal,  
339. Israel maybe won't exist very long.  
340. It's a disaster,  
341. and we have to protect Israel. But...  
342. So we need people—  
343. I'm a free trader.  
344. But the problem with free trade is you need really talented people to negotiate for you.  
345. If you don't have talented people,  
346. if you don't have great leadership,  
347. if you don't have people that know business, not just a political hack that got the job  
because he made a contribution to a campaign, which is the way all jobs, just about,  
are gotten,  
348. free trade is terrible.  
349. Free trade can be wonderful  
350. if you have smart people,  
351. but we have people that are stupid.  
352. We have people that aren't smart.  
353. And we have people that are controlled by special interests.  
354. And it's just not going to work.  
355. So, here's a couple of stories happened recently.  
356. A friend of mine is a great manufacturer.  
357. And, you know,  
358. China comes over  
359. and they dump all their stuff,  
360. and I buy it.  
361. I buy it,  
362. because, frankly, I have an obligation to buy it,  
363. because they devalue their currency so brilliantly,  
364. they just did it recently,  
365. and nobody thought they could do it again.  
366. But with all our problems with Russia, with all our problems with everything—  
everything, they got away with it again.  
367. And it's impossible for our people here to compete.  
368. So I want to tell you this story.

369. A friend of mine who's a great manufacturer, calls me up a few weeks ago.  
370. He's very upset.  
371. I said,  
372. "What's your problem?"  
373. He said,  
374. "You know,  
375. I make great product."  
376. And I said,  
377. "I know.  
378. I know that  
379. because I buy the product."  
380. He said,  
381. "I can't get it into China.  
382. They won't accept it.  
383. I sent a boat over  
384. and they actually sent it back.  
385. They talked about environmental,  
386. they talked about all sorts of crap that had nothing to do with it."  
387. I said,  
388. "Oh, wait a minute, that's terrible.  
389. Does anyone know this?"  
390. He said,  
391. "Yeah, they do it all the time with other people."  
392. I said,  
393. "They send it back?"  
394. "Yeah. So I finally got it over there  
395. and they charged me a big tariff.  
396. They're not supposed to be doing that.  
397. I told them."  
398. Now, they do charge you tariff on trucks,  
399. when we send trucks and other things over there.  
400. Ask Boeing.  
401. They wanted Boeing's secrets.  
402. They wanted their patents and all their secrets  
403. before they agreed to buy planes from Boeing.  
404. Hey, I'm not saying they're stupid.  
405. I like China.  
406. I sell apartments for—  
407. I just sold an apartment for \$15 million to somebody from China.  
408. Am I supposed to dislike them?  
409. I own a big chunk of the Bank of America Building at 1290 Avenue of the Americas,  
that I got from China in a war. Very valuable.  
410. I love China.  
411. The biggest bank in the world is from China.  
412. You know where their United States headquarters is located? In this building, in  
Trump Tower.  
413. I love China.  
414. People say,

415. “Oh, you don’t like China?”  
416. No, I love them.  
417. But their leaders are much smarter than our leaders,  
418. and we can’t sustain ourself with that.  
419. There’s too much—  
420. it’s like—  
421. it’s like  
422. take the New England Patriots and Tom Brady  
423. and have them play your high school football team.  
424. That’s the difference between China’s leaders and our leaders.  
425. They are ripping us.  
426. We are rebuilding China.  
427. We’re rebuilding many countries.  
428. China, you go there now,  
429. roads, bridges, schools, you never saw anything like it.  
430. They have bridges that make the George Washington Bridge look like small potatoes.  
431. And they’re all over the place.  
432. We have all the cards,  
433. but we don’t know how to use them.  
434. We don’t even know that we have the cards,  
435. because our leaders don’t understand the game.  
436. We could turn off that spigot by charging them tax  
437. until they behave properly.  
438. Now they’re going militarily.  
439. They’re building a military island in the middle of the South China sea. A military  
island.  
440. Now, our country could never do that  
441. because we’d have to get environmental clearance,  
442. and the environmentalist wouldn’t let our country—  
443. we would never build in an ocean.  
444. They built it in about one year, this massive military port.  
445. They’re building up their military to a point that is very scary.  
446. You have a problem with ISIS.  
447. You have a bigger problem with China.  
448. And, in my opinion, the new China, believe it or not, in terms of trade, is Mexico.  
449. So this man tells me about the manufacturing.  
450. I say,  
451. “That’s a terrible story.  
452. I hate to hear it.”  
453. But I have another one, Ford.  
454. So Mexico takes a company, a car company that was going to build in Tennessee,  
455. rips it out.  
456. Everybody thought the deal was dead. Reported it in the Wall Street Journal recently.  
457. Everybody thought it was a done deal.  
458. It’s going in  
459. and that’s going to be it, going into Tennessee. Great state, great people.  
460. All of a sudden, at the last moment, this big car manufacturer, foreign, announces  
they’re not going to Tennessee.

461. They're gonna spend their \$1 billion in Mexico instead. Not good.  
462. Now, Ford announces a few weeks ago that Ford is going to build a \$2.5 billion car and truck and parts manufacturing plant in Mexico.  
463. \$2.5 billion, it's going to be one of the largest in the world. Ford. Good company.  
464. So I announced that I'm running for president.  
465. I would...  
466. ... one of the early things I would do,  
467. probably before I even got in—  
468. and I wouldn't even use—  
469. you know,  
470. I have—  
471. I know the smartest negotiators in the world.  
472. I know the good ones.  
473. I know the bad ones.  
474. I know the overrated ones.  
475. You get a lot of them that are overrated.  
476. They're not good.  
477. They think they are.  
478. They get good stories,  
479. because the newspapers get buffaloed.  
480. But they're not good.  
481. But I know the negotiators in the world,  
482. and I put them one for each country.  
483. Believe me, folks.  
484. We will do very, very well, very, very well.  
485. But I wouldn't even waste my time with this one.  
486. I would call up the head of Ford, who I know.  
487. If I was president,  
488. I'd say, "Congratulations.  
489. I understand that you're building a nice \$2.5 billion car factory in Mexico and that you're going to take your cars and sell them to the United States zero tax, just flow them across the border."  
490. And you say to yourself,  
491. "How does that help us," right?  
492. "How does that help us?  
493. Where is that good?"  
494. It's not.  
495. So I would say, "Congratulations.  
496. That's the good news.  
497. Let me give you the bad news.  
498. Every car and every truck and every part manufactured in this plant that comes across the border, we're going to charge you a 35-percent tax,  
499. and that tax is going to be paid simultaneously with the transaction,  
500. and that's it.  
501. Now, here's what is going to happen.  
502. If it's not me in the position,  
503. it's one of these politicians that we're running against,  
504. you know, the 400 people that we're (inaudible).



