

---

# **Functions of Rhetorical Questions in Trump's Political Speeches (2015–16)**

**An Empirical Investigation**

---

**D i s s e r t a t i o n**

**zur**

**Erlangung des akademischen Grades Doktor**

**der Philosophie**

**in der Philosophischen Fakultät**

**der Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen**

**vorgelegt von**

**Maren Ebert-Rohleder**

**(né Rohleder)**

**aus**

**Erlenbach am Main**

2026

**Gedruckt mit Genehmigung der  
Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen**

**Dekanin:** Prof. Dr. Angelika Zirker

**Hauptberichterstatterin:** Prof. Dr. Susanne Winkler

**Mitberichterstatter:** Prof. Dr. Joachim Knappe

**Tag der mündlichen Prüfung:** 13.08.2024

Universitätsbibliothek Tübingen, TOBIAS-lib

© 2026 Maren Ebert-Rohleder. This dissertation is the result of my work in the Research Training Group: Ambiguity - Production and Perception and has been funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project number 198647426.

Maren Ebert-Rohleder

Functions of Rhetorical Questions in Trump's Political Speeches (2015–16)

An Empirical Investigation

# Abstract

This thesis investigates the functions of rhetorical questions (RQs) in political speeches by Donald Trump (2015–16) by considering the notions of ambiguity and common ground (CG) from a pragmatic perspective. RQs have been discussed from a structural standpoint by Caponigro and Sprouse (2007), Dayal (2016), den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002), Egg (2007), Giannakidou (2002), Han (2002), Krifka (1995), Molnár and Winkler (2026), and van Rooy (2003). They have been analysed semantically by Biezma and Rawlins (2017), Caponigro and Sprouse (2007), Han (2002), Krifka (2015, 2023), Rohde (2006), Sadock (1971), and Progovac (1993) as well as pragmatically by Athanasiadou (1991), Ene (1983), Ilie (1994), Meibauer (1986), and Wong and Yap (2015). The thesis focusses on three main questions: (1) How were RQs previously approached and classified to distinguish them from ordinary questions (OQs)? (2) What kinds of strategic functions do RQs have and how are RQs and their functions different from assertions? (3) What are the functions of RQs in the political speeches by Donald Trump from 2015–2016?

Previous literature has identified various criteria to distinguish RQs from OQs. RQs have been associated with questions, assertions, and indirect speech acts. Structural and semantic criteria include linguistic markers such as negative polarity items (NPIs), modals, combinations of these two markers, and the assertion of opposite polarity. These semantic and syntactic observations are empirically investigated using a corpus comprising sixteen of Donald Trump's speeches. The empirical investigation shows that neither semantic nor structural factors alone determine the classification of RQs. In addition, I investigate the communicative setting. Speeches are shown to consist of different levels of communication. Based on the analyses, a corpus of RQs, the Rhetorical Questions in Trump Speech Corpus (TSC-RQ), has been compiled from sixteen of Trump's political speeches. The empirical findings provide the basis for investigating the functions of RQs. To provide a context-based account, various discourse examination proposals are discussed, focussing on those of Beaver et al. (2021), Camp (2018), Lewis (1979), Stalnaker (1978, 2002, 2014), and Roberts (2006, 2012, 2021), combined with pragmatic theories on the communicative functions of speech acts and especially RQs (Austin 1962; Harris 2016; Ilie 1994; Saul 2018a; Searle 1969; Roberts 2018; Wong and Yap 2015). The previous work on RQs serves as the theoretical basis for the analysis of the RQs in the speeches by Trump. Speakers use RQs that take the form of questions but function differently, employing ambiguity for communicative purposes. RQs are speech acts aligned with the speaker's aims to achieve communicative goals that are

distinct from ordinary questions or assertions. The “mismatch” (Farkas 2024b) invokes a pragmatic reasoning process and signals the uniqueness of RQs. Pragmatic reasoning is grounded in the observations of Camp (2018), Camp (2022), Farkas (2024b), Grice (1975), and Roberts (2017). Three main strategic functions are discussed on the basis of previous literature. The guiding question is how do the strategic functions of RQs contribute to Donald Trump’s persuasive rhetorical strategy? I argue for a context-based approach that considers the communicative setting, the CG, the conversational record (CR), presuppositions, and the speaker’s intention. The corpus analysis reveals how the speaker manages the CG, either through pragmatic focussing or by accommodating presuppositions. Furthermore, this thesis presents ways to align beliefs on controversial topics and illustrates communicative strategies realised in Trump’s speeches. This thesis makes both theoretical and empirical contributions to research on RQs and their functions, with its main contribution being the analysis of the functions of RQs in Trump’s political speeches from 2015 to 2016.

# Contents

	<b>Page</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 The Phenomenon of Rhetorical Questions . . . . .	1
1.2 Central Research Questions and Proposal . . . . .	5
1.3 Outline . . . . .	10
<b>2 Previous Approaches to Rhetorical Questions</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Research Questions and Chapter Outline . . . . .	13
2.2 Rhetorical Questions as Information-Seeking Questions . . . . .	16
2.3 Rhetorical Questions and Responses . . . . .	22
2.4 Rhetorical Questions as Assertions . . . . .	35
2.5 Rhetorical Questions and Common Ground . . . . .	45
2.6 Conclusion . . . . .	58
<b>3 Empirical Investigation</b>	<b>61</b>
3.1 Research Questions and Chapter Outline . . . . .	62
3.2 The Trump Speech Corpus . . . . .	63
3.3 The Communicative Setting of Political Speeches . . . . .	67
3.4 Annotation Schema . . . . .	70
3.5 Corpus Analysis – Trump Speech Corpus . . . . .	76
3.5.1 Questions Distributed between Forms of Communication . . . . .	77
3.5.2 Frequency of Forms of Questions Distributed between Forms of Communication . . . . .	80
3.5.3 Problematic Cases . . . . .	85
3.6 The Trump Speech Corpus – Rhetorical Questions . . . . .	88
3.7 Discussion . . . . .	92
3.8 Conclusion . . . . .	94
<b>4 Rhetorical Questions in Context</b>	<b>97</b>
4.1 Research Questions and Chapter Outline . . . . .	97
4.2 Approaches to Speech Acts . . . . .	100
4.3 Speech Acts, Language Game, and Discourse Structure . . . . .	110
4.4 Speech Acts and Their Communicative Functions . . . . .	123
4.5 Rhetorical Questions and Their Communicative Functions . . . . .	130
4.6 Conclusion . . . . .	140

<b>5 Strategic Functions of Rhetorical Questions in Trump’s Political Speeches (2015–16)</b>	<b>143</b>
5.1 Research Questions and Chapter Outline . . . . .	143
5.2 Strategic Functions . . . . .	146
5.2.1 Strategic Function: Pragmatic Focusing to Manage the Common Ground	146
5.2.2 Strategic Function: Forcing the Accommodation of Presuppositions . .	156
5.2.3 Strategic Function: Aligning Beliefs . . . . .	162
5.2.4 Discussion and Conclusion: Strategic Functions . . . . .	167
5.3 Conclusion . . . . .	169
<b>6 Conclusion and Outlook</b>	<b>171</b>
6.1 Conclusion . . . . .	171
6.2 Summary . . . . .	173
6.3 Outlook . . . . .	178
<b>References</b>	<b>181</b>
Corpus Sources . . . . .	188
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>191</b>
<b>A Corpus Data</b>	<b>193</b>
A.1 Description Annotation Data . . . . .	193
A.2 Corpus Study: Strategic Functions in Speech 5 and Speech 12 . . . . .	194
A.2.1 Speech 5 . . . . .	195
A.2.2 Speech 12 . . . . .	253
A.3 Corpus: Trump Political Speeches in 2015–16 . . . . .	313
A.4 All Political Speeches Donald Trump 2025–16 . . . . .	502

# List of Figures

	<b>Page</b>
3.1 Annotation Schema - 1.1: Speech Data, Electoral Tendency, Number of Questions, Number of Words, Number of Questions per 1000 Words . . . . .	72
3.2 Annotation Schema - 1.2: Form of Questions, Problematic Cases, NPIs, Form of Questions in the TSC-RQ . . . . .	73
3.3 Annotation Schema - 1.3: Polarity Relative to Form of Communication, Form of Communication, Form of Question Relative to Form of Communication . .	74
3.4 Annotation Schema - 1.4: Appearance of NPIs Relative to Form of Questions and Form of Communication, NPIs in RQs, Appearance of NPIs subdivided into Form of Question, Negative or Positive Question, and Degree of NPI . . .	75

# List of Tables

3.1	Trump Speech Corpus Overview (Trump Speech Corpus (TSC)) . . . . .	66
3.2	Structural and Semantic Criteria Possible in RQs (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002; Han 2002) . . . . .	90
3.3	NPIs and Forms of Questions in TSC-RQ based on Han (2002) . . . . .	91
A.3	All Political Speeches by Donald Trump during the Presidential Election Campaign 2015–16 . . . . .	504

# Abbreviations

***M(Q)*** meaning of utterance

***y/n-question*** yes–no-question

**A.o.O.P.** Assertion of Opposite Polarity

**CAH** Complex Ambiguity Hypothesis

**CG** common ground

**CLH** Cross-Linguistic Hypothesis

**CR** conversational record

**iff** if and only if

**InT** invariant tag question

**IS** information structure

**ISIS** Islamic State of Iraq and Syria

**NAFTA** North American Free Trade Agreement

**NI** negative interrogative

**NPI** negative polarity item

**OQ** ordinary question

**PPI** positive polarity item

**QUD** question under discussion

**RQ** rhetorical question

**SD** standard deviation

**TInCAP** Tübingen Interdisciplinary Corpus of Ambiguity Phenomena

**TSC** Trump Speech Corpus

**TSC-RQ** Rhetorical Questions in Trump Speech Corpus

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 The Phenomenon of Rhetorical Questions

- (1.1.1) a. So you live in the inner cities. You're African-American. You're Hispanic. The schools are no good. There are no jobs. And it's totally unsafe. And I say I will fix it.
- b. What the *hell* do you have to lose? (A.3.521)
- c. I'm going to fix it. We are all *gonna* fix it.

(Donald Trump, Speech 16, A.3.521)

In monologue speech, an audience does not expect genuine questions and is possibly puzzled when a speaker uses an interrogative form, as in (1.1.1b), which is associated with a request for information. A possible answer under an ordinary question (OQ) reading is “I have nothing to lose” or “I have a job to lose”. However, the communicative setting prevents one from closing a possible knowledge gap of the speaker about what the listener might have to lose. The question was uttered during the presidential election campaign 2015–16 by the Republican candidate Donald Trump. If it is a rhetorical question (RQ), the function changes. In the previous literature, it is asserted that the speaker aims to make a specific rhetorical point and is not asking the listener to fill a knowledge gap (Farkas 2024b; Ilie 1994). In addition, the answer is perceived as obvious, and the speaker is primarily intending to make a statement (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Han 2002; Rohde 2006). According to Caponigro and Sprouse (2007), RQs are defined as in (1.1.2) and OQs as in (1.1.3).

- (1.1.2) A RQ is an interrogative clause whose answer is known to the Speaker and the Addressee, and they both also know that the other knows the answer as well. An answer is not required, but possible. Either the Speaker or the Addressee can answer.

(Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 9)

(1.1.3) An OQ is an interrogative clause whose answer is not known to the Speaker, but the Speaker thinks the Addressee may know it. An answer is required in order for the dialogue to be felicitous. Only the Addressee can answer.

(Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 9)

According to the definition of RQs in (1.1.2), RQs are characterised by their answer, however it remains unclear what the functions of the RQs are. Soanes and Stevenson (2003b) focus on communicative features of RQs in their definition in (1.1.4).

(1.1.4) Rhetorical [question] asked in order to produce an effect or to make a statement rather than to elicit information.

(Soanes and Stevenson 2003b: 1510)

The different approaches to the classification of RQs are discussed in Chapter 2 and Chapter 4.

In (1.1.1b), assuming the answer is obvious, it would be that you have nothing left to lose. A statement in which a speaker implies that the listener has nothing to lose could be perceived disparagingly. Hence, a close consideration of the function becomes necessary. The driving questions of the thesis are: What are the functions of RQs instead of eliciting information and how do RQs contribute to the communicative strategy of the speaker? Why does a speaker use a question instead of an assertion in a political speech? The speaker risks a misunderstanding; if the listeners are unsure of what the utterance might refer to or what the meaning of the questions is, the communicative setting prevents any form of clarification.

Questioning in monologues has a long tradition and has been frequently discussed (Kegel 2012; Knape and Winkler 2015; Schoepsdau 1996; Wong and Yap 2015). According to Schoepsdau (1996), the term 'rhetorical' is used to describe a type of question that is not intended to receive an actual answer. Instead, the answer is assumed to be obvious or self-evident based on the context or situation. In using such a question, the speaker is not seeking information, but instead is making an assertion, expressing a request, delivering a reproach, or conveying a similar message. This creates a discrepancy between the grammatical form of the sentence – which appears to be a question – and the actual communicative function

it serves. Because of this mismatch, rhetorical theory classifies such questions not as literal inquiries but as a figurative mode of expression. In this framework, RQs are considered figures of thought or figures of speech, used to enhance the expressive or persuasive impact of the language (Schoepsdau 1996: 445).

The analysis of RQs in political speeches is important for several reasons. RQs play a crucial role in persuasion and participation, focussing on key points, guiding the structure of the discourse, and evoking emotional appeal. The investigation of RQs reveals insights into the speaker's strategies, intentions, and underlying arguments. By examining the questions posed, their framing, and the context in which the speaker uses them, linguists (or any potential voter or people interested in politics and rhetoric) can gain a deeper understanding of the speaker's persuasive techniques, styles, and the overall messaging of the speech. A detailed analysis of RQs in political speech reveals their impact on the speech as a whole and its persuasive power. RQs are known to be a powerful tool for engaging the audience and capturing their attention. They are often used to emphasise key points, important arguments, and ideas. By framing a point as a question, the speaker encourages the listener to consider its implications. In addition, by asking questions, the speaker shapes the discourse and influences how the audience perceives different aspects. By asking questions that tap into people's values, beliefs, or experiences, politicians can create a sense of bonding, empathy, and closeness (cf. Schoepsdau 1996). Hence, the analysis of RQs in political speeches provides valuable insight into communicative strategies and how politicians use language to persuade, align beliefs, and shape perspectives. The questions of which aspects influence the interpretation of a RQ and which different functions a RQ can have are the subject of different discussions and approaches and lead to various proposals that will be discussed in the course of this work. This thesis aims to investigate the functions of the RQs in Donald Trump's campaign speeches from 2015–16.

Over the years, the language of Donald Trump has garnered significant attention, e.g. in regard to his way of apologising (Hauck and Mitsuhara 2020), his framing of the American decline (Biegon 2019), and his linguistic style (Egbert and Biber 2020; Gunn 2020; Hodges 2019; McMurry 2018; Sclafani 2018; Theye and Melling 2018; Walzer 2019). In addition, several other topics have been discussed: his use of Twitter (Stolee and Caton 2018), his hand gestures (Hall et al. 2016), or his relationship with race (Desjardins 2017). In "Under the Cover of Chaos: Trump and the Battle for the American Right", Grossberg (2018) places

“Trumpism” in a historical and cultural context to provide an analysis of the rise of Trump. The list can be extended indefinitely. For this thesis, the main focus is on Trump’s linguistic style during the presidential election campaign of 2015–16. Trump’s language is known for simple sentences, repetitions, hyperbole, exaggerations, and his well-known catchphrases, e.g. “Make America Great Again” or “Fake News”. In addition, he is notorious for his insults and populist language. The far-reaching consequences of his powerful language have unfolded during the “Unite the right” rally in Charlottesville and the storming of the Capitol in 2021. These aspects point to the importance of a closer analysis of his language in order to comprehend the effects it may have.

In general, political speeches are an exciting field for investigating how propaganda, manipulation of public opinion, and adaptation of attitudes work. In recent years, the notions of fake news, populism, and hate speech have received a great deal of public attention. In political contexts, not only since Trump’s increased public visibility, “a high level of discrimination, selective xenophobia, and racism” (Cedroni 2013: 228) can be observed. The analysis of linguistic devices that may contribute to harmful language is increasingly important. In a political speech, the speaker wants to persuade the listeners of “the acceptability of certain arguments regarding the citizens’ future” (Longobardi 2013: 235). According to Cedroni (2013), such a speech functions as social practice, “plays an interpretive function”, is a “symbolic ritual”, and is above all a “legitimizing task” (Cedroni 2013: 221).

In political culture, speeches play a decisive role. The speaker and their text are given great importance because their quality not only determines the quality of the entire event but also has a considerable influence beyond that. Political performance is often measured by oratorical power. A situation is oratorical when someone speaks publicly and wants to promote his or her cause, imbue it with relevance, and, if possible, change social and/or political realities accordingly. The main goal of this dissertation is to investigate the strategic functions of RQs in Trump’s political election campaign speeches in 2015–16. The analysis of strategic functions will show how RQs contribute to the persuasive rhetoric strategy of Donald Trump.

The aim is to show how the persuasive force of Trump’s speeches is displayed in the linguistic structure by examining the occurrence of RQs. RQs are considered questions structurally and assertions semantically, a mismatch that requires a pragmatic approach to identify their communicative goals. There are counterproposals to the perception of RQs as

questions and to the practical classification of RQs as assertions. Both notions are widely argued for and, therefore, relevant in terms of positioning my research among previous accounts. Possible explanations for their ambiguous status are given, for example that RQs are perceived as questions that are uttered to challenge stances, induce doubt, or align beliefs (Farkas 2024b; Ilie 1994; Wong and Yap 2015). A consideration of whether previous observations on the functions of RQs are tenable or whether they have to be elaborated upon will be the core of the dissertation project.

## 1.2 Central Research Questions and Proposal

The central research question of the thesis is formulated in (1.2.1).

- (1.2.1) What are the strategic functions of RQs in Donald Trump's presidential election campaign speeches from 2015–16?

Based on the central research question, the research questions in (1.2.2) underpin the thesis in general.

### (1.2.2) Research Questions

1. How were RQs previously approached and classified to distinguish them from ordinary questions (OQs)?
2. What kinds of strategic functions do RQs have and how are RQs and their functions different from assertions?
3. What are the functions of RQs in the political speeches by Donald Trump from 2015–16?

In previous linguistic research, RQs were widely discussed on a formal level to distinguish them from OQs, as I will show in Chapter 2. RQs are either associated with questions or assertions, and their answer is meant to be obvious. In particular, the assumption of the obviousness of the answer has serious ramifications for the analysis of RQs, as I will show in Chapters 3 and 5. The concept of common ground (common ground (CG)) is considered, highlighting differences with respect to the obviousness of the answers to RQs. The theoretical discussions in Chapter 2 and 3 centre around the question of how to identify a RQ in general. The discussion will show that there is a strong context relation between the

classification of RQs and OQs. From a pragmatic point of view, there have been proposals to classify them as indirect speech acts, as I will show in Chapter 4. The focus in the current literature lies mainly on the classification of RQs as questions or assertions. They are closely considered in order to identify similarities and differences in the proposals. Previous accounts have not conclusively answered the question in (1.2.1) and various possible proposals have been presented that I will discuss and summarise in a proposal of the functions of RQs. There are proposals suggesting that RQs are uttered to challenge, reinforce or alter beliefs, point to something, or to persuade (Athanasiadou 1991; Farkas 2024b; Ilie 1994; Wong and Yap 2015).

Two major insights on the classification of RQs and their functions arise from the theoretical discussion in Chapters 2 and 4 as well as from the empirical investigation reported on in Chapter 3: The first is that it is challenging to identify structural and semantic criteria to classify RQs. The second insight is that the connection to the context and the constraints of the communicative setting determine a RQ's function. The notion of perceiving RQs as questions calls for focussing on structural patterns in order to examine similarities and differences between RQs and OQs (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002; Giannakidou 2002; Han 2002; Krifka 1995).

Due to their interrogative form, RQs share similarities with OQs; therefore, their differences must be clarified (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Molnár and Winkler 2026). The form–function ambiguity of the utterance raises the question of their strategic use (Winkler 2022). The main difference from OQs is that they do not aim to close a knowledge gap and that speakers aim to achieve different communicative goals by uttering RQs. Hence, the difference is pragmatic (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Farkas 2024b; Huddleston and Pullum 2006). However, I propose that they can still be described as questions, but their functions differ from ordinary ones that seek information. The thesis aims to investigate the functions of RQs that deviate from those of OQs.

The proposals by Biezma and Rawlins (2017), Caponigro and Sprouse (2007), Han (2002), and Rohde (2006) focus on the possible statements implied in RQs to distinguish them from OQs. Their main condition for classifying a RQ as such is that the answer to a RQ is part of the CG. However, in cases in which the answer is neither obvious nor may be derived by way of polarity, it remains unclear how the implicit message can be identified. In addition, the proposals remain unspecific on how the utterance can be classified in cases where

the requirements of RQs are not met, i.e. there is no obvious answer (Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Han 2002; Rohde 2006). The question remains why the speaker chooses a question form although they want to make a statement. In addition, these approaches mainly consider turn-taking sequences. Hence, I propose to carefully consider the communicative constraints of political speeches in order to examine the functions of RQs.

I propose that the main factors differentiating them from assertions are the plausible deniability, the lack of commitment, and their illocutionary form, which invites involvement (cf. Farkas 2024b). This observation leads to my proposal that the meaning of the utterance may also be denied. Here, I refer to Camp (2018) and her proposal of “plausible deniability”. Camp (2018) argues for a difference between the meaning of utterance ( $M(Q)$ ) and the insinuated  $M(Q)'$  and the resulting plausible deniability. Plausible deniability is defined by Camp (2018: 47) as in (1.2.3).

(1.2.3) After all,  $S$  intends to communicate  $M(Q)$  by getting  $H$  to recognize this communicative intention, and  $H$  successfully recognizes this. Further, if  $S$  does claim to have meant  $M(Q)'$  instead of  $M(Q)$ , she lies about her communicative intentions; and that lie is often a bald-faced one.

(Camp 2018: 47)

Plausible deniability refers to the concept that the speaker may implicitly utter a possibly controversial proposition, avoids accountability, and willingly accepts that the listener accepts the controversy. This observation is further discussed with respect to RQs. I propose that the interrogative form of a RQ is a way to communicate controversial topics without exposing the subject and that avoids liability.

Assertions are closely associated with commitment; a key distinguishing feature, as I propose, between assertions and RQs. Commitment is defined as in (1.2.4).

(1.2.4) [T]he expressed commitment to a proposition by the speaker causes a proposition to become part of the common ground.

(Krifka 2023: 154)

When a speaker asserts a proposition, it is associated with commitment – that is, they clearly express that they believe or are asserting to be true – and they intend to add that statement

to what both the speaker and the listener accept as shared knowledge or belief (Krifka 2023). This shared understanding is described as CG. Stalnaker (1978) refers to commitment as when a speaker makes an assertion, they commit to the proposition being true, and (if unchallenged) it becomes part of the CG, while Lewis (1979) associates commitment with the speaker's role in shaping the direction and assumptions of the conversation. In speech act theory, Searle (1969) proposes that assertions carry a commitment to the truth of the proposition in contrast to questions. All contribute to the interpretation of shared meaning. The concepts of commitment and CG are further discussed in Chapters 2 and 4.

The following discussion aims to close the research gap by applying the functions previously observed by Athanasiadou (1991), Farkas (2024b), Ilie (1994), and Wong and Yap (2015) to the RQs of Donald Trump. Wong and Yap (2015) propose four functions based on their investigation of political speeches; however, it is not clear how they identify RQs in the first place and which factors determine their classification.

Farkas (2023) argues for the “rhetorical point”, which indicates the differences between RQs and OQs, and associates the difference with their function (Farkas 2023: 6). This rhetorical point establishes the crucial distinction between RQs and OQs and arises from the “obligatory conversational implicature” (Farkas 2024a: 21). The rhetorical point is defined as the key feature of RQs “namely to persuade Ad to accept the truth of a proposition that should have been obvious to her but which she appears to overlook” (Farkas 2024b). Farkas (2024b) proposes that the rhetorical point is to convince the addressee (Ad) of the truth of a proposition; however, she does not argue that the proposition itself has to be true and stresses the notion of “public” aim. The issue raised in the question is OK in the context, and contrary to OQs, there is no open issue to be resolved. As a public goal, it is intended to be followable in the context by all participants, an insightful aspect that will be further discussed with respect to the functions of RQs.

The aim is to provide a discussion of the functions of RQs in consideration of the CG, in the distinct communicative setting of a monologue, and an analysis of how RQs contribute to the persuasive rhetoric of Donald Trump. The purpose of Chapter 5 is to close this research gap by taking into account the findings in Chapters 2, 3, and 4.

The communicative setting in which the utterances appear is highly relevant in order to classify the utterances and their functions. Traditionally, questions in political speeches are perceived as RQs before a reading as a genuine question is considered. Speeches cannot be

assumed to be monologues in their entirety (Collins 2012; Knappe 2015; Martin 2015; Reisigl 2008; Sclafani 2018). The empirical findings in Chapter 3 show that the considered political speeches consist of monologue, the extra-textual level, and storytelling sequences. Based on the findings, I will show that a careful consideration of the classification of questions is required in order to avoid including various other types of questions although one only wants to examine RQs. Previous studies of RQs, for instance by Wong and Yap (2015) or the ones examined in Chapter 2, lack this observation and thus analytical challenges arise. I will discuss approaches to analysing the functions of speech acts in Section 4.4 and then I will turn to the functions of RQs in 4.5.

Thus, an analysis is required that considers the formal level of the utterances as well as their communicative and contextual setting. This proposal is summarised in Section 5.1 and exemplified using the corpus in Section 5.2. The interdisciplinary proposal I aim to put forward is two-fold. First, I provide an approach to classifying RQs in political speeches in Chapter 3 to explore in a second step the strategic functions of RQs in Chapter 5. I suggest that to analyse RQs, the communicative setting, the CG, and the speaker's intention should be considered. Thus, the combination of linguistics and rhetorical analysis allows for a fruitful approach to grasping the functions of RQs. The rhetorical perspective describes a composite, multi-layered performance embodied in communication, such as how a speaker strategically uses linguistic devices to persuade the hearer – in the present case, how to convince potential voters (Martin 2015). The combination allows us to account for the persuasiveness of the speeches, which is often both emotional and rational, and serves to impress the audience in order to influence their judgement on certain topics (Martin 2019: 9). The approach is located at a micro-level in order to examine the functions of specific structures and aims to examine the persuasive argumentation of RQs (cf. Dedaić 2006: 702). I propose that the speaker, in the present discussion Donald Trump, strategically chooses an interrogative form to achieve communicative intention. There are three main functions, although this may not be exhaustive, that the speaker aims to fulfil: pragmatic focusing to manage the CG, forcing the accommodation of presuppositions, and aligning beliefs. The main functions are anchored in linguistic markers on the sentence level.

### 1.3 Outline

The central aim of this work is to provide an analysis of RQs in political speeches by Donald Trump (2015–16) taking into account the CG. First, I present the literature on this topic, then I present the Trump corpus, and finally I analyse the functions of the RQs on the basis of this corpus. I will divide previous accounts of RQs into three groups: (i) accounts that analyse RQs as questions, (ii) accounts that approach RQs as assertions, and (iii) accounts that approach RQs using a pragmatic notion, thus comprising a strong context-based analysis. The main distinction between these approaches is which factors they propose as relevant for the functional analysis of RQs, and in particular, how decisive they consider the context.

In Chapter 2, I consider the observation that RQs are structurally similar to interrogatives, but semantically, they are associated with assertions. This chapter is structured along the lines of one main question that shapes the overall argument of the analysis of the functions of questions: Are RQs questions or are RQs assertions? Thus, I will provide an overview of the approaches that refer to the formal structure of RQs. Specific linguistic markers and possible structural tendencies that have previously been observed are discussed. In Section 2.2, syntax-based accounts focus on linguistic markers that signal the rhetoricity of the question to distinguish RQs from OQs. They argue for specific items, e.g. polarity items and structural patterns, as characteristic markers. Due to their similarity to questions, the possible responses to RQs are considered. In Section 2.4, the semantic accounts classify RQs based on their assertive force and polarity, and I examine the heuristic tests proposed to distinguish OQs from RQs.

In Chapter 3, the proposed markers for RQs are applied to the questions in Trump's campaign speeches in an empirical study. The main goal of the investigation is to compile the Rhetorical Questions in Trump Speech Corpus (TSC-RQ) on the basis of the questions in the Trump Speech Corpus (TSC). Based on the corpus, the functions of RQs are examined in Chapter 5. In addition, structural patterns and tendencies regarding the form and the communicative level are examined. I zoom in on the details of political speech, viz. their composition of monologue, extra-textual level, and storytelling. The investigation is based on a rich set of questions, to be exact 712 questions in sixteen speeches.

In Chapter 4, the pragmatic treatment of RQs in speech act theory is discussed. I will touch upon the pragmatic–semantic interface and approaches related to information structure. The notion of speech acts is included to shed light on the functions of the questions and the possible communicative intention that the speaker may achieve by means of RQs. The role of the speaker is examined in order to investigate their intentions. In Section 4.3, I discuss the applicability of perceiving discourse as a game with rules, strategies, and moves based on Camp (2018), Lewis (1979), Roberts (2012, 2018), and Stalnaker (2002). Their notion includes the classification of public and private beliefs, which is of great importance in public discourse and therefore in political speech (Dayal 2016; Krifka 2002; Stalnaker 2014). The discourse model of the CG as well as the scoreboard proposal suggested by Lewis (1979) and Roberts (2018) and its further adaptation in relation to insinuation (Camp 2018) are examined. The aim is to shed light on ways in which complex utterances, e.g. RQs in a strategic context such as political speeches, can be analysed. In Section 4.4, speech acts and their communicative functions are discussed: the notions of communicative functions as perlocutionary acts, communicative functions as goals (Austin 1962; Athanasiadou 1991; Farkas 2024b; Harris 2016; Ilie 1994; Meibauer 1986; Saul 2018a; Staffeldt 2007; Wong and Yap 2015). In Section 4.5, I discuss previous approaches to the functions of RQs. The proposed functions in the literature are summarised, and they serve as the basis for the analysis in Chapter 5.

In Chapter 5, based on these theoretical observations and the proposed functions in Section 4.5, I examine the functions of RQs in the TSC-RQ taking into account the CG, the question under discussion (QUD), and the main empirical findings of Chapter 3 in Trump’s political speeches from 2015–16. The analysis shows how Trump strategically uses RQs to gain the prerogative of interpretation over political situations and controversial topics. Furthermore, the analysis shows far-reaching insights into how the speaker strategically uses the question form to manage the CG and accommodate presuppositions.

In Chapter 6, I reflect on my observations and provide a summary of the present argument, as well as an outlook for further research. The contribution of the dissertation project goes beyond a proposal concerning the functions of RQs. The work at hand provides valuable insights into the structure of discourse, the role of the CG, and how RQs shape beliefs and feelings.

In summary, there are three main empirical contributions. I provide a review of the approaches to RQs of the three main theoretical frameworks (syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic) as well as their studies of the functions of RQs. I compile a large data set and provide an annotation schema that incorporates previous studies and analyses. I provide an analysis of the strategic functions of RQs in Trump's election campaign speeches (2015–16). Hence, this work presents an analysis of the functions of RQs in Trump's speeches, but does not aim to provide an exhaustive classification of the functions of RQs. The analyses in Chapter 5 are based on functions identified in the literature and presented in Section 4.5. Further functions of RQs may be examined in future work. The three strategic functions are presented under the consideration of the CG, the QUD, and the speaker's intention, which have a linguistic anchor on the sentence level.

The main contribution is the analysis of the strategic functions of RQs in the speeches from Donald Trump's election campaign (2015–2016). In order to achieve this goal, I discuss previous approaches to RQs and their functions, collect RQs from the TSC corpus, and present an analysis of their functions on the basis of previous approaches and the specifically compiled corpus TSC-RQ. The work does not aim to present a theoretical definition of RQs, but instead discusses previous accounts and presents the analysis based on their work. The thesis contributes to the question of how speakers can influence and shape the CG using RQs without taking responsibility for the proposition of the utterance and shows how RQs contribute to the persuasive strategy of Trump speeches.

# 2 Previous Approaches to Rhetorical Questions

## 2.1 Research Questions and Chapter Outline

Chapter 2 reviews previous approaches to RQs and their differentiation from OQs and assertions. The main goal of this chapter is to identify research gaps and to provide an overview of how RQs have previously been analysed. It is crucial to say that in order to analyse the functions of RQs, it has to be clear how RQs can be characterised and what conclusions can be drawn from the classification. Thus, this work will begin with a consideration of the subject matter of RQs because they are closely related to both OQs or assertions. Questions are defined as in (2.1.1), assertions as in (2.1.3), and RQs as in (2.1.2). For now, I provide a general definition of questions and assertions; I will refer to a finer-grained understanding of them in the corresponding Sections 2.2 and 2.4.

(2.1.1) A sentence worded or expressed so as to elicit information.

(Soanes and Stevenson 2003a: 1442)

(2.1.2) Rhetorical [question]: asked in order to produce an effect or to make a statement rather than to elicit information.

(Soanes and Stevenson 2003b: 1510)

(2.1.3) Asserting is the act of claiming that something is the case. [...] We make assertions to share information, coordinate our actions, defend arguments, and communicate our beliefs and desires.

(Pagin and Marsili 2021)

I will consider accounts which propose a structural condition on RQs in Section 2.2 and accounts which address their possible responses in Section 2.3. The subsequent Section 2.4

introduces accounts in which the possibility of perceiving utterances as RQs depends on semantic factors rather than structural conditions. In addition, their findings are examined with respect to the functions of RQs. In Section 2.5, I will shed light on the notion of CG and RQs. The driving question is whether RQs are a special type of question or whether they constitute their own speech act type. This question is to be answered guided by the following research questions (2.1.4):

- (2.1.4) a. How do the linguistic fields syntax and semantics approach RQs and formulate how they are distinct from OQs?
- b. What conclusions do the different approaches draw about the functions of RQs?
- c. How are RQs defined with respect to CG?

The first research question in (2.1.4a) focusses on how RQs have traditionally been analysed in a semantic and syntactic framework. I will concentrate on approaches that focus on linguistic markers to distinguish RQs from OQs, such as those of den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002), Egg (2011), Han (2002), and Rohde (2006). According to Han (2002), ordinary yes–no-questions (*y/n*-questions) are known to license weak negative polarity items (NPIs) such as “any”. In contrast, “ordinary *yes–no* questions do not license strong NPIs such as *lift a finger* or *budge an inch*” (Han 2002: 204). In *wh*-questions, for example, when “the trace of the *wh*-phrase c-commands the weak NPI, both the ordinary reading and the RQ are available” (Han 2002: 205). However, den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002) argue that an ordinary *wh*-question can contain a weak NPI. Modals in combination with NPIs are a strong indication of RQs (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002). The main shortcomings of syntactic accounts are that they exclude co-texts and contexts. These observations will be discussed in more detail in Section 2.2.

In a semantic framework, accounts closely associate RQs with assertions (Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Han 2002; Rohde 2006; Sadock 1971). The discussion of approaches in a semantic framework will show that there are various ways to signal RQs, for example through opposite polarity (Han 2002; Progovac 1993; Sadock 1971). Han (2002) argues that a positive RQ elicits a negative answer and vice versa. The main shortcoming of such accounts is that they typically are unspecific regarding under what conditions the polarity shift is met, and

it is unclear how utterances should be treated if the derived assertion is overridden by a context analysis.

The second research question in (2.1.4b) takes stock of the theoretical conclusions that different approaches make with respect to the functions of RQs. There are proposals that argue that the functions of RQs are, for example, to persuade listeners or to make them vote for a certain candidate (Ephratt 2008), to reflect the speaker's opinion, to serve as a politeness strategy, or to synchronise the beliefs of the speaker and addressee (Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Farkas 2024b; Ilie 1994; Meibauer 1986; Rohde 2006). However, the discussion in this chapter shows that they focus on the differentiation between RQs and OQs rather than on the functions of RQs.

Previous accounts regularly refer to the notion of CG (Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Farkas 2024b; Rohde 2006). Biezma and Rawlins (2017), Caponigro and Sprouse (2007), Han (2002), and Rohde (2006) argue that the main condition on RQs is that their answer must be part of the CG. First, I will consider different approaches to the concept of CG in general that differ in their understanding of what they perceive as part of the CG and what assumptions we can draw from them in order to classify RQs. Thus, the influence of the CG is investigated in the research question (2.1.4c) to shed light on the role of the CG in the classification of RQs and what it possibly tells us about the function of the RQs. Farkas (2024b) rejects the characteristic of a known answer as a sufficient or necessary condition and argues that there are RQs that are unanswerable. Farkas (2024b) argues for their redundancy and their rhetorical point as a mandatory conversational implicature that can be derived from the previous context. The proposals consider the relation between RQs and the CG only in one direction, viz. how the CG contributes to the interpretation of an utterance as a RQ. It is a shortcoming of previous accounts that they omit the use of RQs as a way to change the CG. If hearers have to accommodate presuppositions in order to follow the conversation, RQs may have the potential to change the CG. This theoretical consideration is discussed in Section 2.5.

In order to approach the functions of RQs, which is the main research question in the present work, it is necessary to begin with the question whether RQs are associated with OQs or assertions. An association with one or the other would require varying interpretations and analysis steps. Therefore, we first address the notion of RQs as questions, followed by the perception of RQs as assertions, and finally examine RQs using a pragmatic approach in

Chapter 4. As will be shown, the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic accounts make very different assumptions about the nature of RQs and their functions. Based on the empirical investigation in Chapter 3 and the previous pragmatic proposals and studies discussed in Chapter 4, I will provide an analysis of the functions of RQs in political speeches by Donald Trump in Chapter 5.

## 2.2 Rhetorical Questions as Information-Seeking Questions

The first set of approaches that I discuss investigate the differentiation between RQs and OQs. Both appear as interrogatives in structure, but, while OQs ask for new information, RQs do not. Hence, the puzzle is how to tell the difference between them when they may appear in the same or a similar form.

There are proposals arguing that there are linguistic markers that signal the classification as a RQ (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002; Han 2002; Meibauer 1986). The proposals (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Huddleston and Pullum 2006; Ladusaw 1980; van Rooy 2003) argue that RQs as well as OQs evoke answers, however the difference is the set of possible answers they allow. Hence, the proposals argue that it is the answer that completes the classification as a RQ because on a structural level they cannot be distinctively distinguished from OQs. Molnár and Winkler (2026) refer to the ambiguity of an identical form and a different function and introduce two hypotheses that summarise the ambiguity introduced in the form and function, as well as the strategic function of RQs (Molnár and Winkler 2026: 98–9).

### (2.2.1) *Complex Ambiguity Hypothesis (CAH)*

The speaker is aware of the fact that a *wh*-question may be ambiguous along two dimensions:

- i. *Interactional Ambiguity*: the *wh*-question is either an information-eliciting question or a rhetorical question;
- ii. *Information-Structural Ambiguity*: the *wh*-question may be ambiguous with respect to its information structure.

(Molnár and Winkler 2026: 98)

### (2.2.2) *Cross-Linguistic Hypothesis (CLH)*

- There are language-specific means that a speaker can select to disambiguate
- i. the interactional ambiguity between IEQs and RQs, and
  - ii. the information-structural ambiguity.

(Molnár and Winkler 2026: 99)

Molnár and Winkler (2026) combine these two central notions for the investigation of RQs: the form–function ambiguity and the interaction of RQs and OQs. The goal of this section is to examine possible language-specific means to distinguish between RQs and OQs. I will investigate the role of linguistic markers, the question of the knowledge gap, and whether the speaker is interested in the answer, which are closely linked to the possibility of actually answering the question.

In the previous literature (e.g. den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002; Meibauer 1986; Nunberg et al. 1997), there are different proposals to identify structural differences, e.g. linguistic markers such as positive polarity items (PPIs) and NPIs, which are defined as in (2.2.3).

(2.2.3) A significant number of items – specific words, fixed or variable phrases, and idiomatic expressions – are **polarity-sensitive**, i.e. sensitive to the polarity of the environment in which they occur. [...] We need two pieces of new terminology for referring to these kinds of items:

- i. Items which prefer negative contexts over positive ones (such as *any longer*) are **negatively-oriented polarity-sensitive items**, or **NPIs**.
- ii. Items which prefer positive contexts over negative ones (such as **already**) are **positively-oriented polarity-sensitive items**, or **PPIs**.

(Huddleston and Pullum 2006: 822)

According to den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002), NPIs are linguistic signals with and without modal auxiliaries which influence the epistemic strength of the utterance and the function of a question.

(2.2.4) a. Who bought that book?

(den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002: 32)

b. Who the hell bought that book?

(den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002: 32)

According to den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002), the examples in (2.2.4a) and (2.2.4b) are OQs. They argue that “the speaker who utters [2.2.4a] or [2.2.4b] expects that someone did indeed buy that book and seeks information about the identity of the buyer(s)” (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002: 32). They assume that *wh*-phrases like “what on earth”, “who the hell”, and “what the dickens” can still be classified as ordinary *wh*-questions (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002: 32). However, when the *wh-the-hell* phrase appears in combination with a modal, the interpretation changes. Consider (2.2.5b) in the same context:

(2.2.5) a. Who would buy that book?

(den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002: 32)

b. Who the hell *would* buy that book?

(den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002: 32)

Example (2.2.5a) includes a modal and is interpreted as an information-seeking question eliciting new information from the addressee (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002). Further, den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002) point to the possibility that “the example [2.2.5b] can also have an,—arguably less salient—negative rhetorical reading anticipating an answer such as *Nobody would buy that book*” (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002: 32). In order to evoke a negative reading as in (2.2.5a), den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002) point out that the “would” is required. In the given context, they argue that the utterance cannot be used as an OQ because of the presence of “who the hell” in combination with the modal “would”. Neither the modal nor the NPI alone determine the interpretation as a RQ or OQ. According to den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002: 32), the combination of both is what flags it as a RQ.

In contrast, Han (2002) argues that ordinary *y/n*-questions and ordinary *wh*-questions can be distinguished from RQs with respect to NPIs. She proposes that they do not license strong NPIs (cf. Han and Siegel 1997).<sup>1</sup> She provides the following examples (2.2.6a) and (2.2.6b).

(2.2.6) a. Did John lift a finger to help Sam?

(Han 2002: 204)

b. Did John budge an inch when Sam was in trouble?

(Han 2002: 204)

---

<sup>1</sup> See footnote 2 in Han (2002): “Zwarts (1996) makes a distinction between weak and strong NPIs. Weak NPIs include *any* and *ever*. [...] Strong NPIs include *lift a finger*, *budge an inch*, etc. and can only be licensed by negative elements such as *no* or *not*” (Han 2002: 204).

According to Han's assumption, the examples in (2.2.4b) and (2.2.5b) can only be RQs. Han (2002) argues that ordinary *y/n*-questions are known to license weak NPIs such as "any". In contrast, "ordinary *y/n*-questions do not license strong NPIs such as *lift a finger* or *budge an inch*" (Han 2002: 204). In *wh*-questions, when "the trace of the *wh*-phrase c-commands the weak NPI, both the ordinary reading and the RQ are available" (Han 2002: 205). Ordinary *wh*-questions do not allow strong NPIs (Han 2002: 205). However, den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002) argue that an ordinary *wh*-question can contain a weak NPI as discussed for (2.2.5a) and (2.2.5b). In contrast to Han (2002), den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002) do not agree that NPIs determine RQs. NPIs show a tendency but are not determining cues, because the analysis shows that NPIs can also appear in OQs (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002). The findings are in line with the work by Meibauer (1986). Meibauer (1986) observes that there is a relation between RQs and modal particles, negation, polarity items, conjunctives, comparative constructions, clause linkage, verbs as well as verbal constructions, conventional rhetorical acts, and rhetorical devices. Specific verbs and verbal constructions can be linguistic markers for a RQ, but they only support a rhetorical interpretation and do not determine it. They function as intensifiers of "rhetoricity" (*translation by MER of Meibauer's (1986) use of "Rhetorizität", August 2023*) (Meibauer 1986: 155). "Rhetoricity" refers to the "rhetorical-ness" of the communicative act, i.e. the specific use of rhetorical elements (Schmidt-Haberkamp and Ostheeren 2013). As intensifiers, specific verbs and verbal constructions point to actual vs. possible and desirable vs. non-desirable aspects, which makes it easier to interpret a question as rhetorical and ordinary (Meibauer 1986: 156). However, according to Meibauer (1986), the force of a RQ is always dependent on the specific context, the background knowledge of the participants, and their emotional involvement (Meibauer 1986: 158).

Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) propose that NPIs are possible in ordinary and rhetorical questions; however, they closely associate the appearance of NPIs with presuppositions and answers. They propose that the presupposition triggers, which participants take for granted, are identical to the answer, and participants share the notion of the identical answer they derive from RQs (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 8). Caponigro and Sprouse (2007: 3) link strong NPIs in RQs with presupposition. Presuppositions are defined as in (2.2.7).

- (2.2.7) Presuppositions can be defined as the phenomenon whereby speakers mark linguistically information as being taken for granted, rather than being part of the main propositional content of a speech act.

(Beaver et al. 2021)

In RQs, NPIs are licenced as exemplified in (2.2.8).

- (2.2.8) a. After all, who lifted a finger to help Luca?  
b. Who gave a damn when Paolo was in trouble? Yet he made it.

(Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 3)

The NPI triggers a negative answer in both cases. They argue that both participants share the negative answer. They argue that NPIs are not possible in OQs and demonstrate this with examples such as (2.2.9).

- (2.2.9) a. # I'm really curious: Who lifted a finger to help Luca?  
b. # I really don't know: Who gave a damn when Paolo was in trouble?

(Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 3)

The prefixed phrases “I’m really curious” and “I really don’t know” reinforce the genuine question form, which signals a knowledge gap of the speaker. According to their proposal, the genuine aim of closing the knowledge gap contradicts the presupposition trigger of NPIs, which evokes a shared negative answer. However, they do not fully exclude the possibility of NPIs in OQs and argue that this would require a c-commanding negation within the clause in which it appears (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 8). Rather, Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) make a strong argument that the difference between ordinary and rhetorical questions lies in their answer possibilities.

In conclusion, linguistic markers, here we have focussed on NPIs, help to distinguish between rhetorical and ordinary questions, because they signal a rhetorical reading but do not determine the classification as a RQ. The theoretical proposals of linguistic cues are considered in the empirical investigation in Chapter 3. Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) consider both proposals, RQs as OQs and assertions, link NPIs to answers, and argue for a strong consideration of the CG. According to them, the determining feature of the CG is that the answer has to be known to the speaker and the addressee and thus be part of the CG. Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) share the view that RQs have no difference in form

from OQs and argue that they can only be differentiated semantically. They state that RQs allow the same set of answers as OQs. In addition, they reject the proposal that RQs are assertions because they argue that grammar does not treat the identical string of words in one situation as an assertion and in the other as a question (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 12). They ask us to imagine the situations in (2.2.10) and (2.2.11).

(2.2.10) You are on the search committee for a semantics position, look at Onavi's job application, and see that he hasn't taken any class or done any work in semantics. Then, you utter:

- a. I don't think we should have Onavi on our short list. (After all,) *what does he know about semantics?*

(Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 1)

(2.2.11) Now imagine a slightly different situation. Somebody suggests hiring Onavi for a syntax position. Since you want your new syntactician to know at least a bit of semantics, you utter:

- a. Onavi looks like an interesting syntactician. *What does he know about semantics?*

(Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 1)

Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) argue that the RQ in (2.2.10a) allows for answers and variability of answers, so that it is equivalent to the OQ in (2.2.11a). This notion is shared by Ilie (1994) and will be further discussed in Section 2.3. Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) treat OQs with no answer<sup>2</sup> such as (2.2.12) and (2.2.13) as special types. They differ from RQs since RQs require that the speaker and addressee are familiar with the answer and both are aware that the answer is known to both of them (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 11). In their classification, RQs are strictly limited to the availability of an answer in the CG, as exemplified in (2.2.12) and (2.2.13).

(2.2.12) What's the meaning of life?

(2.2.13) Does God exist?

(Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 11)

<sup>2</sup> For a specific group of interlocutors (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 11).

They argue that the questions in (2.2.12) and (2.2.13) can be answered neither by the speaker nor by the listener and classify them as questions without answers (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 10). In contrast, Farkas (2024b) argues that there are “unanswerable/unresolvable RhQs”. Hence, according to Farkas (2024b), they may also be RQs because it is their rhetorical point that determines RQs as such (Farkas 2024b). Although they cannot be answered or resolved relative to the context, it is the rhetorical point in (2.2.12) and (2.2.13) that finally makes them RQs relative to the context. Farkas’ (2024b) proposal is discussed further in Section 2.4.

RQs are structurally a question and there are no distinct markers that signal that they are not. As they appear in the form of interrogatives, their response possibilities have to be considered. RQs can be answered as well as OQs, therefore RQs can have the same set of answers as OQs (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Ilie 1994). As this section shows, responses to RQs are crucial to the interpretation and classification as RQs and may provide further clues about the implicit rhetorical point the speaker aims to make. Therefore, I did not consider the question in isolation from its context. The question arises as to what kind of responses RQs allow and how they influence the interpretation of a specific question. The notion of responses is controversially discussed and various approaches will be introduced in Section 2.3 (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Farkas 2024b; Han 2002; Ilie 1994; Rohde 2006).

## 2.3 Rhetorical Questions and Responses

The consideration of previous analyses reveals the necessity to closely consider the responses to RQs in order to differentiate between rhetorical and ordinary questions (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Molnár and Winkler 2026). The standard function of OQs is that they have two closely related dimensions, as Molnár and Winkler (2026: 92) indicate in (2.3.1):

- (2.3.1) 1. The cognitive dimension: the presence of a “knowledge gap”  
2. The interactive dimension: the relevance of closing a “gap”

(Molnár and Winkler 2026: 92)

Thus, an information-seeking question must have a knowledge gap and the speaker has to be interested in the response of the listener (Molnár and Winkler 2026: 92). Molnár and Winkler (2026) claim that if the speaker already knows the answer, the question must be

rhetorical. Ladusaw (1980) also argues that RQs are questions that do not require an answer. They maintain that RQs should be analysed as OQs whose answer sets are empty because they cannot be answered or have a negative answer (cf. Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 2).