505. And here's what's going to happen.  
506. They're not so stupid.  
507. They know it's not a good thing,  
508. and they may even be upset by it.  
509. But then they're going to get a call from the donors or probably from the lobbyist for  
Ford  
510. and say,  
511. "You can't do that to Ford,  
512. because Ford takes care of me  
513. and I take care of you,  
514. and you can't do that to Ford."  
515. And guess what? No problem.  
516. They're going to build in Mexico.  
517. They're going to take away thousands of jobs.  
518. It's very bad for us.  
519. So under President Trump, here's what would happen:  
520. The head of Ford will call me back,  
521. I would say within an hour after I told them the bad news.  
522. But it could be he'd want to be cool,  
523. and he'll wait until the next day.  
524. You know,  
525. they want to be a little cool.  
526. And he'll say, "Please, please, please."  
527. He'll beg for a little while,  
528. and I'll say, "No interest."  
529. Then he'll call all sorts of political people,  
530. and I'll say, "Sorry, fellas. No interest,"  
531. because I don't need anybody's money.  
532. It's nice.  
533. I don't need anybody's money.  
534. I'm using my own money.  
535. I'm not using the lobbyists.  
536. I'm not using donors.  
537. I don't care.  
538. I'm really rich. I (inaudible).  
539. And by the way, I'm not even saying that's the kind of mindset, that's the kind of  
thinking you need for this country.  
540. So— because we got to make the country rich.  
541. It sounds crass.  
542. Somebody said,  
543. "Oh, that's crass."  
544. It's not crass.  
545. We got \$18 trillion in debt.  
546. We got nothing but problems.  
547. We got a military that needs equipment all over the place.  
548. We got nuclear weapons that are obsolete.  
549. We've got nothing.  
550. We've got Social Security that's going to be destroyed if somebody like me doesn't

bring money into the country.  
551. All these other people want to cut the hell out of it.  
552. I'm not going to cut it at all;  
553. I'm going to bring money in,  
554. and we're going to save it.  
555. But here's what's going to happen:  
556. After I'm called by 30 friends of mine who contributed to different campaigns,  
557. after I'm called by all of the special interests and by the— the donors and by the  
lobbyists—  
558. and they have zero chance at convincing me, zero—  
559. I'll get a call the next day from the head of Ford.  
560. He'll say.  
561. "Please reconsider,"  
562. I'll say no.  
563. He'll say,  
564. "Mr. President, we've decided to move the plant back to the United States,  
565. and we're not going to build it in Mexico."  
566. That's it.  
567. They have no choice.  
568. They have no choice.  
569. There are hundreds of things like that.  
570. I'll give you another example.  
571. Saudi Arabia, they make \$1 billion a day. \$1 billion a day.  
572. I love the Saudis.  
573. Many are in this building.  
574. They make a billion dollars a day.  
575. Whenever they have problems,  
576. we send over the ships.  
577. We say  
578. "we're gonna protect."  
579. What are we doing?  
580. They've got nothing but money.  
581. If the right person asked them,  
582. they'd pay a fortune.  
583. They wouldn't be there except for us.  
584. And believe me,  
585. you look at the border with Yemen.  
586. You remember Obama a year ago,  
587. Yemen was a great victory.  
588. Two weeks later, the place was blown up.  
589. Everybody got out—  
590. and they kept our equipment.  
591. They always keep our equipment.  
592. We ought to send used equipment, right?  
593. They always keep our equipment.  
594. We ought to send some real junk,  
595. because, frankly, it would be—  
596. we ought to send our surplus.

597. We're always losing this gorgeous brand-new stuff.  
598. But look at that border with Saudi Arabia.  
599. Do you really think that these people are interested in Yemen?  
600. Saudi Arabia without us is gone.  
601. They're gone.  
602. And I'm the one that made all of the right predictions about Iraq.  
603. You know, all of these politicians that I'm running against now—  
604. it's so nice to say I'm running as opposed to if I run, if I run.  
605. I'm running.  
606. But all of these politicians that I'm running against now,  
607. they're trying to disassociate.  
608. I mean,  
609. you looked at Bush,  
610. it took him five days to answer the question on Iraq.  
611. He couldn't answer the question.  
612. He didn't know.  
613. I said,  
614. "Is he intelligent?"  
615. Then I looked at Rubio.  
616. He was unable to answer the question,  
617. is Iraq a good thing or bad thing?  
618. He didn't know.  
619. He couldn't answer the question.  
620. How are these people gonna lead us?  
621. How are we gonna—  
622. how are we gonna go back and make it great again?  
623. We can't.  
624. They don't have a clue.  
625. They can't lead us.  
626. They can't.  
627. They can't even answer simple questions.  
628. It was terrible.  
629. But Saudi Arabia is in big, big trouble.  
630. Now, thanks to fracking and other things, the oil is all over the place.  
631. And I used to say it,  
632. there are ships at sea, and this was during the worst crisis, that were loaded up with  
oil,  
633. and the cartel kept the price up,  
634. because, again, they were smarter than our leaders.  
635. They were smarter than our leaders.  
636. There is so much wealth out there that can make our country so rich again, and  
therefore make it great again.  
637. Because we need money.  
638. We're dying.  
639. We're dying.  
640. We need money.  
641. We have to do it.  
642. And we need the right people.

643. So Ford will come back.  
644. They'll all come back.  
645. And I will say this,  
646. this is going to be an election, in my opinion, that's based on competence.  
647. Somebody said — thank you, darlin'.  
648. Somebody said to me the other day, a reporter, a very nice reporter,  
649. "But, Mr. Trump, you're not a nice person."  
650. That's true.  
651. But actually I am.  
652. I think I am a nice person.  
653. People that know me, like me.  
654. Does my family like me?  
655. I think so, right.  
656. Look at my family.  
657. I'm proud of my family.  
658. By the way, speaking of my family, Melania, Barron, Kai, Donnie, Don, Vanessa,  
Tiffany, Evanka did a great job.  
659. Did she do a great job?  
660. Great. Jared, Laura and Eric, I'm very proud of my family.  
661. They're a great family.  
662. So the reporter said to me the other day,  
663. "But, Mr. Trump, you're not a nice person.  
664. How can you get people to vote for you?"  
665. I said,  
666. "I don't know."  
667. I said,  
668. "I think that number one, I am a nice person.  
669. I give a lot of money away to charities and other things.  
670. I think I'm actually a very nice person."  
671. But, I said,  
672. "This is going to be an election that's based on competence,  
673. because people are tired of these nice people.  
674. And they're tired of being ripped off by everybody in the world.  
675. And they're tired of spending more money on education than any nation in the world  
per capita, than any nation in the world,  
676. and we are 26th in the world,  
677. 25 countries are better than us in education.  
678. And some of them are like third world countries.  
679. But we're becoming a third world country, because of our infrastructure, our airports,  
our roads, everything.  
680. So one of the things I did, and I said, you know what I'll do.  
681. I'll do it.  
682. Because a lot of people said,  
683. "He'll never run.  
684. Number one, he won't want to give up his lifestyle."  
685. They're right about that,  
686. but I'm doing it.  
687. Number two, I'm a private company,

688. so nobody knows what I'm worth.  
689. And the one thing is that when you run, you have to announce and certify to all sorts  
of governmental authorities your net worth.  
690. So I said,  
691. "That's OK."  
692. I'm proud of my net worth.  
693. I've done an amazing job.  
694. I started off— thank you—  
695. I started off in a small office with my father in Brooklyn and Queens,  
696. and my father said —  
697. and I love my father.  
698. I learned so much.  
699. He was a great negotiator.  
700. I learned so much just sitting at his feet playing with blocks listening to him negotiate  
with subcontractors.  
701. But I learned a lot.  
702. But he used to say,  
703. "Donald, don't go into Manhattan.  
704. That's the big leagues.  
705. We don't know anything about that.  
706. Don't do it."  
707. I said,  
708. "I gotta go into Manhattan.  
709. I gotta build those big buildings.  
710. I gotta do it, Dad.  
711. I've gotta do it."  
712. And after four or five years in Brooklyn, I ventured into Manhattan  
713. and did a lot of great deals— the Grand Hyatt Hotel.  
714. I was responsible for the convention center on the west side.  
715. I did a lot of great deals,  
716. and I did them early and young.  
717. And now I'm building all over the world,  
718. and I love what I'm doing.  
719. But they all said, a lot of the pundits on television,  
720. "Well, Donald will never run,  
721. and one of the main reasons is he's private  
722. and he's probably not as successful as everybody thinks."  
723. So I said to myself,  
724. you know,  
725. nobody's ever going to know  
726. unless I run,  
727. because I'm really proud of my success.  
728. I really am.  
729. I've employed—  
730. I've employed tens of thousands of people over my lifetime.  
731. That means medical.  
732. That means education.  
733. That means everything.

734. So a large accounting firm and my accountants have been working for months,  
735. because it's big and complex,  
736. and they've put together a statement, a financial statement, just a summary.  
737. But everything will be filed eventually with the government,  
738. and we don't [use] extensions or anything.  
739. We'll be filing it right on time.  
740. We don't need anything.  
741. And it was even reported incorrectly yesterday,  
742. because they said,  
743. "He had assets of \$9 billion."  
744. So I said,  
745. "No, that's the wrong number.  
746. That's the wrong number. Not assets."  
747. So they put together this.  
748. And before I say it,  
749. I have to say this.  
750. I made it the old-fashioned way.  
751. It's real estate.  
752. You know,  
753. it's real estate.  
754. It's labor,  
755. and it's unions good and some bad and lots of people that aren't in unions,  
756. and it's all over the place and building all over the world.  
757. And I have assets— big accounting firm, one of the most highly respected— 9 billion  
240 million dollars.  
758. And I have liabilities of about \$500 million.  
759. That's long-term debt, very low interest rates.  
760. In fact, one of the big banks came to me  
761. and said,  
762. "Donald, you don't have enough borrowings.  
763. Could we loan you \$4 billion"?"  
764. I said,  
765. "I don't need it.  
766. I don't want it.  
767. And I've been there.  
768. I don't want it."  
769. But in two seconds, they give me whatever I wanted.  
770. So I have a total net worth, and now with the increase, it'll be well-over \$10 billion.  
But here, a total net worth of—net worth, not assets, not— a net worth, after all debt,  
after all expenses, the greatest assets— Trump Tower, 1290 Avenue of the Americas,  
Bank of America building in San Francisco, 40 Wall Street, sometimes referred to as  
the Trump building right opposite the New York— many other places all over the  
world.  
771. So the total is \$8,737,540,00.  
772. Now I'm not doing that...  
773. I'm not doing that to brag,  
774. because you know what?  
775. I don't have to brag.