There are further proposals by Ilie (1994) and Rohde (2006) that argue for the consideration of responses to RQs, especially with respect to their function. Due to the formal appearance of RQs as questions, either answers or responses are possible, because the meaning of a question is a set of possible answers (Karttunen 1977). Whereas “answer” is a semantic category, “response” is a pragmatic concept as exemplified in (2.3.2) (Huddleston and Pullum 2006: 866).

(2.3.2) *Have you seen it?*

- i *No.* [...]
- ii *I'm not sure.* [...]
- iii *I've already told you that I have.* [...]

(Huddleston and Pullum 2006: 866)

Huddleston and Pullum (2006) argue that the response in (i) is an answer, but (ii) and (iii) are uttered in order to avoid an “answer either on the grounds of insufficient knowledge or for some other reason” (Huddleston and Pullum 2006: 866).

Ilie (1994) specifies the notion of various responses and provides a detailed overview of various response options. Like others (e.g. Han 2002), Ilie (1994: 128) argues that RQs are meant to be heard as questions and understood as statements. According to Ilie (1994), RQs allow a wide set of responses. The responses are closely related to the discourse functions of RQs in Ilie’s (1994) proposal. For example, Ilie (1994: 152) provides (2.3.3) to illustrate how the function can depend on the corresponding response by the addresser.

- (2.3.3) a. ***Would the G7 listen to them about beating inflation, when Labour’s aim is to raise it here?***
- b. No. (POL 72, John Major’s speech, 7.4.1992; Ilie 1994: 152)

Ilie (1994) points out that No in (2.3.3b) is meant to strengthen the intended message of (2.3.3a). The answer determines the question’s function as an argument: “If *p* (*Labour’s aim is to raise inflation*) then *q* (*the G7 would not listen to Labour about beating inflation*). [...] Therefore, *q* (*the G7 will not listen to Labour about beating inflation*)” (Ilie 1994: 152).

Even though RQs differ from OQs because they are asked from a position of epistemic bias, that does not limit their response possibilities (Dayal 2016: 283; Ilie 1994). Ilie (1994) links her definition of RQs specifically to their possible responses: “a rhetorical question is a question as a challenging statement to convey the addresser’s commitment to its implicit answer in order to induce the addressee’s mental recognition of its [the answer’s] obviousness and the acceptance, verbalised or non-verbalised, of its validity” (Ilie 1994: 128). Whereas Han (1998) and Krifka (1995) associate RQs with single negative answers, Rohde (2006) also states that RQs have a wider answer set: positive/negative, null/non-null, single/multiple, which can indicate the un informativity of RQs (Rohde 2006: 134–35).

- (2.3.4) a. *Negative answer*: Who lifted a finger to help?  
b. *Positive answer*: Has the educational system been so watered down that anybody who’s above average is now gifted?  
c. *Non-null answer*: Who always shows up late to class?  
d. *Multiple answers*: What’s going to happen to these kids when they grow up?  
(Rohde 2006: 135)

The observation refers to the notion that the speaker does not expect an answer when posing a RQ (Rohde 2006: 134–35). RQs look like questions, but differ in their functions (Sadock 1971). However, Rohde (2006) points out that the felicity of RQs depends on the shared commitment of both participants to an obvious answer as exemplified in (2.3.5) and (2.3.6) (Rohde 2006: 140).

- (2.3.5) *yes/no* Question: Did John ever help? (Implies: John never helped.)  
(Rohde 2006: 137)

- (2.3.6) *wh-* Question: What has John ever done to help? (Implies: John has done nothing to help.)  
(Rohde 2006: 137)

The answers to RQs have an “identical value or share an extreme position on a contextually relevant scale” (Rohde 2006: 134). RQs are similar to interrogatives, but the obviousness of a distinct answer shows the constraint of the utterance.

The question of informativity is controversial in the academic literature on the topic. Rohde (2006: 150) contends that RQs are non-information-seeking questions whereas van

Rooy (2003) states that RQs are information-seeking. According to Rohde (2006), RQs require shared knowledge of an obvious answer and consequently this presence of an obvious answer makes the utterance unnecessary. Further, the answer has to be unsurprising so that it does not have to be uttered at all. The effect is that beliefs of the speaker and addressee are synchronised. Rohde (2006) proposes that the addressee only responds in certain cases: “(i) if the rhetorical intent was misunderstood, (ii) if the question was an “exam question”, or (iii) if the response confirms or acknowledges the implication of the rhetorical question” (Rohde 2006: 142). The three felicity conditions include “(i) the presence of an **obvious** answer, (ii) **uninformativity** of the answer, and (iii) the **sufficient similarity** of the Speaker’s and Addressee’s answers” (Rohde 2006: 135). An obvious answer requires that both participants know or are able to derive this obvious answer to the question. The participants have to share prior commitments in order to share a similar answer. According to Rohde (2006), “sufficiently similar answers [are] those that either have an identical value or those that share an extreme position on a contextually relevant scale” (Rohde 2006: 136). Rohde (2006) does not restrict RQs to negative singleton answers in contrast to, for example, Han (2002). Further, they do not function like regular questions and are more similar to statements as exemplified in (2.3.7a)–(2.3.7c) (Rohde 2006: 138).

(2.3.7) a. Rhetorical question: Did John lift a finger to help?

    Invoked answer set:

- b. Yes, John lifted a finger to help.
- c. No, John did not lift a finger to help.

(Rohde 2006: 138)

Although Rohde (2006) gives a wider range of possible answers to RQs than previous studies, she states that the speaker expects a strong negative answer (Rohde 2006: 138–39). However, Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) argue that the possible set of answers to RQs are the same as for OQs and that the distinction between RQs and OQs is intended to be of a pragmatic nature.

In contrast to Rohde (2006), and in line with Caponigro and Sprouse (2007), Ilie (1994) analyses different forms of responses, verbalised and non-verbalised answers and replies, which are not linked to the CG. Basically, RQs are mentally response-eliciting “since they are intended to affect the addressees’ cognitive background by inducing, reinforcing or altering

their assumptions, beliefs and ideas” (Ilie 1994: 98). Similarly to Rohde (2006), Ilie (1994) states that RQs have the structure of interrogatives and function as indirect statements. However, the main contrast is that even though no overt response is normally required, responses may occur optionally and can be supplied either by the addressee or by the addresser. The main difference between reply and answer is that the reply responds to the statement and that the answer responds to the interrogative particle (Ilie 1994). Ilie (1994) states different criteria to classify responses: overtness vs. covertness, implicitness vs. explicitness, and verbalisation vs. non-verbalisation. These criteria may also enrich the functions of the questions. In the following, I will discuss relevant implicit and explicit responses with respect to political speeches and show their differences.

The answer or reply given by the addresser has to be considered as well, since the response possibilities of the addressee are highly limited in a monologue sequence. One of the possible responses is the answer supplied by the addresser or by the addressee. Whereas the implicit answer is covert and already included in the RQ, the explicit answer is overt and optional. The implicit answer is the crucial aspect of the RQ; the addressee must acknowledge and process the implicit answer to understand the meaning of the RQ (Ilie 1994: 102). Hence, the speaker aims to draw the listener’s attention to the implied answer. The ultimate goal is to get the addressee to agree with the indirect statement of the addresser derived from the implicit rhetorical answer. The interrogative form challenges the listener to supply a more adequate answer than the one implied by the addresser, but at the same time points to the implicit answer as the only possible one. Therefore, the challenge is to draw the addressee’s attention to the message conveyed by the implicit answer.

(2.3.8) ***What use is a smoke alarm with dead batteries?***

*Don't forget it, check it.* (AD 43 in The Observer, 3.3.1991; Ilie 1994: 103)

In (2.3.8) the implicit rhetorical answer is that a smoke alarm without batteries is useless, and it is meant to make the listener check their smoke alarms from time to time. The implicit rhetorical answer “A smoke alarm with dead batteries is useless, because it cannot warn of fire” excludes all other answers and pre-selects the answer. The addresser provides the following directive: “Don’t forget it, check it” to prompt the addressee to check their smoke alarms. The reply “Don’t forget it, check it” is a response to the implicit statement because it does not fill any knowledge gap regarding what the use of a non-functional smoke

alarm might be (Ilie 1994: 104). An explicit answer, for example “A smoke alarm with dead batteries has no use”, is not provided. The reply “Don’t forget it, check it” refers to the implicit statement that it has no use and advises the reader of the advertisement to check their own smoke alarms.

The main difference between explicit answers and replies is that the explicit answer responds to the question and the reply responds to the implicit statement. Ilie (1994) points out that “the explicit answer is a response to the question and provides a value for the interrogative variable” (Ilie 1994: 104). To illustrate the difference, Ilie (1994) provides the following example of an explicit addresser response taken from the dialogue of a television series (2.3.9).

(2.3.9) Penelope: *You’ve done it again. You’ve been drinking too much. You are in no condition to take care of yourself.*

Drunkard: **Who cares?**

Penelope: *Well, obviously I do or I wouldn’t be here.* (TALK 146, the British TV series *The House of Eliott*; Ilie 1994: 105)

The drunkard asks for a subject (“who”) and Penelope explicitly answers his question with “I do” in (2.3.9). Ilie (1994) refers here to the distinction between the reply to the implicit statement and the question. While the reply in the fire alarm example refers to the implicit statement (a fire alarm without batteries is not functional and does not protect, so you should check the batteries), Penelope answers the question. This changes the intended interpretation. The drunkard’s question implies that nobody cares. Penelope, however, who answers the question, “cancels” this implied statement and points out that she is concerned. The statement posed by the drunkard as a rhetorical question is treated by Penelope as a genuine question. The resulting rhetorical effect is that Penelope makes it clear that she is interested, even if the drunkard signals through the implied statement that he does not assume that anyone is interested whether he is drinking too much, not even Penelope. Penelope had the option of either picking up on his implied statement or answering the question.

The addresser-reply is exemplified in (2.3.10).

(2.3.10) a. *Can you believe that any political party would set out deliberately to close down good schools and undermine quality in those that remained?*

- b. *But this is what the Left did, right here in Britain. We must never let in a Labour government that would unmuzzle such people again.* (POL 12, John Major's speech, 19.03.1992, p. 19; Ilie 1994: 117)

According to Ilie (1994), the implicit answer to (2.3.10a) is “*You cannot possibly believe that any political party would set out deliberately to close down good schools and undermine quality in those that remained. [...] However, that is precisely what Labour did*” (Ilie 1994: 117). Therefore, it contributes to the argumentative goal of the addresser (Ilie 1994: 116).

In example (2.3.11), the addresser-answer in (2.3.11b) is meant to reinforce the implicit answer in (2.3.11a) exemplified by Ilie (1994): “*No new medicines that are laden with unacceptable side effects can be any use at all*” (Ilie 1994: 107).

- (2.3.11) a. ***What use are the most effective new medicines if they are laden with unacceptable side effects and risks?***
- b. *No use at all. They can only be harmful.* (AD 44, a Bayer advertisement in Newsweek, 25.9.1989; Ilie 1994: 108–9)

Because it is possible for the addresser to answer the RQ, the response coincides with the implicit answer (Ilie 1994: 106). The answer is either included in the RQ (2.3.11) or is attached to reinforce the statement (Ilie 1994: 107). Wong and Yap (2015) present an example (2.3.12) that is similar to the Bayer advertisement presented by Ilie (1994).

- (2.3.12) a. Where are the 9 million more jobs that President Obama promised his stimulus would have created by now? (Mitt Romney; Wong and Yap 2015: 657)
- b. They are in China, Mexico, and Canada and in countries that have made themselves more attractive for entrepreneurs and business and investment... (Mitt Romney; Wong and Yap 2015: 657)

In (2.3.12a), the speaker asks whether President Obama's promise to create more jobs has been fulfilled and where one can find these jobs. Possible answers are “The jobs can be found in New York”, “The jobs can be found in Mexico”, or “There are no new jobs.” In (2.3.12b), the speaker answers his own question and states that President Obama's stimulus has created jobs. The jobs are in foreign countries instead of the U.S. Thus, Mitt Romney provides an answer to his question in (2.3.12a) to strengthen his argument that Obama's

pump priming has failed (Wong and Yap 2015: 657). In summary, Romney provides an explicit answer to his question by providing new information.

Ilie (1994) argues that the addresser can supply an answer which, at least at first sight, is detached from the implicit message and is meant to either qualify or cancel the implicit answer or to add a humorous note. Ilie (1994) calls this alteration a “rhetorical shift” (Ilie 1994: 108).

(2.3.13) *The Moss Bros Original Dress Shirt Offer*

***What can equal the elegance of a Moss Bros dinner jacket?*** *Your very own Moss Bros dress shirt, bow tie, cummerbund and cuff links.* (AD 153, A Moss Bros advertisement, *The Observer*, 7.6.1992; Ilie 1994: 107)

According to Ilie (1994), in contrast to the expected “*Nothing (at all) can possibly equal the elegance of a Moss Bros dinner jacket*”, “the addresser-answer appears to invalidate the initially inferred implicit answer” (Ilie 1994: 108). However, it is the very recontextualisation the RQ enables that brings about the rhetorical force of the question: “A recontextualisation consists in altering the message derived from the conventionally implied answer to a rhetorical question either by supplying contextual clues and/or by supplying an explicit answer as in [2.3.13] or a reply with different or opposite implications” (Ilie 1994: 108). In (2.3.13), the answer does not cancel the implicit answer but qualifies it and strengthens the rhetorical force of the question.

As well as the addresser, the addressee can answer the RQ. However, the first step is either to acknowledge or not acknowledge the RQ (Ilie 1994).

(2.3.14) Audience: *Nobody else likes him in the family; somebody's got to. **If my mother doesn't, who's gonna?***

Winfrey: *Okay. So is Michael the favourite in the family?* (TALK 47, The Oprah Winfrey Show, 11.03.1988, p. 7; Ilie 1994: 110)

If the addressee acknowledges the implicit answer as in (2.3.14), they commit to either agreeing or disagreeing with the RQ (Ilie 1994: 110–11). Non-acknowledgement can, on the other hand, lead to the failure of the RQ. The hearer may provide an answer because they misunderstand or misinterpret the RQ as an information-seeking question. Then again, the hearer might have understood the rhetorical force and, nevertheless, intentionally

provided an answer. This answer may echo the question because the hearer does not accept or disagrees with the addresser's statement. According to Ilie (1994), the addressee often chooses to convey disagreement indirectly, as this is more acceptable according to politeness rules (Ilie 1994: 111).

Whereas the addressee-answer can be unintentional, the addressee-reply is always intentional and reflects the relationship between the addresser and the addressee (Ilie 1994: 120). Again, the addressee has to acknowledge the rhetorical force of the question to show commitment to the implicit answer by agreement or disagreement. The possible scope of addressee replies encompasses only intentional utterances and the scope of addressee answers encompasses unintentional and intentional utterances. The reasons for providing an addressee-reply are either that the addressee has failed to recognise the rhetorical force of the question, that the addressee aims to add a humorous or sarcastic effect, or that there are conflicting goals between the addresser and addressee (Ilie 1994: 120).

(2.3.15) Colonel: *Helga, we have to get Herr Flick out of prison.*

Helga: *But, colonel, I have already visited them twice, as a tart, and then as a nun.*

***What else can I do?***

Colonel: *You will think of something.* (Talk 209, the TV series *Allo, allo*; Ilie 1994: 120)

In (2.3.15), Helga utters a RQ which implies the answer “nothing”. However, the colonel answers her question, thus cancelling the rhetorical force and treating it as an OQ (Ilie 1994: 120). As Ilie (1994) only provides dialogue sequences such as (2.3.15), it is unclear whether similar replies are also possible in political speech. This research gap will be closed by the corpus analysis in Chapter 5.

Ilie (1994) states that there are three main categories of non-verbalised responses to RQs that display agreement and types of disagreement, e.g. *booing* and *gestures* such as applause in (2.3.16) (Ilie 1994: 127).

(2.3.16) L: *Now Mr. Donahue would never have a Klansman on this program, and be Palsy-Walsy with him, and take him out to dinner, and pick up his cheque [...] He wouldn't have an anti-Semite that he would socialize with. So why do you do it with a communist? Why do you do it with Mr. Posner. Will you answer the one question on this program?*

D: *I wanted to behave somewhat like my own president behaves. He took Raisa and Michail Gorbachev to dinner. So why can't I take Posner? What's the difference?*

[Audience: applauds.] (Walton D., 1988:247, the Phil Donahue Show broadcast, 5.8.1986; Ilie 1994: 126–27)

The dialogue in (2.3.16) took place on a talk show and thus in a communicative setting that is different from a political speech. However, in the context of political speeches, the audience also provides non-verbalised responses such as *applause* and *booing*.

Furthermore, the speaker considers the “non-verbalised response” of silence. The risk of silence as an answer is examined by Ephratt (2008). Ephratt (2008) states that a RQ “which leaves the unspoken answer to the audience affords the addressee time for processing and assessing, and creates an impression of his or her importance and a sense of being in command” (Ephratt 2008: 1922). Following Ephratt (2008), the speaker can risk a silent answer if they are sure that the answer will be in their favour. However, since this is not always the case, listeners might grasp an unintended meaning. Ephratt (2008) analysed the Israeli general elections in 2006 and revealed that the political speakers only asked RQs when they had unquestionable trust in their audience. However, to avoid the risk of misunderstanding, some RQs were immediately answered by the speaker (Ephratt 2008: 1922).

The context is a broadcast of the center-right Kadima in which the speaker asked a candidate:

(2.3.17) If you are not a comrade of Comrade Peretz [head of the rival Labor party], why would you vote Labour?

(Ephratt 2008: 1922)

In (2.3.17), the candidate directs the RQ to an audience of potential voters and expects the listeners to come to the intended conclusion, namely, to vote for him and not for his opponents (Ephratt 2008: 1922). In (2.3.18), in contrast, in which the speaker provides an answer to the RQ, the Green party candidate says:

(2.3.18) The Prime Minister will guard our security. But on the 28th of this month [election day], when you open the window of your home, are you sure you will not have

a cellular antenna near your home? Are you sure someone will take care of air pollution? What about this kind of security? Who will take care of it? We – the Greens – will guard every Prime Minister, and also protect you.

(Ephratt 2008: 1922)

Ephratt's (2008) analysis identifies two kinds of RQs in political speech: First, politicians use RQs when they do not expect any risk of misunderstanding as in example (2.3.17). Second, they use them whenever they cannot be sure and are trying to avoid an unintended consequence as in example (2.3.18) (Ephratt 2008). The speaker's intention is to persuade listeners to consider the utterance so that the purpose is achieved: to make them vote for the speaker, and not for the competitors. Politicians are highly aware of the risk of unintended consequences of misunderstandings because they cannot be fully certain of the mind and knowledge of listeners (Ephratt 2008).

Biezma and Rawlins (2017) and Farkas (2024b) elaborate on the role of the answers to RQs and the context. Biezma and Rawlins (2017) argue that the answer to a RQ has to be assertable but not knowable in the context uttered and stress the relation between the question's response and context.

(2.3.19) RhQs signal the speaker's assumption that the attitude is (or should be) mutually accepted by all participants. That is, RhQs are interrogatives with linguistic cues that trigger the presupposition that all participants are (or can be) privileged to the answer.

(Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 303)

In their approach, RQs can propose an update to the context (similar to an assertion); however, their update is indirect. RQs may force the accommodation of presuppositions in the context set, which may also be rejected by the addressee (Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 319).

(2.3.20) A: Such a silly idea! Who on earth will buy a book on rhetorical questions?

B: # That is not true!

B': Actually, I would.

(Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 318)

In (2.3.20), speaker A asks who would buy a book about RQs. Under an OQ reading, a possible answer is, for example, “Mary would buy a book about rhetorical questions” or “No one would buy a book about rhetorical questions.” Biezma and Rawlins (2017) propose that the speaker does not invite an answer under a RQ reading and expects that the listener knows the answer. If the listener does not, they are meant to accept the proposal to update the QUD, so that in (2.3.20) “no one would buy the book”. By answering it, they would accept the proposal. This observation is interesting because it reveals that RQs not only refer to aspects that are already part of the CG but also aim to update the CG.

Farkas (2024b) adopts the proposal by Biezma and Rawlins (2017) that the answer to a RQ is not a determining feature of RQs but argues against the assertable-ness of the answer. According to Farkas (2023), there are no restrictions on possible answers with respect to the form or polarity, but she argues for a strong consideration of the input context. In addition, there are RQs that are unanswerable and Farkas (2023) refers to them as “unresolvable relative to the input context” (Farkas 2023: 5).

(2.3.21) Political candidates are no longer necessarily accepting the results of elections.  
Governors are busing or flying migrants to ‘blue’ states. Politicians are openly threatening violence. What next?

(Farkas 2023: 3)

In (2.3.21), the question of the speaker as to what will happen next is unresolvable because it is a matter in the future. The question can be answered neither by the speaker nor by a possible hearer; only predictions can be made. According to Farkas (2023), the question is still a RQ because the input context provides sufficient information so that the speaker is aware that the question is unresolvable. Furthermore, the rhetorical point is that a very bad state has been reached but the further course is unknown (Farkas 2023: 3). Farkas (2024b) refers to Rohde (2006) in observing there are unanswerable RQs and proposes that the speaker seems to have another reason for raising the question and then signalling the shared answer. This proposal is considered in more detail in Section 4.5. Farkas (2024b) rejects the idea that the answer has to be part of the CG but rather asserts that it has to be part of the input context that the RQ is also unanswerable. If the input context provides the answer, there are no restrictions concerning scale or polarity.

RQs and OQs share the similarity that they appear as interrogatives and invite the listener to respond to the utterance. However, they differ in their expected response. Speakers utter OQs to gain information and ask the listener to close a knowledge gap. OQs do not implicitly provide an answer to the requested content, and the context does not provide contextual clues that signal the redundancy of the question. RQs can also be answered, but the speaker does not expect that the addressee will actually fill the knowledge gap raised. Rather, RQs refer to an aspect of the context in order to draw the listener's attention to it. The notion that RQs do not allow an answer has been contested in previous research. This section has shown that the response to a RQ is not necessarily obvious. Instead, RQs allow a wide range of possibilities that may even contribute to the questions' function. Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) refer to the possible answer as the distinguishing feature between RQs and OQs. According to their proposal, if the answer is already known and both the addresser and the addressee know that the other knows, it is a RQ. However, it is debatable how to draw the conclusion about whether each participant knows that the other knows, and therefore it is only possible to utter a RQ to someone who the speaker expects to share the same set of information. Further proposals, for example, Biezma and Rawlins (2017), Farkas (2024b), Ilie (1994), and Rohde (2006), assume that to responses are possible, but they are not the determining factor that differentiates ordinary and rhetorical questions. Rather, they contribute to their interpretation and function. The proposals differ in regard to what kind of responses RQs allow. While Rohde (2006) argues that there is only a limited set of possible responses, Ilie (1994) provides a large and detailed proposal of possibilities that refer to either the implicit statement or the explicit question of RQs. Ilie's (1994) proposal presents an insightful overview of how the addressee may choose to react to a RQ – either to the inner statement or to the explicit question. In addition, the speaker can strategically use RQs to convey an implicit message in an explicit question and offers the addressee two ways to react to it. Farkas (2024b) argues that the response must be assertable and associated with the conversational implicature provided in the previous context. Consequently, RQs may also be unanswerable as long as the rhetorical point is plausible and can be derived from the input context. In summary, responses are possible to ordinary and rhetorical questions, but responses to RQs are subject to several constraints. For the argument at hand, it is of great importance that it is insightful to consider possible responses to further draw interpretations about the speaker's expectation about the shared knowledge and possible interpretation

of the question's function. In Section 2.4, we turn to the proposals that perceive RQs as assertions. This section introduces accounts in which the possibility of perceiving utterances as RQs depends on semantic factors rather than structural conditions.

## 2.4 Rhetorical Questions as Assertions

This section provides an overview of various accounts that approach RQs from a semantic angle and associate them with assertions (Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Farkas 2023; Han 2002; Rohde 2006). According to commitment-based proposals, assertions refer to public commitments and truth conditions (2.4.1).

(2.4.1) According to the commitment view, if a speaker *S* asserts a proposition  $\varphi$  then *S* guarantees for the truth of  $\varphi$ . In other words, *S* becomes publicly liable to the truth of  $\varphi$ , and if  $\varphi$  turns out to be false, then *S* may experience social sanctions.

(Krifka 2019: 76)

According to the definition in (2.4.1), assertions are subject to guarantees, public liability, and consequences of falsehood. When a speaker (*S*) asserts a proposition ( $\varphi$ ), they are not only stating it, but also taking responsibility for its truth. This means that by affirming  $\varphi$ , *S* is in effect guaranteeing that  $\varphi$  is true. The feature “publicly liable” means that this commitment is not just internal or private, but is socially recognised. Others can hold *S* responsible for the truth of  $\varphi$ . If  $\varphi$  turns out to be false, *S* may face social sanctions. This could include losing credibility, being corrected or criticised, or suffering damage to their reputation. This view of assertions differs from the Gricean view of assertions as a communicative act guided by conversational rules. Following Gricean maxims, speakers aim to be truthful, informative, relevant, and clear. Assertions do not require full knowledge or commitment, but must follow the norms of cooperative conversation. Pragmatic proposals of RQs in general are considered in Chapter 4.

According to Farkas and Bruce (2010), an assertion is a proposal for negotiation and they argue for a two-step model. The speaker proposes an assertion in order to update the CG and the hearer is asked to accept and add it to the CG. They define the default proposition as in (2.4.2).

(2.4.2) We take it that a default assertion is performed when a participant X utters a declarative sentence S with falling intonation.

(Farkas and Bruce 2010: 90)

According to Farkas and Bruce (2010), assertions are meant to update the CG, and they focus on their effect on conversational discourse. They focus on the communicative aspect because making an assertion is understood as making a proposal to update the CG, in differentiation to the commitment view that making an assertion requires a commitment to the uttered proposition.

Hence, there are proposals that perceive assertions as stating a proposition that the speaker believes to be true and also aims to be believed by the listener (Grice 1975), as something made in order to update the CG (Farkas and Bruce 2010), or as a proposition that the speaker is committed to (Krifka 2019). From a semantic angle, RQs are seen as having characteristics of statements, namely they are public commitments by the speaker to what they perceive to be true (Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Krifka 2019, 2023; MacFarlane 2011). In this section, RQs are considered from a semantic angle; the proposed semantic understanding of assertions and its association with truth value is the underlying definition in the following section. The aim is to show how the proposals previously made in academic work are insufficient to provide a coherent approach to RQs in terms of their difference from OQs and their possible implied statements.

Han (2002), Progovac (1993), and Sadock (1971) argue that positive RQs behave as negative statements and negative RQs behave as positive statements. Consequently, in such a framework, *wh*-words behave like negative quantifiers in RQs, but in OQs they function as a genuine question particle to gain information. Thus, Han (2002) provides the following definition in (2.4.3) and argues that RQs do not anticipate an answer.

(2.4.3) A rhetorical positive question has the illocutionary force of a negative assertion, and a rhetorical negative question has the illocutionary force of a positive assertion.

(Han 2002: 202)

Consider the examples (2.4.4a) and (2.4.4b) given by Han (2002: 202).

(2.4.4) a. What has John ever done for Sam?

## b. What hasn't John done for Sam?

(Han 2002: 202)

According to the rhetorical reading by Han (2002: 209), the *wh*-questions assert that John has done nothing for Sam (2.4.4a) and that John has done everything for Sam (2.4.4b). Han (2002: 102) provides the following examples (2.4.5) for rhetorical *y/n*-questions.

(2.4.5) a. Did I tell you that writing a dissertation was easy?

b. Didn't I tell you that writing a dissertation was easy?

(Han 2002: 202)

Han (2002) argues that when reading these questions as RQs, the *y/n*-questions in (2.4.5a) and (2.4.5b) respectively assert “I did not tell you that writing a dissertation was easy” and “I told you that writing a dissertation was easy” (Han 2002: 202). Similarly, Quirk et al. (1985) point out that *y/n*-question-RQs behave like *y/n*-question-OQs, in contrast to *wh*-RQs. Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) do not take this notion into account because they argue that this cannot explain the similarities between RQs and OQs. They argue that it does not resolve why, in some cases, the question particle *wh*- is replaced by a negative or positive statement without any further indication (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 2).

In order to classify RQs as such, Han (2002), among others (Ene 1983; Han 2002; Sadock 1971), refers to heuristic tests. The heuristic tests are introduced to distinguish OQs and RQs in order to verify their failure to close a knowledge gap or the expectation of an answer. They attempt to tell apart RQs and OQs with the help of question tags, parenthetical verbs, and adverbials. The insertion of parenthetical verbs and the reformulation of questions in statement plus tag questions are ways to demonstrate that there is no expectation on the speaker's part that a knowledge gap will be closed. Parenthetical verbs are a special group of verbs that aim to focus on the content of the utterance and do not convey meaning independently (Urmson 1952). They appear in the first-person, non-progressive present indicative form, positioned either at the beginning or in the middle of the sentence (Urmson 1952: 495; cf. Schneider et al. 2015: 2). Parenthetical verbs serve as an indication of “how the content of the host fits logically, evidentially and emotionally into the context.” (Urmson 1952: 495; cf. Schneider et al. 2015: 2). “Host” in this sense refers to the characteristic of parenthetical verbs that they are attached to other words, phrases, or clauses in order to

refer to them. Thus, it is possible to add parenthetical verbs (e.g. “I wonder...”, “I would like to know...”) to OQs as in (2.4.6) and (2.4.7) but not to the RQs in (2.4.8) and (2.4.9) (Ene 1983: 43).

(2.4.6) How many children are in the courtyard, *I wonder?*

(2.4.7) When, *I'd like to know*, does he expect us to give him the paper?

(2.4.8) \*Shall I compare thee to a summer's day, *I'd like to know?*

(2.4.9) \*Who else but Mary did it, *I'd like to know?*

(Ene 1983: 43)

The reason is that in contrast to (2.4.6) and (2.4.7), (2.4.8) and (2.4.9) do not anticipate an answer (Ene 1983). The parenthetical verb underlines the speaker's intent to receive new information, an aspect the speaker does not aim to achieve with a RQ.

The reformulation of questions into statements and question tags is discussed by Ene (1983: 8). Due to the assumption that RQs are not uttered to close a knowledge gap, it is not possible to reformulate them in a statement plus question tag form, equivalent to *y/n*-questions. This equivalent is, referring to Sadock (1971), only possible in OQs since RQs are self-confirming and do not explicitly invite the hearer to offer new information. For example, (2.4.10) in its reading as a question can be understood as equal to (2.4.11).

(2.4.10) Is syntax easy?

(2.4.11) Syntax isn't easy, is it?

(Ene 1983: 42)

Both (2.4.10) and (2.4.11) ask for new information and are equivalent utterances (Ene 1983: 42). According to Ene (1983: 8), RQs do not share this feature of parallelism because there are slight differences in meaning. Although tag questions are the result of a statement plus an interrogative clause, RQs do not carry any interrogative clause in their deep structure because they neglect the knowledge gap and the request to close it, which would be necessary to count them as interrogatives (cf. Ene 1983: 42). Assuming that the RQ does not request new information, in contrast to a [statement] + [tag question] combination, they rather function as highly reinforced statements.

Adverbial phrases such as “after all” as introductory items can only occur in rhetorical *y/n*-questions (2.4.12a) and rhetorical *wh*-questions (2.4.12b) (Han 2002: 203–4; Sadock 1971).

- (2.4.12) a. After all, do phonemes have anything to do with language?  
(Han 2002: 203)
- b. After all, who helped Mary?  
(Han 2002: 204)

In contrast, non-introductory adverbial phrases such as “by any chance” can only occur in OQs, as exemplified in (2.4.13) (Han 2002: 203).

- (2.4.13) Does Arthur, by any chance, know anything about syntax?  
(Han 2002: 203)

In contexts in which an ordinary or rhetorical reading is possible, adverbial phrases may be signals to the rhetoricality of the question. This observation is disputed by Caponigro and Sprouse (2007), Dayal (2016), and Meibauer (1986), who claim that they are not determining features that signal whether a question is rhetorically and is similar to an assertion, or is meant to be understood as an OQ. Reading RQs as assertions (hence RQs are simultaneously questions and assertions) is debatable (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007). Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) provide the counter-examples using “after all” in (2.4.14) and (2.4.15), stating that RQs cannot be equated with assertions. They argue that in (2.4.14) an answer to the RQ is allowed, regardless of whether it is provided by the speaker or the addressee, if the hearer and speaker are aware of each other’s awareness that only one guest/Luca was dancing (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 4).

- (2.4.14) Speaker: You should stop saying that Luca didn’t like the party last night. *After all, who was the only one that was still dancing at 3am?*  
Addressee or Speaker: Luca.

(Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 4)

If RQs are equivalent to statements, an answer is not allowed, neither by the speaker nor by the addressee as in (2.4.15).

(2.4.15) Speaker: You should stop saying that Luca didn't like the party last night. *After all, who was the only one that was still dancing at 3am!*

Addressee or Speaker: #Luca.

(Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 4)

Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) point out that while RQs allow answers, as exemplified in (2.4.14), the assertion in (2.4.15) does not. The observation in Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) serves as an argument for their proposal that RQs are different from assertions. They argue that if RQs were grammatically equivalent to assertions, one would treat syntactically identical constructions semantically differently. They claim that proposals that equate RQs with assertions are required to provide an explanation for the restriction on answers. The heuristic tests strengthen the difference between RQs and OQs with respect to the expectation of an answer. Heuristic tests are proposed to show that reinforcing the question prompt is implausible as it shifts the focus of the RQ to the knowledge gap raised rather than the implicit statement. These tests are sufficient to describe the lack of a need for new information, but not to identify the utterances as rhetorical in the first place. As already shown in Section 2.3, RQs can also be responded to or answered, but the important distinction is that the speaker neither expects nor prompts the listener to do so.

There are proposals that describe RQs as closer to questions but similar to assertions and stress the contextual surrounding in classifying an utterance as a RQ (Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Farkas 2023). Biezma and Rawlins (2017: 302) provide a summary of the similarities of RQs to assertions in (2.4.16).

- (2.4.16) a. RQs don't expect an answer.  
b. RQs have the feel of an assertion.  
c. RQs can optionally be answered.

(Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 302)

Biezma and Rawlins (2017) exemplify their characteristics (they refer to them as “hallmarks”) with the following examples (2.4.17), which refer to the previous account by Caponigro and Sprouse (2007).

(2.4.17) a. Am I a nerd or am I a nerd? (COCA)<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Corpus of Contemporary American English

- b. PhD student whining a lot about the work she has to do: Prof: Are you doing a PhD or vacationing in Konstanz?
- c. You should stop saying that Luca didn't like the party last night. After all, who was the only one that was still dancing at 3am? (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007)
- d. At the entrance of a golf resort on a Saturday morning, club in hand: Golfer: Can you possibly imagine a better way to spend a Saturday?
- e. B does something very stupid: A: Are you an idiot?

(Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 303)

They refer to their examples in (2.4.17) as a set of interrogatives of which examples (a.) and (b.) are live alternatives. Live alternatives are alternative questions that provide “alternatives relative to the context, and this is signaled by the conventional presuppositions of an ALTQ<sup>4</sup> – that the alternatives presented by the question exhaust the contextual possibilities.” (Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 309). Their proposal suggests that alternative questions not only ask for information, but also define the scope of the relevant options. These “live alternatives” therefore represent those possibilities that are considered complete and significant in the specific context. The structure of the alternative question indicates that no further alternatives outside of those mentioned need to be considered. In addition to contextual clues, the examples in (c.)–(e.) also contain linguistic cues. In (c.), there is “after all”, in (d.), there is the “Can you possibly imagine a better way”, and in (e.), there is the redundant question whether one is an idiot, hence the answer is obvious that the speaker does not expect an answer. All these questions share the characteristics that the speakers do not expect an answer, and the questions have the feel of assertions and can optionally be answered. The context and linguistic signals determine the overall interpretation as RQs (Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 304).

Biezma and Rawlins (2017) exclude examples from monologues in their proposal because they argue that the crucial aspect of RQs unfolds in relation to the listener. They refer to the similarity of self-addressed questions in their footnote 2.<sup>5</sup> They point out that RQs are

<sup>4</sup> alternative questions, Biezma and Rawlins (2015)

<sup>5</sup> Footnote 2: “This characterization leaves out examples in monologues like (i), uttered in a semantics talk: (i) Presenter: [. . .] So, we have seen all the machinery we have at our disposal. Can we find an answer to our initial problem? Well, let's see... In (i) the speaker doesn't expect the audience to respond. In fact, s/he may assume that the audience is in no position to provide an answer. The interrogative in (i) here is perhaps closer to a self-addressed question, though we leave open whether it is rhetorical in some broader sense” (Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 303).

interrogatives that raise the assumption that the answer is already part of the context and if the listener accepts the raised topic, the question can be immediately answered by the context. Hence, their proposal distinctly includes the listener. The question raised in their footnote is a self-addressed question, according to the definition of Quirk et al. (1985) in (2.4.18) and needs to be distinguished from RQs.

- (2.4.18) a. They are like rhetorical questions in not expecting an answer from others:  
b. Let me see. Should I take the car or go by bus?  
c. But the speaker may answer such a question:  
d. What do I want to EAT? Well, a roll will do.

(Quirk et al. 1985: 826)

The question is uttered to structure the speaker's own thought process and does not aim to make a rhetorical point as such. However, as previous analyses reveal, the determining aspect of a RQ is the rhetorical point and context (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Farkas 2024b; Ilie 1994; Schoepsdau 1996; Wong and Yap 2015), as will be discussed in the following, especially in Section 4.5. Hence, the conditions by Biezma and Rawlins (2017) in (2.4.16) can also be fulfilled similarly to the two conditions of rhetorical point and context. In addition, the conditions in (2.4.16) may be relevant for the analysis of RQs in political speech and also lead to the question of context relevance (2.4.19).

- (2.4.19) The core of our analysis is that, following Farkas and Bruce (2010) on assertions and Starr (2016) on imperatives, *asking* a question proposes to update the context with that question, and accepting a proposed question leads to that update happening. In the case of rhetorical questions, in context the questioning part of the update is trivial but the proposal part isn't.

(Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 304)

Biezma and Rawlins (2017) argue for a two-factor model: a signal that is conventionally accepted for a rhetorical reading and contextual clues that support the interpretation as a RQ (Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 313). Thus, they point to the common repair strategy of contextualisation of semantic proposals. Their proposal provides insights on the puzzle of the similarity of assertions and RQs. The speaker signals the expectation of a context update while at the same time, similar to assertions, he does not expect an update from the listener.

Even if the update itself is not expected, the way in which the utterance is formulated – with the request to the listener – is an essential part and special feature of RQs.

Farkas (2023) analyses this complexity and similarity of statements and questions in more detail. Her proposal in Farkas (2023) was a work in progress and elaborated on in Farkas (2024b). Farkas (2023) provides the following example (2.4.20).<sup>6</sup>

(2.4.20) A: Should I invite Sam to the party?

B: Are you crazy? Implicature: It would be crazy to invite him.

A: You are right, it would be a crazy thing to do.

(Farkas 2023: 14)

In (2.4.20), speaker A may or may not answer the RQ uttered by B. In (2.4.20), A responds to B and confirms the implicature by B. In the framework by Farkas (2023), the speaker “makes a non-trivial commitment when uttering a RhQ; unlike assertions, in the case of RhQs, that commitment is a mandatory implicature” (Farkas 2023: 14). Due to the relation to the context, the stated utterance of B, and thus also its implicature, results in B’s commitment that it would be crazy that Sam should be invited. The crucial difference between RQs and assertions is that “assertions are non-inquisitive because of their semantics, RhQs [...] despite their semantics” (Farkas 2023: 14). According to her observations, RQs share with OQs their inquisitive appearance, while they share with assertions that they are non-inquisitive because they do not seek to solve a specific issue that is open relative to the context. Inquisitive speech acts are defined in (2.4.21).

(2.4.21) A speech act  $\mathcal{A}$  is *inquisitive* relative to a context  $c$  iff the issue it places on the Table has more than one possible resolution in  $c$ .

(Farkas 2023: 14)

According to Farkas (2023), assertions are non-inquisitive: they denote singleton propositions independently of the context, in contrast to regular questions, which denote non-singleton issues. Farkas’ proposals lead to the definition of RQs in relation to inquisitiveness in (2.4.22).

<sup>6</sup> In Farkas (2024b), the example has been slightly changed: Amy asks Connie whether she should invite “Bill” instead of “Sam”.

(2.4.22) The redundancy of RhQs renders them non-inquisitive, a property they share with assertions: there is at most one way of resolving the issue they express because either there is only one  $p \in I$  that is consistent with  $cg_i$  or there is no  $p \in I$  that is consistent with  $cg_i$ .

(Farkas 2023: 14)

According to Farkas (2023), the previous context resolves the inquisitive nature of RQs, either because the previous context provides the aspect referred to or because one can derive from the previous context that the question is not resolvable. Hence, there is no need for heuristic tests because the classification is based on the previous context and whether the issue can be resolved. This notion is further discussed in Sections 2.5 and 4.5.

In conclusion, the presented proposals argue that RQs are not the same as assertions, but semantically, they may be close to assertions since their answer is supposed to be – even if not obvious – at least in the CG (cf., among others, Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Han and Siegel 1997; Han 2002; Koshik 2005; Rohde 2006). However, Han (2002) argues that, differently from assertions, RQs have a direct opposite counterpart, while others (Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Farkas 2023; Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Rohde 2006) refer to their characteristics as redundant with respect to informativity; contrary to assertions and contrary to OQs they do not ask for new information or aim to close a knowledge gap.

Semantic accounts remain unspecific on the communicative consequences of a classification of RQs as assertions, for example, in terms of commitment or truth conditions, as well as the preference for using a RQ instead of an assertion to avoid ambiguity or the risk of misunderstanding. Furthermore, it remains largely unclear how RQs are identified in the first place. Heuristic tests may signal the lack of a speaker's intent to close a knowledge gap but do not provide a distinct classification without further contextual cues. Typically, accounts present examples that are already classified as RQs, but it is debatable how they can be classified as such without a contextual environment that provides the necessary information to determine their classification.

Previous accounts (Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Farkas 2024b; Rohde 2006) approach RQs through contextualisation and references to the CG. Previous analyses reveal that the difference between OQs and RQs is their expectation of an answer and a context update by the listener despite their interrogative form. The difference

to assertions is that their form signals a context update request on behalf of the listener but they implicitly carry a context update on their own. The reference is made to the CG, which is intended to explain that the speaker is not trying to close a knowledge gap, but is pursuing a different goal. The assumption has the condition that the addressee is well aware of what is part of the CG in order to perceive a question as a RQ. This strengthens a context-based analysis because, in order to identify a RQ, more information about the contextual environment of the communicative situation in which the RQ is uttered is required. Furthermore, the question arises of whether RQs mirror the state of the CG because their answer is meant to be part of it. In Section 2.5, I will closely consider the relation between RQs and CG.

## **2.5 Rhetorical Questions and Common Ground**

Among others, Biezma and Rawlins (2017), Caponigro and Sprouse (2007), and Rohde (2006) refer in their proposals about RQs to the notion of CG. RQs are often characterised by the requirement that their answer is already part of the CG. Section 2.5 will show challenges with respect to the content of the CG and what role the notion of CG plays in characterising the meaning of RQs. The question is how the concept of CG helps to understand RQs and their functions, especially with regard to their intriguing formal appearance as questions and semantic relation to assertions. There is a proposal of CG by Stalnaker (1978) that is related to a philosophy of language and a pragmatic framework. In his elaborated work, Stalnaker (2002, 2014) reveals how beliefs, propositions, and presuppositions can enter the CG, while Krifka (2008) and others examine arguments from a semantic and syntactic point of view that supports the consideration of commitment. While Krifka's work is a rather formal concept and is closely linked to questions of commitment, Stalnaker's work is less direct about the notion of commitment and is primarily framed in terms of presumptions about shared beliefs and what participants accept as true. The proposals of Krifka (2008) and Roberts (2012) provide more insight into the question of how the content in the CG can be managed and how the questions influence the CG. Furthermore, it is debatable how propositions are accommodated and become part of the CG, especially when they are uttered implicitly or presupposed. The question is of great importance for understanding the context and serves as a basis for work by Biezma and Rawlins (2017), Camp (2018), Caponigro and Sprouse (2007), and Roberts (2021) that is relevant for the interpretation of

RQs in context. In the following, I will focus on the pragmatic and semantic approaches to CG to show the differences and the role that these proposals play in the analysis of RQs. First, I will provide a brief overview of approaches to the CG in general. In a next step, I will reflect on how previous analyses describe the concept of CG and how the CG can be managed (Krifka 2008; Roberts 2012). In addition, I will introduce analyses that refer to the relation between CG and RQs.

Stalnaker (1974) proposes that the CG is shaped by propositions that reflect what the world might be like. This differs in the understanding of, for example, the early proposals of CG by Clark (1996) because Clark (1996) focusses on the coherence and understanding of the ongoing communication. Stalnaker's (1974) proposal is associated with the notion of common knowledge and presuppositions and does not consider "beliefs" or how implicit utterances relate to the CG. Stalnaker (1978) refers to the CG as being shaped by assertions, what the participants explicitly said, and how a set of propositions can be understood as possible worlds. However, he has elaborated on his theory over the decades (Stalnaker 2002, 2014). Stalnaker (2014) describes the CG as a set of beliefs. According to Stalnaker (2014), CG refers to "the body of information that is presumed to be shared by the parties to a discourse" (Stalnaker 2014: 2). The elaboration of this understanding of CG is reflected in his notion of the dynamics of the concept. Stalnaker then focusses on the dynamics of the CG, implicit assumptions, and also the presuppositions that influence and change the CG. In his framework, assertions are not equal to beliefs. The assertions aim to change the CG by introducing new shared information. Beliefs exist individually and do not necessarily become part of the CG unless asserted and accepted. Not all beliefs are part of the CG, but only those that are accepted. The concept of "belief" and acceptance is amplified in his later work (Stalnaker 2002, 2014) and has also been proposed by Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) and elaborated on by Camp (2018).

There are proposals (Camp 2018; Farkas and Bruce 2010; Roberts 2006, 2012) on the CG that build on Stalnaker's original idea but refine and expand it in several key ways. Farkas and Bruce (2010) argue for a change from immediate to gradual updates. Farkas and Bruce (2010) propose that not every assertion immediately updates the CG. Instead, assertions first enter a temporary space as public commitments, which means that a speaker is responsible for their claim, but they only become part of the CG if accepted by others. This contrasts with Stalnaker's (1978) view, where assertions directly update the CG unless explicitly rejected.

Although Stalnaker (1978) assumes that a successful assertion instantly modifies the CG, models such as those of Farkas and Bruce (2010) propose a two-step process: first, an assertion becomes a public commitment; then, if not contested, it is gradually integrated into the CG. This approach accounts for situations where assertions are met with silence, hesitation, or indirect challenges rather than outright acceptance or rejection.

The QUD framework, developed by Roberts (1996, 2012), further refines the concept of CG by emphasising that conversations are structured around the resolution of implicit or explicit questions. QUD refers to the implicit or explicit question that a conversation or part of a discourse is trying to answer and how conversations are organised. In this view, assertions are not just updates to a shared knowledge base but contributions to answering the current QUD. This model helps explain why some assertions are ignored or perceived as irrelevant because they do not directly address the conversational goal at hand. Further proposals (Geurts 2019a; Krifka 2008) expand the notion of CG beyond the strict propositional content. Krifka (2008) argues that CG also includes social dynamics such as politeness, speaker credibility, and authority. This perspective suggests that not all assertions are evaluated solely on the basis of their truthfulness; factors such as the speaker's reputation and the context of the conversation influence whether an assertion is accepted into the CG. In the following, I will consider the proposals of Stalnaker (1974, 2002, 2014) and Roberts (2012) in more detail in regard to how the CG is updated and will focus on Krifka (2008, 2019) with respect to the management and content of the CG.

Stalnaker's work refers to semantics and pragmatics and aims to examine the interaction between the meaning of language and its use in everyday communication (Stalnaker 2014: 2). Stalnaker (2002) claims that CG is associated with belief. Participants *believe* some proposition in the sense of treating it as true and accepting it. However, in cases in which the participants believe that a proposition is false, they may accept it for the reason of conversation. Hence, Stalnaker (2002) argues that it becomes essential to establish a notion of CG based on acceptance rather than belief, defined as in (2.5.1) (Stalnaker 2002: 715–16).

(2.5.1) It is common ground that  $\phi$  in a group if all members *accept* (for the purpose of the conversation) that  $\phi$ , and all *believe* that all accept that  $\phi$ , and all *believe* that all *believe* that all accept that  $\phi$ , etc.

(Stalnaker 2002: 716)

Common belief refers to a state where a group of individuals not only believe a proposition but also believe that others believe it, and that others believe that they believe it, continuing indefinitely. This recursive structure ensures that the belief is mutually recognised, which makes it essential for coordination between participants. For example, in social conventions or linguistic communication, a common belief in meanings and norms allows individuals to anticipate how others will interpret their words and actions. Acceptance, on the other hand, is a more pragmatic notion. Acceptance, according to Stalnaker (2002), includes beliefs, but acceptance, unlike belief, reflects a participant's epistemic stance on the truth of a proposition. Acceptance is about treating a proposition as true for the sake of conversation, reasoning, or decision-making but not necessarily believing that it is true. The difference from commitment-based notions (Geurts 2019a; Krifka 2008) is that in a pragmatic notion, participants accept a proposition for the ongoing conversation but do not necessarily believe it is true. In a commitment-based framework, acceptance refers to the commitment of the listener to the truth of the proposition.

Stalnaker (2014) provides an approach to perceiving the context as the CG, i.e. the context as a body of available information. In his work, Stalnaker delves into the concept of context and its significance for understanding meaning and communication.

(2.5.2) [The CG is a] body of information that is presumed to be shared by the parties to a discourse. The course of a discourse and the interpretation of what is said in it are guided by that body of information, and by the way that it evolves in response to what is said.

(Stalnaker 2014: 2)

Stalnaker's aim is to provide a model that considers the representation of contexts of speech, the interpretation, and the dynamics of speech.

(2.5.3) This notion of context, like any notion of a body of information, can be modelled by a set of possible worlds, labelled "the context set", the set of possible worlds that is compatible with the assumed common knowledge of the participants. The information that a context set models includes all the information that is a resource for the interpretation of context-dependent expressions, but it is also a representation of the live options that participants take themselves to be distinguishing between in the discourse.

(Stalnaker 2014: 24)

Stalnaker (2014) points to various topics that are related to context and content, such as indexicality (words and phrases whose meaning depends on the context of their use), presupposition (implicit assumptions or beliefs that underlie our communication), and the role of context in resolving ambiguities in language. Furthermore, in contrast to Krifka (2008), Stalnaker (2002) argues that as long as a content is believed by all participants and others believe that others believe it, it is sufficient to become part of the CG but does not necessarily have to be true (Stalnaker 2002: 716). Stalnaker (2002) points out that someone who lies also aims to provide the necessary information and argues that the necessary beliefs may just be accepted for the reason of conversation. This observation is further considered in Chapter 4.

Certain words or grammatical constructions “g[ive] rise to” presuppositions (Stalnaker 2014: 55), i.e. “what the speaker takes to be shared common background” (Stalnaker 2014: 62). Karttunen (1974) as well as Stalnaker (1974)<sup>7</sup> provide a pragmatic proposal of presuppositions. According to them, presuppositions include all situation-relevant beliefs (assumptions) of conversation partners, hence information that may not have been explicitly uttered in the local context, and are available to the listener in the global context and can be accommodated by the listeners. The local context refers to specific information relevant to a part of a sentence during its evaluation, which might include more details than the global context. The global context refers to the general information available at the time the whole sentence is interpreted (Karttunen 1974). Beaver et al. (2021) and Roberts (2012) discuss how presuppositions and their accommodation can change the CG. They refer to presuppositions as to the information pieces that participants “mark linguistically [...] as being taken for granted, rather than being part of the main propositional content of a speech act” (Beaver et al. 2021). Presupposition accommodation may appear in all forms of utterances and is defined as in (2.5.4).

(2.5.4) Presupposition accommodation is the process by which the context is adjusted quietly and without fuss to accept the utterance of a sentence that imposes certain requirements on the context in which it is processed.

(von Fintel 2008: 137)

<sup>7</sup> As well as in later work: Stalnaker 2002 and Stalnaker 2014.

Similarly, Lewis (1979) provides a rule of accommodation of presuppositions in (2.5.5).

- (2.5.5) If at time  $t$  something is said that requires presupposition  $P$  to be acceptable, and if  $P$  is not presupposed just before  $t$ , then – *ceteris paribus* and within certain limits – presupposition  $P$  comes into existence at  $t$ .

(Lewis 1979: 340)

Presuppositions may sometimes need to be accommodated (for a cooperative conversation) by “an adjustment of the presumed common ground in response to the manifest event that a certain speech act took place” (Stalnaker 2014: 69). In some cases, for the reason of a successful conversation, aspects can be accommodated even though they might only be presupposed, which makes the examination of possible content of the CG challenging. This notion is exemplified by the following example in which Alice tells Bob (2.5.6):

- (2.5.6) I have to pick up my sister at the airport.

(Stalnaker 2002: 709)

The utterance in (2.5.6) signals that the speaker has a sister. According to Stalnaker (2002), this sentence is appropriate even in contexts in which Bob did not know beforehand that Alice has a sister. In that case, Bob must accommodate the information for the sake of the conversation, regardless of whether Bob believes it is true. However, if Alice has no sister and B learns that it was untrue, Alice has to accept the social sanctions in the form of, for example, disappointment from Bob and may offer an apology. The presuppositions are meant to help save time and effort and are part of the social game. Hence, an individual may accept a claim without necessarily believing it. The distinction between common belief and acceptance highlights two different ways in which individuals engage with propositions. Although belief is tied to an agent’s epistemic state, acceptance is a context-dependent attitude that facilitates interaction, problem solving, and theoretical inquiry. By differentiating these notions, Stalnaker provides a framework for understanding how individuals coordinate and reason within shared contexts. The consideration of presuppositions provides underlying information or refers to background assumptions that shape the argument in a discourse context. Stalnaker’s proposal provides insightful perspectives on the notions of beliefs and acceptance, and how speakers coordinate them for the reason of conversation.

Roberts (2006) proposes how specific constraints of linguistic structures update the discourse context, as exemplified in (2.5.7)–(2.5.9).

(2.5.7) **Pragmatics of Questions**

- a. If a question is accepted by the interlocutors in a discourse, then it is added to the set of QUDs.
- b. A member of the set of QUDs in a discourse is removed from that set iff its answer is entailed by CG or it is determined to be unanswerable.

(Roberts 2006: 215)

(2.5.8) **Pragmatics of Request** If a request is accepted by an addressee *i* in a discourse, the set of *i*'s goals is updated with the information expressed by the corresponding indicative, with *i* taken as the denotation of the subject.

(Roberts 2006: 215)

(2.5.9) **Pragmatics of Assertion** (following Stalnaker 1978)

If an assertion is accepted by the interlocutors in a discourse, it is added to CG.

(Roberts 2006: 215)

An utterance and its context may include presuppositions, and thus they are crucial for the analysis of moves. In order to update the context, moves have to be accepted – depending on their felicity in the context of the utterance – and all of the moves' presuppositions have to be resolved. Roberts (2015a) follows Lewis (1979) in his definition of the accommodation of presuppositions and defines them as in (2.5.10).

(2.5.10) An utterance of  $\phi$  presupposes proposition  $p$  if and only if (iff)  $\phi$  is felicitous in any given context  $C$  only when  $C$  entails  $p$ . In order for the context to entail  $p$ , the context set should be a subset of  $p$ .

(Roberts 2012: 23)

Roberts (2012) points out that if an “utterance has a presupposition, this is a conventional redundancy — the presupposition is already at least entailed by the context, if not explicitly, part of the common ground” (Roberts 2012: 27). Speakers can use the redundancy of presuppositions and “actually introduce information which was only implicitly assumed previously or even not previously introduced at all” (Roberts 2012: 27). A cooperative hearer may accommodate the presupposition, and behave as if the presupposition had already been part of the CG and act accordingly (Roberts 2012: 27). Roberts (2012) exemplifies the observation with the example of idle talk in (2.5.11).

- (2.5.11) Consider the gossip's use of factive verbs to introduce scandalous information with impunity:

*Isn't it shocking that Mary has run away from home?*

(Roberts 2012: 27)

In (2.5.11), the speaker presupposes that Mary has run away from home and behaves as if the information is already part of the CG. If the information is not yet part of the CG, a cooperative listener accommodates the information that Mary has run away from home. Thus, presuppositions may already be part of the CG or the speaker may act as if they are and introduce the information as such (Roberts 1996, 2012). These observations are valuable for the analysis of RQs because they reflect ways in which information can become indirectly manifest in the CG and how the speaker may act as if information were already part of the CG. Biezma and Rawlins (2017) stress the relation between presuppositions and RQs.

- (2.5.12) RhQs can draw attention to entailments of information taken to be already in the CG by a speaker, and take the CG-status of this entailed information for granted. On our proposal, accommodating a RhQ amounts to either acknowledging such entailments [...] or even accommodating information that would lead to the acceptance of such entailments by some agent.

(Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 319)

Biezma and Rawlins (2017) refer to the implicit way in which RQs manage the CG. RQs may refer to information in the CG and the speaker signals that they take the entailed information for granted similar to declarations. If the addressee acknowledges the information and also possibly accepts the information, the CG can be changed by RQs. Their proposal hints that a RQ may also change the CG, and not only be influenced in its interpretation.

Krifka (2008) and others closely link CG to information states, commitment, and the truth of propositions that structure the CG (Benz and Jasinskaja 2017; Brandom 1994; Clark and Schaefer 1989; Geurts 2019a; Krifka 2019; MacFarlane 2014; Shapiro 2020). Krifka (2008) provides an insightful perspective on how the CG can be managed. According to Krifka (2019), the utterance of an assertion leads to a public commitment, and the speaker is responsible for the truth of the commitment (Krifka 2019: 76). Public refers to the aspect that the speaker is liable for the stated information and hence has to face social sanctions if it is wrong. Krifka (2015: 332) argues that social sanctions function as a guarantee for the

addressee to assume the truth of a proposition. Public commitments are supported by social sanctions if a proposition turns out to be false (Geurts 2019a; Krifka 2015). In addition to the proposals introduced in Section 2.4, assertions are not the only way to add information to the CG. Speakers can change the CG by accommodating presuppositions and the CG can consist of a set of “propositions that are presumed to be mutually accepted (or the conjunction of this set, one proposition) or a set of entities which have been introduced before” (Krifka 2008: 246). If the listener accepts the information uttered by the speaker, to which the speaker commits themselves to be true, it becomes part of the CG. The CG contains information that has been mentioned so far, as well as information about the “manifest communicative interest and goals of the participants” (Krifka 2008: 246). With respect to questions, Krifka (2008) argues that they “do not add factual information to the CG but indicate informational needs of one participant that should be satisfied by a conversational move of the other” (Krifka 2008: 246). Krifka (2008) argues that interlocutors may manage the CG by asking (Krifka 2008: 246) (see 2.5.13):

(2.5.13) [Q]uestions typically do not add factual information to the common ground, but indicate informational needs on the side of one participant that should be satisfied by a conversational move of the other. I propose to call this dimension of the common ground **CG management**, as it is concerned with the way the CG content should develop. Just as CG content, CG management is supposed to be shared, with the understanding that the responsibility for it may be asymmetrically distributed among participants[.]

(Krifka 2008: 246)

Krifka (2008) argues for a structured way of assessing the CG. Questions shape the intended development of the discourse and the addresser commits to receiving new information from the addressee and introduces new discourse goals by asking OQs. The addressee is expected – contrary to with RQs – to provide the informational needs. So, an OQ “manages” how the discourse should be and introduces different ways to update the CG. The speaker is not committed to any specific answer but to the signalled informational need. CG management and content are closely associated with focus. Focus is defined as in (2.5.14).

(2.5.14) Focus indicates the presence of alternatives that are relevant for the interpretation of linguistic expressions.

(Krifka 2008: 247)

For the following work, two types of focus are of relevance: pragmatic focus and semantic focus. The pragmatic focus relates to how communication is structured and directed, thus management of the CG (Krifka 2008: 249). It does not change the truth conditions of a statement, i.e. it does not affect whether a statement is true or false. Instead, it helps guide the flow of conversation and influences how people build mental representations of information. If the wrong focus is chosen, communication can become confusing or incoherent (Krifka 2008: 250). The semantic focus relates to the actual factual content of a statement and affects the truth conditions of the meaning of a sentence. Focus also refers to the alternatives that are introduced by stating a question (Krifka 2011: 1780). In stating a question, the speaker's communicative goal is reflected because it shows the informational needs (Krifka 2008: 250). The challenge with respect to RQs is that by uttering the question, the speaker signals how the discourse should develop, but the speaker does not expect the addressee to fill the explicitly uttered knowledge gap with respect to the CG content, in contrast to with an OQ. Even if no information gap is to be closed, the aspect to which reference is made nevertheless comes into focus. Krifka's (2008) proposal explains how a RQ may reflect an attempt to manage the CG by steering the listener towards the speaker's perspective in an indirect yet forceful manner. This observation will be further considered with respect to RQs in Section 5.2.1.

The notion of CG is adopted by Rohde (2006) and set in relation to RQs and the obviousness of the answer. Rohde (2006) argues that "the presence of an obvious answer renders the answer set as a whole highly predictable, or minimally entropic" (Rohde 2006: 135). She exemplifies this notion with (2.5.15).

- (2.5.15) a. A: So, who's your favorite team?  
b. B: Who do you think? The Dallas Cowboys!

(Rohde 2006: 135)

Rohde (2006: 136) points out that RQs carry a strong bias and do not require updates to the commitment sets of the participants as in (2.5.15) and (2.5.16). In (2.5.15), the listener signals the obviousness by responding "Who do you think?". In (2.5.16), the answer is supposed to be "very high" and obvious to any potential addressee, hence they share commitment to the answer.

(2.5.16) How high are taxes going to be when my kids are my age?

(Rohde 2006: 136)

The crucial aspect that characterises RQs is the knowledge of the shared world and its dependence on the shared knowledge of the CG (Rohde 2006: 154). Rohde (2006) argues that the “[RQ] felicity is dependent on both participants’ shared commitment to an obvious answer” (Rohde 2006: 140), and that they are not limited to *y/n*-questions and argument *wh*-questions. Likewise, Caponigro and Sprouse (2007: 10) argue that a question is a RQ when its answer is known to the speaker and the addressee as part of their shared CG. This shows the difference to an OQ, as its answer is not known to the speaker, and is thus outside of their CG. This notion closely links the classification of RQs to the addressee and their shared commitment to the answer. Biezma and Rawlins (2017) and Farkas (2024b) argue against the shared commitment of an obvious answer and argue that RQs rather signal a shared answer. There are cases in which the hearer may also extract the signalled commitment the hearer is expected to accept, hence the shared answer is not the determining feature of the RQ. In Section 2.3, the example in (2.3.21) by Farkas (2024b) reveals the puzzle that there are questions that cannot be solved, i.e. there is no an answer provided to the topic in question. Further, in speeches, it is challenging to tell whether all participants share commitment to an obvious answer. The view of shared commitment requires a strong consideration of the hearer and in speeches, speakers only expect a specific answer and can expect aspects to be shared knowledge. Hence, an approach is required that can make assumptions in regard to the discourse context and what can plausibly be part of the CG in the given situation.

Previous analyses in the Sections 2.2–2.4 repeatedly refer to the notion of CG and how the classification of RQs is associated with the concept (Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Farkas 2024b; Rohde 2006). All the proposals share a strong consideration of the CG with respect to possible answers but also with respect to the classification of RQs as such. The notion of CG plays a crucial role in the understanding of RQs and their possible functions. I adopt and follow the line of thinking by Stalnaker (2002) that the CG reflects what the speaker believes, what the speaker wants to make the listener believe, and what we can derive from such an understanding of CG with respect to RQs. The speaker states a question, assumes that the listener is already familiar with the topic referred to, and aims to make use of shared knowledge. Hence, the question arises of what one can perceive as

familiar and/or shared knowledge. This section reveals the different approaches to and understanding of the CG, how topics enter the CG and may change it, and how the relation between RQs and CG can be described.

In Stalnaker's earlier view (Stalnaker 1978), an assertion is a speech act that proposes to update the set of propositions, i.e. the CG, which interlocutors consider true for the purposes of conversation. When a speaker makes an assertion, they put forward a proposition with the expectation that it will be accepted and added to the CG unless challenged. His later work (Stalnaker 2002, 2018) introduces the notion of belief and elaborates the notion of acceptance and dynamics of CG. There are commitment-based perspectives of CG proposed by Krifka (2008), among others, that stress the association of truth and social sanctions. In particular, the proposals by Krifka (2008, 2019) provide insightful perspectives on the way in which the speaker may add aspects to the CG and manage it by specific utterances. According to the commitment-based proposal, only statements that are accepted by the listener can be accepted as part of the CG. With regard to speeches and monologues, this leads to the problem that we do not know whether the listener has accepted the statements. But we can still assume that the speaker takes responsibility for the statements they make. However, according to the commitment-based proposal, aspects become manifest in the CG only if they are also accepted by the listener and are closely related to truthfulness. The question of commitment and RQs is further considered in Chapter 4.

Pragmatic and dynamic concepts of CG are particularly suitable for explaining complex communicative situations such as political speeches in which we only can make assumptions about the speaker's beliefs, background knowledge, and communicative coordination. Furthermore, Stalnaker's concept takes greater account of the assumptions made by participants in a conversation. This is helpful for texts and communicative situations in which the communicative dynamics and function of the statements, as indicated in works such as Caponigro and Sprouse (2007), Farkas (2024b), and Ilie (1994), are more important than the truthfulness of the statements. Roberts (2012) shows how information can become part of the CG without being explicitly expressed and how the approach can be used strategically. Situations in which the speaker makes insinuations and avoids taking responsibility for a statement, as in Roberts' (2012) example (2.5.11), can be analysed with the help of beliefs. Here too, the speaker will be subject to social sanctions, but the question of responsibility is

more flexible. The main point is to express a belief or assumption, which may or may not be confirmed by the other person.

There are proposals that associate RQs closely with answers that are meant to be part of the CG (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Rohde 2006). This requires that sufficient knowledge of the CG and the relevant participants is available. This is particularly challenging in contexts such as political speeches and monologues. The question arises as to how a link to the answer can always be guaranteed. A proposal of CG that refers to beliefs can serve here as a fruitful basis for deriving the necessary features to analyse and classify RQs. A proposal that refers to what is plausible for the hearer to accept in order to follow the further discourse rather than what the speaker is committed to as a determining feature of RQs provides the necessary flexibility to also analyse RQs that are either unresolvable or hint at topics that have not previously been part of the CG. This dynamic approach is discussed further in Chapter 4 and serves as a basis for how we can approach RQs.

Section 2.5 reveals the research gap regarding whether RQs may also influence the CG. It can be shown that the notion of CG is relevant in order to perceive RQs as such. The research gap is already mentioned but not solved by Biezma and Rawlins (2017). Biezma and Rawlins (2017: 319) point out that RQs can be used to signal something the speaker perceives to already be part of the CG and to which they aim to shift the addressees' attention. If the speaker believes that a specific commitment should already be part of the CG, the speaker may use a RQ so the listener can extract that commitment (Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 319). Although the result, i.e. the aspect becomes part of the CG, is the same as for the declarative counterpart, the way of getting to that CG status offers a wider range of flexibility and deniability (Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 319). Hence, the question arises whether the addressee may accept the implicit statement or presupposition and add it to the CG, because it is signalled by the speaker as already being part of the CG. Further, the question arises whether the speaker may exploit what is meant to be part of the CG. The example (2.5.11) by Roberts (2012) raises the question whether the speaker indirectly aims to change the CG by acting as if something is already known. This research gap, which has yet to be filled, will be further considered in Chapter 4, which aims to investigate the role of RQs in the discourse context, and will subsequently be closed in Chapter 5.

## 2.6 Conclusion

The major questions of Chapter 2 have been: How can we differentiate RQs from OQs in a syntactic and semantic framework? Structurally, they are questions, while semantically, they can be associated with assertions (Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Han 2002; Progovac 1993; Rohde 2006; Sadock 1971). The chapter has been guided by the following three research questions:

- (2.6.1)
- a. How do the linguistic fields syntax and semantics approach RQs and formulate the distinction between RQs and OQs?
  - b. What conclusions do the different approaches draw about the functions of RQs?
  - c. How are RQs defined with respect to CG?

Various previous approaches share the notion that RQs can have the same syntactic and lexical form as OQs (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Dayal 2016; Ladusaw 1980; Molnár and Winkler 2026). In addition, proposals have been introduced on how RQs can be distinguished from OQs, e.g. by means of NPIs, parenthetical verbs, or heuristic tests (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002; Egg 2007; Ene 1983; Han 2002). The insertion of parenthetical verbs and adverbials strengthens the reading of questions as OQs, but is not a distinct test to classify utterances as ordinary. Based on the syntactic and semantic approaches examined, we can conclude that from the syntactic perspective, RQs are similar but not the same as questions. The main difference is that, in contrast to OQs, RQs are not uttered in the expectation of closing a knowledge gap.

From a semantic perspective, they are considered close to but not equal to assertions. The observations showed that the focus on propositional content and the perception of RQs as assertions leaves us with several challenges. RQs invite possible interpretations, but cannot be considered equal to specific utterances, and rather invite the listener to infer the meaning of the question while the speaker remains uncommitted, in contrast to assertions. In addition, the speaker invites the listener to interact because of the interrogative form. The utterances cannot be perceived as assertions as they do not aim to present a propositional content to which the speaker is committed and assertions do not invite inferences as questions do. In summary, there are three main shortcomings of the discussed

accounts that aim to classify RQs either as assertions or as OQs without providing a larger context: i) the difficulty of identifying RQs in the first place, ii) their lack of specifics regarding cases in which the statement condition does not hold, and iii) the classification of cases in which the answer is neither well known nor obvious. The analyses reveal that RQs are not the same as OQs or as assertions but share characteristics of both of them. The discussion revealed the necessity of a context-based consideration. Accounts such as Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) and Farkas (2024b) that describe RQs as neither assertions nor OQs and argue for a consideration of the CG solve the puzzle and stress an interpretation based on the context. Further, the proposal by Farkas (2024b) provides possible functions of the RQs in addition to signalling an obvious aspect and stress the notion of a rhetorical point the speaker aims to make. This notion will be further discussed in Chapter 4.

Previous accounts refer to the notion of CG in order to classify an utterance as a RQ. In Section 2.5, different approaches to the concept of CG were introduced. The differences between normative and pragmatic concepts were illustrated and considered in relation to RQs. RQs are perceived as such if the answer is part of the CG (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Rohde 2006). This assumption is challenged because there are cases in which the answer is neither obvious nor can be expected to be known. Rather, the answer is meant to be plausibly derivable from the CG or the CG provides enough information that the RQ is unsolvable. This requires a consideration of background knowledge and utterances in the previous context in order to analyse the RQs, hence the question of dynamic concepts will be further elaborated in Chapter 4. In Section 2.5, the goal was to focus on the difference between how to approach the concept in general and what proposals serve as a basis for analysing RQs. Chapter 4 will provide further insight into the dynamics of the context and how beliefs and presuppositions can be coordinated. In addition, the research gap of whether the speaker can use RQs as a repair strategy to introduce new information will be discussed with respect to the functions of RQs in Chapter 4.

In conclusion, this Chapter 2 has shown that there are several different approaches to RQs that identify different factors responsible for their interpretation as such. The classification as either an assertion or question faces challenges, and previous analyses reveal that RQs can be formally associated with questions and are semantically close to assertions. A RQ is characterised by its interrogative form, but lacks the speaker's expectation towards the listener to actually close a knowledge gap. In speeches, this can be assumed since the

speaker does not provide any possibility to actually provide the expressed informational need. In Chapter 3 I will elaborate on the specific communicative setting. The speaker aims to make a rhetorical point that the listener can derive from the CG. It needs to be reasonable to derive the meaning on the basis of what the listener believes or accepts to be true in the given context. The further dynamics of this approach are discussed in Chapter 4. In order to analyse their functions and due to their similarity to other question types, the RQs in Trump's speeches have to be identified. In the following Chapter 3, we will take an empirical perspective on the validity of selected conditions from the existing literature to identify specific patterns and finally compile the set of RQs that forms the empirical data to analyse the functions of RQs in Trump's speeches.

### 3 Empirical Investigation

The goal of Chapter 3 is to compile a set of RQs from the *Trump Speech Corpus* (TSC), the functions of which I will analyse in Chapter 5. The TSC refers to the collection of all the questions identified within the speeches, while the subset containing only RQs is designated as the *TSC-RQ*. As presented in Chapter 2, various studies have investigated the formal appearance of questions to distinguish between RQs and OQs (Han 2002; Molnár and Winkler 2026; Rohde 2006) and have examined the semantic treatment of RQs (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Dayal 2016; Han 2002). These two approaches sometimes overlap and consider RQs syntactically and semantically, as well as consider pragmatics, especially speech act theory. In this chapter, I will focus on the discussions of the previous Chapter 2 and proceed to the notion of pragmatics and speech acts in Chapter 4.

The setting of all the questions in TSC is election speeches held by one speaker, Donald Trump, during the presidential election campaign 2015–16. This is persuasion-orientated discourse since the setting is political competition rallies at which candidates try to win over potential voters (cf. Knape 2017). The semiotic frame of the present speeches comprises the spoken language, the recorded speech and its visual component, and the published transcripts. Thus, the speeches were accessible to a live audience, watchable and hearable on YouTube, as well as just readable in the form of transcripts, with the restriction that the reader could not observe Trump's gestures or hear the intonation. The following empirical investigation is based on the transcripts provided by the American Presidency Project (Woolley and Peters 2022).<sup>1</sup> The goal is to compile a corpus of RQs (the TSC-RQ) based on an analysis of all the identified questions from the collected speeches in the TSC to analyse the functions of RQs.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/index.php>

### 3.1 Research Questions and Chapter Outline

The purpose of Chapter 3 is to align previous accounts with corpus data, to identify the RQs in the TSC, and to compile the corpus TSC-RQ based on the functions analysed. In addition, any tendencies regarding the form of the questions posed by Trump in his political speeches are identified. I focus specifically on linguistic markers such as NPIs, modals, the notion of polarity, and communicative settings. The general research goal is to identify RQs in the TSC. To guide the empirical investigation, I formulated the following research questions (3.1.1).

- (3.1.1) a. In what communicative settings do questions appear in the TSC?
- b. What are the possible forms of the questions in the TSC?
- c. Is there any structural pattern that can be observed in the RQs in the TSC-RQ?

The first research question in (3.1.1a) considers the different forms of communication that can appear in speeches. This consideration is crucial for the analysis of RQs because political speeches can include monologues, para-textual sequences, and extra-textual sequences in which questions can also be uttered (Collins 2012; Knape 2015; Reisigl 2008; Sclafani 2018). The second research question in (3.1.1b) explores the form of the questions in the TSC to identify any preferences, e.g. *y/n*-questions, *wh*-questions, or (invariant) tag questions. The previous accounts in Section 2.2 showed that structurally, RQs share similarities with OQs. The question arises whether they also appear in the main forms (*wh*-questions, *y/n*-questions, and alternative questions) in the corpus at hand and whether further special cases of questions marked with a question mark can be identified. In Section 2.4, I presented approaches that look at RQs from a semantic perspective. Semantically, RQs are closer to statements and may exhibit specific markers that signal the implicit statement or invite an assertion of the opposite polarity, thus reflecting their intended answer (as discussed in Section 2.4). The final research question in (3.1.1c) combines the findings of (3.1.1a) and (3.1.1b) and assesses the relationship between formal appearance, form of communication, and specific markers. In the following, I will present the TSC in Section 3.2, the annotation schema in Section 3.4, and the results in Section 3.5. In Section 3.5.3, I present questions that are signalled as such by a question mark but show further structural problems, for example, regarding their well-formedness. These questions have been excluded from a

further analysis of RQs because their function in discourse differs from that of the rhetorical ones; their definitive status has to be examined in future work.

## 3.2 The Trump Speech Corpus

Moving on to the TSC, the selected speeches fulfil three conditions: contemporaneity, being within a political setting, and their status as election campaign speeches by the same speaker. These requirements are met in the speeches given by Donald Trump during the 2015–16 presidential election campaign. The corpus consists of sixteen election campaign speeches given by Donald Trump, who was the Republican presidential candidate at the time. According to the American Presidency Project, Donald Trump delivered a total of 74 campaign speeches during that period (Woolley and Peters 2022). The complete list of speeches is provided in Appendix A.3. All the speeches have been thoroughly examined, and a preliminary list of the possible forms and the number of questions has been made. The selected questions are marked by the grammatical punctuation of a question mark.

The approach differs from the empirical analysis of RQs by Rohde (2006) or Wong and Yap (2015) in the way in which RQs in the TSC-RQ have been classified as rhetorical. Rohde (2006) examines the RQs annotated in the Switchboard Corpus that were collected from conversations. The Switchboard Corpus already contains annotations marking questions as ordinary or rhetorical. RQs in the corpus are annotated as such with respect to their possible set of answers (single, negative, or null answer) and it has to be “perfectly obvious or perfectly obviously unknowable” (Rohde 2006: 137–38). Rohde (2006) argues for a wider set of answers, as presented in Section 2.3. Hence, the selection of the questions in the work at hand differs due to the different communicative setting and the respective constraints. Rohde (2006) argues that the answers to RQs are characterised by the assumption that they signal a shared commitment. This assumption is questionable, as discussed in Section 2.3.

For their analysis of RQs in the political campaign speeches of Mitt Romney and Barack Obama, Wong and Yap (2015) selected all the questions that appeared in the corresponding speeches without considering the communicative settings in which those questions appeared. However, this procedure likely led to the inclusion of questions that, upon closer inspection, are not rhetorical. The following analysis will show that the consideration of the form of communication is of major importance due to possible reaction questions and

reported questions, as discussed in Section 3.5.1 and Section 3.5.3. Hence, the numbers that Wong and Yap (2015) present may include non-rhetorical questions. Due to the setting of the monologue, I will provide adapted guidelines on how to classify questions in political speeches in this thesis to analyse the functions of RQs. In their approach, Wong and Yap (2015) make a strong case for a significant link between electoral tendency and the frequency of the questions. Wong and Yap (2015) analysed all 48 political speeches given by Mitt Romney in 2011–12 and observed that Romney asked 76 questions in 29 speeches in Democratic-safe states (1.26 RQs per 1000 words). In Republican-safe states, he held 5 speeches and posed 3 RQs (0.28 RQs per 1000 words), and in swing states he made 14 speeches, posed 46 RQs, and had a distribution of 1.51 RQs per 1000 words (Wong and Yap 2015). The numbers are indications, but, as noted above, it remains unclear how their corpus of RQs was compiled and whether possible non-rhetorical question forms were considered. Furthering Wong and Yap's (2015) line of inquiry, I include the electoral tendency in my analysis, as it might be linked to the number of questions posed during a political speech (based on the tendencies examined by Kondik et al. 2015).

In general, there are two ways to signal the status of a question, either by syntax or intonation. In this thesis, the selection of the questions is based on the syntax. In addition, there are utterances marked by a question mark which may represent an expressive function, as argued by Gutzmann and Turgay (2024). Gutzmann and Turgay (2024) argue in favour of a distinction between grammatical and expressive punctuation and also refer to question marks. Their work emphasises, similar to the rhetorical consideration of question functions, that questions have a pragmatic function which is to be distinguished from a possible information content or assertion. These can be an expression of, for example, wonder or admiration. However, it must also be taken into account that questions as RQs require a rhetorical point. The work of Gutzmann and Turgay (2024) provides a valuable contribution to the observation that question marks in different contexts reflect different functions or signals of the attitude of the writer (Gutzmann and Turgay 2024: 128). There is a similarity here to RQs, which can offer insight into the speaker's attitude, e.g. why a certain issue is mentioned in question form. The work of Gutzmann and Turgay (2024) can serve as a basis for further work investigating other forms of questions identified in the TSC, such as invariant tag questions (InTs) or "Remember-x" cases.

Taking into account the functions of RQs, previous studies included the electoral tendency of the audience to reveal specific patterns of appearance (Wong and Yap 2015). The so-called swing states in the U.S. are characterised by their changing voting behaviour and thus differ from states in which it is generally assumed that there is a safe base for either the Republican or Democratic candidate. In consequence, these states are more contested by the candidates. Thus, this aspect is considered in the corpus list in table 3.1. To ensure a balanced overview, I selected speeches from both Republican- and Democratic-safe states, as well as swing states. In addition, speeches with the lowest and highest number of questions were included. To improve accuracy, Trump's speeches were cross-checked using recordings available on YouTube. Multiple research assistants proofread the speeches and any revisions or changes that have been made are indicated in italics. The questions listed in the TSC were selected by hand and the requirement was that the questions must be marked with a question mark in the transcripts provided by the American Presidency Project to be listed in the TSC as questions. The exact times of the questions' occurrences were added to the speeches to provide better traceability. The complete TSC can be found in Appendix A.3.

	<b>Date</b>	<b>Speech</b>	<b>Ques- tions</b>	<b>Stated Words</b>	<b>Questions/ 1000 Words</b>
1	16 Jun 15	Announcing Candidacy for President in New York City (D)	46	6463	7.12
2	16 Jul 16	Introducing Governor Mike Pence (D)	28	4150	6.75
3	05 Aug 16	KI Convention Center in Green Bay (SSt.)	97	9657	10.04
4	09 Aug 16	University of North Carolina in Wilmington (SSt.)	85	7386	11.51
5	12 Aug 16	Erie Insurance Arena in Erie (SSt.)	81	8073	10.03
6	19 Aug 16	Summit Sports and Ice Complex in Dimondale (SSt.)	15	4310	3.48
7	24 Aug 16	Mississippi Coliseum in Jackson (R)	14	3722	3.74
8	31 Aug 16	Immigration at the Phoenix Convention Center, Phoenix (R)	21	6949	3.02
9	09 Sep 16	11 <sup>th</sup> Annual Values Voter Summit in Washington, D.C. (D)	31	5721	5.42
10	15 Sep 16	Economic Club of New York at the Waldorf Astoria in NYC (D)	12	4744	2.53
11	04 Oct 16	Prescott Valley Event Center in Prescott Valley (R)	55	7135	7.71
12	12 Oct 16	The Southeastern Livestock Pavilion in Ocala (SSt.)	81	8604	9.41
13	28 Oct 16	Radisson Armory in Manchester (SSt.)	32	5348	5.98
14	02 Nov 16	The Central Florida Fairgrounds in Orlando (SSt.)	22	3804	5.78
15	02 Nov 16	Bayfront Park Amphitheater in Miami, Florida (SSt.)	29	4840	5.99
16	07 Nov 16	J.S. Dorton Arena in Raleigh (SSt.)	63	6483	9.72
<b>SUM</b>		<b>712</b>	<b>97389</b>	<b>7.30</b>	

**Table 3.1:** Trump Speech Corpus Overview (TSC).

Questions and stated words were quantified according to each speech transcript listed by “Date”; “Questions / 1000 Words” were determined for each speech with a calculated mean for all sixteen speeches. The highest numbers can be observed in SSt. (Speech 3, 4, 12, and 16). These battleground states are of particular importance for winning the presidential election. The numbers have to be adjusted with respect to non-rhetorical questions; the final number for RQs will be listed in the TSC-RQ.

Table 3.1 includes all sixteen speeches listed by date, title (based on The American Presidency Project) and place of the speech, the state's electoral tendency, the total number of questions, the total number of words, and the number of questions per 1000 words to provide comparability. The abbreviation *D* refers to Democratic electoral tendency, *R* to Republican, and *SSt.* to swing state. The corpus overview in 3.1 reveals that the highest numbers of questions were uttered in swing states, and the numbers show that the calculated means are higher than the numbers observed by Wong and Yap (2015). The challenge of comparability lies in the fact that the figures by Wong and Yap (2015) are questionable in that all the questions asked in the speech are categorised as rhetorical. Hence, the numbers cannot be perceived as significant but only as tendencies. The high number of questions in his speeches, in total 712 in sixteen speeches, makes them an interesting feature which is worth examining. In the following, I will discuss the different types of communication settings in political speeches.

### 3.3 The Communicative Setting of Political Speeches

Some of the questions that appear in monologues still cannot be classified as rhetorical because they appear within parts of the monologues that contain reported or reaction questions. The communicative mode of a political speech requires a detailed explanation and analytical attention. Political speeches may appear to be monologues by default, but previous research indicates that they reflect interaction patterns (Collins 2012; Reisigl 2008). Political speeches, by their nature, involve one speaker addressing an audience, which aligns with the characteristics of a monologue. In a monologue, a single speaker speaks, while the various addressees are not orators themselves (Knappe 2015: 122–23). The key distinction from dialogues lies in the performance setting; dialogues involve turn-taking sequences, speech, and counter-speech, requiring the presence of multiple speakers. Linguistic markers in speeches signal the speaker's intention to interact with the audience.

In the context of political speeches, which constitutes a highly strategic setting, speakers are aware that their utterances may be received by listeners with divergent assumptions and goals. Reisigl (2008) highlights this observation, introducing specific conditions for the analysis of multi-layered political oratory (Reisigl 2008: 257). His approach considers processuality/sequentiality, linguistic and social context, the various addressees, the medium

used, the type of speech, and the aim and function of the political speech (Reisigl 2008: 248-49). Reisigl (2008) argues that speeches reflect interaction patterns because speakers can react to audience interjections or heckling (Reisigl 2008: 256). Hence, he stresses the complex linguistic context, but also argues that there is no turn-taking possible (Reisigl 2008: 257).

The performance model (*Performanzmodell, translation MER*) presented by Knappe (2015) differentiates between monologue and dialogue, exploring the distinguishing aspects of each (Knappe 2015: 122-23). In a monologue, there is only one speaker who addresses an audience that does not possess oratorical roles in that particular setting. A monologue is defined as in (3.3.1).

- (3.3.1) Monological form of action, i.e. on the part of an orator unilateral, unidirectional, and performatively continuous address to addressees who are not orators in the event context.

(Knappe 2015: 123) (*translation MER*)

In contrast, a dialogue requires interaction, i.e. there are at least two orators (Knappe 2015: 123), and is defined as in (3.3.2).

- (3.3.2) Dialogic form of interaction, i.e. at least two orators appear. They express themselves poly- or bilaterally, poly- or bidirectionally, and performatively discontinuously, but with direct reference to the respective other orator, who is not a passive addressee or an addressee not permitted as a speaker by the rules, but an active communication partner and thus, rhetorically speaking, an active counter-orator.

(Knappe 2015: 123–24) (*translation MER*)

Considering the second aspect, the setting, which includes, for example, the communicative framework, social, ritual, or situative requirements, as well as occasions, the classification as a monologue requires that no turn-taking sequences are necessary or intended, whereas in a dialogue that condition is mandatory (Knappe 2015: 123–24). The third aspect, *characteristics of the text (Textmerkmale, translation MER)*, refers to the constraint of coherence and cohesion. Whereas in a monologue only the speaker is considered, in a dialogue, the characteristics of both participants must be included (Knappe 2015: 123–24).

Sclafani (2018) observes the use of constructed dialogues in monologic contexts. She argues that the constructed dialogue is an important aspect in political speeches (3.3.3).

- (3.3.3) [It involves] both involvement and persuasion in spoken conversational discourse. The term ‘constructed’ emphasizes the change in meaning that necessarily accompanies the importation of prior text (A. Becker 2000) into a new speaking context.

(Sclafani 2018: 48)

By means of constructed dialogues, the speaker is able to frame the personal relationships and the power relations between the individuals referred to, for example, by presenting a conversation with their family or with a friend about trade as in (3.3.4) (from Sclafani 2018: 48–50).

- (3.3.4) a. Trump: “A friend of mine who’s a great manufacturer, calls me up a few weeks ago.  
 b. He’s very upset. I said, “What’s your problem?”  
 c. He said “You know, I make great product.”  
 d. And I said “I know. I know that because I buy the product.”  
 e. He said, “I can’t get it into China. They won’t accept it.  
 f. I sent a boat over and they actually sent it back.  
 g. They talked about environmental,  
 h. they talked about all sorts of crap that had nothing to do with it.”  
 i. I said, “Oh, wait a minute, that’s terrible. Does anyone know this?”  
 j. He said, “Yeah, they do it all the time with other people.”  
 k. I said, “They send it back?”  
 l. “Yeah. So I finally got it over there and they charged me a big tariff.  
 m. They’re not supposed to be doing that. I told them.”

(Sclafani 2018: 50)<sup>2</sup>

In (3.3.4), Trump aims to create a personal identity that appears close to manufacturers in the U.S. He wants to show that they share their challenges with Trump (Sclafani 2018:

<sup>2</sup> See also Speech 1, examples A.3.24–A.3.26 in Appendix A.3.

50). The sequences have their own functions, such as “constructing alignment, creating involvement, [...] serving the function of positive self-promotion and denigration” (Sclafani 2018: 51) and, in and of themselves, constitute an interesting topic for future research. Furthermore, the quotation allows the speaker to distance himself from the utterance if it includes lies or misrepresents the truth (Sclafani 2018: 48).

Labelling these exchanges as dialogue appears problematic, as in Knape’s (2015) performance framework, the presence of two orators taking turns in a conversation is a critical part of dialogue. Exchanges such as (3.3.4) will therefore be classified as reported questions in this work. Since the communicative setting in which these reported questions originally appeared does not qualify as monologue, these questions do not meet the criteria for being counted as rhetorical. Such questions are therefore excluded from the analysis.

The observations in previous work (Knape 2015; Reisigl 2008; Sclafani 2018) discussed in this section provide insightful perspectives on the different forms of communication in political speeches. Questions that are stated in imported sequences are special cases and are isolated from the ongoing speech. Hence, they differ from RQs due to their function and classification relative to the form of communication. This consideration reveals the necessity of considering the different forms to distinguish a given question relative to its textual level.

### **3.4 Annotation Schema**

The questions that appear in Donald Trump’s political speeches take a variety of forms and surface in a number of different communicative settings. In addition, they contain a range of syntactic elements that have been previously identified as RQ markers. In this section, I annotate the questions from the TSC to identify patterns that are unique to RQs. In order to compare the questions in the speeches, I have listed all 712 questions in an EXCEL file and added pre-text and post-text to each. The questions are categorised based on their form of communication (monologue, reported and reaction questions in monologue, extra-textual). The distinction of the form of communication is essential to isolate questions in the monologue part and questions in additional textual parts. The goal is to annotate the questions according to their formal appearance (*wh*-question, *y/n*-question, alternative question, and InT). The questions are analysed with respect to the opposite

polarity condition. Further, the appearance of linguistic markers, e.g. NPIs, as well as their relation to the opposite polarity condition are examined.

The compiled annotation schema is modelled on the annotation schema of the Tübingen Interdisciplinary Corpus of Ambiguity Phenomena (TInCAP) (Hartmann, Achimova, et al. 2022; Hartmann, Ebert, et al. 2023) and has been extended and aligned based on previous studies and accounts, as well as preliminary observations (Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Collins 2012; den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002; Han 2002; Hartmann, Ebert, et al. 2023; Heritage 2002; Ilie 1994; Krifka 1995; Progovac 1993; Reisigl 2008; Rohde 2006; Sadock 1971; Sclafani 2018). The setup of an EXCEL file allows for comparison between several of Trump's speeches, the form of the question, the form of communication, and linguistic markers. The data files reveal the complexity and variation of the questions asked in the TSC. The questions are listed with their pre-text, the relevant part, the post-text, the electoral tendency of the state, and the time in minutes. In addition, the number of words has been counted to enable comparability throughout the results. The annotation schema in figures 3.1–3.4 includes the possible forms of the questions, the form of communication, the relation between the form of the question and the form of communication, the notion of polarity and its respective relation to the form of communication, and the type of question. In addition, modals and weak and strong NPIs are considered as well as their frequency of occurrence in each type of question and the relationship to the polarity. The results and mean and, if necessary, their percentage have been calculated. Based on the results, the corpus analysis in Section 3.5 was performed. Additional information on the calculations and descriptions of the columns are listed in Appendix A.1. In Section 3.5, I will present the processed data.

Speaker	Speech	Date	State	Electoral Tendency	Number of Questions	Number of Questions (excl. Problematic Cases)	Number of Words	Number of Questions per 1000 Words
Trump, Donald	Speech 1	16 Jun 2015	New York	Democratic	46	39	6463	6.03
Trump, Donald	Speech 2	16 Jul 2016	New York	Democratic	28	23	4150	5.54
Trump, Donald	Speech 3	05 Aug 2016	Wisconsin	Swing State	97	68	9657	7.04
Trump, Donald	Speech 4	09 Aug 2016	North Carolina	Swing State	85	46	7386	6.23
Trump, Donald	Speech 5	12 Aug 2016	Pennsylvania	Swing State	81	55	8073	6.81
Trump, Donald	Speech 6	19 Aug 2016	Michigan	Swing State	15	9	4310	2.09
Trump, Donald	Speech 7	24 Aug 2016	Mississippi	Republican	14	8	3722	2.15
Trump, Donald	Speech 8	31 Aug 2016	Arizona	Republican	21	13	6949	1.87
Trump, Donald	Speech 9	09 Sep 2016	Washington, D.C.	Democratic	31	20	5721	3.50
Trump, Donald	Speech 10	15 Sep 2016	New York	Democratic	12	4	4744	0.84
Trump, Donald	Speech 11	04 Oct 2016	Arizona	Republican	55	31	7135	4.34
Trump, Donald	Speech 12	12 Oct 2016	Florida	Swing State	81	47	8604	5.46
Trump, Donald	Speech 13	28 Oct 2016	North Hampshire	Swing State	32	12	5348	2.24
Trump, Donald	Speech 14	02 Nov 2016	Florida	Swing State	22	14	3804	3.68
Trump, Donald	Speech 15	02 Nov 2016	Florida	Swing State	29	19	4840	3.93
Trump, Donald	Speech 16	07 Nov 2016	North Carolina	Swing State	63	38	6483	5.86
<b>Sum</b>					<b>712</b>	<b>446</b>	<b>97389</b>	<b>4.58</b>
<b>Percentage (Sum)</b>								
<b>Mean</b>						<b>27.88</b>	<b>6086.81</b>	<b>4.23</b>
<b>SD</b>						<b>19.02</b>	<b>1800.09</b>	<b>1.98</b>
<b>Sum with Problematic Cases (PC)</b>								

**Figure 3.1:** Annotation Schema - 1.1.: Speech Data, Electoral Tendency, Number of Questions, Number of Words, Number of Questions per 1000 Words.

Form of Questions (All Communicative Forms and Types)					Form of Questions (TSC-1)						
Speech	Wh- Questions	Y/n- Questions	Alternative Questions (Ints)	Invariant Tag Questions (Ints)	Problematic Cases - Form Cases	Problematic Cases / Total	NPIs	Wh-Questions	Y/n- Questions	Alternative Questions	
Speech 1	23	13	0	3	7	0	7	15	5	0	
Speech 2	13	5	0	5	5	0	5	4	5	0	
Speech 3	16	11	0	41	29	0	29	11	7	0	
Speech 4	6	6	0	34	39	0	39	4	5	0	
Speech 5	9	13	0	33	26	0	26	2	7	0	
Speech 6	5	2	1	1	5	4	6	5	1	1	
Speech 7	7	0	0	1	6	0	6	7	0	0	
Speech 8	4	2	0	7	8	0	8	4	1	0	
Speech 9	6	5	0	9	10	1	11	4	5	0	
Speech 10	4	0	0	0	8	0	8	3	0	0	
Speech 11	15	8	0	8	24	0	24	12	5	0	
Speech 12	15	15	0	17	34	0	34	14	14	0	
Speech 13	2	4	0	6	20	0	20	0	1	0	
Speech 14	6	4	0	4	8	0	8	6	3	0	
Speech 15	2	4	0	13	10	0	10	2	3	0	
Speech 16	13	15	0	10	24	1	25	8	9	0	
	<b>146</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>1</b>	
	32.74	23.99	0.22	43.05				58.38	41.04	0.58	
	9.13	6.69	0.06	12.00				6.31	4.44	0.06	
	6.02	5.16	0.25	12.81							
<b>Sum of Questions (TSC-1)</b>								<b>173</b>			

Figure 3.2: Annotation Schema - 1.2: Form of Questions, Problematic Cases, NPIs, Form of Questions in the TSC-RQ.

Speech	Polarity / Form of Communication (excl. Problematic Cases)				Form of Communication (excl. Problematic Cases)			Form of Question / Form of Communication (excl. Problematic Cases: Incl. Reported and Reaction Questions)		
	Assertion of Opposite Polarity (Monologue + Extra-Textual	Polarity Monologue (incl. Reported and Reaction Questions)	Polarity Monologue (only ROs)	Non-Polarity Monologue (only ROs)	Monologue (incl. Reported Questions, Reaction	Extra-Textual Level	Reaction Question	Reported Question	W/- Questions / Monologue	Y/n- Questions / Monologue
Speech 1	20	20	16	4	39	0	17	23	13	3
Speech 2	4	4	4	5	23	0	9	13	5	5
Speech 3	16	16	11	7	68	0	5	16	11	41
Speech 4	10	10	6	3	46	0	1	6	6	34
Speech 5	8	8	4	5	55	0	4	9	13	33
Speech 6	1	1	1	6	9	0	0	5	2	1
Speech 7	4	4	4	3	8	0	0	7	0	1
Speech 8	2	2	2	3	13	0	0	4	2	7
Speech 9	8	8	7	2	20	0	1	6	5	9
Speech 10	4	4	3	0	4	0	0	4	0	0
Speech 11	9	9	7	10	27	4	3	13	7	7
Speech 12	10	10	10	18	47	0	1	15	15	17
Speech 13	2	2	1	0	12	0	2	2	4	6
Speech 14	6	6	5	4	14	0	1	6	4	4
Speech 15	4	4	3	2	19	0	2	2	4	13
Speech 16	12	12	11	6	35	3	7	10	15	10
	120	120	95	78	439	7	41	141	106	191
		27.3%	54.9%	45.1%	98.4%	1.6%	9.3%	32.12%	24.15%	43.51%
	7.50	7.50	5.94	4.88	27.44	0.44	2.56			
	5.28	5.28	4.20	4.33	18.91	1.21	2.58			
						13	69			86

Figure 3.3: Annotation Schema - 1.3: Polarity Relative to Form of Communication, Form of Communication, Form of Question Relative to Form of Communication.

Speech	NPI / Form of Question / Form of Communication (excl. Problematic Cases, Reported and Reaction Questions)		NPI / RQ (excl. InTs, Problematic Cases, Reported and Reaction Questions)		Form of Question / pos. or neg. Question / Degree of NPI (excl. InTs, Problematic Cases, Reported and Reaction Questions)									
	Wh-Questions / Monologue	Y/n-Questions / Monologue	Invariant Tag Questions / Monologue	NPI + Modal	Weak NPI	Strong NPI	Pos/Wh/ Strong	Weak	Neg/Wh/ Strong	Weak	Pos/Y/n/ Strong	Weak	Neg/Y/n/ Strong	Weak
Speech 1	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech 3	2	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Speech 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech 5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech 6	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Speech 7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech 8	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech 9	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech 11	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech 12	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Speech 13	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Speech 14	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech 15	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech 16	2	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>52%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>24%</b>												

**Figure 3.4:** Annotation Schema - I.4: Appearance of NPIs Relative to Form of Questions and Form of Communication, NPIs in RQs, Appearance of NPIs subdivided into Form of Question, Negative or Positive Question, and Degree of NPI.