776. I don't have to,  
777. believe it or not.  
778. I'm doing that to say that that's the kind of thinking our country needs.  
779. We need that thinking.  
780. We have the opposite thinking.  
781. We have losers.  
782. We have losers.  
783. We have people that don't have it.  
784. We have people that are morally corrupt.  
785. We have people that are selling this country down the drain.  
786. So I put together this statement,  
787. and the only reason I'm telling you about it today is because we really do have to get going,  
788. because if we have another three or four years—  
789. you know,  
790. we're at \$8 trillion now.  
791. We're soon going to be at \$20 trillion.  
792. According to the economists— who I'm not big believers in, but, nevertheless, this is what they're saying—  
793. that \$24 trillion— we're very close—  
794. that's the point of no return. \$24 trillion.  
795. We will be there soon.  
796. That's when we become Greece.  
797. That's when we become a country that's unsalvageable.  
798. And we're gonna be there very soon.  
799. We're gonna be there very soon.  
800. So, just to sum up, I would do various things very quickly.  
801. I would repeal and replace the big lie, Obamacare.  
802. I would build a great wall,  
803. and nobody builds walls better than me,  
804. believe me,  
805. and I'll build them very inexpensively,  
806. I will build a great, great wall on our southern border.  
807. And I will have Mexico pay for that wall.  
808. Mark my words.  
809. Nobody would be tougher on ISIS than Donald Trump. Nobody.  
810. I will find — within our military,  
811. I will find the General Patton  
812. or I will find General MacArthur,  
813. I will find the right guy.  
814. I will find the guy that's going to take that military and make it really work.  
815. Nobody, nobody will be pushing us around.  
816. I will stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons.  
817. And we won't be using a man like Secretary Kerry that has absolutely no concept of negotiation, who's making a horrible and laughable deal, who's just being tapped along as they make weapons right now, and then goes into a bicycle race at 72 years old, and falls and breaks his leg.  
818. I won't be doing that.

819. And I promise I will never be in a bicycle race.  
820. That I can tell you.  
821. I will immediately terminate President Obama's illegal executive order on immigration, immediately.  
822. Fully support and back up the Second Amendment.  
823. Now, it's very interesting.  
824. Today I heard it.  
825. Through stupidity, in a very, very hard core prison, interestingly named Clinton, two vicious murderers, two vicious people escaped,  
826. and nobody knows where they are.  
827. And a woman was on television this morning,  
828. and she said,  
829. "You know, Mr. Trump,"  
830. and she was telling other people,  
831. and I actually called her,  
832. and she said,  
833. "You know, Mr. Trump,  
834. I always was against guns.  
835. I didn't want guns.  
836. And now since this happened"—  
837. it's up in the prison area—  
838. "my husband and I are finally in agreement,  
839. because he wanted the guns.  
840. We now have a gun on every table.  
841. We're ready to start shooting."  
842. I said, "Very interesting."  
843. So protect the Second Amendment.  
844. End— end Common Core.  
845. Common Core should—  
846. it is a disaster.  
847. Bush is totally in favor of Common Core.  
848. I don't see how he can possibly get the nomination.  
849. He's weak on immigration.  
850. He's in favor of Common Core.  
851. How the hell can you vote for this guy?  
852. You just can't do it.  
853. We have to end...  
854. education has to be local.  
855. Rebuild the country's infrastructure.  
856. Nobody can do that like me.  
857. Believe me.  
858. It will be done on time, on budget, way below cost, way below what anyone ever thought.  
859. I look at the roads being built all over the country,  
860. and I say I can build those things for one-third.  
861. What they do is unbelievable, how bad.  
862. You know,  
863. we're building on Pennsylvania Avenue, the Old Post Office,



864. we're converting it into one of the world's great hotels.  
865. It's gonna be the best hotel in Washington, D.C.  
866. We got it from the General Services Administration in Washington. The Obama administration.  
867. We got it.  
868. It was the most highly sought after— or one of them,  
869. but I think the most highly sought after project in the history of General Services.  
870. We got it.  
871. People were shocked,  
872. Trump got it.  
873. Well, I got it for two reasons.  
874. Number one, we're really good.  
875. Number two, we had a really good plan.  
876. And I'll add in the third,  
877. we had a great financial statement.  
878. Because the General Services, who are terrific people, by the way, and talented people, they wanted to do a great job.  
879. And they wanted to make sure it got built.  
880. So we have to rebuild our infrastructure, our bridges, our roadways, our airports.  
881. You come into La Guardia Airport,  
882. it's like we're in a third world country.  
883. You look at the patches and the 40-year-old floor.  
884. They throw down asphalt,  
885. and they throw.  
886. You look at these airports,  
887. we are like a third world country.  
888. And I come in from China  
889. and I come in from Qatar  
890. and I come in from different places,  
891. and they have the most incredible airports in the world.  
892. You come to back to this country  
893. and you have LAX, disaster.  
894. You have all of these disastrous airports.  
895. We have to rebuild our infrastructure.  
896. Save Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security without cuts.  
897. Have to do it.  
898. Get rid of the fraud.  
899. Get rid of the waste and abuse,  
900. but save it.  
901. People have been paying it for years.  
902. And now many of these candidates want to cut it.  
903. You save it by making the United States, by making us rich again, by taking back all of the money that's being lost.  
904. Renegotiate our foreign trade deals.  
905. Reduce our \$18 trillion in debt,  
906. because, believe me,  
907. we're in a bubble.  
908. We have artificially low interest rates.

909. We have a stock market that, frankly, has been good to me,  
910. but I still hate to see what's happening.  
911. We have a stock market that is so bloated.  
912. Be careful of a bubble  
913. because what you've seen in the past might be small potatoes compared to what  
happens.  
914. So be very, very careful.  
915. And strengthen our military  
916. and take care of our vets. So, so important.  
917. Sadly, the American dream is dead.  
918. But if I get elected president  
919. I will bring it back bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and  
920. we will make America great again.  
921. Thank you. Thank you very much.

### Appendix III: RNC Speech Transcript, July 21<sup>st</sup> 2016

1. Friends, delegates and fellow Americans: I humbly and gratefully accept your nomination for the presidency of the United States.
2. Who would've believed that when we started this journey, June 16<sup>th</sup> of last year... we and I say we, because we are a team ... would have received almost 14 million votes, the most in the history of the Republican party.
3. And that the Republican party would get 60% more votes than it received 8 years ago.
4. Who would've believed this?
5. Who would've believed this?
6. The democrats, on the other hand, received 20% fewer votes than they got 4 years ago. Not so good. Not so good.
7. Together, we will lead our party back to the White House, and we will lead our country back to safety, prosperity, and peace.
8. We will be a country of generosity and warmth.
9. But we will also be a country of law and order.
10. Our Convention occurs at a moment of crisis for our nation.
11. The attacks on our police, and the terrorism in our cities, threaten our very way of life.
12. Any politician who does not grasp this danger is not fit to lead our country.
13. Americans watching this address tonight have seen the recent images of violence in our streets and the chaos in our communities.
14. Many have witnessed this violence personally, some have even been its victims.
15. I have a message for all of you: the crime and violence that today afflicts our nation will soon, and I mean very soon, come to an end.
16. Beginning on January 20th 2017, safety will be restored.
17. The most basic duty of government is to defend the lives of its own citizens.
18. Any government that fails to do so is a government unworthy to lead.
19. It is finally time for a straightforward assessment of the state of our nation.
20. I will present the facts plainly and honestly.
21. We cannot afford to be so politically correct anymore.
22. So if you want to hear the corporate spin, the carefully-crafted lies, and the media myths the Democrats are holding their convention next week.
23. Go there.
24. But here, at our convention, there will be no lies.
25. We will honor the American people with the truth, and nothing else.
26. These are the facts:
27. Decades of progress made in bringing down crime are now being reversed by this Administration's rollback of criminal enforcement.
28. Homicides last year increased by 17% in America's fifty largest cities.
29. That's the largest increase in 25 years.
30. In our nation's capital, killings have risen by 50 percent.
31. They are up nearly 60% in nearby Baltimore.
32. In the President's hometown of Chicago, more than 2,000 have been the victims of shootings this year alone.
33. And more than 3,600 have been killed in the Chicago area since he took office.
34. The number of police officers killed in the line of duty has risen by almost 50% compared to this point last year.
35. Nearly 180,000 illegal immigrants with criminal records, ordered deported from our

- country, are tonight roaming free to threaten peaceful citizens.
36. The number of new illegal immigrant families who have crossed the border so far this year already exceeds the entire total from 2015.
  37. They are being released by the tens of thousands into our communities with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources.
  38. One such border-crosser was released and made his way to Nebraska.
  39. There, he ended the life of an innocent young girl named Sarah Root.
  40. She was 21 years-old, and was killed the day after graduating from college with a 4.0 Grade Point Average. Number one in her class.
  41. Her killer was then released a second time, and he is now a fugitive from the law.
  42. I've met Sarah's beautiful family.
  43. But to this Administration, their amazing daughter was just one more American life that wasn't worth protecting.
  44. One more child to sacrifice on the order and on the altar of open borders.
  45. What about our economy?
  46. Again, I will tell you the plain facts that have been edited out of your nightly news and your morning newspaper:
  47. Nearly Four in 10 African-American children are living in poverty, while 58% of African American youth are now not employed.
  48. Two million more Latinos are in poverty today than when the President took his oath of office less than eight years ago.
  49. Another 14 million people have left the workforce entirely.
  50. Household incomes are down more than \$4,000 since the year 2000.
  51. That's 16 years ago.
  52. Our trade deficit in goods reached nearly... think of this, think of this, our trade deficit is \$800 billion, yeah, think of that, \$800 billion dollars last year alone.
  53. We're gonna fix that.
  54. The budget is no better.
  55. President Obama has almost doubled our national debt to more than \$19 trillion, and growing.
  56. And yet, what do we have to show for it?
  57. Our roads and bridges are falling apart, our airports are in Third World condition, and forty-three million Americans are on food stamps.
  58. Now let us consider the state of affairs abroad.
  59. Not only have our citizens endured domestic disaster, but they have lived through one international humiliation after another. One after another.
  60. We all remember the images of our sailors being forced to their knees by their Iranian captors at gunpoint.
  61. This was just prior to the signing of the Iran deal, which gave back to Iran \$150 billion and gave us absolutely nothing – it will go down in history as one of the worst deals ever negotiated.
  62. Another humiliation came when president Obama drew a red line in Syria – and the whole world knew it meant absolutely nothing.
  63. In Libya, our consulate – the symbol of American prestige around the globe – was brought down in flames.
  64. America is far less safe – and the world is far less stable – than when Obama made the decision to put Hillary Clinton in charge of America's foreign policy.
  65. Let's defeat her in November, ok?

66. I am certain it is a decision that president Obama truly regrets.
67. Her bad instincts and her bad judgment – something pointed out by Bernie Sanders – are what caused so many of the disasters unfolding today.
68. Let's review the record.
69. In 2009, pre-Hillary, ISIS was not even on the map.
70. Libya was stable.
71. Egypt was peaceful.
72. Iraq was seeing a really big big reduction in violence.
73. Iran was being choked by sanctions.
74. Syria was somewhat under control.
75. After four years of Hillary Clinton, what do we have?
76. ISIS has spread across the region, and the entire world.
77. Libya is in ruins, and our Ambassador and his staff were left helpless to die at the hands of savage killers.
78. Egypt was turned over to the radical Muslim brotherhood, forcing the military to retake control.
79. Iraq is in chaos.
80. Iran is on the path to nuclear weapons.
81. Syria is engulfed in a civil war and a refugee crisis that now threatens the West.
82. After fifteen years of wars in the Middle East, after trillions of dollars spent and thousands of lives lost, the situation is worse than it has ever been before.
83. This is the legacy of Hillary Clinton: death, destruction terrorism and weakness.
84. But Hillary Clinton's legacy does not have to be America's legacy.
85. The problems we face now – poverty and violence at home, war and destruction abroad – will last only as long as we continue relying on the same politicians who created them in the first place.
86. A change in leadership is required to produce a change in outcomes.
87. Tonight, I will share with you my plan for action for America.
88. The most important difference between our plan and that of our opponents, is that our plan will put America First.
89. Americanism, not globalism, will be our credo.
90. As long as we are led by politicians who will not put America First, then we can be assured that other nations will not treat America with respect.
91. The respect we deserve.
92. The American People will come first once again.
93. My plan will begin with safety at home – which means safe neighborhoods, secure borders, and protection from terrorism.
94. There can be no prosperity without law and order.
95. On the economy, I will outline reforms to add millions of new jobs and trillions in new wealth that can be used to rebuild America.
96. A number of these reforms that I will outline tonight will be opposed by some of our nation's most powerful special interests.
97. That is because these interests have rigged our political and economic system for their exclusive benefit.
98. Believe me, its for their benefit.
99. Big business, elite media and major donors are lining up behind the campaign of my opponent because they know she will keep our rigged system in place.
100. They are throwing money at her because they have total control over everything single