### 3.5 Corpus Analysis – Trump Speech Corpus

The questions in the TSC are analysed with respect to the form of communication, the form of question, and the frequency of the types of questions. Furthermore, the questions in the TSC-RQ are analysed with respect to the Assertion of Opposite Polarity (A.o.O.P.) hypothesis and linguistic markers, such as NPIs, which have been discussed in the literature on the topic, as summarised in (3.5.1):

- (3.5.1)
1. Questions in political speeches differ with respect to the communicative setting in which they appear. (Collins 2012; Reisigl 2008; Sclafani 2018)
  2. There are linguistic cues that signal the rhetoricity of a question. (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002; Han 2002; Krifka 1995)
  3. Rhetorical questions have an opposite polarity counterpart. (Han 2002; Progovac 1993; Sadock 1971)

The discussion of previous observations in Section 3.3 revealed that speeches should be closely considered with respect to their form of communication. In order to compile the TSC-RQ, the questions have been analysed in relation to the different forms of communication and different types of questions. Taking into account the form of communication, which includes not only the speech itself but also the setting in which it occurs, will allow us to delineate RQs from other types of questions that appear in the political speeches of Donald Trump. In the monologue itself, there are different types and forms of questions possible. The aim of the empirical investigation is to analyse the identified questions, determine the RQs, and to distinguish them from other question types, e.g. reaction questions and reported questions.

Furthermore, the approaches in Section 2.2 showed that RQs are structurally the same as OQs and there are linguistic cues to signal the difference. In addition to the particular communicative settings in which RQs appear, they have been claimed to display distinct semantic patterns. Thus, Han (2002), Progovac (1993), and Sadock (1971) have developed an opposite polarity hypothesis to capture the meaning of RQs: if the question is positive, then the meaning is taken to be negative, and a negative RQ carries a positive meaning (as discussed in Section 2.4). In addition, the constraints of the communicative setting are central to the classification and interpretation of RQs. The goal of this analysis is to

consider the previous observations and hypotheses to identify RQs and compile the TSC-RQ. I analysed and discussed the aspects listed in (3.5.2).

- (3.5.2)
1. Questions Distributed between Forms of Communication
  2. Frequency of Questions in the TSC
  3. Distribution of Questions in Monologue Sequences
  4. Assertion of Opposite Polarity (A.o.O.P.) in the TSC-RQ
  5. Negative Polarity Items, Modals and Their Relation to the Assertion of Opposite Polarity in the TSC-RQ

In the following Sections 3.5.1–3.6, I will provide the results of this analysis.

### 3.5.1 Questions Distributed between Forms of Communication

The first analysis includes the distribution of questions between the forms of communication. For the argument at hand, it is crucial to investigate whether the questions in the TSC are all stated in the speech itself or in an extra-textual sequence. The extra-textual level refers to situative parts which surround the monologue, e.g. the welcoming of guests at the beginning. The analysis shows that there are 13 questions in the TSC that are excluded from further analysis because they appear in parts of the speech that are interrupted by extra-textual sequences, for example, stating that someone should call a doctor in (3.5.3) or welcoming a particular guest in the audience (3.5.4).

- (3.5.3)
- a. *Oh, doctor, is there a doctor in the house please?* (A.3.381)
  - b. *Get a medic please.*
  - c. *Thank you.*
  - d. *A doctor please?* (A.3.382)
  - e. *Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you very much.*
  - f. *Is he okay?* (A.3.383)

(Donald Trump, Speech 11, A.3.381–A.3.383)

- (3.5.4)
- a. *And I wanna thanks – he's here some place – governor Jan.*
  - b. *Where's Jan?* (A.3.387)

c. *Where the hell is?* (A.3.388)

(Donald Trump, Speech 11, A.3.387–A.3.388)

They are excluded because they are directives to call a doctor (3.5.3a) and (3.5.3d) or requests that someone make themselves visible to be welcomed by the speaker outside of the main textual sequence (3.5.4b) and (3.5.4c). The findings reveal the importance of distinguishing between the monologue and extra-textual questions to avoid an incorrect assignment to the TSC-RQ.

There are two types of non-rhetorical questions in monologues: reported questions and reaction questions. Reported questions appear in storytelling sequences and convey reports of previous conversations (Sclafani 2018). These questions have to be excluded because they are situational imports and must be statistically recorded as such. In the TSC, there are 86 occurrences of reported questions.<sup>3</sup> They are uttered to signal the closeness to others, competence, or intimacy, since the speaker is telling his listeners about conversations he presumably conducted himself. On several occasions, Trump reports private conversations that include turn-taking sequences as in (3.5.5).

(3.5.5) a. And I said how are things going? (A.2.3)

b. He said very well, how are you doing in the U.S.? (A.2.4)

(Donald Trump, Speech 5, A.2.3–A.2.4)

These quotes are signalled by reported speech markers such as “I said to him”, “I asked”, etc. The reported sequences reflect closeness to business partners or reveal insights into his family life. Although they may have contained RQs in the original situation, they do not contribute as such to the given speech.

The political speeches of Donald Trump further include reaction questions in the monologue sequences that are excluded from the analysis. The speaker invites the audience to respond (Knape 2009a, 2015). Reaction questions invite a response that encourages the listener to interact; however, they do not attempt to make a rhetorical point as such. They are therefore excluded from the corpus. The analysis reveals that there are reaction questions in monologue sequences that are marked by “seriously, I would like to know” and “anybody else, please raise your hand” as in (3.5.6).

---

<sup>3</sup> Such problematic cases are not excluded because the questions are regularly embedded in, for example, “And I said to him” and listed as reported questions.

- (3.5.6) a. Now, how many of you people have gotten rid of cell phones and you start whacking them with a hammer? (A.2.105)
- b. Has any please raise your hand? (A.2.106)
- c. Please, one.
- d. What business are you in? (A.2.107)
- e. I see two hands.
- f. We have 15000.
- g. Two hands.
- h. Anybody else? (A.2.108)

(Donald Trump, Speech 12, A.2.105–A.2.108)

In (3.5.6a), (3.5.6b), (3.5.6d), and (3.5.6h), Trump aims to engage the audience. The speaker repeats a request to react non-verbally, to raise their hands in reaction to his question about how many people in the audience have destroyed their mobile phones with a hammer. Knappe (2015) refers to these as accompanying components that form a separate category from RQs. In monologues, the audience can respond, and any reaction that arises is not incorporated into the orator's speech and is typically met with a subjective response from the speaker (Knappe 2015: 123). Their function is to invite a form of interaction in an intra-textual sequence. Thus, the sequence still consists of one orator, the speaker Donald Trump. In contrast to RQs, they do not make a specific rhetorical point. In total, there are 69 (41 without problematic cases) reaction questions that have been excluded from the set of possible RQs. For all question types, I will provide further evidence in this chapter and in Appendix A.3.

In summary, the campaign speeches consist of two communicative parts: the monologues and extra-textual parts, for example those in which Trump is looking for the local governor to greet ((3.5.4b) and (3.5.4c)) or asks someone to call a doctor ((3.5.3a) and (3.5.3d)). These questions surrounding the speech are marked as extra-textual parts. The questions in the monologue as such in which he asks the audience to answer questions with non-verbal replies such as hand signals (e.g. “How many of you [...]” (A.2.105), “[...] please raise your hand” (A.2.106)) are classified as “reaction questions”. The questions in narrative sequences in which Trump reports on conversations with Ford, business partners (3.3.4), or friends and family are classified as “reported questions”.

The exclusion of questions at the extra-textual level (13) and reported questions in narrative sequences and reaction questions in the monologue (155) results in a set of 544 remaining questions. There are 7 problematic cases that are either reaction questions, reported questions, or RQs.

Based on the questions, I will consider the different possible forms of the questions. In a first step, I will include as a reference the questions from the additional textual levels to reveal any difference between the forms of questions at each textual level. The main goal is to identify utterances that have an interrogative marker but are, for example, declarative questions or para-textual components such as InTs.

### **3.5.2 Frequency of Forms of Questions Distributed between Forms of Communication**

The goal of Section 3.5.2 is to present an analysis of the possible question forms and excluding possible problematic cases. Only questions that follow grammatical guidelines should be assigned to the corpus. In addition, their frequency relative to the form of communication is considered, and possible structural patterns are examined.

Wong and Yap (2015) argue for four possible question types, *y/n*-questions, *wh*-questions, alternative questions, and declarative questions (Wong and Yap 2015: 645). Each type of question has a pragmatic function that also influences the analysis of the question (cf. Wong and Yap 2015). In general, *wh*-questions have an open set of answers and allow a wide range of possible answers to fill the knowledge gap. In contrast, *y/n*-questions have a limited set of responses. Alternative questions offer choices; declarative questions share structural properties with declarative statements and are marked by prosodic realisation. The work in this thesis is based on written texts and the challenges of the forms, e.g. declarative questions, are discussed in Section 3.5.3. Wong and Yap (2015) refer to the pragmatic functions of the question forms; while *wh*-questions invite a range of possible interpretations, *y/n*-questions are more direct. The questions in (3.5.7) have an open set of answers and invite a wider range of responses, in contrast to (3.5.8). First, I will present the identified form on the basis of the analysis by Wong and Yap (2015). In the following, I will present further forms, for example, tag questions and InTs and problematic cases that have not been considered by Wong and Yap (2015).

- (3.5.7) a. What exactly does President Obama intend to do differently once he is no longer accountable to the voters?
- b. Why does ‘flexibility’ with foreign leaders require less accountability to the American people?
- c. And, on what other issues will he state his true position only after the election is over?

(Mitt Romney; Wong and Yap 2015: 659–60)

The possible answers to (3.5.7a) are, for example, “Nothing” or “He will change the administration”. Similar answers are possible to (3.5.7b) and (3.5.7c). The open *wh*-questions appear to allow for a range of possible interpretations and signal that the listener should draw their own conclusions (Wong and Yap 2015: 660). Wong and Yap (2015) stress that the ongoing questions signal the preferred interpretation and answer, however the questions appear to be more objective. The second type is *y/n*-questions. The *y/n*-questions in (3.5.8) allow Romney to express “his criticism more directly and explicitly” as stated by Wong and Yap (2015).

- (3.5.8) a. Did you hear what he said today about the 9.1% of unemployed Americans? He said that’s just a bump in the road. No, Mr. President. That’s not a bump. That’s Americans.
- b. Do you realize how much government at the federal, state, and local level now accounts for in our economy?
- c. About 40% of the total US economy is accounted for by government. The federal share of that is about 25% of the total economy of the GDP.

(Mitt Romney; Wong and Yap 2015: 660)

The answer possibilities for the examples in (3.5.8) are limited to “yes”, “no”, or “I don’t know”. Wong and Yap (2015) argue that the questions in (3.5.8) allow the speaker to utter his argument more directly in contrast to *wh*-questions.

Alternative questions are possible and are exemplified in (3.5.9) (Wong and Yap 2015: 646).

- (3.5.9) Will we be one nation, one people, with one common destiny, or not?

(Bill Clinton, Wong and Yap 2015: 646)

Alternative questions propose several options and offer choices in the form of a question. The alternative question by Bill Clinton provided by Wong and Yap (2015) offers the options that the U.S. will be a unified nation or that it will not. The intended answer is that the U.S. will be a unified nation with one common destiny. Clinton links the realisation of being a unified nation with a vote for him for president. In RQs, the proposals are biased, and the speaker arguably prefers one alternative. Biezma and Rawlins (2017) argue that the alternatives proposed by RQs in the form of alternative questions may not propose actual alternatives and the context and linguistic cues may determine the preferred option (Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 309). In (3.5.9), the preferred option is “one nation, one people, with one common destiny”. The functions of RQs are discussed in more detail in Section 4.5 and Chapter 5.

The analysis of Wong and Yap (2015) highlights how speakers strategically use discourse to emphasise specific topics, express criticism (3.5.8), or question potential changes by the incumbent president (3.5.7). They argue that *wh*-questions, in particular, present a unique challenge as a form of inquiry because they invite a wide range of possible interpretations, making them a powerful tool for steering conversations and framing issues.

All three types of questions are found in the TSC. Wong and Yap (2015) do not consider (invariant) tag questions and further problematic cases. In the following, I will explore additional forms, such as (invariant) tag questions, that need to be considered to effectively compile a set of RQs for the TSC-RQ. This discussion aims to ensure that all relevant variations of questions are identified and accounted for in the analysis. Additionally, tag questions have been identified in the TSC. This question form was not considered by Wong and Yap (2015). The standard tag questions are defined as in (3.5.10).

(3.5.10) The general rules for forming the most common types of tag questions are:

- a. The tag question consists of operator and subject in that order (enclitic *n't*, if present, is attached to the operator [...]): *is he?, didn't she?, can't I?, will you?*  
[...]
- b. The operator is generally the same as the operator of the preceding statement (*cf* Note [c] below):

I *haven't* seen you before, *have* I?

If the statement has no operator, the dummy auxiliary DO is used, as for *yes-no* questions in general [...]:

She knows you, *doesn't* she!

- c. The subject of the tag must be a pronoun which either repeats, or is in coreference with, the subject of the statement, agreeing with it in number, person, and gender.
- d. If the statement is positive, the tag is generally negative, and vice versa [...].  
[...]

(Quirk et al. 1985: 810)

According to Quirk et al. (1985: 810), standard cases such as in (3.5.11) are classified as *y/n*-questions.

(3.5.11) It really doesn't work, does it?

(Donald Trump, Speech 4, A.3.182)

In the TSC, there are 5 standard tag questions in the annotated corpus. In a first step, they are listed under *y/n*-questions. The tag questions are classified as *y/n*-questions and are also labelled Problematic Cases. In the standard case, a tag question is asked to emphasise a previous statement. Hence, they are asked to get agreement with or put emphasis on the previous statement and differ in this sense from RQs. The tags in the questions explicitly refer to the statement that the speaker has tagged, in contrast to RQs, which convey a message that relates to the previous discourse (cf. Farkas 2024b). They differ in their explicit and implicit messages. Hence, tag questions must be treated as a special case of questions and are excluded from the set in the TSC-RQ. They are classified as special cases in Section 3.5.3.

(3.5.12) And they don't need to make those big, big beautiful, you could call them locomotives I guess, right?

(Donald Trump, Speech 5, A.2.8)

In (3.5.12), Trump adds the tag question “right?” to the utterance. This is a different type of tag question. There are additional types, for example InTs, which are defined as in (3.5.13).

(3.5.13) An [invariant tag question] is a tag that is not a canonical question tag, in that there is no polarity issue and no subject agreement [...].

(Columbus 2010: 87)

Columbus (2010) provides the following example (3.5.14).

(3.5.14) *I can get them photocopied and send them out to people if that would be easiest, eh; And you approve of that, huh?*

(Columbus 2010: 87)

In (3.5.14), “eh” and “huh” are added to the previous utterance, to elicit a response by the addressee. The tag is not determined by the positive agreement or subject “I” or “you” in contrast to the standard tag questions. The tags have the pragmatic function of signalling the speaker’s attitude, e.g. uncertainty as to whether the proposal in (3.5.14) is a reasonable procedure. Quirk et al. (1985) point to the similarity of comment clauses and invariant tag questions, e.g. “you know” and “I hope” (Quirk et al. 1985: 814). On the basis of the definition in (3.5.13), I classify examples such as (3.5.12) as invariant tag questions.

There are also cases in which the phrase appears isolated from the previous statement. Following Columbus (2010), their function differs from that of genuine questions. Trump consistently uses “Right?” or “OK?” independently of the previous utterance.

- (3.5.15)
- a. Three, four, five times more and they came in seventh.
  - b. Who the hell do you want to have as your president, right? (A.2.22)
  - c. Right? (A.2.23)
  - d. Right? (A.2.24)
  - e. Oh, boy, and then they don’t like me – couple of them, most of them have really supported us, but some of them just can’t get over it.

(Donald Trump, Speech 5, A.2.23–A.2.24)

In (3.5.15b), Trump states an InT “right” appended to the previous utterance. In (3.5.15c) and (3.5.15d), the tag questions appear in isolation in contrast to the example in (3.5.15b), which is added to its anchor “Who the hell do you want to have as your president”. The case is challenging since it can be treated as a *y/n*-question or a question tag. For the present argumentation, I classify it as an InT, in reference to Columbus (2010), which is a

non-canonical question tag that requires special treatment. All InTs are excluded and hence not part of the TSC-RQ.

The analysis reveals the complexity and variation of the questions that appear in the TSC and the need to carefully consider the compilation of the TSC-RQ. In the TSC-RQ, I include well-formed questions of the types in (3.5.16) that show the definite grammatical structure of a question: “subject–verb inversion” (1), “do-support” (2), or the presentation of alternatives (3).

- (3.5.16) 1. **Wh-Question:** What the hell do you have to lose?  
(Donald Trump, Speech 6, A.3.263)
2. **Y/n-Question:** Did we win the debate?  
(Donald Trump, Speech 16, A.3.492)
3. **Alternative Question:** Is it going to be great, good, or terrible?  
(Donald Trump, Speech 6, A.3.271)

In summary, there are 712 questions in the TSC: 146 *wh*-questions, 107 *y/n*-questions, one alternative question, and 192 InTs. The analysis reveals that there are 263 problematic cases that cannot be assigned to any of the three categories. There are 6 “Problematic Cases” which are either RQs, reported questions, or reaction questions. The “Problematic Cases” are discussed in Section 3.5.3. The analysis of RQs in the monologue is the main interest of this thesis and will be closely considered in the following. In total, 98.17% of all questions are uttered in the monologue sequences. In the TSC-RQ, there are 58.38% *wh*-questions, 41.04% *y/n*-questions, and 0.58% alternative questions. The analysis reveals that there is a trend towards *wh*-questions. It is an interesting aspect, as *wh*-questions are open questions that engage the audience in complex arguments and narratives, while *y/n*-questions are closed-ended and introduce contrast, especially when paired with a challenge or counterpoint. Their pragmatic functions are further considered in Chapters 4 and 5.

### 3.5.3 Problematic Cases

In addition to the InTs and tag questions, the classification of questions in the TSC identified utterances that, although marked with an interrogative marker, lack the grammatical structure of fully formed questions. These types are categorised as problematic cases due to

their forms, which include shortened question forms, “you-know” questions, “remember-x”-questions, “guess-what” questions, declaratives, and the invariant tag questions and standard tag questions discussed above; these forms are listed in (3.5.17).

- (3.5.17) a. *“You-know” questions*: You know what’s happening?  
(Donald Trump, Speech 13, A.3.427)
- b. *“Remember-x”-questions*: Remember they give the low-interest loans?  
(Donald Trump, Speech 5, A.2.54)
- c. *“Guess-what” questions*: Guess what?  
(Donald Trump, Speech 5, A.2.31)
- d. *Declaratives* And they think they’re gonna sell it there and have no repercussions?  
(Donald Trump, Speech 4, A.3.224)
- e. *Shortened Form*: You ever notice?  
(Donald Trump, Speech 8, A.3.299)
- f. *Invariant Tag Questions*: We ought to send used equipment, right?  
(Donald Trump, Speech 1, A.3.35)
- g. *Standard Tag Questions*: It really doesn’t work, does it?  
(Donald Trump, Speech 4, A.3.182)
- h. *Embedded Questions*: And *she’s* disregarded the lives of Americans – you see what’s happening – with what *she’s* done with her server?  
(Donald Trump, Speech 4, A.3.205)
- i. *Question + Invariant Tag Question*: Wouldn’t that have been wonderful, right?  
(Donald Trump, Speech 8, A.3.301)

The questions do not follow the standard grammatical rules of questions (“do-support”, “subject-verb inversion”, or the presentation of alternatives). There are utterances as exemplified in (a.) that are either declaratives or questions and include “you-know” phrases.

The “you-know” cases are annotated as rhetorical in the Switchboard Corpus, but this is also criticised by Rohde (2006). Rohde (2006) argues that the question structure only superimposes a dialogue structure on the communication situation without giving the addressee the opportunity to respond. They are similar to utterances of type (b.), which are

either directives or questions and are signalled by “Remember-x-?”. “Guess-what” cases as exemplified in (c.) are idioms typically used to stress a previous or following point. There are questions that appear in the form of a declarative (d.). Like the questions exemplified in (a.) and (b.), they require special consideration in regard to their prosodic contours. Their final status must be closely considered with an extended Praat<sup>4</sup> analysis. There are shortened forms as exemplified in (e.) that lack a standard question structure and require special consideration to determine whether they can function as RQs. An elaborated analysis of these special cases should be part of future work since this analysis focusses on the written texts. Although they are marked with a question mark, their status is uncertain and requires further analysis. According to Caponigro and Sprouse (2007), RQs can be embedded if the matrix clause signals that the answer is known to both participants (Caponigro and Sprouse 2007: 6). However, the cases exemplified in (h.) are complex. The matrix clause “And *she’s* disregarded the lives of Americans – you see what’s happening [...]” signals a bias towards a known answer. In addition, the embedded clause is a declarative one. An additional case is exemplified in (3.5.18).

(3.5.18) And then you watched him yesterday saying that, can you believe it?

(Donald Trump, Speech 3, A.3.165)

The matrix clause “And then you watched him yesterday saying that” does not signal that the answer to the question “can you believe it?” is known to all participants. “Can you believe it?” is typically used as a phrase to show excitement about shocking news and can still be classified as a RQ if it meets the criteria of RQs and is uttered to make a rhetorical point. If it is embedded, it is excluded from further analysis. There are 263 problematic cases that have been excluded due to their form. The questions listed in (3.5.17) do not follow the standard grammatical structure and have been excluded from the TSC-RQ for the analysis conducted here.

The second group of problematic cases are questions that are well-formed but are ambiguous between reaction questions and RQs or reported questions and RQs. Reaction questions do not signal a rhetorical point as such, but invite a form of reaction, e.g. “Are you ready?” (A.3.289, A.2.149) or “And who is going to pay for the wall?” (A.2.150). They aim to evoke a form of response such as booing or cheering and each case has to be further

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/praat/>.

considered with respect to pauses and reactions in an intonational analysis to ascertain whether it is a stimulus-response question or a RQ that involves a message. These have been excluded from the set. These are problematic cases because they are either reported questions or RQs as exemplified in (3.5.19) and (3.5.20).

(3.5.19) To those I say the following, what do you have to lose by trying something new like Trump? (A.3.259)

(3.5.20) What do you have to lose? (A.3.260)

(Donald Trump, Speech 6, A.3.259–A.3.260)

The question in (3.5.19) is embedded because Trump is addressing a specific group with his question: “to those I say”. It remains unclear whether the addressed group is present in the audience or whether Trump is reporting the question. The following question (3.5.20) is a repetition of the reported question in (3.5.19) or a RQ. The questions have been labelled problematic cases and excluded from further analysis. In summary, there are 266 problematic cases that have not been included in the TSC-RQ.

### **3.6 The Trump Speech Corpus – Rhetorical Questions**

The TSC-RQ contains the questions that are uttered in the monologue sequences and are well-formed with respect to the grammatical structure of the questions. Reported questions as well as reaction questions have been excluded from the set. Questions that are ambiguous between reaction questions or RQs have been excluded. The TSC-RQ contains 173 questions and is the basis for the analysis of their functions in Chapter 5. They share the characteristics that they are well-formed questions (“do-support”, “subject–verb inversion”, or the presentation of alternatives) and are uttered in the monologue sequences as defined by the setting having one orator. In summary, there are 101 *wh*-questions, 71 *y/n*-questions, and 1 alternative question. In the following, I will provide the results of the analysis of the assertion of the opposite polarity hypothesis and of possible linguistic markers. The guiding question is whether the speaker uses specific markers to signal a preferred interpretation.

I investigated whether linguistic markers or the assumption of the assertion of opposite polarity, previously established by Han (2002), Progovac (1993), and Sadock (1971), can be observed. The use of the latter is a linguistic tool that is used to reduce the risk of

misunderstanding. In monologues, the speaker is aware of the risk of misunderstanding, since the listener cannot ask for clarification. Hence, they may use ways to signal an intended answer even though that diminishes the pragmatic reasoning processes. According to Han (2002), the main proposition is supposed to have an opposite polarity counterpart.

In the TSC-RQ, there are 95 RQs (i.e. 54.9% of all RQs in the TSC-RQ) that invite an assertion of opposite polarity as exemplified in (3.6.1).

- (3.6.1) a. We allow them to get away with it.  
 b. Who can blame them? (A.3.349)  
 c. And I don'[t] blame them at all.

(Donald Trump, Speech 10, A.3.349)

The assertion of opposite polarity is supported by the provided answer “And I don'[t] blame them at all” in (3.6.1c) by Trump. The questions in the TSC-RQ were analysed by hand to see whether an answer of opposite polarity is reasonable. However, 45.1% of the questions do not invite an opposite polarity statement (78 questions). Interestingly, despite the high risk of misunderstanding, Trump does not utilise the opposite polarity strategy to narrow down possible interpretations. This observation strengthens the claim that the speaker aims to elicit a pragmatic reasoning process, allowing sufficient flexibility for the listener to produce a response that fits the listener's background assumptions, etc.

The analysis presented in Chapter 2 reveals the contribution of NPIs to the interpretation of RQs. Hence, the occurrence of NPIs in RQs has been analysed. According to Han (2002), ordinary *y/n*-questions are known to license weak NPIs such as “any”. In contrast, “ordinary *y/n*-questions do not license strong NPIs such as *lift a finger* or *budge an inch*” (Han 2002: 204). In *wh*-questions, when “the trace of the *wh*-phrase c-commands the weak NPI, both the ordinary reading and RQ are available” (Han 2002: 205). Ordinary *wh*-questions do not license strong NPIs (Han 2002: 205). However, den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002) argue that an ordinary *wh*-question can contain a weak NPI. Positive and negative *y/n*-RQs can contain a strong NPI as can positive *wh*-RQs. However, negative *wh*-RQs cannot contain strong NPIs. Weak NPIs are possible in positive *y/n*-RQs but not in negative *y/n*-RQs nor in negative *wh*-RQs. Modals in combination with NPIs are a strong indication of RQs (den

Dikken and Giannakidou 2002). Therefore, I include a feature “modal” and “modal+NPIs”.<sup>5</sup> Further, the possible information structure (IS) ambiguity is considered, i.e. whether the questions may be ambiguous with respect to their IS (Molnár and Winkler 2026: 99). The following structural and semantic criteria were examined (3.2).

Criteria/Form	positive y/n-RQ	negative y/n-RQ	positive wh-RQ	negative wh-RQ
<b>Strong NPI</b>	possible	possible	possible	not possible
<b>Weak NPI</b>	possible	not possible	possible (if c-commanded)	not possible
<b>Introductory “After-all”</b>	possible	possible	possible	possible
<b>By-any-chance</b>	not possible	not possible	not possible	not possible
<b>Followed by yet-clause</b>	possible	possible	possible	possible
<b>Modal + NPI</b>	possible	possible	possible	possible
<b>A.o.O.P.</b>	possible	possible	possible	possible

**Table 3.2:** Structural and Semantic Criteria Possible in RQs (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002; Han 2002).

According to my annotations, there is no appearance of an introductory “After all” or “By any chance”, as well as no question that is followed by a “yet-clause” (cf. Han 2002). In order to provide further insights into the occurrence of NPIs, I examined their possible appearances and whether they are preferably used in specific types of questions or communication settings. In addition, I investigated whether there are combinations of modals and NPIs. NPIs are linguistic signals, especially strong NPIs (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002), combined with and without modal auxiliaries, which influence the epistemic strength of the utterance and the function of the question. The list of NPIs in (3.6.2) was examined in the corpus (Barker 2018; den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002; Han and Siegel 1997; Han 2002; Krifka 1995; Nunberg et al. 1997; Sailer 2009).

- (3.6.2) a. “the hell”  
 b. “never”  
 c. “such a thing”  
 d. “anybody”

<sup>5</sup> Modality: Meaning and Use, Cambridge Grammar, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/grammar/british-grammar/modal-verbs-and-modality>, accessed 7 August 2023.

- e. “even”
- f. “ever”
- g. “any”
- h. “whatever”
- i. “lift a finger”
- j. “budge an inch”
- k. “what on earth”
- l. “who the hell”
- m. “what the dickens”

In the TSC, in well-formed utterances there are 29 NPis. In the TSC-RQ, 18 instances of NPis are observed. According to my findings, Trump uses 13 NPis in *wh*-questions (and 5 in *y/n*-questions) in the TSC-RQ to either maximise the chance of a specific answer or to trivialise the alternative answers. This might be due to the wide answer set which *wh*-questions allow, and thus the higher risk of misunderstanding in comparison to *y/n*-questions. Six instances have been identified in InTs. Three cases appear in either reported or reaction questions. Hence, NPis are not prevalent in the TSC-RQ. Trump may not have used NPis to signal the rhetoricity of the question because the communicative setting as such determines their classification as rhetorical. They can be perceived as emphasisers, but not as distinct markers for a rhetorical reading. However, it can be observed that NPis appear significantly more frequently in monologue sequences and have a tendency to occur in *wh*-questions. This observation is a preliminary observation and needs to be strengthened using the corpus in future research. The findings are summarised in 3.3.

Form/NPI	positive <i>y/n</i> -RQ	negative <i>y/n</i> -RQ	positive <i>wh</i> -RQ	negative <i>wh</i> -RQ
<b>strong NPI</b>	0	0	9	0
<b>weak NPI</b>	4	1	3	0

**Table 3.3:** NPis and Forms of Questions in TSC-RQ based on Han (2002).

The annotation revealed that the criteria apply to the data in the TSC-RQ with one exception (3.6.3).

(3.6.3) But didn't he say he waited forever?

(Donald Trump, Speech 3, A.3.113)

The weak NPI in (3.6.3) is one single finding and may challenge the assumption by Han (2002) but requires more research. The remaining NPI criteria apply to my corpus data. In conclusion, Trump neither significantly makes use of the assertion of opposite polarity nor prevalently uses linguistic markers to signal the rhetoricity of the question.

### **3.7 Discussion**

The corpus analysis in Section 3.5 provides a broad overview of the different structural and semantic factors in the annotated corpus. The analysis faced several challenges, for example, the body of source material, the colloquial language, challenges in cohesion and coherence, the first application of the annotation schema, as well as certain examinations that I will discuss in this section. The available scripts are part manuscript and part transcript. The scripts were proof-read on the basis of YouTube and C-Span Videos. Thus, the exact wording is challenging to reconstruct and vulnerable to errors. The body of source material is a selection of presidential election campaign speeches by Donald Trump 2015–16 and is listed in table 3.1. Thus, the corpus results may change if all speeches were to be considered. In addition, the results can be compared with Trump's presidential election campaign speeches in 2020–21 and 2023–24. It should be noted that some speeches tend to have a higher number of questions per 1000 words, as listed in 3.1. Of these speeches, all were given in swing states. There is no observable tendency for Trump to consistently utter a similar number of questions. The standard error differs between speeches, and the deviation is high. The numbers may change if a larger data set is taken into account. Currently, there is no empirical analysis of a comparably large data set of RQs in political speeches. The following hypotheses presented in previous analyses were considered:

1. Questions in political speeches differ with respect to the communicative setting in which they appear. (Collins 2012; Reisigl 2008; Sclafani 2018)
2. There are linguistic cues that signal the rhetoricity of a question. (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002; Han 2002; Krifka 1995)
3. Rhetorical questions have an opposite polarity counterpart. (Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Han 2002; Progovac 1993; Rohde 2006; Sadock 1971)

The results in Section 3.5.1 contribute to hypothesis (1). The results show that questions can appear either in monologues or in extra-textual level sequences. The questions in monologues can be RQs, reaction questions, reported questions, or several types of problematic cases. The highest number of questions was expected to appear in monologue sequences due to the communicative setting. This expectation was confirmed because the most questions appear in monologue sequences, viz. 98.17%. In extra-textual sequences 1.83% of the questions were identified (1.57% without problematic cases). In monologue sequences, 12.08% reported questions (9.19% without problematic cases) and 9.69% reaction questions (9.19% without problematic cases) were identified. Further research may consider the exact words per sequence to provide greater comparability.

The results in Section 3.5.2 show the distribution of the types of questions among the forms of communication. The speaker was expected to prefer the direct *y/n*-questions to limit the range of possible interpretations of the questions. The results show that a tendency can be observed, though it is not decisive, because Trump uses 58.38% *wh*-questions, 41.04% *y/n*-questions, and 0.58% alternative questions in the TSC-RQ. The *y/n*-questions are worth analysing in more detail because this category, in the analysis at hand, additionally contains the negative interrogatives (NIs) and standard tag questions. NIs have a strong bias that may influence the function of the question and therefore merit separate analysis in future studies (Heritage 2002). It is remarkable that Trump uses a high number of InTs, namely 43.05% (TSC). The occurrence of InTs has not been investigated so far and the observation would benefit from further examination. InTs may be examined in more detail in relation to the standard tag questions, which are counted as *y/n*-questions.

The primary analysis focusses on questions within monologue sequences. Based on the findings in Section 3.5.2, it was initially anticipated that the speaker would predominantly use *y/n*-questions. However, the distribution of question types in the TSC-RQ reveals a different pattern: *wh*-questions account for the majority (101 questions), followed by 71 *y/n*-questions, and only one alternative question. This expectation of a preference for *y/n*-questions cannot be fully substantiated, as there is an observable tendency, but the results do not clearly establish a definitive preference. Consequently, further analysis was performed to explore the role of opposite polarity assertions and linguistic markers in monologue utterances in greater depth.

Examining the opposite polarity hypothesis, linguistic markers, and the occurrence of polarity statements in relation to NPIs yielded results contrary to the expectations outlined in hypotheses (2) and (3). Specifically, there is no discernible tendency towards opposite-polarity statements, nor are there distinctive linguistic markers that reliably signal the rhetorical nature of a question. There is a tendency towards statements of opposite polarity (54.9%) but it is not significant. Polarity and non-polarity statements are possible. This underlines the need for RQs to be analysed by also taking into account various contextual factors in order to analyse their implied message.

A total of 18 NPIs were identified in the TSC-RQ. Despite the expectation that NPIs would be used frequently, neither strong nor weak NPIs exhibited high frequencies in positive or negative questions. Future research using the proposed analytical framework, with a more narrowly defined set of parameters, is expected to yield more detailed insights into linguistic cues and rhetorical structures. Although not all aspects explored in this thesis may be applicable to future studies, they provide a valuable foundation for further investigation. To achieve statistically significant results, it would be necessary to analyse all speeches from a presidential election campaign, in particular to uncover strategies employed in critical regions, such as swing states. Future testing with the presented schema, along with a more narrowly defined preset of parameters, will provide an even more detailed analysis about linguistic cues and rhetorical figures. Not all of the aspects analysed in this thesis may be used for future studies, but they serve as a valuable overall starting point.

### **3.8 Conclusion**

The goal of Chapter 3 was to compile the TSC-RQ from the collected speeches and the questions listed in the TSC as a basis for the analysis of the functions of RQs. The analysis showed that the speeches consist of extra-textual levels that have to be excluded as well as reported and reaction questions. Problematic cases were identified and categorised as such. In total, there are 712 questions in the TSC. The exclusion of InTs (184), reaction questions (41), reported questions (41), questions at the extra-textual level (7), and further problematic cases in monologues (266) resulted in a set of 173 questions in the TSC-RQ. In the TSC-RQ, there are 101 *wh*-questions, 71 *y/n*-questions, and one alternative RQ. Their functions will be considered in Chapter 5.

The results of this study offer new and valuable insights into the use of questions, particularly RQs, in political speeches. The findings highlight the need for a close examination of the occurrence and appearance of the questions to accurately identify RQs and distinguish them from other types. Simply relying on the communicative setting to determine the type of question is insufficient, as InTs, such as “right?” can appear in monologue sequences without being rhetorical. Additional problematic cases have also been identified, which arise from either the form of the question or the mode of communication. This research represents the first extensive investigation into the occurrence of InTs in the context of political speeches. Furthermore, it lays the foundation for examining InTs in greater detail, especially in relation to standard tag questions, which are generally classified as *y/n*-questions.

Political speeches include various forms of communication, as explored in Section 3.3 and considered in Section 3.5.1. These include storytelling sequences with reported questions, reaction questions, and extra-textual sequences. Consequently, the context in which questions occur must be carefully considered to identify signal words that differentiate extra-textual questions from those embedded in narratives about conversations. This approach enables a more nuanced analysis that focusses specifically on RQs. Using this distinction, the study facilitates an empirical investigation of RQs, incorporating linguistic markers and the opposite polarity hypothesis, which are particularly relevant to RQs in spoken discourse. Previous studies on RQs (Sclafani 2018; Wong and Yap 2015) have often classified questions as rhetorical without providing precise definitions or detailed examinations of their characteristics. This study aims to avoid such generalisations by offering a targeted analysis of RQs grounded in the TSC-RQ. The investigation of communication levels allows for a more precise analysis of RQs to distinguish them from other possible question types.

Investigating the communication levels in political speeches reveals a substantial presence of questions within monologues, as discussed in Section 3.5.2. These include reaction questions posed by speakers to elicit audience responses, as well as reported questions drawn from quoted situations. RQs appear across various forms, both with and without NPIs or implicit assertions of opposite polarity. In particular, there is no clear preference for specific forms or linguistic markers among RQs. However, speakers have access to linguistic tools, such as NPIs, and strongly biased question structures, such as negative interrogatives, to signal the rhetorical nature of questions. NPIs are rarely found in extra-textual questions, reaction questions, or reported questions, and are significantly more prevalent in RQs.

My investigations reveal the necessity to distinguish RQs from other question types to examine their functions using a pragmatic approach. Linguistic markers contribute to understanding the functions of RQs, but do not determine them solely. This study highlights the complexity of questions in context, analysing various forms of communication, question structures, and linguistic markers to establish a clear distinction between RQs and other types of questions. Misclassifying all questions in political speeches as RQs risks conflating rhetorical and non-rhetorical questions, particularly reported ones. In summary, the TSC-RQ includes 173 RQs. In the following Chapter 4, previous analyses of RQs and their possible functions will be discussed from a pragmatic point of view. In Chapter 5, I will analyse RQs identified in the TSC-RQ according to the functions presented in Section 4.5.

## 4 Rhetorical Questions in Context

### 4.1 Research Questions and Chapter Outline

RQs are a phenomenon whose classification and interpretation can only be formulated in context. This observation is based on the discussions in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3. The purpose of Chapter 2 was to approach RQs from a semantic and syntactic perspective. The questions were considered in relative isolation, on the sentence level, and their formal appearance was discussed. The goal of Chapter 3 was to compile the TSC-RQ in order to identify RQs in the TSC. The analysis in Chapter 3 revealed that it is necessary to carefully analyse the utterances with a question mark and to include the form of communication, as well as to examine the grammatical form of the questions. The analysis revealed that there are a large number of utterances with a question mark that are not RQs. Compared to the previous analysis (Rohde 2006), the selection of RQs was based not only on the entropy of the responses, but also on other contextual factors such as the determination of the communicative form. An analysis that only takes question marks into account would lead to incorrect analyses, as reported questions, reaction questions, and problematic cases can also be observed. The analysis in Chapter 3 revealed that the speaker does not commonly use linguistic cues that can help narrow down a possible interpretation and that a slight tendency towards *wh*-questions is observable. They invite a wider set of interpretations in contrast to *y/n*-questions, which elicit only the responses “yes” or “no”. The discussion in Chapters 2 and 3 showed that a context-based approach is necessary to explore the differences between RQs and other question forms and consequently the functions of RQs.

In Chapter 2, the discussion revealed that a direct association between form and function is the norm, but they do not always match. Speech act theory refers to this as direct and indirect speech acts. Roberts (2018) argues for an understanding of pragmatic and

grammatical moods of utterances and hence their classification in context. Contextual clues are required because the illocutionary force depends on the context. As we have seen in Chapter 2, RQs share their form with interrogatives but not their function.

In Chapter 4, RQs and their functions are examined from a pragmatic angle. In the following, I will investigate RQs in a pragmatic framework that focusses on “what language does”.<sup>1</sup> Chapter 4 is guided by the following research questions (4.1.1a)–(4.1.1c).

- (4.1.1) a. How do pragmatic accounts approach RQs? What kinds of speech acts are RQs?
- b. What tools does the context provide to reason about the speaker’s meaning and to analyse the functions of the question?
- c. What functions of RQs have been previously examined?

The first research question in (4.1.1a) explores accounts that examine RQs in a pragmatic framework as speech acts. RQs are associated with indirect speech acts because their function differs from their formal appearance as questions (Ene 1983). The question in (4.1.1a) addresses the pragmatic accounts that focus on the speaker’s role, intention, and functions of the questions. Pragmatic proposals (Austin 1962; Harris, Fogal, et al. 2018; Roberts 2018; Searle 1969) include the co- and context and aim to include conditions from both of them. Three main approaches are discussed: the conventionalist, intentionalist, and normative views. As pointed out in the previous Chapters 2 and 3, to analyse the functions of RQs, it is insightful to examine them in context, and thus examine ways of analysing the contexts of the RQs themselves.

The second research question in (4.1.1b) considers the larger discourse context; thus, in Section 4.3, previous accounts such as the question-based model proposed by Roberts (2012) are explored. Roberts (2012) argues for a QUD approach that integrates the participants’ goals, the CG, and the internal structure of the discourse context. In her proposal to examine speech acts in discourse context, Roberts (2018) refers to and combines several approaches and concepts, e.g. the speech act taxonomy by Searle (1975), the Stalnakerian CG, presupposition accommodation by Lewis (1979), and the QUD account by Roberts (2012). Roberts (2018) does not provide further empirical data or observations that include RQs, but instead offers an insightful way to examine utterances in larger texts. With respect

---

<sup>1</sup> Alluding to Austin (1962) “How to Do Things with Words”.

to the communicative functions of speech acts, the notions of Austin (1962), Harris (2016), Roberts (2018), and Saul (2018a) are discussed. In particular, here again, Roberts (2018) provides a coherent approach that includes the notion of background assumptions or CG, QUD, and goals. She introduces the power relations between the speaker and the listener. Her observations are insightful for the analysis of political speeches with the special role of an orator. Camp (2018) presents an analysis proposal in terms of the conversational record (CR). In her proposal, Camp (2018) argues for a distinction between the CR and *score*. She argues for differentiating between statements that are explicitly expressed (CR) and those that are merely believed or implied (*score*). These distinctions manifest differently in the CG or are temporarily accepted solely to ensure the success of the communicative interaction. Camp's (2018) proposal offers an insightful analytical method to approaching RQs in complex communicative situations. As discussed in Chapter 3, RQs appear to invite a pragmatic reasoning process that has to be interpreted relative to the context, because the form of the question does not fit the function in the discourse. Pragmatic reasoning refers to the process of language comprehension in order to infer the communicative goal of the speaker (cf. Smith et al. 2013: 1). Farkas (2023) refers to pragmatic reasoning as a process that “involv[es] Sp's intention and relevance to the current QUD, rather than being part of the semantics of the uttered sentence” (Farkas 2023: 9). In Farkas (2024b), she elaborates on the notion ( $c_i$  refers to “input context”):

- (4.1.2) Ad [addressee] is expected to recover  $p$  and commit to it based on pragmatic reasoning rooted in Grice's Cooperative Principle, based on (i) the semantic content of the question; (ii) its status in  $c_i$  imposed by the CQ condition<sup>2</sup>, and (iii) the connection between the RhQ and the QUD. The point Sp [speaker] makes is rhetorical because her aim is to persuade Ad of the truth of  $p$  by making Ad conclude it on her own and thereby show that Ad could have resolved the QUD on her own.

(Farkas 2024b)

This observation is further discussed in Section 4.5. The third research question in (4.1.1c) considers previous accounts that propose functions of RQs (Athanasidou 1991; Ilie 1994; Meibauer 1986; Wong and Yap 2015). Thus, in Section 4.5, I will introduce previously ob-

<sup>2</sup> **Closed question (CQ) condition of RhQs:** In order to for a question to be interpreted as a RhQ, Sp must be taken as assuming that the issue raised by the question is closed in  $c_i$  (Farkas 2024b).

served functions of RQs. As shown in Chapter 3, quite fundamentally, a RQ must be classified and its function interpreted in context. That requires consideration of the communicative setting, i.e. monologue, extra-textual setting, or narrative sequences. This analysis was carried out in Chapter 3 in order to create the TSC-RQ corpus. Furthermore, based on the discussion in Section 4.3, I argue for including the notion of CG. The notion is a determining factor in the classification of RQs and requires consideration in the interpretation of their functions. Finally, we will summarise the observed functions and adapt them, taking into consideration the CG. They are the basis for the analysis of RQs in Section 5.2.

In summary, in Chapter 4, we will discuss accounts that approach RQs from a pragmatic angle. Hence, the focus lies on speech act theory. In addition, the notion of the speaker's role and proposals to examine the discourse context (Section 4.3) are discussed. In Section 4.4, the communicative functions of speech acts and in Section 4.5, the communicative functions of RQs are examined. Finally, I will provide a conclusion in 4.6 before continuing with the analysis of the functions of RQs from the TSC-RQ listed in table 3.2. The goal of this chapter is to present previous pragmatic approaches to RQs and proposals on their functions.

## **4.2 Approaches to Speech Acts**

In order to analyse the effectiveness and functions of RQs, a speech act analysis is necessary. This section is guided by the questions as to how utterances have been previously approached with respect to the notion of speech acts and how RQs' functions can be examined considering RQs as speech acts. The question is relevant in the sense that the classification refers to the function as well. Declaratives are used to convey information, questions are used to seek information on a specific point, and imperatives are uttered to request that the addressee do something. A direct association with each function is the standard case, but form and function do not always match. This ambiguity between form and function is at the core of the phenomenon of RQs.

In the following, I will discuss approaches to analysing the meaning of an utterance in terms of the three main ways of approaching speech acts (conventionalist, normative, and intentionalist). RQs as speech acts attempt to carry out functions, hence they are indirect and lack conventions, e.g. performative verbs. The consideration of the context is

required in order to analyse the speaker's intention to utter an indirect speech act. Three proposals can be differentiated: the conventional view, the normative approach, and the intentionalist approach. Each approaches speech acts slightly differently in order to examine their functions and meanings (cf. Harris, Fogal, et al. 2018; Harris and McKinney 2021). In the following, I will discuss the conventionalist approach which particular consideration of Austin (1962) and Searle (1965) and their late work. In addition, I will consider the intentionalist approach introduced by Grice (1957), Harris, Fogal, et al. (2018), and Roberts (2018). I will briefly touch on speech acts in the normative framework of Brandom (1994), Geurts (2019a), and Krifka (1995).

In order to determine the place of RQs among the different types of speech acts, I will first consider various classifications and examine where RQs fit in. According to Quirk et al. (1985), speech acts are defined as in (4.2.1).

(4.2.1) Utterances of sentences are SPEECH ACTS, *ie* acts of verbal behaviour (spoken or written). When a person performs a speech act, that person at one and the same time utters a particular utterance, namely a LOCUTIONARY ACT. We use ILLOCUTIONARY ACT to refer to a speech act identified with reference to the communication intention of the hearer. The intended effect of an illocutionary act is its ILLOCUTIONARY FORCE. Occasionally, the speaker explicitly refers to the illocutionary act being performed by using a PERFORMATIVE VERB[.]

(Quirk et al. 1985: 804)

Proposals are introduced to examine the ways in which speakers formulate utterances so that the listeners recognise what the speakers mean and the hearers act accordingly. Speakers signal what they mean to their addressees by using specific wording, e.g. performative verbs. For example, Austin (1962) refers to the specific design of the utterance that signals actions, and Searle (1969) argues that there are specific illocutionary verbs that signal the illocutionary act. Austin (1962) provides the following utterance (4.2.2) with which he exemplifies the three components of speech acts.

(4.2.2) I bet you sixpence it will rain tomorrow.

(Austin 1962: 5)

The three components of a speech act are locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts (Austin 1962: 103). The locution is the actual utterance "I bet you sixpence it will rain

tomorrow”. The illocutionary act covers the intended meaning, hence the bet that “it will rain tomorrow”. The performative is signalled by the contractual “I bet”. The perlocutionary act covers the effect, in this case, that the bet is accepted by the hearer (Austin 1962: 9). The proposal by Austin is further developed, for example by Searle (1965). The conventionalist approach closely links the classification of illocutionary acts to performative verbs and linguistic convention. If the locution and illocutionary act differ, one speaks of an indirect speech act. Speech acts may appear direct or indirect due to the dynamic relationship between form and content (Athanasiadou 1991; Egg 2007; Ene 1983; Dayal 2016; Searle 1975). From a conventionalist’s perspective, RQs are indirect speech acts. For direct speech acts, we expect specific performative verbs that relate to their specific category, e.g. “to congratulate” for expressives. Indirect speech acts, in contrast, show a mismatch between form and content.

The content of the speech act may also include a reference that has to be carefully examined in order to classify the illocutionary act. This remark is worth considering because the observation contributes to the issue of implicit statements and possible references made using them. Searle (1969) argues that in the event that the reference in a speech act is false, the utterance is not defective. Hence, a question is still successful even if the reference in the question itself is not (Searle 1969: 162). The conventionalist approach of Searle (1969, 1975) is closely related to performative verbs and does not account for social relations, shared knowledge, or assumptions that could be ensured by considering the CG. Subsequent proposals argue for a consideration of commitment, but also of the speaker’s intention.