- she does.
101. She is their puppet, and they pull the strings.
  102. That is why Hillary Clinton's message is that things will never change. never ever.
  103. My message is that things have to change – and they have to change right now.
  104. Every day I wake up determined to deliver a better life for the people all across this nation that have been neglected, ignored, and abandoned.
  105. I have visited the laid-off factory workers, and the communities crushed by our horrible and unfair trade deals.
  106. These are the forgotten men and women of our country.
  107. And they are forgotten, but they're not gonna be forgotten long.
  108. These are people who work hard but no longer have a voice.
  109. I AM YOUR VOICE.
  110. I have embraced crying mothers who have lost their children because our politicians put their personal agendas before the national good.
  111. I have no patience for injustice,... (Protester interruption)
  112. How great are our police and how great is Cleveland.
  113. I have no patience for injustice, no tolerance for government incompetence, no sympathy for leaders who fail their citizens.
  114. When innocent people suffer, because our political system lacks the will, or the courage, or the basic decency to enforce our laws – or still worse, has sold out to some corporate lobbyist for cash – I am not able to look the other way and I won't look the other way.
  115. And when a Secretary of State illegally stores her emails on a private server, deletes 33,000 of them so the authorities can't see her crime, puts our country at risk, lies about it in every different form and faces no consequence – I know that corruption has reached a level like never before in our country.
  116. When the FBI Director says that the Secretary of State was “extremely careless” and “negligent,” in handling our classified secrets, I also know that these terms are minor compared to what she actually did.
  117. They were just used to save her from facing justice for her terrible terrible crimes.
  118. In fact, her single greatest accomplishment may be committing such egregious crime and getting away with it – especially when others, who have done far less, have paid so dearly.
  119. When that same Secretary of State rakes in millions of dollars trading access and favors to special interests and foreign powers I know the time for action has come.
  120. I have joined the political arena so that the powerful can no longer beat up on people that cannot defend themselves.
  121. Nobody knows the system better than me, which is why I alone can fix it.
  122. I have seen firsthand how the system is rigged against our citizens, just like it was rigged against Bernie Sanders – he never had a chance. Never had a chance
  123. But his supporters will join our movement, because we will fix his biggest single issue: trade deals that strip our country of its jobs and strip us of our wealth as a country.
  124. Millions of Democrats will join our movement because we are going to fix the system so it works fairly and justly for each and every American.
  125. In this cause, I am proud to have at my side the next Vice President of the United States: Governor Mike Pence of Indiana. And a great guy.
  126. We will bring the same economic success to America that Mike brought to Indiana,

- which is amazing.
127. He is a man of character and accomplishment.
  128. He is the man for the job.
  129. The first task for our new Administration will be to liberate our citizens from the crime and terrorism and lawlessness that threatens our communities.
  130. America was shocked to its core when our police officers in Dallas were so brutally executed.
  131. Immediately after Dallas, we have seen continued threats and violence against our law enforcement officials.
  132. Law officers have been shot or killed in recent days in Georgia, Missouri, Wisconsin, Kansas, Michigan and Tennessee.
  133. On Sunday, more police were gunned down in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
  134. Three were killed, and three were very very badly injured.
  135. An attack on law enforcement is an attack on all Americans.
  136. I have a message to every last person threatening the peace on our streets and the safety of our police:
  137. when I take the oath of office next year, I will restore law and order to our country.
  138. Believe me.
  139. Believe me.
  140. I will work with, and appoint, the best and brightest prosecutors and law enforcement officials to get the job done.
  141. In this race for the White House, I am the Law And Order candidate.
  142. The irresponsible rhetoric of our President, who has used the pulpit of the presidency to divide us by race and color, has made America a more dangerous environment than frankly I have ever seen and anybody in this room has every watched or seen.
  143. This Administration has failed America's inner cities.
  144. Remember, it has failed America's inner cities.
  145. It's failed them on education.
  146. It's failed them on jobs.
  147. It's failed them on crime.
  148. It's failed them in every way and on every single level.
  149. When I am President, I will work to ensure that all of our kids are treated equally, and protected equally.
  150. Every action I take, I will ask myself: does this make better for young Americans in Baltimore, in Chicago, in Detroit, in Ferguson who have, really, in every way folks, the same right to live out their dreams as any other child America? Any other child.
  151. To make life safe for all of our citizens, we must also address the growing threats we face from outside the country:
  152. We are going to defeat the barbarians of ISIS and we're going to defeat them fast.
  153. Once again, France is the victim of brutal Islamic terrorism. Men, women and children viciously mowed down. Lives ruined. Families ripped apart. A nation in mourning.
  154. The damage and devastation that can be inflicted by Islamic radicals has been proven over and over – at the World Trade Center, at an office party in San Bernardino, at the Boston Marathon, at a military recruiting center in Chattanooga, Tennessee and many many other locations.
  155. Only weeks ago, in Orlando, Florida, 49 wonderful Americans were savagely murdered by an Islamic terrorist.