Criticism of the conventionalist approach was raised by normative proposals (Brandom 1994; Geurts 2019a, 2019b; Krifka 2015), which focus on aspects such as commitment, and by intentionalists (Egg 2007; Ene 1983; Grice 1975; Harris, Fogal, et al. 2018; Ilie 1994; Roberts 2018), who stress, for example, the speaker’s intention. The approaches are considered in order to identify ways to classify the communicative functions while taking into consideration the context and possible development of the discourse. One normative proposal is made by Brandom (1994). He emphasises that speech acts have the power to modify the deontic score, influencing the appropriate commitments and entailments not only attributed to the speaker, but also to the recipients of the speech act (Brandom 1994: 142). This normative approach to speech acts is closely intertwined with the concept of commitment.

When individuals perform speech acts, they are not just uttering words, but also making social commitments. These commitments can vary depending on the type of speech act being performed. Different types of speech acts carry distinct social obligations, reflecting the various levels of obligation, intention, and social consequences associated with them (Brandom 1994; Geurts 2019a, 2019b; Krifka 2015).<sup>3</sup> Geurts (2019b) provides the following example (4.2.3).

(4.2.3) Barney: “I’ll do the dishes.”

(Geurts 2019b: 1)

In example (4.2.3) Barney promises Betty that he will do the dishes (Geurts 2019b). Following Geurts (2019b), “the purpose of Barney’s promise is to undertake a commitment to Betty: as a result of saying, “I’ll do the dishes”, Barney becomes committed to Betty to do the dishes” (Geurts 2019b: 1). Thus, the consequence is that Betty will act accordingly and, for example, goes for a run instead of doing the dishes because she is relying on Barney’s commitment *p*. If Barney does not do the dishes, he has to face the social consequences, e.g. Betty is cross with Barney. In the normative framework, speech acts are social effects that affect the normative status of participants and may be characterised in these terms (Krifka 2015; Geurts 2019b). It is crucial to say that “commitment” requires that there is an “uptake” of the commitment by the addressee (Geurts 2019b: 18 referring to Austin 1962). Consequently, Barney and Betty share commitments to act on *p*, e.g. that Barney will do the dishes.

The normative approach has been criticised for its close association with commitment and successful speech acts (Harris 2019). Geurts (2019b) claims that a speech act is successful in the case where the addressee accepts the commitment. If the speaker utters something very quietly that no one else notices, Harris (2019: 60) points out that the speaker has not committed to a specific content but signals an intention to do something and the speech act is successful without acceptance by the listener. In contrast to the intentionalist approach, the success of a speech act under the normative approach is closely linked to the addressee. An additional point of criticism refers to miscommunication. Harris (2019: 60) stresses the possibility that “a speaker performs a speech act of a certain kind and their addressee wrongly takes it to be a speech act of some other kind. [...] S might describe some local bylaws by saying, ‘you mustn’t park here’, but A might misinterpret S’s utterance for a command”

<sup>3</sup> For a more in-depth discussion, see Brandom (1994, 2011), and Harris, Fogal, et al. (2018).

(Harris 2019: 60). If a speaker gives a statement as in example (4.2.4), Harris (2019) claims that it is challenging to refer to the notion of commitments.

(4.2.4) Arrive on time.

If you don't, come in quietly through the back door.

(Harris 2019: 62)

In (4.2.4), the speaker may wish and intend that addressee arrives on time, but if they do not, alternative behaviour is suggested.

(4.2.5) It is normally wrong to lead someone to believe that I am seeking to share knowledge with them when I am not, for example, and it is normally wrong to deceive someone into thinking that I am attempting to coordinate my actions with them when I am not. If we grant this unobjectionable claim, then it is clear why failing to act on the content of one's speech act is cause for sanction: doing so is evidence either that one has violated a rational requirement or that one is wrongfully deceiving another person.

(Harris 2019: 65)

Thus, it is challenging to argue that the speaker's utterance in (4.2.4) includes the social commitment that the addressee must arrive on time. Otherwise, the backup plan would be infelicitous. If we assume that also questions require some form of commitment, the question arises whether it is the commitment to ask for new information – or in the case of indirect speech acts – commitment to an implicit statement. As previous analyses in Section 2.4 revealed, it is challenging to derive a statement from RQs and the main aspect of RQs is the rhetorical point they aim to make. For example, in the case of the RQ “Is the Pope Catholic?” it is sufficient that it is mutually believed that the Pope is Catholic in the given context to stress the aspect that some other content is redundant. Rather, the speaker signals that some other content is redundant and the question arises of what the speaker's intention might be.

Intentionalism refers to the speaker's intention to utter a speech act instead of invoking linguistic conventions such as performative verbs. From an intentionalist perspective, linguistic devices do not determine the speech act classification and stress the notion of the context and communicative setting. Harris, Fogal, et al. (2018: 2–3) criticise that

the conventionalist approach lacks a coherent explanation of how to grasp, for example, indirect speech acts, as their meanings evolve from additional factors rather than only from linguistic conventions. In a similar vein, Lepore and Stone (2015) argue that cases such as metaphor, insinuation, and many cases of indirect speech have to be treated in a special way, i.e. that they are not illocutionary acts at all. This is because they lack a distinct propositional content  $p$  that makes a communicative act successful (Lepore and Stone 2010, 2015). Furthermore, they contend that these actions should be labelled as perlocutionary acts rather than illocutionary acts, given that the speaker's objective is not to convey a particular proposition, but simply to initiate an unbounded chain of thoughts in the listener (Lepore and Stone 2010; Harris, Fogal, et al. 2018). It is debatable whether RQs are different from other indirect speech acts, e.g. metaphors, in the sense that they may carry a propositional content and additionally aim to evoke, for example, a pragmatic reasoning process as discussed in Chapter 2. In addition, the propositional content of the RQs refers to the CG to make a rhetorical point. The notion of perlocution is discussed in Section 4.4.

Harris and McKinney (2021) argue for the notion of conventional and communicative speech acts, a further development of the previous assumptions of direct and indirect speech acts, under which classification RQs are communicative acts. The notion of communicative acts relates to the observation that there are acts – referring to Grice – that can be formulated as “exercises of basic human capacities for inferring and shaping others’ states of mind” (Harris and McKinney 2021: 71). The point refers to the notion that there are several conventional acts such as assertions, requests, and questions, but their meaning may be indirect and they are supposed to be perceived as communicative acts (Harris and McKinney 2021: 71). It is crucial that the speaker utters their message directly but nevertheless in a way that the listener recognises the intention and behaves accordingly, e.g. in example (4.2.6).

(4.2.6) Context: The window is open and A utters:

“I’m cold.”

Speaker *A* utters the locution “I’m cold” in (4.2.6) with the intention to make *B* close the window. If the speech act is successful, *B* recognises the intention and closes the window. If the speech act is unsuccessful, *B* does not perceive the intention and may hand over a blanket, or ask why, etc. The concept of indirectness provides us with valuable tools for

analysing RQs. It serves as a reminder that the function of a question may not always align with its form, necessitating careful consideration of its intended meaning. Following Harris and McKinney (2021), RQs can be classified as communicative acts rather than indirect speech acts. The speaker's intention also deviates from the conventional approach of simply seeking new information. Recognising this deviation, we gain insight into the relevance of incorporating the speaker's intention into the analysis of the communicative functions of RQs. Consequently, the definition of indirectness, coupled with its exemplified usage, underscores the importance of considering the intention of the speaker when evaluating RQs. Previous accounts reveal the necessity of considering the question whether RQs are direct or indirect speech acts, or conventional or communicative speech acts. They share the notion that RQs deviate from direct forms of utterances, such as questions, assertions, or imperatives, and hence cannot be classified as direct or conventional speech acts.

Roberts (2018) argues that under a strongly context-based approach, the distinction between direct and indirect speech acts can be overruled in total. In contrast to Searle (1975), who links the taxonomy of speech acts to performative verbs, Roberts (2018) argues that illocutionary acts can be recovered without any dependency on performative verbs. In addition, the Gricean relevance is already reflected in the CG. Thus, it is reasonable, because of the context, for the speaker to intend and for the listener to recognise what they say. Their goals can be analysed taking the context into consideration because the context reflects an underlying conversational plan. Based on her observations, Roberts (2018) presents the definition of speech acts in (4.2.7).

- (4.2.7) A **complete speech act** is one such that the proffered content of the uttered constituent is coherent and compositionally maximal and has the type of denotation (either on its own or with contextually implicit modification) which can serve as one of the standard types of discourse move.

(Roberts 2018: 347)

Further, Roberts (2018) proposes that “successful, felicitous speech acts don't guarantee speaker intentions, only speaker public commitments” (Roberts 2018: 352). Roberts (2018) argues that the distinction between direct and indirect speech acts in the traditional sense becomes unnecessary since the context provides all the essential information needed to

comprehend the utterance in its intended sense. To illustrate the different approaches within the speech act taxonomy, Roberts (2018: 317) provides the examples in (4.2.8)–(4.2.11).

(4.2.8) I hereby request that you close the window.

(Roberts 2018: 317)

The example in (4.2.8) is classified as a directive in Searle's classification and an assertion according to Roberts' proposal.

(4.2.9) I'm going to Paris tomorrow.

(Roberts 2018: 317)

While (4.2.9) is a commissive with respect to Searle's taxonomy, it can be classified as an assertion according to Roberts (2018).

(4.2.10) I'm sorry that I lied to you.

(Roberts 2018: 317)

(4.2.10) is a Searlean expressive; Roberts (2018), however, argues for a classification as an assertion.

(4.2.11) I hereby pronounce you man and wife.

(Roberts 2018: 317)

According to Searle's taxonomy, the utterance in (4.2.11) is considered a declaration, and according to Roberts (2018), it falls under the category of an assertion. Roberts' perspective emphasises the significance of context and asserts that the core of a speech act lies in its domain goal – what the speaker intends to achieve with their statement. Hence, Roberts (2018) introduces an approach that relies on contextual assumptions and Gricean reasoning, particularly cooperativity, to demonstrate how speech acts can be effectively understood and inferred.

Roberts (2018) argues that speech acts are intimately tied to the context in which they occur, and the meaning of specific verbs cannot be directly associated with their use. This approach challenges the traditional distinction between direct and indirect speech acts and proposes a fundamental reevaluation of Searle's classification. In Roberts' (2018) proposal, a differentiation is made between the grammatical universal mood and the pragmatic mood of

utterances. The pragmatic mood takes into account contextual factors such as background information and setting in its classification. The grammatical mood, on the other hand, encompasses three main types: declarative, interrogative, and imperative (Roberts 2018: 319). The various acts falling under pragmatic moods are defined as in (4.2.12). A proposed direction is abbreviated as  $!_iP$ , an assertion as  $.\alpha$ , discourse as  $D$ , and questions as  $? \alpha$ . This system enables a more comprehensive understanding of speech acts and their implications that highlights the importance of considering the broader context in interpreting utterances.

(4.2.12) **Assertion:** (following Stalnaker 197[8])

If an assertion of  $.\alpha$  is accepted by the interlocutors in a discourse  $D$ ,  $|\alpha|^D$  is added to CG.

(Roberts 2018: 327)

**Interrogation:** (Roberts 1996)

If a question posed by  $? \alpha$  is accepted by the interlocutors in a discourse  $D$ , then  $|\alpha|^D$ , a set of propositions, is added to the QUD. A question is removed from QUD iff either its answer is entailed by CG or it is determined to be unanswerable

(Roberts 2018: 327).

**Direction:**<sup>4</sup> (cf. related proposals in Portner 2007, Roberts 2006)

If a proposed direction  $!_iP$  is accepted by the addressee  $i$  in a discourse  $D$ , then the goal by an interlocutor  $G_i$  and  $i$ 's associated evident plans are revised to include the realization, under the applicable circumstances, of  $!_iP$ .

$G_i$  is revised to remove the realization of  $!_iP$  once it *or the larger goals it subserves* are no longer potentially applicable (e.g. it has been realized, or else it is determined that it cannot be practically realized).

(Roberts 2018: 327)

Thus, the grammatical mood may not fit the pragmatic mood. The grammatical mood is typically associated with the following moves: declarative mood with assertions, interrogative mood with questions, and imperative mood with a direction (Roberts 2018: 320). However, each of the grammatical moods may deviate from the standard case as exemplified by Roberts (2018) in (4.2.13).

<sup>4</sup> Footnote by Roberts (2018: 327): This characterization of Direction is incomplete, since it does not cover what Kaufmann (2012) calls Expressive uses of imperatives, like *Be well!* See Roberts (2015b) for modification of this pragmatics to cover those uses.

(4.2.13) You're not hungry (declarative used as question)

(Roberts 2018: 321)

The utterance in (4.2.13) is a declarative (grammatical mood) used as a question (pragmatic mood) (Roberts 2018: 321). Roberts (2018) argues that if the context provides enough information, the declarative can be used as a question. Imagine a context in which the speaker knows that the hearer has not eaten for a while but still rejects any food that is offered. The speaker's domain goal is to elicit the information as to why the hearer is not hungry. In this case, the speaker in (4.2.13) does not intend to make an assertion but instead wants to ask the hearer why they are not hungry. Declaratives as questions are signalled through intonation and always lack a distinct structural label, i.e. a question mark, that would mark them as questions. Declarative questions are a sub-type of *y/n*-question and are defined as in (4.2.14).

(4.2.14) The declarative question is a type of question which is identical in form to a declarative, except for the final rising question intonation.

(Quirk et al. 1985: 814)

Declarative questions are a sub-type of *y/n*-questions and are characterised by a missing subject-operator inversion (Quirk et al. 1985: 814). Hence, in (4.2.13) the grammatical mood, the declarative, does not fit the pragmatic mood, the question. In summary, Roberts (2018) advocates an analysis of speech acts that is separate from the distinction between direct and indirect speech acts that is based on specific performative verbs. She points out that the contextual features, especially the QUD, the CG, and the interlocutors' goals, are central to the interpretation of speech acts.

In conclusion, the examination of direct and indirect speech acts, along with conventional and communicative acts, underscores the intricate nature of classifying utterances such as RQs. The concept of communicative acts emphasises the centrality of the speaker's intention while avoiding prescriptive assertions about commitment within the CG. The notion of the speaker's intention is central in order to grasp the speaker's strategy regarding the development of the discourse, i.e. what the speaker intends the listener to recognise and how the hearer is meant to react. In an intentionalist account, it is secondary to link the analysis of speech acts to linguistic devices the speaker uses, but rather the speech act is analysed in terms of the speaker's communicative intention, which can be derived from

the discourse context. The result of the possible indirectness may be a persuasive effect because the addressee has to perform a reasoning act to recognise the speaker's intention, an observation that is crucial for the further analysis of the communicative function of speech acts. This framework is further enhanced by Roberts (2018), who integrates contextual characteristics, speaker intentions, and communicative goals into the interpretative process. Consequently, RQs can be understood as speech acts without necessitating a strict distinction between direct and indirect forms.

RQs share their inquisitive nature with questions, even though they differ regarding their request to fill the knowledge gap of a speaker, and are similar to declaratives in the sense that they carry propositions that the speaker proposes that the listener accept. In contrast to assertions, they are non-informative in the sense that they propose a content to which the speaker is committed. Previous approaches share the notion that the consideration of contextual clues is required to analyse the functions RQs fulfil and how they are supposed to influence the CG. In the following section, I will provide further insights into the notion of the CG and its role relative to RQs. The functions that have previously been observed are discussed in Section 4.5.

### **4.3 Speech Acts, Language Game, and Discourse Structure**

In Section 4.3, the aim is to shed light on how to analyse the contextual setting of RQs, which is highly relevant for the analysis of the functions of RQs. Section 4.3 is guided by the question of what tools the proposals which consider the context provide to reason about the speaker's meaning and the intention to utter a RQ. The discussions in the previous chapters revealed that the notion of context is at the core of the analysis of speech acts and RQs. Referring to Harris and McKinney (2021), context is – from an intentionalist perspective – a set of “participants' shared states of mind, and illocutionary acts are understood in terms of their intended effects on these states” (Harris and McKinney 2021: 72) (cf. Roberts 2018, Stalnaker 2018, Thomason 1990).<sup>5</sup> There are pragmatic proposals (Beaver et al. 2021; Camp 2018; Fetzer 2017; Lewis 1979; Portner 2007; Stalnaker 1978, 2014), question-based proposals (Benz and Jasinskaja 2017; Riestler et al. 2018; Roberts 1996, 2012), and CG-based proposals

---

<sup>5</sup> Further discussion about the understanding of discourse from a conventionalist and normative perspective can be found in Harris, Fogal, et al. (2018).

(Benz and Jasinskaja 2017; Clark and Schaefer 1989). I will focus on pragmatic proposals and the understanding of presuppositions in Beaver et al. (2021), Lewis (1979), and Stalnaker (1978), as well as the question-based proposal by Roberts (2006, 2012). Of particular interest are Roberts' proposal to analyse strategies and moves in a discourse as well as Camp's (2018) proposal of the CR. The proposals reveal strategies to explore the relationship between the stated questions in order to explore the structural interaction between context, stylistic devices, and persuasion (Roberts 2021).

As mentioned previously, the questions have to be discussed in a discourse context in order to differentiate between the different types and their functions. In order to understand the speaker's goals and inquiry, the hearers in our case have to be able to follow the speech. The speaker is not always explicit and may disguise his goals through, for example, RQs. To identify what is plausible for the listeners to interpret and what appears to be relevant, the internal discourse structure has to be considered. Especially in cases where specific linguistic markers are absent and the topic under discussion remains unclear, the speaker's goals are challenging to recover. Thus, I will discuss the question-based approach the "Question-Under-Discussion (QUD) Model of Discourse Interpretation" by Roberts (1996) (elaborated in Roberts 2012, 2017).

Under the notion of QUD, the discourse is understood as a game, and the QUD-model examines moves, rules, and strategies (Roberts 2012). Thus, discourse proceeds by continually raising and, at the same time, answering implicit questions. Roberts describes her concept of information structure as a "structure on information" (Roberts 2012: 2).

(4.3.1) The conception I will develop here is one in which information structure is literally a structure on information — on the inquiry pursued in discourse and the information which that inquiry yields — and not on the utterances or sequences of utterances used to present it.

(Roberts 2012: 2)

The approach not only considers the sentence level but also examines how the information relates to its context (Roberts 2012: 2). Roberts (2012) introduces conventional rules such as syntactic, compositional, and semantic rules as well as conversational rules, e.g. Gricean maxims, the goal of the game, and human cognitive limitations. Roberts (2012) introduces two types of moves: set-up moves such as questions and payoff moves such as assertions

(Roberts 2012: 4). This concept is useful for RQs, as despite their question form, RQs are not genuine questions seeking information, but rather control a certain information structure in discourse. In RQs, the discursive function they fulfil is crucial, as no new answers are sought. The inquiry in the discourse is either complete or not really opened at all, and the question structures existing information rather than asking for new information. It thus may draw attention, marks evaluation or presents a conclusion. Therefore, these functions cannot be explained by an analysis that only looks at the form of expression. The concept by Roberts (2012) provides a theoretical foundation for this observation by explaining why RQs, despite their syntactic form, do not realise an information-seeking illocutionary type. Thus, the notion is relevant to the earlier discussion about whether RQs are questions, as examined in Section 2.2, or assertions, as discussed in Section 2.4. In addition, the way information or any form of expression is presented offers information about the relationship between various “purportedly pragmatic phenomena” (Roberts 2012: 63). Therefore, Roberts (2018: 63) argues that an interdisciplinary approach is necessary to analyse pragmatic and linguistic phenomena.

For the current analysis, Roberts’ approach is useful for identifying various moves and rules of (political) speech. The speaker plans various strategies which may or may not be successful. Roberts (2012) suggests that we can develop an analytical scheme that is based on the assumption that “language is cooperative, even when we’re using it to compete” (Roberts 2012: 26). Roberts (2012) proposes that in order to examine the discourse and to follow the “Big Question” (Roberts 2012: 5), one has to be aware of the entailments and underlying sub-question to the overall question: “One interrogative  $p_1$  entails another  $p_2$  iff every proposition that answers  $p_1$  answers  $q_2$  as well” (Roberts 2012: 7). For example, a super-question “What is the way things are?” determines the sub-questions and their logically related entailments (Roberts 2012). In order to put a question on the stack, questions can be introduced to the discourse stack through several mechanisms: explicitly, through conversational implicatures; implicitly, through assertions that presuppose or raise questions; or through the influence of extralinguistic, goal-orientated contexts (Simons et al. 2017: 200). Hence, a QUD does not have to be explicitly uttered as an interrogative, but the proposal stresses the importance of presuppositions and assumptions that shape the context.

Roberts' (2017) proposal considers the non-linguistic CG and QUD to examine the Gricean proposals of "what is said" and "what is contextually implicated" in a given discourse context (Roberts 2017: 419). Following Grice (1975), Roberts (2017) points out that "implicatures are non-detachable, so that if one expression gives rise to an implicature, distinct but synonymous expressions should too" (Roberts 2017: 432). Roberts (2017) argues that implicatures do not necessarily require a specific linguistic marker (see also the observations by Simons 2009, 2011). As long as the audience is capable of intuitively comprehending the implicature, implicatures can be characterised as conversational implicatures that comply with the Gricean theory (Roberts 2017: 431). Consequently, "conversational implicatures are not dependent on a particular lexical item or expression" (Roberts 2017: 432). This observation of Roberts (2017) is considered in the following analysis in order to grasp the intended meaning of RQs in political speech, which is a highly strategic setting.

The question arises whether this account can be strategically exploited, a possibility that is discussed by Camp (2018) and in this ongoing thesis with respect to RQs, as they can be linguistic devices to implicitly convey meaning. In order to examine the discourse structure and to distinguish between what is believed, accepted, and meant – especially in strategic and conflictive settings – Camp (2018) proposes the notion of insinuation and the claim to treat the CG, CR, and the speaker's meaning each on its own terms. Camp's (2018) approach comprises the three approaches to linguistic communication as quoted in (4.3.2) and describes insinuation as in (4.3.3). In (4.3.4), Camp (2022) elaborates on the definition of insinuation.

(4.3.2) It implements the basic outlines of a broadly Gricean story about speaker's meaning, as the attempt to change another's mind by giving them a reason to do so, within a broadly Stalnakerian framework, of conversation as an evolving pool of mutual information, by employing a broadly Lewisian (1979) notion of conversational score to track the evolution of that common ground, and a broadly Lewisian (1969) notion of convention to fix the contents the speaker's contributions to it.

(Camp 2018: 53)

(4.3.3) [Insinuation refers to] the communication of beliefs, requests, and other attitudes 'off-record', so that the speaker's main communicative point remains unstated.

[...] Insinuation aims to achieve [...] coordination while avoiding the distinctive species of cross-contextual stability that is generated by on-record speech, in the form of indirect reports. (Camp 2018: 42/59)

Although she does not provide a definition in her paper (Camp 2018), in a later paper (Camp 2022) she adds the proposal on the characteristic structure of insinuation provided in (4.3.4).

(4.3.4) A speaker *S* produces an utterance *U* of a sentence with an innocuous encoded message *L*, in order to communicate an unstated, risky message *Q*. Faced with the accusation of having meant *Q*, the speaker can demur that they were “just saying” the unobjectionable message *L*. When insinuation succeeds, all parties know, and know that the others know, that *S* did mean *Q*. Nonetheless, *S*'s denial of having meant *Q* sticks: they avoid being held accountable for *Q*, and often thereby for its ensuing practical consequences.

(Camp 2022: 230)

Camp (2018) proposes that the Speaker *S* explicitly formulates a locution *L* whose conventional function is meant to be recognised. *S* also formulates an illocutionary act that should also be recognisable, for example, a question, request, or plea. The illocutionary force *F* can be, for example, prompting, descriptive, or accusatory. The speaker also intends that the content *Q* is recognised in a certain mode *M*, hence that the addressee recognises the intention that information is meant to be shared, or that a request or demand is formulated. Communication is successful when all three are recognised. Camp (2018) points out that communication is most resilient when the addressee not only believes that a certain content should be conveyed by the speaker, but also believes, demands, or strives for a certain aspect.

According to the proposal by Camp (2018), the CG, the CR, and the speaker's meaning have to be distinctly considered. Camp (2018) proposes that the CG is a construct that includes the CR and what is *mutually believed*. There is a crucial difference between what is *mutually believed* and *mutually accepted*, because some contents may be *mutually believed* for the purpose of the conversation, but are not accepted, and hence do not manifest in the CG (Stalnaker 2014: 46). Furthermore, participants may accept the contents but do not believe them (Camp 2018: 57). In addition, the CG is social, but not public (Camp 2018: 61). She states that the difference between mutual belief and acceptance is related to the gap

between what is manifest between the speaker and the listener and what they recognise to be manifest (Camp 2018: 48). Additionally, the speaker's meaning may remain private, while the CG inherits the publicly uttered facts or attitudes of the participants. They may not overlap with the private attitude, hence is it crucial to distinguish between the public persona and public commitments and private beliefs and the speaker's meaning. Knappe (2009b: 35) refers to the public persona as "image". Considering the Stalnakerian understanding of *belief*, one has to distinguish between mutual and individual beliefs. Mutual beliefs are defined as in (4.3.5).

(4.3.5) [Mutual beliefs are the] transitive closure of accessibility relations among the belief states of the relevant individuals, where individual beliefs are themselves defined in terms of epistemically accessible possibilities.

(Camp 2018: 56)

The CR reflects what is actually said in a conversation. However, the CG can also be updated by statements that are not explicitly stated. If it is mutually accepted, it enters the CG. Deniability results from the gap between the semantic meaning of an utterance, what was actually said and accepted, and what is believed about what is said (Camp 2018: 56). The conversational score refers to assumptions and features that are accessible, relatively salient, and plausible within the context of the discourse (Camp 2018: 60).

Based on these assumptions, Camp (2018) proposes the concept of insinuation. The connection between deniability and CG is an important aspect of Camp's argument. Everything that is explicitly said becomes part of the CG. Not everything both sides believe is part of the CG, but only what is signalled as commonly accepted, even if it is not explicitly stated. If a participant signals that they believe something without explicitly saying it and it is therefore not yet part of the CG, they can deny it. If the other participant believes and accepts the suggestion, then it only becomes part of the CG if it is clear that both sides believe and accept it. With insinuation, a speaker may signal that they believe a content, hence asking the listener to believe the content and willingly accept that both believe the insinuated content, while the speaker still can deny it because it is not in the CR if the hearer rejects the signal and does not believe or accept it. However, it may occur that the listener signals that they believe the content and then the speaker willingly accepts that it becomes manifest in the CG. Additionally, it may occur that the listener believes it for the purpose of

the conversation and does not accept it, and hence it does not enter the CG. The crucial aspect is that insinuation is closely correlated with acceptance and beliefs.

Camp (2018: 43) provides a set of examples because insinuation may appear in various forms as assertions (4.3.6) and questions (4.3.7) and in different social contexts, as for example the utterance in a marriage in (4.3.8). In addition, it can refer to different racial backgrounds as in (4.3.6) and (4.3.7) or signal suspicion as in (4.3.8). According to Camp (2022), a characteristic of insinuation is that the expression in the CR may appear innocent.

(4.3.6) You know that Obama's middle name is Hussein. I'm just saying.

(Camp 2018: 42)

(4.3.7) Perhaps you would feel more comfortable locating in a more . . . transitional neighborhood, like Ashwood?

(Camp 2018: 43)

(4.3.8) Wow, it's late! The party must have been really fun, huh?

(Camp 2018: 43)

Insinuations share the characteristic that there is an explicit statement that can be detected based on the CR. In addition, there are conversational cues through which the speaker hints at and reflects his beliefs, for example, in (4.3.6) that it is necessary to bring up the middle name of Obama, which could be attributed to a Muslim background, and to raise the notion of different racial backgrounds. In (4.3.7), the speaker may hint that if potential buyers have a distinguishable racial background or a different sexual orientation from the social norm in the neighbourhood, they can move elsewhere. In (4.3.8), the speaker may hint that the addressee has arrived late and may have more reasons to stay away than the fun environment of the party. The examples reveal a strong consideration of the context in order to interpret the meaning, which goes beyond the semantic meaning. Camp (2018) points out that the strategic planning of insinuation by the speaker can also intend "to produce cognitive effects in their hearers" (Camp 2018: 55), e.g. conveying a feeling of not being welcome in (4.3.7) or giving someone a guilty conscience in (4.3.8). Although insinuation does not have to be used antagonistically, insinuated messages are always planned to be deniable (Camp 2022: 236).

As questions are central to this work, I will take a closer look at the examples in (4.3.7) and (4.3.9) and then discuss the distinction between them and RQs. To make this distinction

clearer, I will first discuss the nature of insinuation. The speaker in (4.3.7) addresses a question to potential buyers who may belong to a different cultural or religious background or sexual orientation than the local majority in the neighbourhood. This is a highly strategic communicative statement: the speaker disguises a potentially controversial or discriminatory aspect by not explicitly addressing it but merely implying it. This communicative trick consists of the speaker aiming to let the listener come to the intended conclusion without having to state it openly. This allows the speaker to distance themselves from the statement or deny its interpretation in case of doubt. The responsibility for interpreting the utterance is thus transferred to the listener, who independently – but guided – deduces a certain implication from what is said. It is precisely this strategy that strengthens the effect of the statement: the conclusion does not appear to the listener as an opinion imposed by others but as their own logically deduced realisation. It is crucial that this realisation is not necessarily associated with the speaker, neither with regard to their convictions nor their intentions. Camp (2018) thus shows how questions, among other forms of expressions, can serve as an effective tool in strategic communication to indirectly convey sensitive or morally questionable content, subtly, manipulatively, and with a certain change in plausibility to the detriment of the recipient.

In cases in which the insinuation is functional, it is difficult for the *H* to challenge *S*'s denial of having meant *M(Q)* (Camp 2018, 2022). Camp (2018) points out that insinuation is practically useful for speakers as in (4.3.9).

(4.3.9) I'm in a bit of a hurry. Is there any way we can settle this right now?

(Camp 2018: 43)

In (4.3.9), the speaker states that they have little time and asks whether an issue can be solved immediately. The answer to the *y/n*-question can be “yes” or “no”. However, if the context is, for example, a traffic check, the interpretation may change. Typically, if someone is meant to get a speeding ticket, there will be an official letter and a fine. Thus, if someone asks for an unbureaucratic procedure, this invites the interpretation that the person aims to get around the fine and is offering, for example, a bribe in order to avoid prosecution. “On the record”, i.e. in what is actually said, the utterance is innocent and may be perceived as an information question. However, in specific contexts, there may be an additional, implicit meaning that one has to derive from the context setting. Instead of an information

question, the speaker “insinuates” bribery so the law will not be enforced (cf. Camp 2018: 51). The crucial aspect of insinuation is that the speaker offers the listener two alternative interpretations in order to avoid responsibility for the illegal purpose of corrupting a public official. In order to approach the difference between the form and the possible function, Camp (2018) argues that there is a distinction between the CR and the score. The CR “status mirrors a commitment the speaker is liable for defending” (Camp 2018: 59). Furthermore, Camp (2018) stresses the point that the CR is public as well as “linguistic insofar as the kind of commitment one undertakes by an utterance depends in part on the language game in which it is generated” (Camp 2018: 63). Consequently, the CR refers to linguistic markers, similar to a record of interrogation or transcript. The notion of score summarises various components of communication that are difficult to grasp as they do not necessarily leave linguistic markers (4.3.10).

(4.3.10) [The score refers to] evolving assumptions which govern the permissibility, relevance, and interpretation of sentences within the dynamic discourse structure: for features like the partitioning and relative accessibility of possibilities, and the existence and relative salience of discourse referents.

(Camp 2018: 60)

In her proposal, Camp (2018) claims that speakers strategically include the CR and also the score in order to achieve their goals, e.g. avoiding that the police officer reports their speed-limit violation. One notable aspect is that Camp (2018) also includes the role of the listener. The police officer can either react to the implicit message, take the money, and let the issue rest, or they might answer the unobjectionable *y/n*-question of the speaker. If the police officer accuses the speaker of an attempted bribe, they do not have any utterance they could directly quote as offering a bribe. In conclusion, the speaker may or may not get across their implicit message, and the listener may or may not become aware of the implicit message. Additionally, even if the implicit message is understood, the listener may decide to reject it. Thus, insinuations are double-edged swords; while the speaker is able to shift responsibility, they leave themselves “vulnerable to a commensurate form of interpretive foot-dragging [on the part of the hearer], in the form of *pedantry*: a refusal by *H* to pick up on and respond to *M(Q)* despite recognizing it as having been intended” (Camp 2018: 47). In (4.3.9), the police may accept the insinuation and both participants may accept that the

speaker meant to offer a bribe, here designated as  $M(Q)$ . If so, this suggestion becomes part of the knowledge of the participants in this context. Insinuations share similarities with implicatures, but can be distinguished from them as exemplified with (4.3.11) (Camp 2018: 45).

(4.3.11) A (standing by car on the side of the road): I'm out of gas.

B: There's a service station two blocks up State Street.

(Camp 2018: 45)

In (4.3.11),  $B$  perceives  $A$ 's utterance as an indirect question as to where they can get petrol and gives directions to the next service station. However,  $B$  implies “but does not say or assert, that the closest gas station is two blocks away [...]” (Camp 2018: 45; see also Grice 1975: 51). The implicature in (4.3.11) that  $A$  might get petrol at the service station  $B$  refers to can still be denied, but unlike an insinuation, it is unlikely that  $B$  planned his utterance in order to deny  $M(Q)$ , i.e. that  $A$  can get gas at the service station two blocks up State Street. Hence, insinuations become relevant when the speaker prepares to deny this statement. With respect to the example in (4.3.11), the objective is to stress Harris' observation that “the speaker's implicature is not a replacement for what they appear to say in this case, it is an additional message” (Harris 2020a: 11). It is questionable whether the cooperative principle is flouted or, through indirectness, complicated by the need for additional linguistic evidence (Harris 2020a: 11). However, this question cannot be answered at the current point, but has to be kept in mind for future analysis. The notion that the message is not replaced, but somehow supplemented, is useful for the analysis of RQs.

Camp (2018) discusses that figurative speech can also be used to insinuate. Therefore, utterances can be used to insinuate, but they do not necessarily have to be *insinuations*. In figurative speech, the speaker formulates an utterance that intentionally deviates from straightforward language use or literal meaning to produce a rhetorical or intensified effect. This figurative speech can be used to insinuate, but follows a different pattern than the insinuation processes proposed by Camp (2018). According to Camp (2018), the speaker locutes a proposition to be recognised as such and further illocutes a proposition that is also recognised as intended, and Camp (2018) proposes that insinuations differ in that sense from figurative speech. In addition, figurative speech does not necessarily have to be produced to deny a proposition. RQs are likely to be recognised as figurative language at the

time of utterance, and the listener recognises that the speaker does not want to receive an answer to the question that closes the information gap presented. Therefore, the first step of Camp's insinuation process does not occur directly. The speaker can continue to convey a certain content (*Q*) and communicate in a certain way (*M*). The difference from insinuations is that the RQ is already signalled as such at the time of utterance, and it is signalled to the listener that a certain communicative function is to be achieved, of which the insinuation can be a part, for example, if the question is asked to point out a controversial aspect that the speaker is prepared to deny.

The determining aspect of insinuations is that the speaker strategically considers the possibility of denying his implied statement. This is not the standard case with RQs, although the speaker can use RQs to insinuate. The similarity is that with insinuations and RQs, the listener is presented with a statement that can be interpreted in two ways. In the case of insinuations, the listener can accept the explicit statement and ignore the hints conveyed; in the case of RQs, the listener can answer the question or accept it as a RQ – at least in situations in which the listener also has the opportunity to answer the question. This is not the case in monologues. For example, in the case where Person *A* utters “Is the Pope Catholic?”, which is a familiar case of a RQ in a situation in which it is known to both sides that the Pope is Catholic, the information content is covered, and the speaker is not asking that a knowledge gap be closed. Person *A* thus formulates an explicit question that is recognised by both sides as figurative speech and whose propositional content is redundant. However, the speaker can utter the RQ to, for example, respond to another statement to show that some aspect is obvious. The speaker does not utter the RQ in a manner to plausibly deny the implicature because both participants know, and also know that the other knows, that the Pope is Catholic.

Parts of the proposal by Camp (2018) can be used advantageously in the analysis of RQs: What has been explicitly said and is found in the CR becomes part of the CG, thus we have a transparent reference point for what is to be described as being part of the CG. The CR can be found entirely in the CG in Camp's model. The CG still consists of beliefs that are accepted by both sides as mutual beliefs. The beliefs of the speaker can also be part of the CG if the hearer accepts them as beliefs of the speaker without accepting them as their own. The same applies the other way around. The CG also consists of points that we can assume are mutual beliefs. Furthermore, speakers signal with their utterances what they

consider to be a belief or relevant in the specific situation and described with respect to the notion of score. Due to the monologue situation in speeches, the listener can receive these without believing in them themselves, but accept them as speaker beliefs for the further unencumbered course of communication. Whether the speaker beliefs then become hearer beliefs cannot be said without a reaction of the listener. So far, the notion of insinuation in political speech has hardly been investigated and it will be considered in the further analysis in Chapter 5 (cf. Camp 2022). As previous analyses in Chapter 2 revealed, there are RQs whose answers are not to be found in the CG, or the speaker pretends that the question is to be found in the CG. In these cases, there are similarities to insinuations, as the speaker in certain situations – such as in political speeches – takes the opportunity to use the question to point out an aspect the relevance of which in context the question is intended to clarify. However, since the answer cannot be found in the CG, the implied statement can be denied. This possibility will be discussed in the further work in Section 4.5 and Chapter 5.

In summary, by insinuations, the speaker has a communicative intention in mind that they want to manifest in their listener. The listener is meant to “recognize, by means of this utterance, that she [speaker] intends for him to take her to be suggesting *Q* (or suggesting that she, or the hearer, will, or should *Q*) just as in standard cases of meaning” (Camp 2018: 55). If the speaker is challenged on the insinuated content, the speaker may be able to avoid conflict because the controversial statement was not uttered. Although the speaker may act as if the content is supposed to be evident to the participants, the speaker does not assume responsibility for it. This observation reflects challenging communicative situations in which speakers strategically aim to retain *plausible deniability*.<sup>6</sup> The listener may explicitly utter *M(Q)*, addressing the speaker or any other person, and thus accepts – willingly or unwillingly – the responsibility for *M(Q)*. If the hearer explicitly utters the content, the speaker can confirm its truth or desirability by, for example, saying “You said it, not me.” In

<sup>6</sup> The term originates from the U.S. Security Council: “As used in this directive, “covert operations” are understood to be all activities (except as noted herein) which are conducted or sponsored by this Government against hostile foreign states or groups or in support of friendly foreign states or groups but which are so planned and executed that any U.S. Government responsibility for them is not evident to unauthorized persons and that if uncovered the U.S. Government can plausibly disclaim any responsibility for them. Specifically, such operations shall include any covert activities related to: propaganda, economic warfare; preventive direct action, including sabotage, anti-sabotage, demolition and evacuation measures; subversion against hostile states, including assistance to underground resistance movements, guerrillas and refugee liberation groups, and support of indigenous anti-communist elements in threatened countries of the free world.” Office of the Historian, Department of State. National Security Council Directive on Office of Special Projects (NSC 10/2), Washington, June 18, 1948, <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1945-50Intel/d292>, accessed 25 August 2023; cf. footnote 17, Camp 2022: 237)

this case, “S’s denial of having meant Q sticks: they avoid being held accountable for Q, and often thereby for its ensuing practical consequences” (Camp 2022: 230).

Camp’s (2018) approach differs from other models in saying that the sets of relations may overlap but are distinct. The distinct treatment of the speaker’s meaning, the CG, and the CR is central in confirming the notion of insinuation (Camp 2018: 62–3). Camp (2018) argues that the CR is cross-contextually stable and includes the level of commitment. According to Camp (2018), there is a difference between commitments that the participants “have actually made themselves liable for defending” and commitments the interlocutors accept as “conversationally available” (Camp 2018: 59). A differentiation Lewis (1979), among others, does not argue for. The classification between score and record, as distinct from the CG, deviates from Roberts (2018) and Stalnaker (2014). Roberts (2018) argues that the CG is part of the CR or score and Stalnaker (2014) understands the “score as a subset of discourse-related assumptions within the common ground” (Camp 2018: 58). The proposal by Camp (2018) offers a fruitful approach for grasping various aspects, e.g. assumptions, that do not necessarily have to be linguistically uttered but influence the development of the discourse.

The preceding Section 4.2 explored speech acts in general and Section 4.3 speech acts within the discourse context or the “language game” frameworks, recalling the terminology of Lewis (1979). Previous analyses revealed how speakers intentionally aim to shape the discourse. Camp (2018) argues for a proposal that differentiates between the concepts of CG, CR, and the intentions of the speaker. This work reveals how speakers make use of the interplay of beliefs and acceptance to influence the CG without the explicit utterance of content and taking deniability into consideration. The approaches of Roberts (2018) and Camp (2018) provide an insightful method to analyse complex phenomena such as insinuation due to its similarities to RQs. The previous section revealed how we can approach utterances by taking into account implicit and explicit features in discourse whose form and function may diverge. In the following Section 4.4, I will discuss speech acts and their communicative functions proposed in the literature. In Section 4.5, I will discuss the functions proposed for RQs in the literature in order to analyse RQs in the TSC-RQ.

## 4.4 Speech Acts and Their Communicative Functions

Section 4.2 reflected on different approaches to speech acts. In the following, I will examine the communicative functions of speech acts to derive possible functions of RQs. There are proposals to analysing functions that take significant account of the hearer and perlocutions. The Austian approach to perlocutions was elaborated by Harris (2016), Lepore and Stone (2010), and Saul (2018a) with respect to conclusions about the speaker's intentions. The objective is to investigate a linguistic strategy to elicit the speaker's interrogative intention, while also considering the possibility of a divergent communicative intention, specifically, the underlying objective of information seeking. They reveal insights into aspects such as emotionalisation. In an elaborated approach to functions as goals, Roberts (2018) argues for a consideration of the CG, QUD, and moves as well as how to describe those goals in regard to the respective concepts.

In the context of the current argument, the observations in Section 4.2 hold great significance as they allow us to differentiate between, for example, the illocutionary act of questioning or pointing to something and the intended effects or consequences that the speaker aims to achieve. The analysis of RQs from a pragmatic perspective involves delving into these communicative functions. This distinction becomes particularly important in the communicative setting of political speeches, where it is challenging to directly observe whether the listener actually carried out the intended act. From a speech act perspective, what is particularly significant is the speaker's ability to perform an interrogative or referential act with the illocutionary intent of prompting the listener to retrieve a specific memory or instance of shared knowledge. The speaker's goal lies in the performance of the act itself, which is intended to be fulfilled through the act of pointing to something in an unconventional manner. Understanding the nuances between the locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts becomes vital when analysing political speeches, as it sheds light on the speaker's intentions and the unconventional methods employed to achieve their desired outcomes.<sup>7</sup>

As discussed, a speech act in the traditional sense, as established by Austin (1962) and Searle (1975), consists of three acts: the locutionary, the illocutionary, and the perlocutionary

<sup>7</sup> Austin (1962: 121–22) provides the preliminary test of “in saying” and “by saying” but refrains from making it a distinct test. It is rather a “slippery test” (Austin 1962: 130) but is nevertheless worth considering (Austin 1962: 131).

act. The perlocutionary act is not conventional and is performed by “what we bring about or achieve *by* saying something, such as convincing, persuading, deterring, and even, say, surprising or misleading” (Austin 1962: 108). Austin (1962) emphasises the distinction between effects and consequences that are planned and those that occur unintentionally: “(i) when the speaker intends to produce an effect it may nevertheless not occur, and (ii) when he does not intend to produce it or intends not to produce it it may nevertheless occur” (Austin 1962: 105). According to Austin (1962), the distinction between illocutionary and perlocutionary is necessary insofar as they “do” something different; while the illocution refers to the “action we do [...], perlocution [refers] to its consequences” (Austin 1962: 110). The reason is that by asking a question, the speaker simultaneously “does” the action of asking a question. However, the consequences such as emotionalisation refer to the perlocutionary notion of speech acts. These consequences are part of the hearer’s side. There are cases that are challenging with respect to their classification, such as in the case described in (4.4.1) (Austin 1962: 118).

(4.4.1) Certainly we can achieve some sequels of perlocutionary acts by entirely non-conventional means (or as we say ‘unconventional’), by acts which are not conventional at all, or not for that purpose; thus I may persuade some one by gently swinging a big stick or gently mentioning that his aged parents are still in the Third Reich.

(Austin 1962: 118)

Austin (1962) proposes that there are cases in which the speaker unintentionally points to something but does not intend to invoke the literal meaning of the utterance. Instead, the speaker wants to invite a different inference. In (4.4.1), Austin (1962) provides an example in which the speaker points out to the listener that their parents are still in the Third Reich. The speaker’s intention may not be to say that they are actually in the Third Reich but that they were either killed in war or that their thinking still aligns with the Third Reich ideology. According to Austin (1962), this unconventionality is a characteristic of perlocutionary acts (Austin 1962: 108). However, Austin (1962) does not elaborate on this.

In contrast to previous treatments of perlocutionary acts as strictly oriented towards the hearer’s side, several attempts (Harris 2016; Lepore and Stone 2010; Saul 2018a; Staffeldt 2007) have been made to approach perlocution as “perlocutionary aim” or “perlocutionary

success”. Additionally, “perlocutionary consequences” (*Emotionale Effekte als perlokutionäre Folge-Effekte, translation by MER, August 2023, Luppold 2015: 389*) are attributed to emotional effects, which are evoked by the speaker through the chosen form and linguistic devices. They do not have to be linked to expressives and can be achieved by any other speech act type. The effects arise in addition to, for example, an accusatory statement or an accusation by the speaker; nevertheless, they may have been considered by the speaker, as proposed by Harris (2016), Lepore and Stone (2010), and Saul (2018a). The notion of perlocutionary acts is strongly dependent on the listener’s psychology, context, and interpretation. In order to analyse them, a detailed analysis of the listener is necessary. This makes perlocutionary acts difficult to analyse systematically, unlike illocutionary acts, which focus on the speaker’s intent (for example, promising, warning, or ordering). Hence, perlocutionary acts are subjective and challenging to classify. The intended effect may differ from the actual effect and requires a thorough analysis of the listener’s behaviour. Therefore, I refer to the speaker’s intention when analysing the functions.

In order to approach RQs and their functions while taking the CG into account, I will consider the account proposed by Roberts (2018), who argues for an analysis of utterances in terms of the scoreboard that takes the CG, moves, and the speaker’s goals into consideration. Regarding the scoreboard, Roberts (2018) argues, all intentions can be derived from the goals and intentions involve commitments to the goals (Roberts 2018: 323). Goals are either domain goals or discourse goals in as (4.4.2).

(4.4.2) **Domain goals** and the associated **plans** to achieve them are the things the interlocutors are publicly committed to achieving in the world and the strategies they adopt to do so. These are relevant in the language game insofar as they may indirectly motivate and constrain the interlocutors’ linguistic interaction.

**Discourse goals** are a distinguished type of domain goal, those the interlocutors are jointly committed to achieving in the discourse itself. These are represented by questions, often implicitly posed, which guide the interlocutors’ inquiry. You can think of these as issues or topics under discussion. These, too, are organized, to reflect an underlying plan for achieving these goals, into **strategies of inquiry**.

(Roberts 2018: 323)

In order to be maximally effective, Roberts (2018) claims that the “discourse must be orderly” (Roberts 2018: 323). The discourse is organised by the players’ immediate goals and intentions in playing the game. Therefore, the intentional structure is defined as in (4.4.3).

- (4.4.3) **The intentional structure of discourse:** The structure of discourse interaction is designed to help retrieve the speaker’s intended meaning for a given utterance, in view of the goals of the interaction. This is what makes it reasonable to intend that one’s audience will recognize that one intends them to grasp a particular meaning (Grice 1957), even when it is underdetermined by the conventional content of what one says.

(Roberts 2018: 324)

This observation refers to Bratman (1987), who argues that it is necessary for all participants to make their utterances in a manner that supports the prevailing intentions in the current discourse to be rationally cooperative. According to Roberts (2018: 324), a crucial way to examine the structure of a discourse is to consider the QUD. Hence, its orderliness is reflected in the QUD. The QUD is meant to “[reflect] the interlocutors’ goals at any point in a discourse” (Roberts 2018: 324). This is defined in the relevance constraint that “in order for an utterance to be rationally cooperative it must address the QUD” (Roberts 2018: 324).

- (4.4.4) An utterance *m* **addresses a question** *q* iff *m* either contextually entails a partial answer to *q* (*m* is an assertion) or is part of a strategy to answer *q* (*m* is a question) or suggests an action to the addressee which, if carried out, might help to resolve *q* (*m* is a suggestion).

(Roberts 2018: 324)

In order to exemplify her approach to speech act recovery in the discourse context, Roberts (2018: 339–40) provides the following conversation between Joan (4.4.5) and Bart (4.4.6).

(4.4.5) Joan

- a. I want you to get a checkup.
- b. Please get a check-up!
- c. Will you please get a check up?

(4.4.6) Bart

- a. OK. I'll make an appointment with Dr. Josephson for my annual physical.

(Roberts 2018: 339)

In all three utterances by Joan in (4.4.5) her intention is that Bart undergoes a medical examination. Her intention is recoverable and recovered in (4.4.6) – if we assume “she is his wife, mother, friend [... and] Bart [...] wants to please her” (Roberts 2018: 340). In contrast to the taxonomy by Searle (1975), Roberts (2018) argues that an analysis as indirect requests can be neglected because the context of the utterance allows Bart to infer Joan's request to make an appointment with his physician (Roberts 2018: 340–41). Bart's response signals that he understood Joan's request, and thereby the request becomes felicitous; consequently, the preparatory and propositional content conditions match. Bart is able to fulfil those conditions, and – at the time of their conversation – they are entailed by the CG. In the following, if Joan understands Bart's response as a sincere follow-up assertion, the sincerity and essential condition are successfully met. Bart's utterance (“OK”) in response to Joan signals his commitment to accepting Joan's proposal. Finally, the relevance condition is satisfied because Bart provides a plan of action regarding how he aims to meet the request (Roberts 2018: 341). The uttered plan means that they have a joint goal, and Bart publicly commits to achieving this goal (Roberts 2018: 341). In the case of Bart and Joan, we can assume that they share similar power positions, which makes it easier to determine their goals and recover their intentions. This stands in contrast to situations where participants have unequal power distributions and their goals are more difficult to decipher or, with respect to the utterance in (4.4.5), are meant as an order rather than a wish. Roberts (2018) exemplifies this with examples in which the context changes but the explicit utterance remains the same. In addition to the speaker, the listener, Joan here, has different motives for possibly accepting them (4.4.7)–(4.4.9) (Roberts 2018: 345).