156. This time, the terrorist targeted LGBTQ community. No good.
157. And we're gonna stop it.
158. As your President, I will do everything in my power to protect our LGBTQ citizens from the violence and oppression of a hateful foreign ideology.
159. And I have to say as a Republican, it is so nice to hear you cheering for what I just said.
160. Thank you.
161. Thank you.
162. To protect us from terrorism, we need to focus on three things.
163. We must have the best absolutely the best gathering of intelligence anywhere in the world. The best.
164. We must abandon the failed policy of nation building and regime change that Hillary Clinton pushed in Iraq, in Libya, in Egypt and in Syria.
165. Instead, we must work with all of our allies who share our goal of destroying ISIS and stamping out Islamic terrorism and doing it now and doing it quickly.
166. We're going to win.
167. We're going to win fast.
168. This includes working with our greatest ally in the region, the State of Israel.
169. Recently, I have said that NATO was obsolete, because it did not properly cover terror.
170. And also that many of the member countries were not paying their fair share.
171. As usual, the United states has been picking up the cost.
172. Shortly thereafter it was announced that NATO was setting up a new program in order to combat terrorism.
173. A new step in the right direction.
174. Lastly, we must immediately suspend immigration from any nation that has been compromised by terrorism until such time as proven vetting mechanisms have been put in place.
175. We don't want them in our country.
176. My opponent has called for a radical 550% increase in Syrian, think of this, think of this, this is not believable but this is happening, a 550% increase in Syrian refugees on top of existing massive refugee flows coming into our country already under the "leadership" (air-quotes) President Obama.
177. She proposes this despite the fact that there's no way to screen these refugees in order to find out who they are or where they come from.
178. I only want to admit individuals into our country who will support our values and love our people.
179. Anyone who endorses violence, hatred or oppression is not welcome in our country and never ever will be.
180. Decades of record immigration have produced lower wages and higher unemployment for our citizens, especially for African-American and Latino workers.
181. We are going to have an immigration system that works, but one that works for the American people.
182. On Monday, we heard from three parents whose children were killed by illegal immigrants Mary Ann Mendoza, Sabine Durden, and my friend Jamiel Shaw.
183. They are just three brave representatives of many thousands who have suffered so gravely.
184. Of all my travels in this country, nothing has affected me more, nothing even close, I



- have to tell you, than the time I have spent with the mothers and fathers who have lost their children to violence spilling across our borders which we can solve.
185. We have to solve it.
  186. These families have no special interests to represent them.
  187. There are no demonstrators to protect them and certainly to protest on their behalf.
  188. My opponent will never meet with them, or share in their pain.
  189. Believe me.
  190. Instead, my opponent wants Sanctuary Cities.
  191. But where was the sanctuary for Kate Steinle?
  192. Where was the Sanctuary for the children of Mary Ann, Sabine and Jamiel?
  193. Where was the sanctuary for all the other... ahh its so sad to even be talking about it, cause we could solve this problem so quickly
  194. Where was the sanctuary for all of the other Americans who have been so brutally murdered, and who have suffered so so horribly?
  195. These wounded American families have been alone.
  196. But they are not alone any longer.
  197. Tonight, this candidate and the whole nation stand in their corner to support them, to send them our love, and to pledge in their honor that we will save countless more families from suffering in the same awful fate.
  198. We are going to build a great border wall to stop illegal immigration, to stop the gangs and the violence, and to stop the drugs from pouring into our communities.
  199. I have been honored to receive the endorsement of America's Border Patrol Agents, and will work directly with them to protect the integrity of our lawful lawful lawful immigration system. Lawful.
  200. By ending catch-and-release on the border, we will end the cycle of human smuggling and violence.
  201. Illegal border crossings will go down.
  202. We will stop it.
  203. It won't be happening very much any more.
  204. Believe me.
  205. Peace will be restored.
  206. By enforcing the rules for the millions who overstay their visas, our laws will finally receive the respect they deserve.
  207. Tonight, I want every American whose demands for immigration security have been denied – and every politician who has denied them – to listen very closely to the words I am about to say.
  208. On January 20th of 2017, the day I take the oath of office, Americans will finally wake up in a country where the laws of the United States are enforced.
  209. We are going to be considerate and compassionate to everyone.
  210. But my greatest compassion will be for our own struggling citizens.
  211. USA! USA! USA!
  212. My plan is the exact opposite of the radical and dangerous immigration policy of Hillary Clinton.
  213. Americans want relief from uncontrolled immigration, which is what we have now.
  214. Communities want relief.
  215. Yet Hillary Clinton is proposing mass amnesty, mass immigration, and mass lawlessness.
  216. Her plan will overwhelm your schools and hospitals, further reduce your jobs and

wages, and make it harder for recent immigrants to escape from the tremendous cycle of poverty they're going through right now and make it almost impossible for them to join the middle class.

217. I have a different vision for our workers.
218. It begins with a new, fair trade policy that protects our jobs and stands up to countries that cheat, of which there are many.
219. It's been a signature message of my campaign from day one, and it will be a signature feature of my presidency from the moment I take the oath of office.
220. I have made billions of dollars in business making deals – now I'm going to make our country rich again.
221. Using the greatest business people in the world, which our country has, I am going to turn our bad trade agreements into great trade agreements.
222. America has lost nearly-one third of its manufacturing jobs since 1997, following the enactment of disastrous trade deals supported by Bill and Hillary Clinton.
223. Remember, it was Bill Clinton who signed NAFTA, one of the worst economic deals ever made by our country or frankly by any other country. Never ever again.
224. I am going to bring our jobs back to Ohio and Pennsylvania and New York and Michigan and all of America – and I am not going to let companies move to other countries, firing their employees along the way, without consequence.
225. Not gonna happen anymore.
226. My opponent, on the other hand, has supported virtually every trade agreement that has been destroying our middle class.
227. She supported NAFTA, and she supported China's entrance into the World Trade Organization – another one of her husband's colossal mistakes and disasters.
228. She supported the job killing trade deal with South Korea.
229. She supported the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which will not only destroy our manufacturing, but it will make America subject to the rulings of foreign governments and it's not going to happen.
230. I pledge to never sign any trade agreement that hurts our workers, or that diminishes our freedom and independence.
231. We will never ever sign bad trade deals. America first again America first.
232. Instead, I will make individual deals with individual countries.
233. No longer will we enter into these massive deals, with many countries, that are thousands of pages long – and which no one from our country even reads or understands.
234. We are going to enforce all trade violations, including through the use of taxes and tariffs, against any country that cheats.
235. This includes stopping China's outrageous theft of intellectual property, along with their illegal product dumping, and their devastating currency manipulation.
236. They are the greatest that ever came about.
237. They are the greatest currency manipulators, ever.
238. Our horrible trade agreements with China and many others, will be totally renegotiated.
239. That includes renegotiating NAFTA to get a much better deal for America – and we'll walk away if we don't get that kind of a deal.
240. Our country is going to start building and making things again.
241. Next comes the reform of our tax laws, regulations and energy rules.
242. While Hillary Clinton plans a massive tax increase, I have proposed the largest tax