- (4.4.7) [Joan is tired and has a lot of bags to carry home after a long day shopping. Her usual way home would be via the subway, but her girlfriend says sympathetically:]  
Take a taxi.

(Roberts 2018: 345)

- (4.4.8) [The boss is angry and irritated with an employee Joan who has been late to work several times lately because her car keeps breaking down. She claims [s]he can't

afford to get a new car, but the boss gives her a withering look and says:] Take a taxi.

(Roberts 2018: 345)

(4.4.9) [Joan had to work late and her husband is worried about her traveling home late at night on the subway alone. Talking to her on the phone before she leaves the office, she insists she'll be just fine, but he says:] Take a taxi!

(Roberts 2018: 345)

The locutionary act “Take a taxi” is the same in all three examples (4.4.7), (4.4.8), and (4.4.9), however, embedded in the contexts, which are influenced by several constraints, the interpretation changes because of variations in plausibility and relevance.<sup>8</sup> It is not important whether the speech act is directly or indirectly uttered or whether specific performative verbs are used to signal the intended act. According to Roberts (2018), the speaker’s goals and intentions, the CG, and the power relations are sufficient to recover the communicative functions of the speech acts (Roberts 2018: 345). With respect to RQs, this observation is valuable because in order to grasp the proposed goals of the speaker, a close consideration of the discourse context is required. Roberts (2021) provides the RQ in (4.4.10) to exemplify her proposal.

(4.4.10) Context: A and B both know that A has no money to spend on non-essential items.

A: I’m really tempted to buy this coat. It’s on sale!

B: Does it fit in your budget?

(Roberts 2021: 12)

The recovery of RQs can be illustrated by (4.4.10) (Roberts 2021: 12). *B*’s intention is not to propose the proffered content but rather to point to the mutually known fact that *A*’s budget does not allow for the purchase of a coat, which both are aware of. Thus, the speech act functions as a reminder in their conversation. Roberts’ (2018, 2021) proposal discusses the importance of intentions, the CG, and power relations in order to classify a speech act and its functions as such, without classification as direct or indirect. Roberts (2018) argues for an approach that considers utterances whose grammatical mood differs from their pragmatic

---

<sup>8</sup> See also Ferreira (2008: 216) for *plausibility*.

mood without the need to classify them as direct or indirect but as speech acts, taking into consideration their goals in the discourse context. Roberts (2018) introduces the notion of goals, which are associated with commitment. Domain goals refer to the individual in the discourse context, while discourse goals are the goals to which they are jointly committed. In a monologue, one can derive the domain goals from the speaker, but without the turn-taking, the goals the participants are jointly committed to cannot be described. In order to achieve those goals, speakers may utter RQs, such as example (4.4.10) to implicitly signal that the listener should not buy a coat. Hence, RQs are strategies and may reflect a plan to achieve a discourse goal that can be analysed taking into account the discourse context.

I propose to refer to the acts the speaker aims to achieve, whether they are similar to the notion of domain goals or perlocutionary aims, as functions (Athanasiadou 1991; Farkas 2024b; Ilie 1994; Molnár and Winkler 2026; Schoepsdau 1996). As a result, the terminology is detached from commitment (Roberts (2018) and “goals”) and perlocutionary with its close association to the listener and follows Athanasiadou (1991), Farkas (2023), Ilie (1994), Molnár and Winkler (2026), and Wong and Yap (2015) in their pragmatic understanding of RQs. Due to the strategic setting and planning, I propose describing the functions as “strategic functions” according to Molnár and Winkler (2026), presented in Section 2.2. The aspect of the “strategy” is a common feature of the proposals discussed and is related to the intention of the speaker (Knape 2000; Knape, N. Becker, et al. 2009; Knape 2015; Martin 2015; Weyland 2017; Winkler 2015b). According to Knape, N. Becker, et al. (2009), strategy can be described as in (4.4.11):

(4.4.11) A strategy (1) is a mental construction; (2) is oriented towards a goal (or several goals), i.e. a desired state in the future; (3) regulates concrete action (internal perspective) or behaviour (external perspective); (4) is necessary in problematic selection or decision-making situations; and (5) is subjectively considered optimal. (*translation by MER, August 2024*)

(Knape, N. Becker, et al. 2009: 162)

In a political speech, a strategic communicator has the persuasive intention of influencing the audience through their speech so that they end up voting for them. The active communicator (orator) is guided by a specific and inherent interest to persuade the listeners. The techniques they use to achieve this, among others, and which I examine, are RQs. In

election campaign speeches, the speaker seeks either to change the voter's point of view or to strengthen their intention. To achieve this, strategic communication planning is necessary. The speaker's goal (telos) is to win the election. I refer to strategy because the speaker chooses certain linguistic means, in this case RQs, to achieve this goal. The importance of looking beyond the propositional content has been emphasised and elaborated in order to examine the functions the speaker may aim to achieve with the utterance. In Section 4.5, I will discuss previous proposals on the functions of RQs.

## **4.5 Rhetorical Questions and Their Communicative Functions**

The previous discussions have considered the communicative functions, referred to as perlocutionary acts or goals, in general. In the following, I will narrow down the focus to the communicative functions of RQs. Given the unique nature of RQs, it becomes essential to employ pragmatic reasoning to uncover their meaning beyond the surface level of the sentence. Taking a simple look at RQs in terms of their propositional content would overlook the persuasive elements and strategies employed by the speaker. To shed light on the various functions of RQs, I will examine previous observations and findings from notable sources. Observations have been made by scholars such as Athanasiadou (1991), Farkas (2024b), Ilie (1994), Meibauer (1986), Molnár and Winkler (2026), Schoepsdau (1996), and Wong and Yap (2015). RQs are described as a “mismatch between form (interrogative) and function (close, though not identical, to assertion)” (Farkas 2024b) or as ambiguous between form and function (Hartmann, Ebert, et al. 2023; Winkler 2015a). The observations refer to the interrogative form of the utterance and their “feel of an assertion” (Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 302). Their indirectness can be used strategically and is seen as highly persuasive (Egg 2007; Ene 1983). RQs have stimulating effects on the audience and are “looked upon as the reiteration of one main idea disguised under various forms, all of them converging towards a highly marked effect of persuasion” (Ene 1983: 38). Ene (1983: 41) argues that the speakers make use of broad generalisations, common sets of presuppositions, and the assumption that the listeners will not reject their utterance. Ene (1983) points to the importance of context, hearer-orientation, and the speaker's potential strategy for the development of

the discourse. She links this observation to the indirectness of RQs and how the speaker indirectly considers the range of possible utterances that may follow. RQs have, according to Ene (1983), a “double-faced structure” that requires an analysis on several levels, e.g. the sentence and context levels. According to Meibauer (1986), the speaker explores the function of the RQ to encourage the listener to think about the content of the question and adopt the content at the same time. RQs tend to include strong opinions; however, their force does not rest solely on the exploration of the formal appearance, but also includes various contextual circumstances (Meibauer 1986: 170). This notion is shared by Caponigro and Sprouse (2007), Harris, Fogal, et al. (2018), and Ilie (1994). Because the utterance loses its function of closing a knowledge gap, the listener has to perform a reasoning process to contextualise the intentional meaning. Drawing upon these scholarly works, my aim is to provide a comprehensive understanding of the potential functions of RQs to analyse the questions that appear in the corpus of Donald Trump’s speeches. This analysis will contribute to the existing body of knowledge on RQs from a pragmatic perspective, allowing a deeper understanding of their communicative importance.

Athanasiadou (1991) argues that the discourse function of the RQs is to provide information (4.5.1), to utter something that the speaker perceives as trivial or well known (4.5.2), to give emphasis to some particular point (4.5.3), or to express wonder (4.5.4) (Athanasiadou 1991: 108–9).

(4.5.1) Do you know that it is 12:30?

(4.5.2) Who else burns a cheque if not an idiot?

(4.5.3) What could be more wonderful than the universe?

(4.5.4) Isn’t she pretty?

(Athanasiadou 1991: 108–9)

All functions refer to the intention of the speaker and the prediction of the behaviour of the listener (Athanasiadou 1991). She argues that “we thus judge how something is said and by whom”<sup>9</sup> (Athanasiadou 1991: 108). Athanasiadou (1991) concludes by observing that “[f]ormality characterizes the use of questions of indirect requests and social relationships the use of rhetorical questions” (Athanasiadou 1991: 119). Her account is interesting with

<sup>9</sup> Emphasis by Athanasiadou (1991: 108).

respect to the notion of relationships and the way information is obtained by speakers of equal status and speakers with great social disparity, similar to the different power relations pointed out by Roberts (2018). However, she does not provide a replicable method for identifying the different functions. I suggest that it is not fully clear how to distinguish between examples (4.5.3) and (4.5.4) with respect to their classification.

In addition, the proposal by Ilie (1994: 128) provides the following definition of RQs, which includes the notion of features and functions.

- (4.5.5) A rhetorical question is a question used as a challenging statement to convey the addresser's commitment to its implicit answer, in order to induce the addressee's mental recognition of its obviousness and the acceptance, verbalized or non-verbalized, of its validity.

(Ilie 1994: 128)

Ilie (1994: 128) observes three main discourse functions of RQs in a political context (4.5.6).

- (4.5.6)
1. to induce assumptions, beliefs, ideas, in the addressee's mind
  2. to reinforce the addressee's assumptions, beliefs, ideas
  3. to alter the addressee's assumptions, beliefs, ideas

(Ilie 1994: 128)

Ilie (1994) focusses on an analysis of RQs integrated in a theory that relates RQs to possible responses. Hence, in this framework, the functions are closely connected to their responses, and thus, there is a very limited set of examples for the functions quoted in (4.5.7). Ilie (1994) states that the three main discursive functions can be fulfilled by the verbalised responses listed in (4.5.7).

- (4.5.7)
1. to reinforce the implication of the rhetorical answer
  2. to qualify the implication of the rhetorical answer
  3. to cancel the implication of the rhetorical answer

(Ilie 1994: 128)

Ilie's (1994) proposal focusses on the relation between questions and answers and provides only a small number of examples that exemplify the functions of the RQs. The question in

(4.5.8) is meant to persuade the listener and to amplify the impact of the implicit statement that *No responsible Government can possibly tolerate that* (Ilie 1994: 54).

(4.5.8) *Unless the Government start listening to Members of Parliament like me who represents towns such as Halifax, unless they stop turning their back on manufacturing, and unless they are prepared to help towns such as mine and restore assisted area status where it has been removed. I believe that times look even bleaker for our increasingly divided country. **How on earth can any responsible Government tolerate that?***

(HANS 30, Parliamentary Debate on the Address, 26.06.1987; Ilie 1994: 54)

(4.5.9) *Some of us warned them then that might not happen, because the longer that Israel remained in those territories, the greater would be the demand from the right wing in Israel for them to be incorporated into the state of Israel. **Who can say that we were wrong?***

(HANS 126, Parliamentary Debate on Northern Ireland, 7.09.1990; Ilie 1994: 55)

The example in (4.5.9) is used to mitigate the implicit message *Nobody can possibly say that we were wrong* and the example functions as self-assessment (Ilie 1994: 54–55). There is a lack of further examples that refer to the functions introduced in the list by Ilie (1994) in (4.5.6). Additionally, it remains unclear whether and to what extent the context, linguistic markers, e.g. “how on earth” as in (4.5.8), and the speaker’s possible intentions influence and determine the proposed functions of RQs. Thus, replicability is challenging.

When referring to political speeches, there are only a few empirical studies in English.<sup>10</sup> Nowak (2016) analysed the use of RQs in the Polish Parliamentary discourse in “Posing Questions without Asking” and focused on this specific national type of parliamentary discourse. In this institutional case, the speaker is allowed to ask only one question. As a result, the speakers pose complex questions, including statements and questions. Nowak (2016) argues that the questions are used to hide the speaker’s personal opinions. His observation can be transferred to other political settings (Nowak 2016: 58). However, I am hesitant to call the questions provided in Nowak (2016) rhetorical because they aim to elicit an answer.

<sup>10</sup> For German, the picture is slightly different. Kegel (2012) provides a coherent and insightful analysis of the political speech “Sportpalastrede” in German by Joseph Goebbels.

With respect to political speeches, Wong and Yap (2015) present an analysis of the possible functions of RQs that consider the formal appearance, topic, purpose, and electoral tendency of the respective state in which the speech was delivered. According to Wong and Yap (2015: 647), the various functions can be classified as persuasion, self-promotion, challenge, and doubt-inducing. It is highly important to add here that Wong and Yap (2015) suppose that all the stated questions are rhetorical, and that they did not consider different communication settings or special questions types as proposed in Chapter 3.<sup>11</sup> Wong and Yap (2015) examine the election campaign speeches by Barack Obama and Mitt Romney (2011–12). Wong and Yap (2015: 651) observed that Romney uttered more RQs in swing states and Democrat-safe states. In addition, they observed that Romney preferred more indirect *wh*-questions in Democrat-safe states and more direct or more “aggressive” *y/n*-questions in swing states (Wong and Yap 2015: 656). In the following, I will briefly introduce their functions.

#### **a. Persuasion**

(4.5.10) Wouldn't it be great if we could look back on the last four years with confidence that the crisis had been confronted and we'd turned the corner toward a brighter future?

(Mitt Romney; Wong and Yap 2015: 646)

The RQ (4.5.10) is meant to hold the listener's attention and persuade them that Romney is a better candidate than his opponents. Additionally, there are three other different sub-aspects: inducing doubt, self-promotion, and challenge.

#### **b. Inducing doubt**

(4.5.11) It is often asked why is this recovery the slowest on record?

(Mitt Romney; Wong and Yap 2015: 647)

According to Wong and Yap (2015: 646), the RQ serves to synchronise the beliefs of the speaker and the addressee. The question form is perceived as planting seeds of doubt in the minds of the listeners and is used to discredit the opponents in a subtle way. Through its indirectness, the RQ is meant to be more effective, since the listener has to come to their own conclusion, even though the set of answers is limited. In this way, the speaker creates an

---

<sup>11</sup> At least there is neither an analysis in order to distinguish between rhetorical and ordinary questions, nor a distinct classification of RQs.

illusion of free choice (Wong and Yap 2015: 647). Wong and Yap (2015) include declarative questions as in (4.5.11), because they accept every utterance with a question mark, as a RQ (as I understand their approach). They describe the question as more direct because the speaker explicitly refers to the frequently asked question about slow recovery. It is debatable whether the example in (4.5.11) is a RQ because it is a reported question.

### c. Self-promotion

(4.5.12) Do you want a president who will celebrate success, not attack it?

(Mitt Romney; Wong and Yap 2015: 647)

The example in (4.5.12) is a *y/n*-question asking what type of president the audience prefers. In contrast to the direct form in (4.5.13), (4.5.12) is more indirect and the speaker emphasises the differences between himself and his opponent in order to present himself better (Wong and Yap 2015: 647). Wong and Yap (2015) argue that the speaker aims to present himself as the best candidate for U.S. president.

### d. Challenge

(4.5.13) Do we want a president who will try to explain again why his policies haven't worked? Do we want a president who will keep promising that this time he will get it right? Do we want a president who keeps telling us why he's right and why we're wrong? [...]

(Mitt Romney; Wong and Yap 2015: 663)

In (4.5.13), Romney indirectly criticises incumbent President Obama without naming him and questions his competence as president (Wong and Yap 2015: 663). The *y/n*-questions challenge Obama's policies and are intended to leave a strong negative impression on the listeners' minds (Wong and Yap 2015: 655). Challenging RQs are supposed to link well-known and obvious facts with logical acceptability (Ilie 1994: 128). This form is powerful because it elicits mental recognition of an obvious problem that is supposed to be easily solved and is meant to show the incompetence of the political opponent (Ilie 1994; Wong and Yap 2015).

There are various concerns that I aim to address with regard to the analysis proposed by Wong and Yap (2015). It remains unclear whether all questions in their analysed speeches are rhetorical and how Wong and Yap (2015) define RQs. Furthermore, the distinctions between functions are somewhat imprecise, as the function "induce doubt" appears similar to the

function “challenge”. Wong and Yap (2015) introduce “persuasion” as a distinct function, although they later claim that the three other types are sub-types of “persuasion”. I argue that a persuasive intention is fundamentally present in an election campaign speech (Knape, N. Becker, et al. 2009: 163). With respect to RQs in a speech from an election campaign, two aspects are central: the setting and the form of communication. In addition, the choice of an ambiguous form–function mode of expression reflects the persuasive character.

Farkas (2023)<sup>12</sup> argues that a speaker uttering a RQ aims to make a rhetorical point, which is the speaker’s immediate public goal and can be found in the previous context. Farkas argues for an approach in terms of the Table framework (Farkas 2023, 2024a, 2024b). Her theoretical framework examines how propositions are introduced and integrated into the CG. The Table model examines different methods or processes for adding information to the CG and refers to their epistemic status (e.g. belief, certainty, or reliability). The notion of “Table” is defined as in (4.5.14).

(4.5.14) Ordered set of issues under discussion, where an issue is a set of consistent non-overlapping propositions that partition the cs [context state].

(Farkas 2023: 10)

While OQs invite multiple moves to solve the issue at hand, RQs only pursue aspects (similar to assertions) as exemplified in Section 2.4. RQs include a mandatory conversational implicature that refers to the previous context and is defined as in (4.5.15).

(4.5.15) Sp commitments Ad is assumed to figure out based on the semantics of the uttered sentence, its status in the discourse and pragmatic reasoning. They are not at issue in the sense that they are not offered for open negotiation.

(Farkas 2023: 13)

Hence, Farkas (2023) proposes that RQs are similar to assertions, which but contrary to assertions that inherit commitment to the proposition, RQs inherit a conversational component. Farkas (2024b) proposes the following functions of RQs.

**a. to resolve an issue**

(4.5.16) Caitlin: Why did Amy vote for Bob?

---

<sup>12</sup> The work by Farkas (2023) is work in progress; it was presented at the University of Tübingen in January 2023 and will be published as an article in Farkas (2024b).

Don: Who supports whatever Amy says in every department meeting?

(Farkas 2024b)

**b. to challenge a stance**

(4.5.17) *Context: Amy asks Barbara to make her a sandwich.*

Barbara to Amy: Am I your mother?

(Farkas 2024b)

**c. to support or justify**

(4.5.18) I will help you with your mortgage. Am I not your mother after all?

(Farkas 2024b)

The consideration of the presuppositions, present in the previous context, is required to interpret the rhetorical point of the utterances exemplified above. The conversational implicatures the RQs include are assertable in the presented contexts: in (4.5.16) Don's goal is to express that Bob always supports Amy and hence, Amy voted for Bob. The presupposed answer to his question is "Bob always supports Amy." In (4.5.17), Barbara challenges Amy's request to provide her with a sandwich with the RQ, whose presupposed answer is that Barbara is not Amy's mother. In (4.5.18), the assumed answer is that the speaker is the mother of the addressee and therefore supports the previous claim that the speaker will support the addressee with the mortgage. The presupposed answer is a characteristic of RQs, but it is not required that it is actually asserted or is assertable in the context (Farkas 2024b). This also includes non-resolvable RQs in cases in which the context provides the necessary information that the RQ cannot be answered.

Farkas (2024b) stresses the relevance of the previous context in order to interpret the speaker's goal and the rhetorical point they aim to make with their utterance. Her proposal is detached from the criteria of possible answers but stresses that the conversational implicatures have to be assertable in the given context. RQs are redundant in the input context because the raised issue cannot be clarified by the question in that it provides new information to the context. Their close integration within the context provokes a mandatory conversational implicature on the speaker's side, which determines the question as such and is assertable in the context (Farkas 2024b). Farkas (2024b) points to the similarities to assertions – hence they do not ask for new information – but stresses the difference in their

addressee participation. The previous accounts reveal the strong notion of the context in order to interpret the speaker's intention in uttering a RQ. As we have seen, Farkas (2024b) stresses that the conversational implicature can be resolved and also uttered on the basis of the previous context. The rhetorical point determines the RQ as such.

Similarly, Biezma and Rawlins (2017) focus on the addressee-orientated impact of RQs, stating that while RQs resemble assertions, they are not merely statements. Instead, they guide discourse in a subtle, indirect way, engaging the addressee by presupposing shared knowledge that the addressee can either accept or reject. This interaction creates an effect on the CG, which represents the knowledge shared between the participants. When the addressee accepts the implied meanings of the RQ, new information may be integrated into the CG, dynamically evolving the discourse. They exemplify this observation with the example in (4.5.19).

- (4.5.19) a. A: I don't understand why John voted for Susan.  
b. B: Who do you think hired him? (with rhetorical prosody)  
c. A: Ah! That makes sense.

(Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 313)

In (4.5.19a), *A* states that they do not understand why John voted for Susan. *B* replies in (4.5.19b) with a RQ, signalled by rhetorical prosody, asking who hired John and implying "Susan". Hence, John voted for Susan because Susan hired John. *A* responds with confirmation and accepts the implied presupposition in (4.5.19c). Biezma and Rawlins (2017) argue that if the answer refers to a presupposition, and the context entails the answer that is signalled by a linguistic presupposition trigger (e.g. prosody), the presupposition can be accommodated (Biezma and Rawlins 2017: 312).

Previous analyses reveal that although RQs and OQs may share similar forms, they play distinct roles in conversation (Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Farkas 2024b; Ilie 1994; Wong and Yap 2015). Unlike OQs, which seek new information, RQs function more like assertions. They lack an inquisitive intent, instead prompting the addressee towards a specific understanding or rhetorical point established by the speaker. Ilie (1994) points out that RQs generally imply answers that are obvious to both the speaker and the listener, thus strengthening shared assumptions. Ilie's (1994) view suggests that questions lacking such clarity are not considered true RQs. Her proposed functions align with later analyses proposing that RQs

can confirm, reinforce, or alter the beliefs of the addressee, even if Ilie (1994) does not specifically mention the concept of CG. Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) propose that RQs are effective only when their answers are already part of the CG. Biezma and Rawlins (2017), however, present a more flexible view, suggesting that RQs can add new information to the CG if the addressee accepts the logical implications of the question. Thus, RQs can function not only by reinforcing existing knowledge but also by introducing new assumptions or conclusions that further shape the discourse.

Thus, all the proposals have provided valuable information on the phenomenon of RQs, and previous analyses have revealed the context dependence that is essential for such an analysis. The speaker's role, presuppositions that can be derived from the context, and conversational implicatures determine the classification as a RQ. RQs share similarities with assertions in their non-inquisitive appearance and the addressee-involvement with questions. Assuming this understanding of RQs, the functions of RQs depend on the rhetorical point the speaker aims to make. The issues raised are either part of the CG or even add to the CG by way of the acceptance of presuppositions or entailments.

There are three main functions, based on previous analyses, and summarised in (4.5.20).

- (4.5.20) a. **Function 1: Pragmatic Focusing to Manage the Common Ground:** RQs are used to put a known aspect that is part of the CG in focus to challenge that aspect or to signal its relevance, or to invite the hearer to question it. The aspect referred to is part of the CG.
- b. **Function 2: Forcing the Accommodation of Presuppositions:** RQs are used to raise presuppositions that are meant to be in focus or accepted for the reason of a CG update.
- c. **Function 3: Aligning Beliefs:** RQs are used to alter beliefs in order to update the beliefs on controversial topics.

Function 1 in (4.5.20a) refers to the previous analysis by Ilie (1994) and her proposal that RQs are used to “to induce and to reinforce”, as well as to the proposal by Farkas (2024b) that RQs are uttered “to resolve an issue” or to “to support or justify”. Further, it elaborates the proposed functions by Wong and Yap (2015) of “inducing doubt, self-promotion, and challenge”. I elaborate the functions by adding the notion of CG and summarise them in function 1. Function 2 in (4.5.20b) refers to the observation of Biezma and Rawlins (2017)

that presuppositions can be indirectly accommodated by means of RQs, and hence enter the CG. Function 3 in (4.5.20c) refers to the previously proposed functions of Wong and Yap (2015) for “self-promotion” and “inducing doubt” as well as the function proposed by Ilie (1994) “to alter the addressee’s assumption, beliefs, ideas” and “to challenge a stance” by Farkas (2024b). Their proposals share similarities and, therefore, I summarised them relative to the notion of CG.

In addition, I argue that the functions are strategic. The designation “strategic” takes into account the communicative setting. Election campaign speeches are strategic settings, and by choosing a question form in a context in which the speaker cannot receive an answer, the speaker is therefore pursuing a communicative goal other than obtaining new information. To this end, they strategically use a rhetorical device whose form deviates from its purpose.

The notion of persuasion is relevant in all functions. In their analysis, Wong and Yap (2015) only assign “persuasion” to certain rhetorical questions. They place persuasion as a function alongside inducing doubt, self-promotion, and challenge. In general, the intention to persuade can be assumed in a speech in an election campaign. The strategic communicator, Trump in this case, has the persuasive intention of influencing the audience through his speech so that they ultimately vote for him. To achieve this, strategic communication planning that involves certain linguistic means is necessary. The questions in speeches 5 and 12 have been analysed based on the identified functions (Appendix A.2). In Chapter 5, I present this analysis of the strategic functions of RQs in Trump’s political speeches.

## **4.6 Conclusion**

In Chapter 4, RQs have been examined in a pragmatic framework. The notion of speech act theory has developed into a complex field that includes a variety of notions such as the conventionalist, the normative, or the intentionalist views. Speech act approaches consider the larger meaning and performance potential of utterances and provide valuable insights into the potential of considering “intended” meanings (Grice 1975). RQs are speech acts that are uttered to fulfil a specific function in the discourse. The analysis of direct and indirect speech acts in RQs as well as the conventional and communicative acts results in the proposal to classify the speech acts following the proposal by Roberts (2018), which dispenses with the distinction between direct and indirect speech acts.

In order to investigate the functions of RQs in discourse contexts, proposals have been introduced that approach the contextual setting of RQs and examine their form–function ambiguity (Camp 2018; Molnár and Winkler 2026; Roberts 2018; Wong and Yap 2015). The question-based approach of Roberts (2018) serves as a valuable basis to examine the form–function ambiguity because it includes CG, QUD, goals, and power relations. Furthermore, the notion of “insinuation” is considered to be able to understand, for example, the plausible deniability that evolves from the flexibility in meaning in context. Camp (2018) differentiates between the CG, the CR, and the meaning of the speaker. Her approach serves as a remarkable analytical tool for distinguishing between what is actually said and what was (probably) meant, and how different beliefs interact. This notion is crucial for the different functions of RQs. I suggest that RQs are not insinuations but rather share similarities with insinuations, such as the speaker’s ability to deny  $M(Q)$ , the possible pedantry on the part of the hearer, and risk-mitigation. RQs are speech acts that aim to perform specific functions and invite possible interpretations.

In a pragmatic framework, previous proposals have been made for the communicative functions of RQs (Athanasidou 1991; Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Farkas 2024b; Ilie 1994; Meibauer 1986; Molnár and Winkler 2026; Wong and Yap 2015). In order to examine RQs, the approach by Roberts (2018) is insightful in focussing on the functions of the questions. In addition, Saul (2018a) presents remarkable observations and an analysis of how speech acts influence discourse and political speech. As I aim to show the intended functions of RQs, I prefer “strategic functions”, instead of “perlocutionary functions” or Roberts’ proposed “domain goals” because of the strategic planning of the speaker to persuade the listener and their choice to utter an ambiguous utterance in a persuasion-orientated discourse such as a political campaign speech.<sup>13</sup> Roberts’ (2018) approach provides analytical tools for perceiving RQs as moves in discourse without explicitly classifying their illocutionary act status. As questions, RQs provide contextual alternatives and, taking into account the CR, CG, and QUD, their functions can be revealed.

In Section 4.5, I presented previously observed functions of RQs (Athanasidou 1991; Biezma and Rawlins 2017; Farkas 2024b; Ilie 1994; Wong and Yap 2015). Three concurring functions were elaborated and adapted to include the notion of CG, reflecting the proposals on RQs that argue for a link between RQs and the CG. RQs may have other functions, but

<sup>13</sup> Although I adapted the terminology, this is still in line with Roberts’ proposal (pc. Roberts 2022).

these can be grouped under the umbrella categories of three main functions that are associated with their relationship to the CG. RQs may either refer to aspects of the CG or may also implicitly introduce information to the CG by means of the repair strategy as already discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.5. The third function is intended to align beliefs about especially controversial topics. Their wider applicability is examined in regard to the RQs by Donald Trump in Chapter 5.

As shown in Chapter 3, linguistic markers, for example, are not sufficient to determine either the classification as RQs or OQs, or any structural patterns that may signal the function of the question. Thus, in Chapter 4 I have suggested that RQs have to be examined in context to explore their functions. In order to examine the context as well as RQs in their contextual setting, I have examined proposals to analyse the context of discourse. My main concern is that previous approaches that analyse the functions of RQs have not provided methods to analyse them in their contextual setting, as well as the consideration of linguistic markers, the speaker's intentions, and the CG. The reason for elaborating on the notion of context was to provide a more detailed approach to the functions of RQs. Hence, I elaborated on the proposals and summarised their findings to examine linguistic markers, contextual clues, and possible strategies, as well as considered previous proposals on the functions of RQs. In Chapter 5, I aim to wrap up the previous discussions and examine the proposed strategic functions of RQs in Trump's presidential election campaign speeches from 2015–16.

# 5 Strategic Functions of Rhetorical Questions in Trump's Political Speeches (2015–16)

*Words can be like tiny doses of arsenic: they are swallowed unnoticed, appear to have no effect, and then after a little time the toxic reaction sets in after all.*

---

Victor Klemperer

## 5.1 Research Questions and Chapter Outline

In the following, I provide an investigation of the strategic functions of RQs in Trump's political speeches (2015–16) (TSC-RQ). In the previous Chapters 2, 3, and 4, I discussed different approaches to RQs to examine how their functions can be described. There are three main functions which the previous analyses revealed; these are summarised in (4.5.20) (here 5.1.1).

- (5.1.1) a. **Function 1: Pragmatic Focusing to Manage the Common Ground:** RQs are used to put a known aspect that is part of the CG in focus to challenge that aspect or to signal its relevance, or to invite the hearer to question it. The aspect referred to is part of the CG.

- b. **Function 2: Forcing the Accommodation of Presuppositions:** RQs are used to raise presuppositions that are meant to be in focus or accepted for the reason of a CG update.
- c. **Function 3: Aligning Beliefs:** RQs are used to alter beliefs in order to update the beliefs on controversial topics.

In this chapter, the functions presented in Section 4.5 will be discussed along with examples from the TSC-RQ. I will apply the previously discussed proposals and theoretical notions, e.g. the CG, the CR, the rhetorical point, and the speaker's intentions, to RQs from the TSC-RQ to examine their possible functions in the presidential election campaign speeches by Donald Trump in 2015–16. In order to grasp the power of Trump's rhetoric, an interdisciplinary approach is required. The functions of RQs in political speech have rarely been discussed empirically as presented in Chapter 4. The research questions listed in (5.1.2) guide this chapter.

- (5.1.2)
- a. How do the theoretical observations of ambiguity, CG, CR, and the speaker's possible intentions influence the analysis of RQs?
  - b. What functions can be observed in Trump's political speeches?
  - c. What is the relationship between the influence of RQs and the CG?

The questions are analysed taking into consideration notions of the speaker's meaning and intention (Camp 2018; Grice 1957; Harris 2020b) and the CG (Lewis 1979; Stalnaker 2014). Based on previous observations, I present an analysis that combines all relevant theoretical notions, e.g. forms of ambiguity, CG, linguistic cues, CR, and the intentions of the speaker, as well as the different forms of communication. The following investigation is based on a corpus that includes sixteen written versions of speeches by Donald Trump held during his presidential election campaign 2015–16. The complete corpus is provided in Appendix A.3.

In order to identify the function of any given question, I propose a systematic approach. First, I investigate the form of the utterance *U*. The analysis of the form includes the form of the utterance, the semantic content, coded words, ambiguity, and implicatures. I contextualise the question to examine the CG and the CR. I consider possible references which the speaker makes and examine whether the topic referred to can be found in the CR or is assumed to be part of the CG. If *U* is stated in a monologue, my aim is to infer the speaker's

potential intention considering what the speaker assumes the hearer might be able to infer for it to be reasonable for the speaker to utter *U*.

In cases in which the speaker refers to a specific aspect recorded or in the CG, I refer to it as the strategic function of pragmatic focus to manage the CG. The function of forcing the accommodation of presuppositions points to a referent that is neither on-record nor in the CG, but the speaker asks the RQ *as if* the referent is already part of the CG. The speaker thereby requests the accommodation of their belief as a shared belief and part of the CG without this being on the record. The third function is called alignment beliefs. It is signalled by code words such as “crooked”, adverbs, such as “badly,” or the use of defamatory speech. These three strategic functions are characterised by their distinct link to linguistic markers on the sentence level. I do not claim that the identified functions are exhaustive. The approach presented here allows me to analyse the questions in a coherent way and to clarify at which point the questions are classified according to specific considerations. If a speaker asks an OQ, they intend to gain new information. If they ask a RQ, they aim to manage the CG through pragmatic focus, strategic forced accommodation of *as if* issues, or the alignment of beliefs. In a campaign speech, the strategic communicator, Donald Trump, has the persuasive intention of influencing the audience through his speech so that they end up voting for him. According to M. Heinemann and W. Heinemann (2002), these techniques represent deliberate strategies in the realm of political communication, using language to achieve specific outcomes.

As an orator, Trump uses rhetorical techniques such as RQs to change the point of view or strengthen the voter’s intention. Trump is pursuing the goal of winning the election, which requires strategic communication planning. Hence, I call the functions of RQs “strategic functions”. Trump’s strategic communication highlights the interplay between linguistic techniques and campaign objectives. By framing his messages in a way that resonates with the concerns of the audience, RQs become tools to align his candidacy with the aspirations of voters. Ultimately, the success of these strategies is measured at the ballot box, where the persuasive power of language is translated into electoral results (Knappe 2009a, 2017; Knappe, N. Becker, et al. 2009). Trump’s use of RQs is designed to influence their thought processes, tapping into shared frustrations and values to elicit emotional responses. This aligns with the broader objectives of strategic campaign communication: shaping perceptions, mobilising voters, and ultimately achieving electoral success. However, not all scholars

agree on the singular persuasive intent of RQs in political speech. Wong and Yap (2015), for instance, argue that RQs may also function to emphasise key points or maintain audience engagement without necessarily aiming to persuade. However, in the context of Trump's campaign, these questions are integrally linked to his persuasive strategy. They work to consolidate his base's support while encouraging undecided voters to align with his vision. This analysis underscores the importance of rhetorical devices like RQs in political communication, illustrating how they serve as both engagement tools and persuasive mechanisms in achieving campaign goals.

## 5.2 Strategic Functions

In Section 5.2, I will present the analysis of the three strategic functions of RQs I identified while analysing Trump's political election campaign speeches from 2015–16. The following analysis of the functions taken into account in the context has been developed in line with previous studies, e.g. Farkas (2024b), Ilie (1994), Roberts (2018), Searle (1975), and Wong and Yap (2015), as presented in Section 4.5. The analysis of strategic functions will show how RQs contribute to the persuasive rhetoric of Donald Trump.

The terminology of the proposed strategic function 1 is based on previous work by Krifka (2008). I follow Krifka's (2008) approach to pragmatic focus as a method of CG management as well as to forcing the accommodation of presuppositions as a type of rescue strategy, as proposed by Lewis (1979). The latter is reconsidered by Stalnaker and Camp (2018) (especially Stalnaker 2014). I also draw on previous accounts of pragmatic focus as a tool for aligning beliefs (Staffeldt 2014; Stalnaker 1974, 2002). All examples are from Donald Trump (2015–16) and are listed in the TSC-RQ.

### 5.2.1 Strategic Function: Pragmatic Focusing to Manage the Common Ground

By means of the first strategic function that I discuss, the speaker aims to point out one aspect in the CG in order to evoke a larger field of associations in the listener. This function summarises the functions previously observed by Wong and Yap (2015) (“inducing doubt, self-promotion, and challenge”), by Farkas (2024b) (“to resolve an issue” or “to support or

justify”), and by Ilie (1994) and concentrates on the speaker’s relationship to the CG and strategic use of RQs. The RQs in this section are uttered to put a known aspect in focus to challenge that topic or to signal its relevance, or to invite the listener to question it. The aspect referred to is part of the CG. The RQs are characterised by their focus on a salient aspect in the CG. Saliency is understood as making something “salient” to contextually determine a preferred aspect and make it more accessible to the listener (Lewis 1979). The question functions as a CG management tool because, through the question, the context is organised into information packages. By way of the utterance, the speaker puts the semantic content on the table and evokes an inquisitive split. Trump uses the strategy in example (5.2.1).

- (5.2.1) a. When did we beat Japan at anything? (A.3.3)
- b. They send their cars over by the millions, and what do we do? (A.3.4)
- c. When was the last time you saw a Chevrolet in Tokyo? (A.3.5)
- d. It doesn’t exist, folks. They beat us all the time.
- e. When do we beat Mexico at the border? (A.3.6)
- f. They’re laughing at us, at our stupidity.
- g. And now they are beating us economically.
- h. They are not our friend, believe me. But they’re killing us economically.

(Donald Trump, Speech 1, A.3.3–A.3.6)

The utterance in (5.2.1a) is a *wh*-question, and reading it as an OQ, the speaker’s communicative goal is to elicit new information. In (5.2.1e), the speaker asks for a specific date, and a possible answer might be, for example, “We will beat Mexico at the border tomorrow.” In a rhetorical reading, the communicative goals change and require further elaboration. In order to approach the speaker’s intention, I will look at the example (5.2.1e) using the framework proposed by Searle (1975) in order to show several challenges such an analysis faces. Searle (1975) argues that there are five types of illocutionary acts: representatives, commissives, expressives, directives, and declarations. To be classified as such, an illocutionary act requires the direction words-to-world, is either true or false, and its sincerity condition is belief. The relevant belief in this example is the belief in the statement that “Mexico needs to be beaten”. A representative is not only a statement about the world in

terms of that “ha[ving] to do something with the interest of the speaker” (Searle 1975: 355). Representatives aim to describe an existing state of affairs and reveal the attitude of the speaker. As the utterance in (5.2.1e) has the form of an interrogative, the question arises of whether it is a directive speech act. Example (5.2.1e) appears as a *wh*-question asking for a specific time. The answer set is open, and a possible answer can be “We will beat Mexico tomorrow at the border” or “We will beat Mexico next week.” Based on the formal means analysis, the speaker asks for a date on which the border will be securely protected. The classification as a directive would mean that the addresser wants the addressee to do something, e.g. “Beat Mexico at the border”. The propositional content of directives is always that the listener does some future act *A*. In addition, Searle (1975: 356) argues that questions are directives because they request the listener to perform a speech act. The utterance in (5.2.1e) has the form of an interrogative, but the communicative setting prevents any kind of response from the audience. The speaker does not aim to close a knowledge gap with the help of the addressees, but invites a mental response, e.g. questioning the security situation at the border. Neither the required sincerity condition – that Trump wants the listener to do something – is fulfilled nor does the propositional content signal that the listener is supposed to do some future act *A*. Thus, the classification as a directive is not supported.

In an expressive, the speaker is neither trying to get the world to match the words nor vice versa, rather the truth of the expression is presupposed (Searle 1975: 356–57). If illocutionary verbs, for example, to “thank”, “congratulate”, “apologise”, or “deplore” appear, we would expect to see an expressive. The assertion can be summarised as “I deplore that Mexico has not been beaten at the border.” The question shows expressive elements because Trump is complaining about the situation.

With respect to the sincerity conditions of a declaration, the speaker, who has not been nominated yet, can make campaign promises but has no institutional authority to change the world or influence the political agenda of his party. However, after his nomination as the Republican candidate, he would have the institutional authority to make campaign pledges on behalf of the Republican party. In the given case, the question is not a declaration since Trump, at the time of uttering the phrase, had not yet been nominated as the Republican presidential candidate (and had not yet won any election). In addition, the implied assertion only describes a subject without any promise to change the matter. Thus, the proposed

taxonomy by Searle cannot provide a framework that explains the speaker's communicative goal in (5.2.1e).

I propose an analysis that includes further linguistic devices on the sentence level and a co-text analysis. The question follows the canonical word order and does not include a polarity item. “To beat” is lexically ambiguous and can refer to several contexts, e.g. sports or military combat, and can either be translated as to win against; to defeat or overcome; to do or be better than (someone); to excel in a particular, competitive event or hitting someone, e.g. with a fist. In economics, the verb “beat down” means to force the competition to accept a disadvantageous deal and “to beat” means to do better than the competition.<sup>1</sup> The lexical ambiguity adds to the number of possible interpretations and contributes to the plausible deniability of the speaker. The local adverb “at the border” narrows down the possible reading alternatives and makes an association with a sporting event or a trade context less likely, while a military context is a more likely reading.

The *wh*-form of the question allows a wide range of possible interpretations, especially compared to *y/n*-questions, which by default only allow *y/n*-answers (arguably, there is still the third possibility of “I don't know”). Some possible answers to the question under analysis here are listed in (5.2.2).

(5.2.2) Trump: When do we beat Mexico at the border?

- a. According to my knowledge, we will beat Mexico at the border in two weeks.
- b. I don't know.
- c. Hopefully soon.

The answer (5.2.2a) would require that the responder has military connections and is able and willing to share the information. The answer (5.2.2b) leads to the – intended or unintended – failure of the RQ, because it provides an answer to the question. The answer (5.2.2c) is an acceptable response to a RQ since the listener is responding to the possible interpretation that there may be some kind of necessity to beat Mexico at the border, which is signalled by the border aspect.

In order to examine the general strategy of Trump's use of questions, the co-text, the speaker's goals, and the CG are examined referring to Roberts (2018). Again and again,

<sup>1</sup> “to beat down”: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/beat-down>; “to beat the competition”: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/beat?q=beat%2C>, accessed 20 September 2025.

Trump poses the same question for  $x$ ,  $x$  being a supposed enemy of the U.S.: “When/how are we gonna beat  $x$ ?” The underlying question is “When are we, the U.S., going to reclaim our former military power and show our enemies that we can beat them all?” The sub-questions of that overarching inquiry concern the main enemies of the U.S. The previous questions in the co-text, referring to the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), China, and Japan, all imply a negative statement. Their negative implications influence the example (5.2.1).

- (5.2.3) They didn't know the room was too big, because they didn't have anybody there. How are they gonna beat ISIS? I don't think it's gonna happen.

(Donald Trump, Speech 1, A.3.1)

- (5.2.4) Our country is in serious trouble. We don't have victories anymore. We used to have victories, but we don't have them. When was the last time anybody saw us beating, let's say, China in a trade deal? They kill us. I beat China all the time. All the time.

(Donald Trump, Speech 1, A.3.2)

- (5.2.5) When did we beat Japan at anything? They send their cars over by the millions, and what do we do? When was the last time you saw a Chevrolet in Tokyo? It doesn't exist, folks. They beat us all the time.

(Donald Trump, Speech 1, A.3.4–A.3.5)

- (5.2.6) When do we beat Mexico at the border? They're laughing at us, at our stupidity. And now they are beating us economically. They are not our friend, believe me. But they're killing us economically.

(Donald Trump, Speech 1, A.3.6)

The utterances in (5.2.3), (5.2.4), and (5.2.5) are embedded in a monologue sequence, and its conventions limit the audience's interactional options to, for example, cheering. The speaker does not encourage the audience to respond (as in other examples; see Section 3.5.1 on questions between different forms of communication). He immediately continues with his speech. The function of the difference between the explicit answer and the reply (see Ilie 1994) is that Trump leaves room for interpretation and does not provide further information. Thus, he creates a powerful illusion of self-awareness. By way of several questions, Trump

points out several problematic issues such as ISIS in (5.2.3), unprofitable trade deals in (5.2.4) and (5.2.5), and finally in (5.2.6) he remarks on the border problems at the U.S.–Mexico border. Trump does not make assertions, but rather challenges, with the help of questions, the belief that the country is in a good state. The context created by (5.2.3), (5.2.4), and (5.2.5) shows that it is not appropriate to discuss a specific date in (5.2.6) but rather to doubt the state of the U.S. Thus, the pragmatic factors must be examined. There are possible implicatures that can be derived. The implicatures in (1.) and (2.) attack the U.S. military, whereas the implicature (3.) refers to a more general group of people, e.g. Mexican people, the military, or the government. All implicatures share the underlying belief that it is an urgent matter to beat Mexico at the border.

1. The American border patrols are not strong enough.
2. The American border patrols are not strong enough because the American government does not equip them properly.
3. The Mexican people/military/government are/is too strong to be defeated.

Trump presupposes that there is some kind of military battle or engagement at the border and that (as of the time of holding the speech) the U.S. is not winning. I suggest that the debate on the U.S.–Mexico border can be understood as background information. Hence, the aspects referred to in the RQ are part of the listeners' and speaker's belief sets and CG. The rest of this passage even suggests something more: that the "we", in this case the Americans, are being beaten. The question is posed to suggest that the audience should "reflect" on what it presupposes. The question is stated in order to shift the listeners' attention and evoke pragmatic reasoning rather than to invite the addressees to give Trump an answer. Thus, Trump asks the listeners to reflect on the presupposition that there is a battle at the border that "we" are losing. He says this, of course, with the tacit assumption that the U.S. ought to win. The question plus his follow-up statements also imply that a positive answer to this question will not be possible: "There will never be a day when we beat them – until we change the way we do business with Mexico." The speaker points to his view that the government is not capable of successfully leading the country and that there is a potential threat. Trump embeds the topic of danger, a topic that invites a large set of associations, into

the question to emphasise the need for stronger border control. He seeks silent confirmation for this from the audience.

The audience's attention is shifted to the ongoing debate about the U.S.–Mexico border. By asking (5.2.1e) Trump signals the relevance of the matter. In this context of a weak state, the question elicits the pragmatic reasoning that there are issues at the Mexican border that urgently need to be resolved. As Trump here introduces the border conflict for the first time within this speech, the record does not contain any further information, but it is likely that the debate is well known to the hearers and the speaker. Therefore, the U.S.–Mexico border issues are likely to be part of the CG. Trump signals that he believes the listener is capable of understanding his message. If everyone acts in congruence with Trump's belief that it is a relevant and urgent matter and also if the addressees themselves believe it, the relevance of beating Mexico at the border becomes part of the CG. However, it is also likely that both sides already share the belief that there are serious problems at the border. In this case, Trump merely reminds his listeners of it. Furthermore, mutual beliefs are updated by shifting notions that are already part of the CG. In Camp's insinuation model, the previously separated beliefs of the speaker and hearers develop into a shared section in the mutual belief part. Thus, the relevance of asking the question as well as the hearer's reasoning process enter the CG. The speaker's domain goals include the pragmatic reasoning process of the hearer – otherwise, he would not have stated a question – and then the reasoning process also enters their shared CG. The speaker signals the relevance of the item that is or becomes part of the CG by asking the question and shifting the attention to it.

This discussion contributes to the theoretical argument that RQs differ from assertions in that they include a question prompt. Responses can either be an answer to the explicit question (in this case “when”) or a reply to the pragmatic value of the RQ (it being an urgent matter to defeat Mexico). A declarative neither evokes a reasoning process nor does it shift the responsibility for its answer to the listener. If the hearer tells a friend that Mexico needs to be beaten at the border, it is – in this case as opposed to a declarative – the hearer who actually says it and commits to the proposition and not the original speaker, who might say, “I was just asking.” I propose that the speaker's intention is to leave a gap which is filled by the reasoning process of the hearer. The utterance is meant to strongly suggest the inference that the government is not competent, that the Americans are in trouble, and that there are security issues that will not change for as long as the current government is in charge.

In summary, the utterance (5.2.1e) reflects the intention of the speaker in his need to remind the audience of the border conflict. Example (5.2.1e) also reflects what he thinks the audience is capable of inferring. Trump signals that there are urgent and critical border problems that must be addressed. The difference between representative speech acts as defined by Searle (1975) and the proposed function in this section is that the latter does not necessarily represent how the speaker perceives the world and aims to describe it.

In the following, I will provide a further analysis of the example introduced in (1.1.1).

- (5.2.7)
- a. So you live in the inner cities.
  - b. You're African-American. You're Hispanic.
  - c. The schools are no good. There are no jobs. And it's totally unsafe.
  - d. And I say I will fix it.
  - e. What the *hell* do you have to lose? (A.3.521)
  - f. I'm going to fix it. We are all *gonna* fix it.

(Donald Trump, Speech 16, A.3.521)

The RQ in (5.2.7e) has the form of a *wh*-question and includes the NPI “the hell”. The possible answers are, for example, “I have a lot to lose”, “I have nothing to lose”, or “I have my job to lose.” In (5.2.7f), Trump continues and says that he will fix “it”. “It” refers to the previous statements in (5.2.7a)–(5.2.7c), in which he lists negative aspects of the lives of African-Americans, Hispanics, and those who live in inner cities, such as bad schools, high unemployment rates, and insecure surroundings. The CR provides the necessary information so that the only possible answer to the question is “Nothing” and it is salient in the context. The rhetorical point is that they have nothing to lose, and so they can vote for Trump – contrary to previous electoral tendencies for such groups to vote Democratic. Although Trump’s question was not intended to seek new information, the Congressional Black Caucus felt compelled to respond in a 130-page document: “We have a lot to lose” (Caucus 2017).

In example (5.2.7) the code word “inner city” is uttered in the co-text (5.2.7a). Since the co-text must also be taken into account when analysing RQs, I will discuss the special nature of code words at this point. In addition, they will be relevant in the analysis of RQs in Section 5.2.3. Code words (Henderson and McCready 2018; Khoo 2017; Saul 2018b), for example, dogwhistles, are an excellent example of how controversial messages can be

conveyed. Code words are meant to evoke certain effects that are different from “their meaning or illocutionary force” (Khoo 2017: 48). Dogwhistles are defined as (5.2.8).

(5.2.8) A dogwhistle is a speech act designed—with conscious or subconscious intent—to allow at least two plausible interpretations of a message, with one interpretation being a coded message targeted for a select audience and concealed in such a way that, at minimum, a broader or out-group audience is unaware of the existence of the coded interpretation.

(Witten 2023: 9)

The non-metaphorical meaning of the term “dogwhistle” refers to whistles that can be heard by the target audience (dogs), but not by others. The metaphorical meaning is that they are communicative acts that are effective despite being not fully understood by the audience or only by parts of the audience (Saul 2018a). Dogwhistles in political contexts are often meant to play on the racism of two kinds of voters, unconflicted racists and conflicted racially resentful voters as defined by Saul (2022) in (5.2.9).

(5.2.9) Unconflicted Racists: Do not accept the Norm of Racial Equality. But it’s still tricky to reach them, because a very clear message will lead those who accept the Norm of Racial Equality to reject [them].

Conflicted Racially Resentful [Voters]: Accept the Norm of Racial Equality. But harbour racial resentment. [There is a n]eed to appeal to racial resentment without obviously violating [the] Norm of Racial Equality.

(Saul 2022)<sup>2</sup>

Dogwhistles and code words may target different addressees and point to multiple messages or to an elaboration of the implicatures since dogwhistles and code words mainly rely on background knowledge and presuppositions. In (5.2.7a) Trump states “so you live the in inner cities” – such a phrase suggests a neutral bias. However, “inner cities” is coded language for “black” and is used in right-wing communities (Saul 2018b: 367). According to Henderson and McCready (2018), “inner cities” is a “code or euphemism for African American neighborhoods (especially stereotypically racialised views of such neighborhoods)” (Henderson and McCready 2018: 232). Henderson and McCready (2018) closely link dogwhistles

---

<sup>2</sup> See also Saul 2019.

to a specific persona of the speaker. Trump uses “inner cities” in a similar way to other right-wing speakers who use the phrase primarily in a welfare context, and while not being overtly offensive, the use of this specific expression makes it rather likely that he meant the racial stereotype of “lazy African Americans and [his own] racial view of their neighbors” (Henderson and McCready 2018: 232), an assessment that is also observed by Signer (2020: 66). The relation between Trump and race is a controversial topic (Desjardins 2017; Theye and Melling 2018). As he labelled an unspecified large number of Blacks as criminals and Mexicans as rapists, it appears unlikely that he would canvass for their votes.<sup>3</sup> The question’s context, too, is one of ostensibly needing to “save” African Americans from their poverty, which makes them lead certain lifestyles (being “lazy” and unemployed or criminal) within certain locations. In cases of mental responses by the listeners, they may accept the stated facts as givens. Trump addresses the ideal desire to free the suppressed (cf. Wodak 2016: 74). Trump engages in white saviourism and stereotyping, which are ultimately rooted in the right-wing ideology of white supremacy. Trump intends to erase the common assumption that Republicans do not care about people of colour by making Democrats appear to be the suppressors. Trump implies that he is the one who will help people in need. The RQ in (5.2.7e) serves to focus on the fact that nothing worse could happen to the voters due to the already bad state of their living conditions as listed by the speaker. Hence, the aspect is listed in the CG. The previous utterance in (5.2.7a) provides the contextual framework that all communicative participants are familiar with the mutual beliefs and with the help of the question, he continues to focus on this.

The example in (5.2.1) further emphasises the importance of the election. In example (5.2.1), the speaker lists arguments for why the country is in serious decline due to the current leadership. Thus, Trump strategically manages the CG and pragmatically focusses on content parts in the CG. On the sentence level, there are referents that can be anchored to linguistic markers in the pre-text or can be understood as background knowledge. By means of the next strategic function discussed in Section 5.2.2, the speaker aims to subtly introduce new topics.

At this point, I would like to stress the rhetorical difference between a RQ and an assertion, exemplified and discussed in the examples. The rhetorical difference lies in the speaker’s

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/jun/16/donald-trump-mexico-presidential-speech-latino-hispanic>; [https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/342190428675796992?ref\\_src=twsrc%5tfw](https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/342190428675796992?ref_src=twsrc%5tfw), accessed 23 August 2023.

communicative goals and the manner in which they are presented. A RQ may shift the attention to a specific topic in discourse, stipulate critical thinking, or guide the listener towards a desired conclusion. In contrast, an assertion is a straightforward statement or declaration of an opinion, suggestion, or belief. It is a direct expression of a position or claim without posing it as a question. For assertions, the CG update is automatic unless the listener does not agree with the assertion. In the case of information questions, the listener is expected to give an answer. In the case of RQs, the question form triggers the hidden – but known – meaning.

In summary, while a RQ is posed to provoke thought and engage the audience, an assertion is a direct statement or claim that presents, for example, a viewpoint without seeking a response. In addition, in political speeches, the seeming mismatch between the question form and the monologue setting as well as the lack of obvious answer or implicit statement evoke a pragmatic reasoning process. This observation has been exemplified in Section 5.2.1 and will be further considered in the next Sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.3.

### **5.2.2 Strategic Function: Forcing the Accommodation of Presuppositions**

The second function differs from the first function in the availability of the referent in the CG. The speaker aims to add new aspects to the CG by acting *as if* they were already known. Thus, Trump forces the accommodation of presuppositions in order to subtly add new aspects to the CG. In contrast to a declarative, the speaker asks a question in order to make use of pragmatic reasoning and distinctly evokes at least a mental reply. This function aims to add new information to the CG by acting *as if* there is background information. The speaker intends to make the listeners believe that they are already familiar with an aspect that is being referred to. It appears challenging for the speaker to refer to an anaphoric presupposition that has not been introduced before (Roberts 2015a). However, the speaker strategically makes use of the required pragmatic reasoning process. The listener may solve the challenge of reasoning that arises because of the lack of a referent via bridging, viz. to use shared knowledge, expectations, and discourse structure to fill in gaps in the given context (Roberts 2015a, cf. Clark 1996). The function is based on the observation by Biezma and Rawlins (2017), who propose that in using RQs presuppositions can be indirectly accommodated, and hence enter the CG. The speaker makes use of the repair

strategy, which was already introduced in Section 4.3. For better readability, I repeat the definitions of presupposition accommodation in (5.2.10) and repair strategy in (5.2.11).

(5.2.10) Presupposition accommodation is the process by which the context is adjusted quietly and without fuss to accept the utterance of a sentence that imposes certain requirements on the context in which it is processed.

(von Fintel 2008: 137)

(5.2.11) If at time  $t$  something is said that requires presupposition  $P$  to be acceptable, and if  $P$  is not presupposed just before  $t$ , then – *ceteris paribus* and within certain limits – presupposition  $P$  comes into existence at  $t$ .

(Lewis 1979: 340)

Accommodation of presuppositions is required in cases in which there is an apparent violation of the CG requirement. Violations of the CG occur frequently in communication and are part of a typical process in the evolution of contexts in response to incoming information (Stalnaker 2002: 710–1).

In Section 4.3, I examined a proposal by Camp (2018) showing how insinuated content can be the target of propositional anaphora and “dodgy epistemics of pragmatic interpretation” (Camp 2018: 50). Camp (2018) also shows why a speaker can often get away with denying that skilfully insinuated content was intended at all, even after successfully communicating it to the recipient (Camp 2018). The gap, i.e. the lacking reference in the utterance, which is filled by the addressee’s pragmatic reasoning process results in the accommodation of presuppositions to keep the conversation going and coherent. This observation strengthens the claim of Stanley (2015) that some propaganda can be understood as speech that intentionally aims to manoeuvre around certain types of content to avoid any form of responsibility. Camp’s (2018) and Stanley’s (2015) observations provide an insightful approach to examining questions that lack a referent either in the CR or in the CG. The second function, I propose, even doubles the power of the presupposition that is accommodated because its content becomes less deniable and the rhetoric effect is even stronger than in declaratives. I will exemplify the linguistic manifestation of this function with example (5.2.12).

(5.2.12) a. Emails also show that the DNC vice-chair was feeding information so much information to the candidate.

- b. Oh man, I want that why can't the Republicans do that? (A.2.122)
- c. Why can't Reince feed me information prior to a debate? (A.2.123)
- d. I'm so angry at the Republicans I want to be fed information like Hillary gets.

(Donald Trump, Speech 12, A.2.122–A.2.123)

The question in (5.2.12b) is a problematic case, because the question is embedded, but it can be seen separately from “Oh man, I want that” and is probably a transcription error. However, due to its appearance, it is classified as a problematic case. Separate from the first sentence is a *wh*-question asking for the reason why the Republicans have not provided the necessary information mentioned by Trump. This is linguistically supported by CAN NOT and the non-use of COULD NOT in (5.2.12c). The speaker presupposes that they did not provide him with the necessary information, because the co-text does not provide the necessary information about whether they actually have not provided the necessary information. The question in (5.2.12b) is repeated in a more precise form in (5.2.12c). In (5.2.12c), the question is a *wh*-question and explicitly asks why then Republican National Committee (RNC) Chairman Reince Priebus did not provide him with information prior to the debate (the previous televised debate with Hillary Clinton). Possible answers are exemplified in (5.2.13).

(5.2.13) Trump: Why can't the Republicans do that?

- a. The Republicans did not have the information.
- b. The Republicans did not want to provide the information.
- c. I do not know.

Trump does not provide an answer and at this point the question cannot be answered conclusively, because the answer cannot be found in the CR. Trump does not say that Priebus did not, but he implies that he intentionally did not. The modality supports that it was not a question of ability, but that there was a lack of will and willingness. Trump attacks his own party, at least those who do not fully support him, and questions their loyalty. Trump makes presuppositional accommodation his own in a skilful way and asks about aspects that are not to be found in the CR and are not to be regarded as background knowledge. Similarly to with insinuations, Trump may be delighted if the audience accepts the implicature, without providing further context and explanations regarding the raised

issue of whether he had information or not. Trump endeavours to add new information to the CG by pretending that certain aspects are already known. In this way, Trump forces the inclusion of presuppositions in order to subtly add new aspects to the CG. Chilton and Schäffner (2002) argue that in political content presuppositions are used because they are not expected to be challenged or rejected because this would take a lot of effort (Chilton and Schäffner 2002: 36). Thus, presuppositions contribute to the building or perhaps the imposing of a consensual reality (Chilton and Schäffner 2002: 36).

As discussed in Section 2.4, RQs differ from assertions in that they do not commit the speaker to a proposition in the same way assertions do, and in their interaction potential. Assertions, by their nature, often convey a speaker's commitment to a particular stance or claim and directly, expect if rejected by the listener, enter the CG. RQs, on the other hand, are inherently open-ended, designed to engage the audience's reasoning process while avoiding explicit responsibility from the speaker. This distinction highlights the rhetorical function of questions in contrast to assertions. Assertions demand validation and carry the speaker's responsibility for the claim. The questions in (5.2.12), unlike a direct assertion that accuses or absolves, strategically avoid providing a clear answer or providing a clear accusation. Their purpose is not to resolve the issue but to cast doubt.

The argument follows Beaver's proposal of presupposition accommodation that involves "reconstructed reasoning", which includes the speaker's goals and intentions (Beaver 1999: 42). Beaver (1999) argues that when the listener accommodates presuppositions, they reconstruct and consider the speaker's assumptions and their intentions (Beaver 1999). I argue that in (5.2.12), the listener will accommodate the presupposition that the Republicans did not provide information in order to follow the ongoing discourse. Hence, the RQs (5.2.12b) and (5.2.12c) add new information to the CG – at least for the current and ongoing communicative situation of the speech.

The second example shifts the focus to the foreign and security-political context.

- (5.2.14)
- a. Japan, economic behemoth. Germany – see how well they're doing – economic behemoth. Saudi Arabia, nothing but money.
  - b. They were making \$1 billion a day with their high oil prices, now they're making a fortune, the same thing.
  - c. Economic behemoth.

- d. Why are we defending them, and why aren't we being fully reimbursed?  
(A.3.153)
- e. Now, if we do that, your budget already is starting to look real good, OK. You know, you have budgets, so we losing our assurance; we have an \$800 billion trade deficit, folks.

(Donald Trump, Speech 3, A.3.153)

The RQ in (5.2.14d) is a multiple *wh*-question and asks for the reason why the U.S. defends *them* and why the U.S. is not fully reimbursed for this protection. In (5.2.15), Trump reports on a news conference in which a general said that Trump does not understand that Japan is paying 50%. Thus, the co-text introduces the notion that the U.S. is not fully (only 50%) responsible for the costs incurred to defend Japan in (5.2.15).

- (5.2.15) So this general comes up, has a news conference a few months ago. And he said, “Mr. Trump doesn't understand that Japan is paying 50 percent of the cost to defend them.”

(Donald Trump, Speech 3, 1.12.20–1.12.28)

Trump introduces the information embedded in a narrative because he is quoting a general. At this point, it is not a question of whether the information is true or false but that it is made known to the listener at the time through the narrative. However, through the narrative structure, he does not take responsibility for the truth content and makes it appear more far-sighted, as he quotes a general.

In addition, Trump lists countries the U.S. is defending as well: Germany and Saudi Arabia. In the CR, there is no information as to whether the U.S. is being fully reimbursed for their costs to defend Germany and Saudi Arabia. It is unlikely that the audience knows the details of the treaties between the countries. However, the RQs in (5.2.14d) presuppose that they are not being fully reimbursed and questions the fact that they are not. The biased reading is strengthened by the negative “aren't”. The reference “them” is plural and unclear and may refer to Saudi Arabia, Germany, or both. The co-text only provides information that Japan pays only 50% of the costs. Trump forces the accommodation of the presupposition that other countries also do not pay the full costs. The audience will reconstruct the intentions of the speaker – that beyond the singular “Japan”, there are more countries, signalled by “them”, and because Trump refers several times to Germany and

Saudi Arabia, it must be the case they do not contribute to the costs. The rhetorical point is that the treaties are to the detriment of the U.S. and Trump's presuppositions expand the examples of why the government is incompetent. The answer possibilities are complex, because there are two combined *wh*-questions. The respective answer parts can be put together in different ways. In (5.2.16), there are possible responses listed, but they are not exhaustive.

- (5.2.16) Trump: Why are we defending them, and why aren't we being fully reimbursed?
- a. We are defending them because of binding treaties and will be reimbursed.
  - b. We defend them because they cannot defend themselves and we are compensated otherwise.
  - c. I do not know.

The interrogative form of the questions in (5.2.14d) merely presupposes the truth content of the facts referred to, in contrast to a statement. The grammatical form of the question in strategic use as a RQ allows the creation of ambiguity, allowing the speaker to distance himself from the content of the presuppositional statement. With the question, the speaker's communicative intention is to add new information to the CG by acting *as if* it is already part of the CG. As discussed in Chapter 4, the speaker's meaning is private (Camp 2018) and whether the speaker actually believes the presupposed aspect is less relevant because Trump as a speaker aims to make the listener believe that he believes it. The update differs from that of assertions because the interpretation has to be reconstructed on the basis of the score and not based on the CR. Hence, a RQ can change the CG, not in the same way as the narrow semantic meaning of an assertion would but rather by a reconstructed pragmatic meaning.

This is a highly persuasive strategy because the listener has to come up with the reply themselves. The speaker makes the listener believe that they were already familiar with the presupposition. In order to follow the argument, the listener has to accommodate the presupposition. In the following Section, 5.2.3, I will discuss the third strategic function: "Aligning Beliefs".

### 5.2.3 Strategic Function: Aligning Beliefs

With function 3, the speaker aims to align the beliefs of the listeners in order to update their beliefs on controversial topics, and he uses RQs to reach this goal. The proposal refers to the functions previously proposed by Farkas (2024b), Ilie (1994), and Wong and Yap (2015) of altering beliefs. In general, the function of aligning beliefs is meant to make the listener feel differently about something, i.e. to evoke a positive or negative feeling. Function 3 refers to the previously proposed function of Wong and Yap (2015) for “self-promotion” and “inducing doubt” as well as the proposed function by Ilie (1994) “to alter the addressee’s assumption, beliefs, ideas” and the function “to challenge a stance” by Farkas (2024b). Their proposals share similarities and, therefore, I have summarised and reformulated them in terms of the notion of CG. The terminology I use to describe this function that considers “beliefs” in relation to the CG refers to previous studies (Camp 2018; Stalnaker 2014). RQs that function in this way usually contain a linguistic marker on the sentence level that has a normative value, e.g. an evaluative adjective, as exemplified in (5.2.17).

- (5.2.17) a. We owe Japan more than that.
- b. So they come in, they take our jobs, they take our money, and then they loan us back the money, and we pay them in interest, and then the dollar goes up so their deal’s even better.
- c. How stupid are our leaders? (A.3.21)
- d. How stupid are these politicians to allow this to happen? (A.3.22)
- e. How stupid are they? (A.3.23)
- f. I’m gonna tell you – thank you.

(Donald Trump, Speech 1, A.3.21–A.3.23)

There are three *wh*-questions in (5.2.17), the examples in (5.2.17c), (5.2.17d), and (5.2.17e). In (5.2.17b), Trump refers to an undefined “they”, probably Japan, because Trump introduces Japan in (5.2.17a). Trump describes that they, hence, the Japanese, come to the U.S. and take away the jobs, take away the money, and then lend the money back to the U.S., for which the U.S. then has to pay interest, leading to the dollar becoming more expensive; thus the treaty would bring even more advantages for Japan. In the subsequent utterance in (5.2.17c), Trump asks the audience to what extent their leaders are “stupid”. The *wh*-question in

(5.2.17d) asks how “stupid” “these” politicians are to allow this, referring to the situation described in (5.2.17b). The third *wh*-question in (5.2.17e) repeats the question, how stupid are “they”, and refers to the politicians who are responsible for the treaty, because they decided on the agreement with Japan. In (5.2.17e), he again uses a pronoun to refer to the politicians and leaders introduced in (5.2.17c) and (5.2.17d) or to a larger unknown group in general; in (5.2.17e) it is plausible that Trump is referring to the politicians who are responsible for the treaty.

All three questions in (5.2.17) are formally marked by “stupid” at the sentence level, hence in the CR. The rhetorical point of the question is to fuel the mood by asking how incompetent politicians must be to have negotiated such a treaty to the detriment of the U.S. The questions cannot be answered on the basis of the CR, because it is rather complex to measure how stupid someone is without considering the complexity of intelligence, the personal context, and the potential harm of labelling someone as “stupid”. Based on the situation described in (5.2.17b), the questions could be answered in a way that makes it clear that the treaty was a decision that had negative consequences and therefore the negotiators’ competence can be denied.

Foremost, the questions are not about the argument, but about the alignment of beliefs that the government is incompetent. The question reflects the speaker’s beliefs and aims to raise emotional appeal. The focus here is on activation by their emotional charge because they have the potential to influence emotions and behaviour (Knappe 2017: 123, Klein 2010: 8). The activation of emotions is in the foreground, which is brought to bear by the noticeably negatively charged “stupid”. The comparison of convictions works in two directions: 1. inwards, to confirm with his supporters that the politicians are stupid, and 2. outwards, as a delimitation and attack that the current politicians are stupid. The question form actively involves the listener in the speaker’s emotionalisation strategy.

The alignment of beliefs with respect to the CG is complex and can be modelled around the proposal by Camp (2018). Beliefs are private; there are the speaker’s beliefs and the hearer’s beliefs, which can become mutual beliefs. The question reflects the speaker’s standpoint by questioning the aspect, to what extent “they” are stupid. The speaker’s intention is not to determine whether “they” are stupid, but to what extent “they” are. Hence, the belief of the speaker can be described as “the government is stupid”. Because the belief is formulated embedded in a question, there is still a potential for dispute. The speaker

did not say that the government is stupid, but only asked how stupid they are. However, the question of extent presupposes the existence of the aspect that they are stupid. The effort to deny the belief is potentially very high, as the speaker did not ask whether they are stupid but to what extent. There is the possibility of denial because the speaker can fall back on the explanation that he just asked a question, but the communicative effort is costly. If we accept it as the speaker's belief, the following scenarios can occur with regard to the CG. The listener can either believe it themselves and accept it, or accept it for the further course of the conversation, or reject it. If the listener believes that the government is stupid, hence the speaker and listener believe it, the notion becomes part of the CG. The listener may also accept the speaker's belief that the government is stupid for the reason of the conversation but not personally accept it, hence it does not enter the CG.

The listener may also recognise it as the speaker's belief and believes it as the speaker's belief. The listener may also believe that the speaker believes that the government is stupid, hence the notion that the speaker believes that the government is stupid becomes mutual belief and enters the CG. If the hearer is asked whether they believe that the government is stupid, they may answer that they believe that the speaker believes it. The crucial point is that the speaker presented the belief as a question, and we can only derive the speaker's belief, but we cannot track it explicitly in the CR. If the speaker had uttered "The leaders are stupid", followed by the question "How stupid are our leaders?", there would be an explicit utterance to attach the speaker to, because it can be tracked in the CR. In (5.2.17), the belief is implicit. If the speaker is asked whether he believes that the government is stupid and rejects it and the hearer already believed it, the notion is only part of the hearer's belief and cannot be assigned to the CG. This reveals the necessity to carefully distinguish between the speaker's and the hearer's beliefs, mutual belief, and the CG. In a communicative setting such as a political speech or monologue, it is challenging to conclusively describe notions like belief and acceptance, because there is no turn-taking sequence to reveal the hearer's reaction or indicate whether they share the speaker's belief, acceptance, or rejection.

In summary, the RQs in (5.2.17) are uttered to address emotional appeal and align beliefs. The speaker aims to stir up the audience using offensive language ("stupid"). It is not only the rational argument that plays a role, but also the affective dimension of linguistic means of expression. This is particularly evident in the use of negatively connoted buzzwords such as "stupid". This word conveys far more than a substantive criticism – it activates

emotions, in particular devaluation, indignation, or rejection, and thus has an immediate affective effect. The emotional charge of such terms gives them considerable potential to influence both individual emotions and collective behaviour. Buzzwords therefore not only act as semantic markers but also as affective triggers that can be used in a targeted manner to provoke reactions or polarise discourse. The focus here is not on argumentative persuasiveness, but on targeted emotional activation, which makes use of the affective effect of linguistic forms.

The second example in (5.2.18b) includes a code word.

- (5.2.18) a. She's turned out to be not what people thought. She gets, illegally – illegally – she gets the questions to the debate. She then takes those questions and gives them to crooked Hillary Clinton.
- b. Now, does crooked Hillary report it? (A.3.495)
- c. Does she say I shouldn't have these questions or these answers? (A.3.496)
- d. I think they gave them the answers also, right? (A.3.497)
- e. No, she doesn't. They doesn't.

(Donald Trump, Speech 16, A.3.495–A.3.497)

In (5.2.18a), Trump says that “she” gets the questions to the debate and gives them to his political opponent Hillary Clinton. With “she” Trump is referring to Donna Brazile, the acting chair of the Democratic National Convention at that time (“You know, thinking about it, though. Also, people, the press doesn't talk about it. Donna Brazile gets the questions through a debate...but then it turns out to be a number of debates.”). Trump then asks in (5.2.18b) whether “Hillary” reports something. Trump is referring to his opponent Hillary Clinton and his previous statement in (5.2.18a) that Hillary Clinton received questions prior to the TV debate. A possible answer is “yes” or “no”. In the question asked immediately afterwards, he asks if she said she should not have gotten those questions or those answers. In (5.2.18e), Trump claims that Hillary Clinton does not do “it”. “It” may refer to the question of whether she said she should not have the questions and answers (5.2.18c) or whether she reported that she received the questions (5.2.18b).

The rhetorical point of the RQs is that Hillary Clinton wanted to gain an advantage over him as her opponent in the TV debate. The question is less about the argument that Hillary Clinton received questions before the debate, but rather about the speaker's

belief that Hillary Clinton is not trustworthy, and he strives to ensure that the listener also adopts this attitude. In addition, the question in (5.2.18b) contains the adjective “crooked”, an adjective with which Trump repeatedly describes her. Trump already attributes the characteristic “crooked” to Hillary Clinton in (5.2.18a). “Crooked” is ambiguous between different meanings, as it can be used to describe someone who is dishonest, a picture that is not hanging straight, or a smile that is uneven. Further, there is an anti-Semitic association with it (Blum 2023). By using “crooked”, Trump indirectly expresses his beliefs through the anti-Semitic associations connected to the word (Blum 2023: 213). In using “crooked” the speaker aims to retain the plausible deniability of having expressed harmful content. “Crooked” is used in conspiracy theories about wealthy international Jewish bankers plotting to destroy the nation and take over the world, controlling politicians with their wealth or through the power of the media that they dominate (Blum 2023: 217–18). By invoking these conspiracy theories without naming Jews, anti-Semitic ideas are introduced without fanfare into mainstream political conversation while encouraging those white nationalists who fully understand the word's implications. Whether intended or not, the speaker has to accept the social sanction the use of a code word may elicit. Further, in a highly strategic setting such as a political speech where there are many occurrences of the word, it is plausible that the speaker knows and willingly accepts the implicature. Hence, the speaker accepts the communicative costs of using a code word to convey his intended anti-Semitic meaning *Q*. The question aims to update the listeners' beliefs about Clinton's possible obscure involvements and, at the same time, invites negative social feedback and creates anger by hinting at the conspiracy that she is entangled in a larger network. The minor aim is to accommodate the presupposition that she is involved in some odd network in order to strengthen the emotional appeal of the controversial issue of anti-Semitism. The emotional appeal of the code word is strengthened because the question itself evokes a form of reaction. The strategic function of (5.2.18b) strengthens the narrative about Hillary Clinton that she is not trustworthy, and aims to align the beliefs of the speaker and listener about Hillary Clinton. If the listener mentally answers the question negatively, i.e. that she does not report it, it aligns their beliefs that Hillary Clinton is not trustworthy. The mutual belief becomes part of the CG about her honesty.

Trump may emotionally address his audience with the code words, and the interrogative form of the question involves the listener. Trump describes his political opponent

as “crooked” and thus invites social feedback – negative social feedback – by insulting her. The emotionalisation is linguistically marked by the code word and strengthened by the form of the questions. Similar to function 1, Trump stresses an aspect that is, at the time of questioning, not in the CR but is likely to be in the CG (that Clinton does not report it). However, by using the attribution “crooked”, emotionalisation is at the forefront. Trump repeats the accusation of deception in both questions and explicitly uses an adjective that carries an association with anti-Semitic meaning in order to align their attitudes towards Hillary Clinton. This use of the emotionalisation tactic is of great importance in Trump’s speeches, especially because it has been previously observed how people vote based on their values and feelings (Seargeant 2020: 6).

#### 5.2.4 Discussion and Conclusion: Strategic Functions

The three strategic functions can be differentiated in terms of certain linguistic manifestations. In function 1, on the sentence level, there is a reference in the previous co-text or in the CG and it serves as a vehicle for CG management. The speaker aims to shift the attention to a specific aspect in order to strengthen that topic’s importance or to additionally distract the hearer from something else closely linked to the topic that the speaker is referring to. In function type 2, the speaker forces the accommodation of presuppositions. The aspect referred to has no reference in the previous co-text nor in the CG, however, the speaker acts *as if* it does. The analysis shows that the speaker uses specific linguistic signals that predict particular features to achieve his communicative goals. The CG may influence the interpretation and rhetorical point of the RQ but can also be enriched by way of the RQs and their presuppositions as discussed in Section 5.2.2. In the third function, there is a linguistic marker on the sentence level that has a normative value, e.g. an evaluative adjective or a code word.

The analysis shows how Trump performs a role and creates a specific persona, therefore there has to be a distinction between private and public beliefs as proposed by Camp (2018). The speaker makes use of the cooperative principle in the sense that the listener is asked to “repair” by reconstructing the speaker’s intention in order to follow the speaker’s speech. The speaker makes use of presuppositions and implicatures in order to make a contribution to the CG but not necessarily by public commitment in the form of a direct assertion. In

the communicative setting of a political speech, RQs with their interactional characteristics play a powerful role in persuasion and in convincing the listener to vote for the speaker. The analysis revealed that it is necessary to develop functions that take the CG into account in order to show how RQs can influence or change certain beliefs. I argue that it is a more comprehensive way to analyse the functions of RQs with respect to the arguments and emotions that change the CG. This is an elaboration of the proposal by Ilie (1994) but takes into consideration the CG.

RQs share striking similarities with insinuations, but they cannot be equated. Both share the fact that the speaker aims to reveal his or her communicative intention to the listener, which is obviously evident to both communicative partners (Stalnaker 2014: 47). The speaker wants the listener to recognise, through this utterance, that they intend to suggest *Q*, i.e. the distinct proposition that the speaker intends to recognise. The speaker does not intend to assume responsibility by explicitly uttering their communicative goals in the form of, for example, an assertion, either directly to the listener or to anyone who may overhear. The speaker aims to avoid liability, but willingly accepts the acceptance by the listener should the listener recognise and accommodate *Q*. For example, in the case of (5.2.1e), Trump shifts the attention to the U.S.–Mexico border and says that the military has to become stronger.

In function 2, the strategic use of RQs is a strong hint that Trump wants to keep his main communicative point concealed and plans his communicative act with the possibility of denying the meaning of the utterance  $M(Q)$ . The form of the utterance, the question form, elicits a (mental) reaction. This mental reaction will take the path of least resistance, meaning that the form of the RQ, a question that, within a given context, has a very limited set of plausible answers, will contribute to aligning the hearers' beliefs with those of the speaker. By using unclear referents in the questions, the elicited mental response will involve adopting presuppositions without questioning them.

The analysis shows that the equating of RQs and assertions would lead to (at least) two crucial problems. First, assertions do not invoke the pragmatic reasoning process and plausible deniability as RQs do. Secondly, the speaker avoids commitment by using RQs, something assertions do not allow. Consequently, the examination of the functions shows that the question's form provides the speaker with plausible deniability and allows the speaker to remain uncommitted, as well as to evoke a reasoning process. The analysis shows

that a complex role of the CG must be taken into account. Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) argue that the answer must be part of the CG but the analysis reveals that RQs may also change the CG. The proposed functions take significant account of the CG and in that sense elaborate on the functions previously introduced by Biezma and Rawlins (2017), Farkas (2024b), Ilie (1994), and Wong and Yap (2015).

### 5.3 Conclusion

In Section 5.2, I examined the possible functions of RQs in Trump's presidential election campaign speeches in 2015–16. The investigation included the theoretical notions discussed in Chapter 2 and Chapter 4, i.e. the CG, the CR, the rhetorical point, and the speaker's intentions, to examine the functions of RQs from the TSC-RQ. The analysis contributes to the research on the persuasive power of Trump's political rhetoric in his presidential election campaign speeches in 2015–16.

In Chapter 5, I have examined the meaning of RQs beyond the sentence level. I propose three strategic functions based on the functions discussed in Section 4.5 that consider the local context of the utterance. In Section 5.2.1, I examined how Trump pragmatically focusses on specific aspects in the CG in order to evoke a larger set of associations. In Section 5.2.2, I showed how Trump treats information as background knowledge and alludes to it by connecting it with the subject of the question. Thus, he forces the accommodation of presupposition and adds new content to the CG. In Section 5.2.3, I showed how he aligns beliefs on controversial topics. The speaker aims to update the beliefs, feelings, or perspectives of the speaker and the audience. The main differences to assertions are the plausible deniability, the non-commitment aspect, and the form that elicits some kind of response by default. Due to their form as questions, RQs divide the discourse into different context sets (or alternatives) and seek a form of response.

The investigation of the strategic functions of RQs contributes to the research on the effective power and persuasiveness of Trump's speeches. The differentiated and comprehensive analysis in Section 5 closes the research gap on what functions RQs in Trump's speeches have and how they can be identified. The aim is to stress that the analysis of RQs is of great importance, because they may contribute to the origins of fake news, conspiracy theories, and resentful beliefs. The goal of the speeches was to be elected in November 2016: Since

Donald Trump was elected President of the United States of America in November 2016, we can assume that certain persuasion operations were successful.

# 6 Conclusion and Outlook

## 6.1 Conclusion

In this thesis, I have investigated the strategic functions of rhetorical questions (RQs) in Donald Trump's political speeches (2015–16). I explored the relationship between context, the speaker's intentions, and utterances in order to provide three strategic functions (although not an exhaustive list) of RQs in Trump's political speeches. At the beginning, I posed the following three central research questions (6.1.1).

### (6.1.1) Research Questions

1. How were RQs previously approached and classified to distinguish them from ordinary questions (OQs)?
2. What kinds of strategic functions do RQs have and how are RQs and their functions different from assertions?
3. What are the functions of RQs in the political speeches by Donald Trump from 2015–16?

Based on a corpus that includes sixteen speeches by Donald Trump, I answered the three research questions. In the previous literature, RQs were mainly approached based on the question of whether they are OQs or assertions. There are syntactic proposals that focus on the formal level and associate RQs with OQs, while semantic accounts argue for the consideration of their semantic meaning and associate RQs with assertions. In Chapter 2, the complexity of identifying RQs was discussed and the limitations of existing approaches revealed. In particular, the handling of ambiguous cases and the reliance on the assumption that the answer is obvious or known were discussed. RQs are shown to share features of both OQs and assertions, and thus require a context-sensitive analysis. The concept of

common ground (CG) is central, with various theories (e.g. Caponigro and Sprouse 2007; Farkas 2024b) arguing that RQs should be interpreted in light of what is plausibly derivable from the CG rather than strictly known.

Speakers may strategically use the form–function ambiguity of RQs to achieve different communicative goals. Previous observations on RQs analyse RQs as questions, assertions, or indirect speech acts. Based on the empirical investigation in Chapter 3, I discussed previous accounts and studies of utterances to provide a theoretical and empirical foundation for the analysis of the functions of RQs. The main result was the identification of 173 RQs (TSC-RQ) out of a total of 712 questions (TSC).

The work reveals that speakers utter RQs to achieve communicative goals and use the question form strategically. The main differences to assertions are the plausible deniability, the non-commitment aspect, and form. Due to their form, which is that of a question, RQs divide the discourse into different context sets (or alternatives) and invite a form of response. However, in contrast to OQs, they are not uttered to fill a knowledge gap. Furthermore, RQs may contain an implicit statement, but their goals go beyond the stated propositional content. Based on previous literature, three strategic functions have been developed and discussed. The importance of the CG was elaborated in order to distinguish questions and statements from RQs.

The RQs in the political speeches by Donald Trump, compiled in the TSC-RQ, were analysed on the basis of the three strategic functions. The strategic functions are anchored in linguistic markers on the sentence level: (i.) pragmatic focusing, (ii.) forcing the accommodation of presuppositions, and (iii.) aligning beliefs. The presented types each aim to achieve a slightly different communicative goal. Type (i.) aims to update shared beliefs, remind the hearers of something, and signal what the speaker intends to bring into focus. Thus, the speaker may distract the hearer from other topics by shifting the attention to a different one. Type (ii.) is instead intended to add something new to the CG while acting as if it is already known. The hearer is meant to just feel reminded of something rather than to notice that they are adopting new information. Type (iii.) is used to create emotional appeal. Type (iii.) is probably the most powerful one as it may evoke anger and fear. The speaker can strategically choose between several markers to signal their communicative goals. Because of the form–function ambiguity, RQs are designed to reduce the accountability of the speaker’s action. The speaker may utter controversial content as an implicit assertion and

can therefore deflect any interpretations that might be evoked. The project has provided valuable insights into how RQs function in discourse contexts and which communicative goals a speaker may intend to achieve. This work may contribute to further investigations on how communicative strategies associated with RQs are used and also how they can be identified. In particular, their role with regard to the expression of resentful messages, e.g. framing controversial topics such as racism, may be considered in future research. The plausible deniability and challenging interpretation may let the speaker appear as less accountable, which can be further enhanced by, for example, code words. By analysing RQs, I could show why RQs are powerful communicative tools. Using my approach regarding how to recover the functions and to investigate whether they are plausible and relevant at the specific point in discourse, I aim to contribute to the question of how speakers can be made liable for covertly harmful language. The proposal at hand can only provide the beginnings of the work that can be done in the broad and complex area of what can be done with words. In times of events such as the Capitol riot (January 6, 2021), in which an attack on the Capitol was fuelled by a president, careful and precise analysis has to be undertaken in order to grasp forms of indirectness. Uncovering insinuations is important in order to infer forms and levels of commitment to acts beyond assertions. In highly strategic settings, speakers make public commitments that may change the CG whether they intended to or not, as I have been able to show in this thesis. The work is in line with Camp (2022), who identified linguistic strategies that render speakers accountable. Nevertheless, as to whether the observations are tenable in court, legal professionals need to decide. In the following, I will first provide a summary of the findings of each chapter and finally, in Section 6.3, I will state some of the questions raised in my research and their relevance regarding future research.

## **6.2 Summary**

There are three main empirical contributions. I provide a review of the three main theoretical approaches to RQs (the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic frameworks) as well as the relevant studies on the functions of RQs. I analysed a large data set and provided an annotation schema that took into account previous studies and analyses. I was able to provide a replicable analysis of the strategic functions of RQs. RQs are speech acts that are

uttered to fulfil specific functions and invite possible interpretations. Whether RQs in political speeches achieve their desired effects cannot be ascertained, and I refrain from claims about the listener's part. The intention of RQs cannot be formally singled out; therefore, I provide an approach that includes the co- and context, the CG, the conversational record (CR), and the question under discussion (QUD).

In Chapter 2, I discuss RQs within a syntactic and semantic framework to provide the necessary background for an investigation of the semantic and structural criteria of RQs in Chapter 3. Therefore, I divided Chapter 2 into three major parts, guided by three research questions: (i) How do the linguistic fields syntax and semantics approach RQs and formulate how they are distinct from OQs? (ii) What conclusions do the different approaches draw about the functions of RQs? (iii) How are RQs defined with respect to CG?

In Section 2.2, I observed RQs from a syntactic perspective because RQs are structurally associated with questions. This section detailed linguistic markers such as negative polarity items (NPIs) and structural patterns to distinguish RQs from OQs. In contrast to OQs, RQs do not generate new information, although they may concern a knowledge gap. Thus, possible linguistic markers were observed to distinguish them from OQs. However, NPIs may appear in both types of questions, an observation which is further verified in Chapter 3. Due to the interrogative form of RQs, possible responses were briefly considered because they can provide more information about the function of a question. Again, RQs allow for a wide range of responses, e.g. answers and replies. In a speech setting, either addresser-answers, addresser-replies, or non-verbal addressee replies are possible. In the work at hand, my focus was on the addresser-response because non-verbal responses, such as booing or cheering, were excluded from the analysis. RQs are structurally questions, allow for a wide set of answers, and do not provide specific markers that can only be found in RQs. In Section 2.4, I examined the association of RQs with assertions. Semantically, RQs are closer to assertions. They are associated with an obvious answer or implicit statement that mirrors their opposite polarity. Several heuristic tests and tags were proposed to distinguish them from OQs. For the work at hand, this is important as their implicit statements may have provided valuable insights into the functions of the questions. According to the semantic treatment of RQs, their answer is claimed to be part of the CG. Thus, I provided an overview of whether the discourse model serves as a suitable approach to equate RQs with assertions. The proposal was shown to have several problems, because in a political speech, the listeners

might not share the speaker's idea of what constitutes world knowledge, but they are bound by the context of an oral event to accept the content that is being presented as part of the CG. This is an important finding because in this way RQs signal the state of the CG from the speaker's perspective, that is, what the speaker perceives and assumes to be part of the CG.

The central discussions in Sections 2.2 and 2.4 reveal that RQs are neither assertions nor genuine questions. This observation has important implications for the understanding of RQs, since they have mainly been discussed as assertions with an implicit statement. However, the discussion showed that this is not always the case. In addition, RQs are not the same as questions, as they do not aim to close a knowledge gap, but rather take advantage of the question form, which invites a possible response, separates the context into alternatives, and lacks a commitment constraint. If the focus is on the propositional content of RQs, their most important functions are missed. These questions invite a set of possible interpretations, but cannot be equated with assertions or with questions. Although assertions are associated with commitment, RQs exhibit a lack thereof. The listener is invited to perform a pragmatic reasoning process in order to infer the meaning of the utterance  $M(Q)$  and thus allow the speaker to easily deny any controversial inference.

In Chapter 3, I examined the questions in the Trump Speech Corpus (TSC) to identify RQs and compile the Rhetorical Questions in Trump Speech Corpus (TSC-RQ). I provided further empirical evidence that not all questions in political speeches are RQs and discussed non-rhetorical questions in Section 3.5.1. The aim was to identify specific patterns, especially tendencies that can provide further insight into the strategic use of the questions. Furthermore, the electoral tendency was included to compare my findings with the data from Wong and Yap (2015). I propose that (1.) all forms and (2.) different communicative settings, e.g. the extra-textual level, are possible and hence speeches have to be carefully considered in order to identify the non-monologue parts. In addition, I hypothesised that there is a tendency to use linguistic markers (3.) and opposite polarity to signal rhetoricality and implicit statements. The annotation of 712 questions was performed manually in order to closely examine their appearance. The first results were provided based on the distribution of questions among the communication levels. An important finding was that questions can appear in monologue, extra-textual, and storytelling sequences. Although there is a clear tendency towards monologue sequences, my observation stressed the importance of considering all communicative levels to identify RQs in speeches and to exclude

reported, reaction, and extra-textual level questions. In addition, the different forms of questions were analysed and problematic cases were identified. The goal was to compile a corpus that includes well-formed RQs. Therefore, problematic cases, as well as invariant tag questions (InTs), were identified in order to finally isolate 173 RQs in the TSC-RQ. The frequency of the structural appearance of all types of questions was examined. The main share is *wh*-questions (101), followed by 71 *y/n*-questions, and one alternative question. This observation is remarkable because *wh*-questions allow a wide set of alternatives, in contrast to *y/n*-questions. In previous research, various linguistic markers, e.g. NPIs, formal patterns, or the assertion of the opposite polarity hypothesis by Han (2002) as well as the obviousness of an answer, were discussed. Thus, I examined the occurrence of NPIs and the assertion of the opposite polarity hypothesis. However, there is no observable trend towards the use of NPIs in positive/negative RQs that significantly leads to negative/positive counterparts. The analysis considered different forms of communication to distinguish between the different forms of questions in relation to the communicative levels while focussing on monologue sequences and RQs.

In order to explain the mismatch of question, statement, and possible function, I discussed the pragmatic treatment of RQs under the notion of speech acts in Section 4.4. In Section 4.2, I provided an overview of the three main approaches to speech act theory: the conventional, the normative, and the intentional approaches. Austin (1962) introduced an influential approach to how things are done with words and provided a theoretical basis for further developments. Searle (1975) elaborated this conventional view and provided a taxonomy that depends on a classification of performative verbs. Additionally, the distinction between indirect and direct speech acts was discussed. With respect to figurative language, the conventional approach did not offer a coherent explanation and was further elaborated through an intention-based approach. Grice (1957) argued for a distinct notion of the speaker's role and intended meaning and set the theoretical basis for further academic research concerning the notion of the speaker's intention. This proposal was met with general approval in several elaborations and is central to the work at hand. The most influential proposal for the later analysis was introduced by Roberts (2018). She introduced an analysis that pragmatically overrides the distinction between direct and indirect speech acts and provides a valuable approach that considers the CG, CR, QUD, and discourse and domain goals as well as power relations, which can be incorporated in a scoreboard model (cf. Lewis

1979). Further observations were made with respect to the notion of “perlocution” in order to stress the importance of possible intended effects. The speaker’s role and meaning were predominantly considered because these factors play a crucial role in speech act theory. Since Grice (1957), there have been several proposals, e.g. the notion of insinuation by Camp (2018), that explore the mismatches between what is said and what is meant. Additionally, I stressed the point that implicatures do not require linguistic markers and may refer to some referent in the discourse if they are plausible or a pragmatic consequence of how the speaker uttered something in a specific context. In Section 4.3, I elaborated on the role of speech acts and especially RQs in discourse contexts. I provided an overview of previous proposals with respect to possible functions of RQs as well as how their place in discourse is considered. I provided ways to approach discourse structure to examine RQs in context that serve as a theoretical basis for the analysis in Chapter 5. The question-based approach by Roberts (2012) was discussed and serves, in combination with the scoreboard analysis by Lewis (1979) and the adaptation by Camp (2018), as a valuable methodological basis to examine the internal structure of discourse. Especially in Trump’s speeches, the text appears partly incoherent and has to be closely investigated in order to analyse the RQs in context. In communication, hearers often adopt or accept utterances for the sake of conversation, or at least accept that it is relevant for the speaker to utter them. Thus, the notions of beliefs and CG are central for the analysis of the communicative functions of RQs. The concepts of CR, score, CG, and the speaker’s meaning are distinct but may overlap and serve as a theoretical basis to approach the functions of RQs. Section 4.3 provided further evidence that RQs are not assertions because of their difference in terms of commitment and context dynamic. Additionally, they share several similarities with insinuations, e.g. speaker deniability, hearer pedantry, and risk mitigation. The most crucial finding was that the analysis of RQs as speech acts allows valuable insights into how they are used to fulfil specific functions and invite possible interpretations. In Section 4.5, previously proposed functions were examined and discussed with respect to the notion of CG. As a result, three strategic functions were summarised on the basis of the work by Athanasiadou (1991), Biezma and Rawlins (2017), Farkas (2024b), Ilie (1994), and Wong and Yap (2015).

In Chapter 5, I presented strategic functions of RQs (Section 5.2) in Trump’s political speeches 2015–16, this being the main contribution of the thesis. The strategic functions in Sections 5.2.1, 5.2.2, and 5.2.3 refer to the methods of CG management. The three main,

but not exhaustive, functions that I discussed are (1.) pragmatic focusing to manage the common ground, as presented in 5.2.1, (2.) forcing the accommodation of presuppositions, discussed in Section 5.2.2, and (3.) aligning beliefs, as presented in Section 5.2.3. Function (1.) allows the speaker to shift the attention to a topic in the discourse context. The referent is either part of the record or can be understood as background knowledge. Thus, the speaker can remind the listener about an aspect in a discourse or put it in focus. Function (2.) is marked by a linguistic marker that prompts the listener to accommodate the presupposition. In order to follow the discourse, the listener is forced to accommodate – at least temporarily – the presupposition. The speaker thus enriches the perspectives and updates the shared beliefs about the world. Function (3.) aims to emotionally touch the listener and is marked by evaluative adjectives and, in particular, code words. The listeners are meant to update their feelings about controversial topics, e.g. immigration, racism, and terrorism. Because of the interrogative form, the statements carry a plausible deniability that makes it rather challenging to confront the speaker about their possibly rancorous message. The speaker can evoke strong emotional responses, such as fear and anger, that are intensified as they evolve through the pragmatic reasoning process that the question elicits.

The findings stress the pragmatic approach to RQs and their high complexity. The speaker may strategically switch between different communicative modes and question forms. The main contribution of the work is the demonstration of how the strategic functions of RQs contribute to the rhetorically persuasive strategy of Donald Trump. My observations have been further verified in two speeches in Appendix in A.2.1 and A.2.2. Through the speeches, I was able to show the applicability of my findings to a larger speech and to give further evidence of the functions I identified.

### **6.3 Outlook**

Regardless of the valuable answers that have been given to the presented research questions, there are still open questions that require further consideration. To distinguish RQs from OQs, they are associated with specific prosodic contours to signal their level of commitment (Gunlogson 2003). I provided an analysis on the basis of written speeches, however their specific prosodic contours may be compared to the written findings to provide further insight into RQs with respect to commitment, QUD, and information structure.

This thesis examined speeches by Donald Trump; the findings may, however, be applied to other political speeches to examine a more far-reaching continuity. Preliminary observations on German political speeches revealed similar patterns, but these still have to be closely examined. From a theoretical point of view, I have provided a unique approach to the strategic functions of RQs as well as to how RQs lead and influence the evolution of discourse, especially under the notion of CG. Previous observations considered the notion of CG without a possible distinction between the CR and the score. In the work at hand, I stressed the aspect of CR and only briefly touched on the notion of score. Hence, the role of the score has yet to be further examined. Roberts (2018) introduces a way to include the score, record, and CG and thus her observations should be closely considered to identify further methodological stances to examine RQs. Camp (2018) argues in favour of a different treatment of the three, and hence their approaches should be closely considered in order to identify the similarities and differences important to a discourse model. RQs are a phenomenon that reflects the state of the CG and reveals valuable information about the speaker's perception of the knowledge of the listeners, i.e. what the speaker perceives should be or is in the CG. The pragmatic reasoning process, the mismatch of questions, and the set of possible interpretations combine in RQs to form a highly persuasive strategy in a way that is not present in their declarative counterparts. Experiments may be conducted to verify persuasive strategies, contrasting questions, and their respective counterparts. The same applies to the use of code words. Khoo (2017), Henderson and McCready (2018), and Saul (2018a) provide valuable work on coded language. Especially Saul (2024) provides an overview of dogwhistles and code words that can be further investigated. Their notion may be experimentally tested to observe whether dogwhistles are associated with possible inflammatory messages from speakers.