- reduction of any candidate who has run for president this year – Democrat or Republican.
243. Middle-income Americans and businesses will experience profound relief, and taxes will be simplified for everyone.
  244. I mean everyone.
  245. America is one of the highest-taxed nations in the world.
  246. Reducing taxes will cause new companies and new jobs to come roaring back into our country.
  247. Believe me.
  248. It'll happen and it'll happen fast.
  249. Then we are going to deal with the issue of regulation, one of the greatest job-killers of them all.
  250. Excessive regulation is costing our country as much as \$2 trillion a year, and we will end it very very quickly.
  251. We are going to lift the restrictions on the production of American energy.
  252. This will produce more than \$20 trillion in job creating economic activity over the next four decades.
  253. My opponent, on the other hand, wants to put the great miners and the great steel workers of our country out of work and out of business– that will never happen with Donald J. Trump as President.
  254. Our steel workers and our miners are going back to work again.
  255. With these new economic policies, trillions of dollars will start flowing into our country.
  256. This new wealth will improve the quality of life for all Americans –
  257. We will build the roads, highways, bridges, tunnels, airports, and the railways of tomorrow.
  258. This, in turn, will create millions of more jobs.
  259. We will rescue kids from failing schools by helping their parents send them to a safe school of their choice.
  260. My opponent would rather protect bureaucrats than serve American children and that's what she's doing and that's what she's done.
  261. We will repeal and replace disastrous Obamacare.
  262. You will be able to choose your own doctor again.
  263. And we will fix TSA at the airports, which is a total disaster!
  264. We going to work with all of our students, who are drowning in debt, to take the pressure off these young people just starting out in their adult lives. tremendous problem.
  265. We will completely rebuild our depleted military, and the countries that we are protecting, at a massive cost to us, will be asked to pay their fair share.
  266. We will take care of our great veterans like they have never been taken care of before.
  267. My just released 10-point plan has received tremendous veteran support.
  268. We will guarantee those who serve this country will be able to visit the doctor or hospital of their choice without waiting 5 days on a line and dying.
  269. My opponent dismissed the VA scandal– one more sign of how out of touch she really is.
  270. We are going to ask every Department Head in government to provide a list of wasteful spending projects that we can eliminate in my first 100 days.
  271. The politicians have talked about this for years, but I'm going to do it.

272. We are going to appoint justices to the United States Supreme Court who will uphold our laws and our Constitution.
273. The replacement for our beloved Justice Scalia will be a person of similar views and principles and judicial philosophy. Very important
274. This will be one of the most important issues decided by this election.
275. My opponent wants to essentially abolish the 2nd amendment.
276. I, on the other hand, received the early and strong endorsement of the National Rifle Association and will protect the right of all Americans to keep their families safe.
277. At this moment, I would like to thank the evangelical and religious community because I tell you what, the support they have given me and I'm not sure I totally deserve it, has been so amazing and has had such a big reason for me being here tonight. True so true.
278. They have much to contribute to our politics, yet our laws prevent you from speaking your minds from your own pulpits.
279. An amendment, pushed by Lyndon Johnson, many years ago, threatens religious institutions with a loss of their tax-exempt status if they openly advocate their political views.
280. Their voice has been taken away.
281. I am going to work very hard to repeal that language and protect free speech for all Americans.
282. We can accomplish these great things, and so much more – all we need to do is start believing in ourselves and in our country again.
283. Start believing.
284. It is time to show the whole world that America Is Back – bigger, and better and stronger than ever before.
285. In this journey, I'm so lucky to have at my side my wife Melania and my wonderful children, Don, Ivanka, Eric, Tiffany, and Barron:
286. You will always be my greatest source of pride and joy.
287. And by the way and Melania and Ivanka, did they do a job?
288. My Dad, Fred Trump, was the smartest and hardest working man I ever knew.
289. I wonder sometimes what he'd say if he were here to see this and to see me tonight.
290. It's because of him that I learned, from my youngest age, to respect the dignity of work and the dignity of working people.
291. He was a guy most comfortable in the company of bricklayers, and carpenters, and electricians and I have a lot of that in me also.
292. I love those people.
293. Then there's my mother, Mary.
294. She was strong, but also warm and fair-minded.
295. She was a truly great mother.
296. She was also one of the most honest and charitable people I have ever known, and a great great judge of character.
297. She could pick 'em out from anywhere.
298. To my sisters Mary Anne and Elizabeth, my brother Robert and my late brother Fred, I will always give you my love.
299. You are most special to me.
300. I have had a truly great life in business.
301. But now, my sole and exclusive mission is to go to work for our country – to go to work for all of you.

302. It's time to deliver a victory for the American people.
303. We don't win anymore, but we are going to start winning again.
304. But to do that, we must break free from the petty politics of the past.
305. America is a nation of believers, dreamers, and strivers that is being led by a group of censors, critics, and cynics.
306. Remember: all of the people telling you that you can't have the country you want, are the same people that wouldn't stand, I mean they said Trump doesn't have a chance of being here tonight, not a chance.
307. The same people... ah we love defeating those people, don't we?
308. We love it.
309. No longer can we rely on those same people in the media, and politics, who will say anything to keep our rigged system in place.
310. Instead, we must choose to believe in America.
311. History is watching us now.
312. We don't have much time, but history is watching.
313. It's waiting to see if we will rise to the occasion, and if we will show the whole world that America is still free and independent and strong.
314. I am asking for your support tonight so that I can be your champion in the White House and I will be your champion.
315. My opponent asks her supporters to recite a three-word loyalty pledge.
316. It reads: "I'm With Her".
317. I choose to recite a different pledge.
318. My pledge reads: "I'M WITH YOU – THE AMERICAN PEOPLE."
319. I am your voice.
320. So to every parent who dreams for their child, and every child who dreams for their future, I say these words to you tonight:
321. I am With You, and I will fight for you, and I will win for you.
322. To all Americans tonight, in all our cities and in all of our towns, I make this promise:
323. We Will Make America Strong Again.
324. We Will Make America Proud Again.
325. We Will Make America Safe Again.
326. And We Will Make America Great Again.
327. God bless you and good night.
328. I love you.