# References

- Athanasiadou, Angeliki. 1991. The Discourse Function of Questions. *Pragmatics* 1, 107–122.
- Austin, John L. 1962. *How to do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Barker, Chris. 2018. Negative Polarity as Scope Marking. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 41, 483–510.
- Beaver, David. 1999. Presupposition Accommodation: A Plea for Common Sense. In: Lawrence S. Moss, Jonathan Ginzburg, and Maarten de Rijke (Eds.), *Logic, Language, and Computation*, 21–44. Vol. 2. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Beaver, David, Bart Geurts, and Kristie Denlinger. 2021. Presupposition. In: Edward N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Spring 2021. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2021/entries/presupposition/>, accessed 16 August 2023.
- Becker, A.L. 2000. *Beyond Translation: Essays toward a Modern Philology*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Benz, Anton and Katja Jasinskaja. 2017. Questions under Discussion: From Sentence to Discourse. *Discourse Processes* 54, 177–186.
- Biegon, Rubrick. 2019. A Populist Grand Strategy? Trump and the Framing of American Decline. *International Relations* 33, 517–539.
- Biezma, María and Kyle Rawlins. 2015. Alternative Questions. *Linguistics Compass* 9.11, 450–468.
- Biezma, María and Kyle Rawlins. 2017. Rhetorical Questions: Severing Questioning from Asking. *Proceedings of SALT* 27, 302–322.
- Blum, Eleni. 2023. Tremendously Metaphorical: A Rhetorical Analysis of Donald Trump’s “Crooked Hillary” Image Macro. In: Ludwig Deringer and Liane Stroebe (Eds.), *International Discourses of Authoritarian Populism: Varieties and Approaches*, 211–225. New York: Routledge.
- Brandom, Robert B. 1994. *Making it Explicit: Reasoning, Representing, and Discursive Commitment*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Brandom, Robert B. 2011. *Perspectives on Pragmatism. Classical, Recent, and Contemporary*. Cambridge, Mass. & London: Harvard University Press.
- Bratman, Michael E. 1987. *Intentions, Plans, and Practical Reason*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Camp, Elizabeth. 2018. Insinuation, Common Ground, and the Conversational Record. In: Daniel Fogal, Daniel Harris, and Matt Moss (Eds.), *New Work on Speech Acts*, 40–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Camp, Elizabeth. 2022. Just Saying, Just Kidding: Liability for Accountability—Avoiding Speech in Ordinary Conversation, Politics and Law. In: Laurence Horn (Ed.), *From Lying to Perjury: Linguistic and Legal Perspectives on Lies and Other Falsehoods*, 227–258. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Caponigro, Ivano and Jon Sprouse. 2007. Rhetorical Questions as Questions. In: E. Puig-Waldmüller (Ed.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, 121–133/1–13. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

- Caucus, Congressional Black. 2017. We have a Lot to Lose. <https://cbc.house.gov/we-havealottolose/>, 13 August 2023.
- Cedroni, Lorella. 2013. Politolinguistics: Towards a New Analysis of Political Discourse. In: I. Poggi (Ed.), *Political Speech*, 220–232. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Chilton, Paul and Christina Schäffner. 2002. Introduction. Themes and Principles in the Analysis of Political Discourse. In: Paul Chilton and Christina Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*, 1–41. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Clark, Herbert H. 1996. *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, Herbert H. and Edward F. Schaefer. 1989. Contributing to Discourse. *Cognitive Science* 13, 259–294.
- Collins, Philip. 2012. *The Art of Speeches and Presentations: The Secrets of Making People Remember What You Say*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Columbus, Georgie. 2010. ‘Ah lovely stuff, eh?’—invariant tag meanings and usage across three varieties of English. In: Stefan Th. Gries, Stefanie Wulff, and Mark Davies (Eds.), *Corpus-linguistic Applications: Current Studies, New Directions*, 85–102.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 2016. *Questions*. Oxford Surveys in Semantics and Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dedaić, Mirjana N. 2006. Political Speeches and Persuasive Argumentation. In: Keith Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of language and linguistics*, 700–706. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Den Dikken, Marcel and Anastasia Giannakidou. 2002. From Hell to Polarity: ‘Aggressively Non-D-Linked’ Wh-Phrases as Polarity Items. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33, 31–61.
- Desjardins, Lisa. 2017. Every moment in Donald Trump’s charged relationship with race. *PBS*. <https://pbs.org/newshour/politics/every-moment-donald-trumps-long-complicated-history-race>, accessed 1 August 2022.
- Egbert, Jesse and Douglas Biber. 2020. It’s Just Words, Folks. Just Words. Donald Trump’s Distinctive Linguistic Style. In: Ulrike Schneider and Matthias Eitelmann (Eds.), *Linguistic Inquiries into Donald Trump’s Language: From ‘Fake News’ to ‘Tremendous Success’*, 17–40. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Egg, Markus. 2007. Meaning and Use of Rhetorical Questions. In: Paul Dikker (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 16th Amsterdam Colloquium*, 73–78.
- Egg, Markus. 2011. Semantic Underspecification. In: Klaus von Stechow, Claudia Maienborn, and Paul Portner (Eds.), *Semantics. An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*, 535–574. Vol. 2. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Ene, Cornelia. 1983. Rhetorical Questions within the Theory of Speech Acts. *Cahiers de linguistique théorique et appliquée*, 35–54.
- Ephratt, Michael. 2008. The Functions of Silence. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40.11, 1909–1938.
- Farkas, Donka F. Jan. 2023. Rhetorical Questions Revisited. In: SfB 833 Colloquium. Tuebingen.
- Farkas, Donka F. 2024a. Canonical and Non-Canonical Questions in Discourse. In: Regine Eckhardt, George Walkden, and Nicole Dehé (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Non-canonical Questions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farkas, Donka F. 2024b. Rhetorical questions revisited. *to appear in: Proceedings of CLS 60*.
- Farkas, Donka F. and Kim B. Bruce. 2010. On Reacting to Assertions and Polar Questions. *Journal of Semantics* 27, 81–118.
- Ferreira, Victor S. 2008. Ambiguity, Accessibility, and a Division of Labor for Communicative Success. In: Brian H. Ross (Ed.), *Advances in Research and Theory*, 209–246. Vol. 49. Psychology of Learning and Motivation. Illinois: Academic Press.

- Fetzer, Anita. 2017. The Dynamics of Discourse. Quantity Meets Quality. In: Piotr Cap and Marta Dynel (Eds.), *Implicitness: From Lexis to Discourse*, 235–257. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Geurts, Bart. 2019a. Commitments continued. *Theoretical linguistics* 45.1–2, 111–125.
- Geurts, Bart. 2019b. Communication as Commitment Sharing: Speech Acts, Implicatures, Common Ground. *Theoretical linguistics* 45.1–2, 1–30.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2002. Licensing and Sensitivity in Polarity Items: from Downward Entailment to (Non)veridicality. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 38.
- Grice, Herbert P. 1957. Meaning. *Philosophical Review* 66.3, 377–388.
- Grice, Herbert P. 1975. Logic and Conversation. In: *Speech Acts*, 41–58. New York: Academic Press.
- Grossberg, Lawrence. 2018. *Under the Cover of Chaos. Trump and the Battle for the American Right*. London: Pluto Press.
- Gunlogson, Christine. 2003. *True to Form: Rising and falling Declaratives as Questions in English*. New York: Routledge.
- Gunn, Joshua. 2020. *Political Perversion: Rhetorical Aberration in the Time of Trumpeteering*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gutzmann, Daniel and Katharina Turgay. 2024. Expressive Interpunktion!?! Interpunktion zwischen Grammatik (?) und Pragmatik! *Linguistische Berichte* 278, 127–160.
- Hall, Kira, Donna Goldstein, and Matthew Bruce Ingram. 2016. The Hands of Donald Trump. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 6, 71–100.
- Han, Chung-Hye. 1998. The Structure and Interpretation of Imperatives: Mood and Force in Universal Grammar. PhD thesis. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Han, Chung-Hye. 2002. Interpreting Interrogatives as Rhetorical Questions. *Lingua* 112, 201–229.
- Han, Chung-Hye and Laura Siegel. 1997. Syntactic and Semantic Conditions on NPI Licensing in Questions. In: *Proceedings of the WCCFL 15*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 177–191.
- Harris, Daniel W. Mar. 2016. Taxonomizing Speech Acts. <https://danielwharris.com/teaching/spring16/handouts/Taxonomy.pdf>, accessed 16 August 2022.
- Harris, Daniel W. 2019. Intention and Commitment in Speech Acts. *Theoretical Linguistics* 45.1–2, 53–67.
- Harris, Daniel W. 2020a. Intentionalism and Bald-Faced Lies. *Inquiry*, forthcoming.
- Harris, Daniel W. 2020b. We Talk To People, Not Contexts. *Philosophical Studies* 177, 2713–2733.
- Harris, Daniel W., Daniel Fogal, and Matt Moss. 2018. Speech Acts. The Contemporary Theoretical Landscape. In: Daniel Fogal, Daniel W. Harris, and Matt Moss (Eds.), *New Work on Speech Act*, 1–39. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, Daniel W. and Rachel McKinney. 2021. Speech Act Theory: Social and Political Applications. In: Justin Khoo and Rachel Sterken (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Social and Political Philosophy of Language*. Routledge.
- Hartmann, Jutta, Asya Achimova, Lisa Ebert, Maren Ebert-Rohleder, Natascha Elxnath, Lorenz Geiger, Lea Hofmaier, Joel Klenk, Miriam Lahrso, Sarah Metzger, Michael Reid, Christian Stegemann-Philipps, Raphael Titt, Thalia Vollstedt, Wiltrud Wagner, and Susanne Winkler. 2022. *TInCAP User Manual GRK 1808 Ambiguity Database*. TInCAP.
- Hartmann, Jutta, Lisa Ebert, Gesa Schole, Wiltrud Wagner, and Susanne Winkler. 2023. Annotating Ambiguity Across Disciplines: The Tübingen Interdisciplinary Corpus of Ambiguity Phenomena. In: Matthias Bauer and Angelika Zirker (Eds.), *Strategies of Ambiguity*, 322–349. New York: Routledge.

- Hauck, Jan David and Teruko Vida Mitsuahara. 2020. Sorry Not Sorry. Political Apology in the Age of Trump. In: Ulrike Schneider and Matthias Eitelmann (Eds.), *Linguistic Inquiries into Donald Trump's Language: From 'Fake News' to 'Tremendous Success'*, 215–323. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Heinemann, Margot and Wolfgang Heinemann. 2002. *Grundlagen der Textlinguistik: Interaktion – Text – Diskurs*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Henderson, Robert and Elin McCready. 2018. How Dogwhistles Work. In: *Proceedings of LENLS 14*, 231–240. JSAI International Symposium on Artificial Intelligence.
- Heritage, John. 2002. The Limits of Questioning: Negative Interrogatives and Hostile Question Content. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34.
- Hodges, Adam. 2019. *When Words Trump Politics. Resisting a Hostile Regime of Language*. Redwood City: Stanford University Press.
- Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2006. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ilie, Cornelia. 1994. What else can I tell you? A Pragmatic Study of English Rhetorical Questions as Discursive and Argumentative Acts. PhD thesis. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1974. Presupposition and Linguistic Context. *Theoretical Linguistics* 1, 181–194.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1977. Syntax and Semantics of Questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1.1, 3–44.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena. 2012. *Interpreting Imperatives*. Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 88. Berlin: Springer.
- Kegel, Jens. 2012. “Wollt Ihr den totalen Krieg?": Eine semiotische und linguistische Gesamtanalyse der Rede Goebbels' im Berliner Sportpalast am 18. Februar 1943. Reprint=2006. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Khoo, Justin. 2017. Code Words in Political Discourse. *University of Arkansas Press* 45, 33–64.
- Klein, Josef. 2010. Sprache und Macht. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte (APuZ)*, 7–13.
- Klemperer, Victor. 2013. *Language of the Third Reich: LTI*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Knape, Joachim. 2000. *Was ist Rhetorik?* Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun.
- Knape, Joachim. 2009a. Persuasion. In: Gert Ueding (Ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, 874–907. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Knape, Joachim. 2009b. Rhetorik des Gesprächs. In: Joachim Knape (Ed.), *Rhetorik im Gespräch : ergänzt um Beiträge zum Tübinger Courtshiprhetorik-Projekt*, 13–51. Berlin: Weidler.
- Knape, Joachim. 2015. Von der intendierten Ambiguität in die Aporie. Monologische und dialogische Erkenntniswege am Beispiel von Platons Hippias Minor. In: Susanne Winkler (Ed.), *Ambiguity: Language and Communication*, 111–154. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Knape, Joachim. 2017. Politrhetorik. In: Thomas Niehr, Jörg Killian, and Martin Wengeler (Eds.), *Handbuch Sprache und Politik in 3 Bänden*, 100–128. Vol. 1. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- Knape, Joachim, Nils Becker, and Katie Böhme. 2009. Strategie. In: Gert Ueding (Ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, 152–172. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Knape, Joachim and Susanne Winkler. 2015. Strategisches Ambiguieren, Verstehenswechsel und rhetorische Textleistung. Am Beispiel von Shakespeares Antony-Rede. In: Susanne Winkler (Ed.), *Ambiguity: Language and Communication*, 51–88. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter.
- Kondik, Kyle, Geoffrey Skelley, and Larry J. Sabato. 2015. The 2016 Results We Can Already Predict: The Battleground States Will Give You Déjà Vu. *Politico Magazine*. <https://>

- politico.com/magazine/story2015/05/2016-predictions-117554/, accessed 16 August 2022.
- Konietzko, Andreas and Susanne Winkler, eds. 2026. *Information Structure and Discourse in Generative Grammar: Mechanisms and Processes*. SGG 146. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Koshik, Irene. 2005. *Beyond Rhetorical Questions: Assertive Questions in Everyday Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1995. The Semantics And Pragmatics of Polarity Items. *Linguistic Analysis* 25, 209–255.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2002. Be Brief and Vague! And How Bidirectional Optimality Theory Allows for Verbosity and Precision. In: David Restle and Dietmar Zaefferer (Eds.), *Sounds and Systems. Studies in Structure and Change*, 439–458. Berlin & New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2008. Basic Notions of Information Structure. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55.3–4, 243–376.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2011. Questions. In: Klaus von Heusinger, Claudia Maienborn, and Paul Portner (Eds.), *Semantics*, 1742–1785. Vol. 2. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2015. Bias in Commitment Space Semantics: Declarative Questions, Negated Questions, and Question Tags. In: *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*. Vol. 25, 328–345.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2019. Commitments and Beyond. *Theoretical Linguistics* 45.1–2, 73–91.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2023. Layers of Assertive Clauses: Propositions, Judgements, Commitments, Acts. In: Jutta Hartmann and Angelika Wöllstein (Eds.), *Propositionale Argumente im Sprachvergleich: Theorie und Empirie*, 115–181. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Ladusaw, William A. 1980. Polarity Sensitivity as Inherent Scope Relations. PhD thesis. Austin: University of Texas.
- Lepore, Ernie and Matthew Stone. 2010. Against Metaphorical Meaning. *Topoi* 29, 165–180.
- Lepore, Ernie and Matthew Stone. 2015. *Imagination and Convention: Distinguishing Grammar and Inference in Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, David. 1979. Scorekeeping in a Language Game. In: Rainer Bäuerle, Urs Egli, and Arnim von Stechow (Eds.), *Semantics from a Different Point of View*, 172–187. Berlin: Springer.
- Longobardi, Ferdinando. 2013. Linguistic Factors in Political Speech. In: I. Poggi (Ed.), *Political Speech 2010*, 233–244. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Luppold, Stefanie. 2015. *Textstrategien. Zur Theorie der Textrhetorik*. neue rhetorik. Berlin: Weidler Buchverlag.
- MacFarlane, John. 2011. What Is Assertion? In: Jessica Brown and Herman Cappelen (Eds.), *Assertion: New Philosophical Essays*, 79–96. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MacFarlane, John. 2014. *Assessment Sensitivity. Relative Truth and its Applications*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Martin, James. 2015. Situating Speech: A Rhetorical Approach to Political Strategy. *Political Studies* 63, 25–42.
- Martin, James. 2019. *Psychopolitics of Speech: Uncivil Discourse and the Excess of Desire*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- McMurry, Andrew. 2018. Donald Trump's Distinctive Discourse and Its Functions. In: *Reading Donald Trump: A Parallax View of the Campaign and Early Presidency*, 33–56.
- Meibauer, Jörg. 1986. *Rhetorische Fragen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Molnár, Valéria and Susanne Winkler. 2026. Ambiguity of wh-Questions. In: Andreas Konietzko and Susanne Winkler (Eds.), *Information Structure and Discourse in Generative Grammar: Mechanisms and Processes*, 87–126. Vol. 146. SGG. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

- Nowak, Bartholomäus. 2016. Posing Questions without Asking: The Use of Rhetorical Questions in the Polish Parliamentary Discourse. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 61, 57–73.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey, Ivan A. Sag, and Thomas Wasow. 1997. Idioms. *Language* 70, 491–538.
- Pagin, Peter and Neri Marsili. 2021. Assertion. In: Edward N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Winter 2021. plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2021/entries/assertion, accessed 24 September 2025.
- Portner, Paul. 2007. Imperatives and Modals. *Natural Language Semantics* 15, 351–383.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 1993. Negative Polarity: Entailment and Binding. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16, 149–180.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Reisigl, Martin. 2008. Rhetoric of Political Speeches. In: Ruth Wodak and Veronika Koller (Eds.), *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere*, 243–270. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Riester, Arndt, Lisa Brunetti, and Kordula Kuthy. 2018. Annotation Guidelines for Questions under Discussion and Information Structure. *Studies in Prosody and Syntax*.
- Roberts, Craige. 1996. Information Structure: Toward an Integrated Theory of Formal Pragmatics. In: Jae Hak Yoon and Andreas Kathol (Eds.), *OSUWPL*. Reprint=2012. Vol. 49.
- Roberts, Craige. 2006. Context in Dynamic Interpretation. In: Laurence Horn and Gregory Ward (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, 197–219. Wiley: Blackwell.
- Roberts, Craige. 2012. Information Structure in Discourse: Towards an Integrated Formal Theory of Pragmatics. *Semantics & Pragmatics* 5, 1–69.
- Roberts, Craige. 2015a. Accommodation in a Language Game. *A Companion to David Lewis*, 345–65.
- Roberts, Craige. 2015b. Plans and Imperatives: A Semantics and Pragmatics for Imperative Mood. In: Thomas; Brochhagen, Floris Roelofsen, and Nadine Theiler (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 20th Amsterdam Colloquium*, 353–362.
- Roberts, Craige. 2017. Linguistic Convention and the Architecture of Interpretation. *Analytic Philosophy* 58, 418–439.
- Roberts, Craige. 2018. Speech Acts in Discourse Context. In: Daniel Fogal, Daniel W. Harris, and Matt Moss (Eds.), *New Work on Speech Acts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, Craige. 2021. In: *Annotating QUDs: Desiderata and Approaches*. Annotating QUDs: Desiderata and Approaches (QUDDanno). Online, ZAS & U Bochum.
- Rohde, Hannah. 2006. Rhetorical Questions as Redundant Interrogatives. *San Diego Linguistic Papers* 2, 134–168.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. 1971. Queclaratives. *CLS* 7, 223–231.
- Sailer, Manfred. 2009. On Reading-Dependent Licensing of Strong Polarity Items. In: Arndt Riester and Torgrim Solstad (Eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 13, 455–468.
- Saul, Jennifer. 2018a. Dogwhistles, Political Manipulation, and Philosophy of Language. In: Daniel Fogal, Daniel W. Harris, and Matt Moss (Eds.), *New Work on Speech Acts*, 360–383. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Saul, Jennifer. 2018b. Negligent Falsehood, White Ignorance, and False News. In: Eliot Michaelson and Andreas Stokke (Eds.), *Lying: Language, Knowledge, Ethics and Politics*, 246–261. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Saul, Jennifer. 2019. What is Happening to our Norms Against Racist Speech? In: *Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume*. Vol. 93. 1, 1–23.
- Saul, Jennifer. Jan. 2022. Figleaves and Their Kin: Mechanisms for Getting Away with Racist Speech. In: online. RTG 1808 Colloquium. Tübingen.
- Saul, Jennifer. 2024. *Dogwhistles and Figleaves*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Schmidt-Haberkamp, Barbara and Klaus Ostheeren. 2013. Rhetorizität. In: Gert Ueding (Ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik Online*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/hwro.8.rhetorizitaet>.
- Schneider, Stefan, Julie Glikman, and Mathieu Avanzi. 2015. Introduction. In: Stefan Schneider (Ed.), *Parenthetical Verbs*, 1–10. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Schoepsdau, Klaus. 1996. Frage, rhetorische. In: Gert Ueding (Ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik online*, 445–454. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1515/hwro.3.frage\\_rhetorische](https://doi.org/10.1515/hwro.3.frage_rhetorische).
- Sclafani, Jennifer. 2018. *Talking Donald Trump: A Sociolinguistic Study of Style, Metadiscourse, and Political Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Seargeant, Philip. 2020. *The Art of Political Storytelling*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Searle, John R. 1965. What is a Speech Act? In: Maurice Black (Ed.), *Philosophy in America*, 221–239. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John R. 1975. A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts. *Language, Mind and Knowledge* 7, 344–369.
- Shapiro, Lionel. 2020. Commitment Accounts of Assertion. In: Sanford C. Goldberg (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Assertion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 75–97.
- Signer, Michael. 2020. *Cry Havoc: Charlottesville and American Democracy Under Siege*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Simons, Mandy. 2009. A Gricean View on Intrusive Implicatures. In: Klaus Petrus (Ed.), *Meaning and Analysis: New Essays on H. Paul Grice*, 1–27.
- Simons, Mandy. 2011. Dynamic Pragmatics or Why We Shouldn't Be Afraid of Embedded Implicatures. In: *Proceedings of SALT 21*, 609–633.
- Simons, Mandy, David Beaver, Craige Roberts, and Judith Tonhauser. 2017. The Best Question: Explaining the Projection Behavior of Factives. *Discourse Processes* 54, 187–206.
- Smith, Nathaniel J., Noah Goodman, and Michael Frank. 2013. Learning and Using Language via Recursive Pragmatic Reasoning About Other Agents. In: C.J. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K.Q. Weinberger (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 26.
- Soanes, Catherine and Angus Stevenson. 2003a. Question. In: *Oxford Dictionary of English*, 1442. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Soanes, Catherine and Angus Stevenson. 2003b. Rhetorical question. In: *Oxford Dictionary of English*, 1510. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Staffeldt, Sven. 2007. *Perlokutionäre Kräfte. Lexikalisierte Wirkungen sprachlicher Äußerungen im Deutschen*. Frankfurt a. M.: Lang.
- Staffeldt, Sven. 2014. Sprechakttheoretisch analysieren. In: Sven Staffeldt and Jörg Hagemann (Eds.), *Pragmatiktheorien. Analysen im Vergleich*, 105–148. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Stalnaker, Robert. 1974. Pragmatic Presuppositions. In: Milton Munitz and Peter Under (Eds.), 197–213. New York: New York University Press.
- Stalnaker, Robert. 1978. Assertion. In: Peter Cole (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics*, 315–332. Vol. 9.
- Stalnaker, Robert. 2002. Common Ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25, 701–721.
- Stalnaker, Robert. 2014. *Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stalnaker, Robert. 2018. Dynamic Pragmatics, Static Semantics. In: Daniel Fogal, Daniel W. Harris, and Matt Moss (Eds.), *New Work on Speech Act*, 384–399. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stanley, Jason. 2015. *How Propaganda Works*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Starr, William B. 2016. *A Preference Semantics for Imperatives*. Cornell.

- Stolee, Galen and Steve Caton. 2018. Twitter, Trump, and the Base: A Shift to a New Form of Presidential Talk? *Sign and Society* 6, 147–165.
- Theye, Kirsten and Steven Melling. 2018. Total Losers and Bad Hombres: The Political Incorrectness and Perceived Authenticity of Donald J. Trump. *Southern Communication Journal* 83.5, 322–337.
- Thomason, Richmond. 1990. Accommodation, Meaning, and Implicature: Interdisciplinary Foundations for Pragmatics. *Intentions in Communication*, 325–363.
- Urmson, J.O. 1952. Parenthetical Verbs. *Mind* 61.244, 480–496.
- Van Rooy, Robert. 2003. Negative Polarity Items in Questions: Strength as Relevance. *Journal of Semantics* 20, 239–273.
- Von Fintel, Kai. 2008. What Is Presupposition Accommodation, Again? *Philosophical Perspectives* 22, 137–170.
- Walzer, Arthur. 2019. Faking the News: What Rhetoric Can Teach Us About Donald J. Trump, edited by Ryan Skinnell. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 209–2012.
- Weyland, Kurt. 2017. Populism: A Political–Strategic Approach. In: Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser, Paul Taggart, Paulina Ochoa Espejo, and Pierre Ostiguy (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Populism*, 48–73. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Winkler, Susanne. 2015a. *Ambiguity: Language and Communication*. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter.
- Winkler, Susanne. 2015b. Exploring Ambiguity and the Ambiguity Model from a Transdisciplinary Perspective. In: Susanne Winkler (Ed.), *Ambiguity. Language and Communication*, 1–26. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter.
- Winkler, Susanne. 2022. Die Grundstrukturen sprachlicher Ambiguität. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik und Theologie* 74(2), 155–171.
- Witten, Kimberly. 2023. *The Definition and Typological Model of a Dogwhistle*. <https://scielo.br/j/man/a/vktmMPLqW4PSWHJhHKmLCfh/?format=pdf>, accessed 12 August 2023.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2016. *Politik mit der Angst: zur Wirkung Rechtspopulistischer Diskurse*. Hamburg & Wien: Satzweiss.
- Wong, Steven Ming-Chiu and Foong Ha Yap. 2015. Did Obamacare Create New jobs? An Analysis of Mitt Romney’s Use of Rhetorical Questions in the 2012 US Presidential Election Campaign. *Text & Talk* 35, 643–668.
- Woolley, John and Gerhard Peters. 2022. *The American Presidency Project*. <https://presidency.ucsb.edu>, accessed 17 August 2022.
- Zwarts, Frans. 1996. A Hierarchy or Negative Expressions. In: Heinrich Wansing (Ed.), *Negation: A Notion in Focus*. De Gruyter, 7–169.

## Corpus Sources

- Donald Trump, *Remarks Announcing Candidacy for President in New York City*, 16 Jun 15,  
*Video*: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SpMJx0-HyOM>,  
*Script*: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-announcing-candidacy-for-president-new-york-city>.
- Donald Trump, *Remarks Introducing Governor Mike Pence as the 2016 Republican Vice Presidential Nominee in New York City*, 16 Jul 16,  
*Video*: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cDh55Ku8UE8>,  
*Script*: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-introducing-governor-mike-pence-the-2016-republican-vice-presidential-nominee-new>.
- Donald Trump, *Remarks at the KI Convention Center in Green Bay, Wisconsin*, 05 Aug 16,  
*Video*: <https://www.c-span.org/video/?413593-1/donald-trump-endorses-speaker-ryan>

- ahead-primary,  
*Script:* <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-the-ki-convention-center-green-bay-wisconsin>.
- Donald Trump, *Remarks at a Rally at the University of North Carolina in Wilmington*, 09 Aug 16,  
*Video:* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pAePRVED32k>,  
*Script:* <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-rally-the-university-north-carolina-wilmington>.
- Donald Trump, *Remarks at Erie Insurance Arena in Erie, Pennsylvania*, 12 Aug 16,  
*Video:* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vTapwTQIxil>,  
*Script:* <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-erie-insurance-arena-erie-pennsylvania>.
- Donald Trump, *Remarks at the Summit Sports and Ice Complex in Dimondale, Michigan*, 19 Aug 16,  
*Video:* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FgDt6RfXVWA>,  
*Script:* <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-the-summit-sports-and-ice-complex-dimondale-michigan>.
- Donald Trump, *Remarks at the Mississippi Coliseum in Jackson, Mississippi*, 24 Aug 16,  
*Video:* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hWTd0eZtf9c>,  
*Script:* <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-the-mississippi-coliseum-jackson-mississippi>
- Donald Trump, *Remarks on Immigration at the Phoenix Convention Center in Phoenix*, 31 Aug 16,  
*Video:* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yxD5QkzmVOA>,  
*Script:* <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-immigration-the-phoenix-convention-center-phoenix-arizona>.
- Donald Trump, *Remarks to the 11th Annual Values Voter Summit in Washington, DC Omni Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C.*, 09 Sep 16,  
*Video:* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pwsj99e-qvc>,  
*Script:* <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-the-11th-annual-values-voter-summit-washington-dc-omni-shoreham-hotel-washington>.
- Donald Trump, *Remarks to the Economic Club of New York at the Waldorf Astoria in New York City*, 15 Sep 16,  
*Video:* [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H\\_EGeoUdTnA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H_EGeoUdTnA),  
*Script:* <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-the-economic-club-new-york-the-waldorf-astoria-new-york-city>.
- Donald Trump, *Remarks at Prescott Valley Event Center in Prescott Valley, Arizona*, 04 Oct 16,  
*Video:* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uMRZ6vS6kzU>,  
*Script:* <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-prescott-valley-event-center-prescott-valley-arizona>.
- Donald Trump, *Remarks at the Southeastern Livestock Pavilion in Ocala*, 12 Oct 16,  
*Video:* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I-M5AjULchU>,  
*Script:* <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-the-southeastern-livestock-pavilion-ocala-florida>.
- Donald Trump, *Remarks at Radisson Armory in Manchester, New Hampshire*, 28 Oct 16,  
*Video:* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4RP4mPH-OKM>,  
*Script:* <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-radisson-armory-manchester-new-hampshire>.
- Donald Trump, *Remarks at the Central Florida Fairgrounds in Orlando, Florida*, 02 Nov 16,  
*Video:* <https://www.c-span.org/video/?417871-1/donald-trump-campaign-rally>

orlando-florida,

*Script:* <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-the-central-florida-fairgrounds-orlando-florida>.

Donald Trump, *Remarks at the Bayfront Park Amphitheater in Miami, Florida*, 02 Nov 16,

*Video:* <https://www.c-span.org/video/?417864-1/donald-trump-campaigns-miami-florida>,

*Script:* <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-the-bayfront-park-amphitheater-miami-florida>.

Donald Trump, *Remarks at J.S Dorton Arena in Raleigh, North Carolina*, 07 Nov 16,

*Video:* <https://www.c-span.org/video/?418210-1/presidential-candidate-donald-trump-rally-raleigh-north-carolina>,

*Script:* <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-js-dorton-arena-raleigh-north-carolina>.

# Appendices



# A Corpus Data

Appendix A.1 contains additional information on the annotation schema. Appendix A.2 contains the corpus study of the strategic functions in speeches 5 and 12. In A.3, all the political speeches by Donald Trump during the presidential election campaign 2015–16 are listed.

## A.1 Description Annotation Data

### Data Collection and Annotation Data

This appendix contains additional information on the calculations and descriptions of the columns and rows in the Annotation Data File in Chapter 3 (3.1–3.4). *Y/n*-questions and *wh*-questions include only well-formed questions. The row “Sum” refers to the total number of questions identified in the speeches. “Sum without PC” refers to the adjusted numbers that exclude any form of problematic case, either “Problematic Case (Form)” or “Problematic Case” (unclear whether a reaction or rhetorical question or a reported or rhetorical question). Problematic Cases and Problematic Cases (Form) are excluded from all calculations. In “Sum with problematic cases (PC)”, the calculations for the categories “extra-textual level”, “reaction questions”, and “reported questions” are provided. These are unclear cases with respect to their classification, because they are either reaction or rhetorical questions or reported or rhetorical questions. The two types of problematic cases are listed and the numbers of problematic cases are merged. There are cases that are problematic according to form and case, but these are only counted once. Therefore, there were 263 problematic cases by form and 6 cases that are problematic by category (reported or reaction question), but the total number is only 266. In “Polarity / Form of Communication”, the results of the calculations with respect to the Assertion of Opposite Polarity are listed. In the columns

“NPI / Form of Question / Form of Communication”, the results are listed based on which question form the NPIs were found in. The results in the RQs are listed separately. In the columns under “Form of Question / pos. or neg. Question / Degree of NPI”, the results of the NPIs are listed based on the form of the questions, the polarity, and the degree of the NPIs.

The row “Percentage (Sum)” contains the percentage results. I list the references in the column “Percentage (Sum)”. The percentages “Form of Questions” refer to the total number of questions, i.e. excluding problematic cases. The results “Form of Questions (TSC-RQ)” refer to the total number of all questions from the TSC-RQ.

The results in the column “Polarity Monologue” refer to all polarity appearances in monologues (439). The results in “Polarity Monologue” and “Non-Polarity Monologue” refer only to RQs.

The results in “Form of Communication” refer to all questions without problematic cases. The results in the columns “NPI / Form of Question / Form of Communication” refer to the total number of NPI appearances without problematic cases in monologues.

In addition, standard deviation (SD) has been calculated. The standard deviation is a measure of the deviation from the mean value of the data values in the respective columns.

## **A.2 Corpus Study: Strategic Functions in Speech 5 and Speech**

### **12**

In Chapter 3, I presented the different forms and classification of the identified utterances with question marks. In the following, the utterances are annotated with respect to their form and function. In Chapter 5, I proposed three strategic functions of RQs, “pragmatic focusing to manage the CG” in Section 5.2.1 (shortened in the following as “focusing”), “forcing the accommodation of presupposition” in Section 5.2.2, and “aligning beliefs” in Section 5.2.3. Speech 5 (A.1) and speech 12 (A.2) are annotated accordingly. In some of the scripts published by Woolley and Peters (2022), reactions by the audiences are listed. Cases in which Trump responds to the reaction by the audience, e.g. “[Audience: We want Trump. We want Trump. We want Trump. We want Trump. We want Trump.] I’m *gonna* tell you – thank you.” in speech 1, are listed in the following speeches. Otherwise, they are

not included in the following transcripts. Changes based on YouTube videos to the scripts published by Woolley and Peters (2022) are marked with italics. The respective videos are listed in the References. As a guide, time markers are given in the speeches. In the transcripts, either - or – are used. I have standardised them to –.

### A.2.1 Speech 5

#### Remarks at Erie Insurance Arena in Erie, Pennsylvania, 12 August 2016

Thank you. Thank you, everybody. Thank you.	
Unbelievable. Thank you very much. Thank you very much.	
It's a great honor. Thank you.	
Amazing. Amazing.	
What great people.	
We're <i>gonna</i> bring back our jobs to Pennsylvania.	
We're <i>gonna</i> bring back our jobs to the United States.	
<i>Gonna</i> bring back our jobs, folks.	
I've looked at the numbers and I see what's happening in Pennsylvania.	
I see what's happening all over our country.	
You look at New York state, you look at New England, you look anywhere in the country where you want to go to, all over it's the same.	
Manufacturing way down, jobs way down.	
You go to other countries, they're taking our companies, they're taking our jobs.	

<p>People are right now working harder than they've ever worked.</p>	
<p>Eighteen years ago, they made more money in real wages, 18 years, think of it.</p>	
<p>Eighteen years ago, many of the people in this incredibly big room, and thank you for being here, you know it's 93 degrees out <i>here</i>.</p>	
<p>And they still have a lot of people trying to get in, I don't know if they can get them in.</p>	
<p>(A.2.1) Should we let them in? (01:03:20–01:03:21)</p>	<p><i>Extra-Textual Level</i></p>
<p>Just let them in.</p>	
<p>But 18 years ago, people were making more money in real wages than they make today. And today they're working two jobs, some people are working three jobs.</p>	
<p>(A.2.2) So, they're older, and they're working harder, and they're making less money, all right? (01:03:43–01:03:44)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question</i></p>
<p>A friend of mine, I've been telling this story over the last month because it's better than going to Wharton or better than going to Harvard and asking them to do a study, because you learn it in three minutes.</p>	

But let me just tell you.	
Right now, Mexico and other countries are building facilities, plants, the likes of which you've never seen.	
<i>Of</i> – We're <i>gonna</i> build the wall, don't worry, we're <i>gonna</i> build the wall, we're <i>gonna</i> build it, we're going to build <i>the wall</i> .	
But a friend of mine, and actually a supporter, big supporter, great guy.	
He builds plants, that's what he does, he builds plants.	
He doesn't want to build apartments, he doesn't want to build office buildings, he wants to build plants.	
And he's just about the biggest there is.	
(A.2.3) And I said how are things going? (01:04:38–01:04:44)	<i>Storytelling</i>
(A.2.4) He said very well, how are you doing in the U.S.? (01:04:38–01:04:44)	<i>Storytelling</i>
Not good.	
(A.2.5) How are you doing in Mexico? (01:04:45–01:04:46)	<i>Storytelling</i>

He said Donald do you want to see, it's the eighth wonder of the world.	
They are building plants, the likes of which I've never seen.	
He's building some of the greatest plants, big – you look at Ford moving vast operations to Mexico.	
The plants.	
You look at – look at, take a look.	
By the way, millions of jobs, thousands of companies over the years, they've left us.	
And we have a few things.	
We have unemployment, we have empty plants, I <i>saw</i> it up in New York state, I saw it in Pennsylvania, you were great to meet, you voted a big victory for Donald Trump, thank you.	
That was a big victory.	
(A.2.6) I mean I assumed I was <i>gonna</i> – if I don't win Pennsylvania – and by the way, I was talking to our great Congressman, and where is he? (01:05:42–01:05:45)	<i>Extra-Textual Level</i>
(A.2.7) He's here some place, where is he? (01:05:42–01:05:45)	<i>Extra-Textual Level</i>

<p>He loves the people, and I have to say, of all of Pennsylvania he wants to see this state do well. Thank you.</p>	
<p>But just talking back to a few of my friends that live here, we have a few of the friends and we see what's happened with General Electric where they're cutting way back.</p>	
<p>Not <i>gonna</i> happen.</p>	
<p>And you know why they're cutting <i>back</i>, one reason.</p>	
<p>Because we don't take care of our miners and we're not producing coal.</p>	
<p>(A.2.8) And they don't need to make those big, big beautiful, you could call them locomotives I guess, right? (01:06:32–01:06:32)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question</i></p>
<p>Whatever the hell they are, they're big and they're powerful and they don't need them like they used to because we don't make our government work for us.</p>	
<p>They're not working for us.</p>	
<p>They're working for others; they're not working for us.</p>	
<p>So, when General Electric goes out and you see the numbers, I see the numbers, and it's about coal, so I just left parts of Virginia and West Virginia, and the coal industries decimated.</p>	

<p>The miners are out of work, they're totally out of work. I mean <i>there's</i> – <i>there</i> will be no such thing as coal in this country pretty soon. And we're talking clean coal, we're talking clean coal.</p>	
<p>So, I was with the miners, we have such tremendous support, West Virginia, the mining parts of Virginia. All over, Ohio, because Hillary Clinton made the statement not so long ago. A number of months ago she said, we're <i>gonna</i> put the mines and miners out of business.</p>	
<p>(A.2.9) All right? (01:07:41–01:07:41)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question</i></p>
<p><i>Gonna</i> put the mines and the miners – so.</p>	
<p>So, we're not gonna let that happen.</p>	
<p>(A.2.10) We're not <i>gonna</i> let that happen and we're not <i>gonna</i> let it happen in Pennsylvania because you know what? (01:07:55–01:07:56)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: “You-Know-What” Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>

<p>A lot of your miners have already lost their jobs, but you have a lot of other jobs that are very reliant on the mines. Like, as an example, General Electric. And what we're going to do, folks, is going to be so special. We're <i>gonna</i> bring it back. We're <i>gonna</i> bring back our jobs, we're <i>gonna</i> bring back our companies.</p>	
<p>When a company wants to leave our country to go to another country and think they're <i>gonna</i> make their product, and because our politicians are weak, stupid, taken care of by lobbyists, special interests – they're taken care of by lobbyists, they're taken care of by donors and special interests. That's what – you know, a friend of mine – very smart guy – said – I can't believe it. We're talking about a deal that took place about a month ago.</p>	
<p>He said, I can't believe they could have gotten that through.</p>	
<p>(A.2.11) I said, Why can't you believe it? (01:08:56–01:08:57)</p>	<p><i>Storytelling</i></p>
<p>Well, it's so bad for the country.</p>	
<p>I said, Yeah, but it's good for the politician because they're taken care of by their lobbyists and their donors and the special interests.</p>	

So even though you say we want, as an example, General Electric to produce more.	
If they don't want to or if for some reason one of the donors of crooked Hillary Clinton doesn't want that to happen – even though it's great for Erie, even though it's great <i>for</i> you, even though it's great for the state of Pennsylvania – then it's not <i>gonna</i> happen, folks.	
It's not gonna happen.	
And by the way – and I have to tell you this.	
So when they think they're <i>gonna</i> take our companies <i>and</i> rip them out of – as an example – this area or this state or any other state.	
And go to Mexico and build massive new plants and employ people other than you, and you're <i>gonna</i> lose your job so you're <i>gonna</i> now get two part – time jobs that don't add up to half of what you used to make.	
That stuff isn't happening anymore.	
So, here's what happens.	
They're <i>gonna</i> build that plant.	
Now, if I were here five years ago and if President Obama put me and maybe secretary of keeping business in the United States – that's my title, secretary of keeping business in the United States.	

I mean, I like the sound of secretary of de- fense better.	
Oh, and by the way, we're <i>gonna</i> build up our military.	
We're <i>gonna</i> be very strong.	
<i>Believe me.</i>	
<i>Believe me.</i>	
And we're <i>Believe me.</i> take care of our vets.	
We're going to take care of our vets, believe me.	
But I like the sound – I like the sound of secretary of Defense. I like the sound of sec- retary of the Treasury. I like the sound of secretary of State. But I'll tell you, would I be good at keeping jobs over here. Would I be...	
I'll tell you this. I just have to say the Bernie Sanders protesters were much, much stronger.	
They had much more passion, I have to say.	
All right.	
(A.2.12) You know what's interesting? (01:12:18–01:12:19)	<i>Problematic Case: "You-Know-What" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i>
If I could speak to them for like five min- utes – we want a strong military, we want to take care of our people, we want good education, we want good housing, we want good healthcare.	

(A.2.13) What do we want? (01:12:30–01:12:31)	<i>Function Focusing: Trump motivates the hearer to think about what they want. In the previous sentence (the input context), Trump listed what he wants – to take “care of our people, good education, good housing, and good healthcare”. He refers with his question to the list and aims to align his political goals and convictions with those of the hearer.</i>
We’re all in for the same thing.	
Really amazing.	
Really amazing.	
(A.2.14) So, I’ll be your secretary of keeping – <i>keeping</i> companies in the United States, right? (01:12:43–01:12:43)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>
So, I would go to a company like Carrier Air Conditioner, which decided to leave Indianapolis, Indiana, and I would say here’s the story.	
We think it’s wonderful that you’re negotiating with Mexico.	
I’m sure you’re <i>gonna</i> have a wonderful plant, but here’s what’s <i>gonna</i> happen.	
If you build that plant and you fire all of these people, 1400 people who were so great to me.	
Indiana, I won that in a landslide.	
Actually, the timing was good.	

<p><i>The time</i> – I won it in a landslide because I know what to do.</p>	
<p>Hillary doesn't know what to do.</p>	
<p>(A.2.15) Did you see her yesterday? (01:13:17–01:13:19)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump intends to stress Hillary Clinton's behaviour the day before. It remains unclear what Trump is exactly referring to, because he only asks the listener if the listener saw "her" yesterday. In the previous utterance, he talks about Hillary, so "her" refers to Hillary Clinton. In the previous utterance, Trump stated that she does not know what to do. Hence, the rhetorical point of the RQ is that Trump 1. utters that she does not know what to do, and 2. asks the listener to remember yesterday and hints something she said or did that supports his previous utterance that she does not know what to do. The RQ stresses her incompetence, however, remains vague what he is referring to. The CG already includes the rhetorical point that Trump perceives her as not capable as an American president. Hence, the classification is "focussing on" because the speaker does not intend to force the accommodation of a new presupposition, but is referring to something common for both sides.</i></p>
<p>She has no clue about what we're talking about.</p>	
<p>Folks, she has no clue.</p>	
<p>She has no clue.</p>	

Crooked Hillary.	
She doesn't know anything about it and, by the way, if she did, she couldn't do it anyway because her donors don't want to do it.	
There's reasons.	
But look, look.	
I would go to them and <i>I would say</i> just to keep them.	
Just to keep them.	
And I wouldn't even care that much. I'll tell you why.	
(A.2.16) Ready? (01:13:43–01:13:43)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>
I'd say here's the story.	
If you leave, in this case, Indianapolis, you're <i>gonna</i> go to Mexico, you're <i>gonna</i> make your air conditioning units.	
Every single unit that you make that crosses our now very, very strong border we're <i>gonna</i> charge you 35 percent of the cost of that unit.	
(A.2.17) Ok? (01:14:03–01:14:03)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>
Thirty five percent.	
(A.2.18) Right? (01:14:05–01:14:05)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>

So simple.	
Thirty five percent the cost of that unit.	
We hope you enjoy your new plant. Very hot weather out there, very hot.	
We hope you enjoy your new plant, but 35 percent is coming to us.	
Now, here's what's <i>gonna</i> happen if they haven't moved yet.	
A lot of them have moved.	
We've lost thousands and thousands of companies; we've lost millions of jobs – too late.	
I should have been there 10 years ago.	
Nobody would have left.	
Nobody would have left because you need the right messenger, you know, I'm your messenger in terms of this movement.	
But you need the right person saying it.	
So, here's what's <i>gonna</i> happen.	
Normally they'd call up whoever it is that was putting the little order down like the new president and they'd have one of their lobbyists call up and they'd say Hillary, I'm sorry, you can't do that, they gave you 2 million for your campaign.	
Can't do that, Hillary.	
OK, I won't do that.	
With me, I'm putting my money up, folks.	
I'm putting my money up.	

(A.2.19) <i>Alright?</i> (01:15:11–01:15:11)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>
Putting my money up.	
We're raising money for Reince and for the RNC, but that's for a lot of other reasons.	
We are putting – I'm putting a lot of money up.	
(A.2.20) I financed my – I funded, not financed, I wish I financed, right? (01:15:25–01:15:26)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>
I funded but I funded my primaries and I spent less than anybody else in terms of the measures.	
(A.2.21) So, here's a story – wouldn't that be nice? (01:15:37–01:15:38)	<i>Problematic Case: "Embedded" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i>
I spent less and won in a landslide.	
Other people spent much, much more. Three, four, five times more and they came in seventh.	
(A.2.22) Who the hell do you want to have as your president, right? (01:15:51–01:15:53)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>

(A.2.23) Right? (01:15:53–01:15:54)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>
(A.2.24) Right? (01:15:54–01:15:55)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>
Oh, boy, and then they don't like me – couple of them, most of them have really supported us, but some of them just can't get over it.	
(A.2.25) You know what I say to them? (01:16:14–01:16:15)	<i>Problematic Case: "You-Know-What" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i>
Get over it.	
We're just having fun.	
Get over it.	
You signed a pledge, I hereby guarantee that I will endorse whoever wins – you know, the funny thing, all those pledges, you know they were signed for different – they were signed so that I would sign it.	
And I would have honored it, I will say.	
Even if I wasn't fond or didn't like – I would have honored it because a pledge is a very important thing.	
But here's the thing.	
So, we are going to take these companies that haven't left – now, I'm looking at your numbers folks, you're not doing too well.	

You're not doing too well here.	
Pennsylvania has lost one in three manufacturing jobs since <i>North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)</i> – you know, that's massive, since NAFTA. NAFTA was signed by Bill Clinton and I believe it's the single worst trade document ever signed in the history of our country and probably in the history of our world.	
It's one of the most one-sided documents that I've ever seen.	
And it allowed Mexico and places to do unbelievably well at our expense.	
(A.2.26) <i>Alright?</i> (01:17:38–01:17:39)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>
And did you see where say, I'm <i>gonna</i> renegotiate NAFTA, I'm <i>gonna</i> – TPP disaster.	
Ok, don't worry.	
Don't worry.	
And Hillary was in favor of TPP.	
She said it's the gold standard.	
Thank you for reminding me.	
I like this guy.	
It's the gold standard.	
TPP.	
Transpacific Partnership.	
It is going to be – I don't think <i>it</i> can be worse than NAFTA honestly.	
But it's <i>gonna</i> be as bad as NAFTA.	

So TPP, she said it is the gold standard.	
She's reading it from a teleprompter.	
It is the gold standard – oh, boy.	
Our country is in trouble.	
Our country is in trouble.	
Our country is in trouble.	
So she said it's the gold standard.	
But when she heard me make a speech, as I understand it.	
And she heard me talking very negatively about it.	
As an example, they don't talk <i>about</i> devaluation, which is the single greatest tool that these countries are using to kill the United States, including China.	
They devalue their currency.	
Well, it doesn't happen.	
Number one thing is not mentioned.	
So complicated, this agreement.	
Too many countries.	
By the way, I believe <i>in</i> trade.	
I believe in trade deals.	
One country at a time.	
Boom. Boom. Boom.	
You got to see the lines.	
We'll have one line.	
And if they don't do well.	

<p>If they don't behave themselves, if they want to start devaluing their currency all over the place, very simple, we write them a notice like we do in business.</p>	
<p>We serve them with a 30-day notice.</p>	
<p>(A.2.27) And by the way, you just saw, how great are our police, right? (01:19:29–01:19:33)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question</i></p>
<p>Law and order.</p>	
<p>We need law and order.</p>	
<p>We need law and order, and we will have law and order.</p>	
<p>Now our police, our firemen – but our police do a fantastic job.</p>	
<p>They are not recognized for the great job they do.</p>	
<p>(A.2.28) If they have 500,000 incidents all positively, beautifully handled, one bad thing happens, that one bad thing is on the news for two weeks and it's a disgrace, OK? (01:20:05–01:20:06)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question</i></p>
<p>It's a disgrace.</p>	
<p>So, we should be very thankful for the job they do.</p>	

So, so, Pennsylvania is losing a lot of its business.	
<i>And</i> right now, we're sitting here, we're talking – oh, here's another one.	
Go home to Mom.	
Go home to Mom.	
And your mother is voting for <i>Trump!</i>	
She's voting for Trump.	
<i>True.</i>	
It's true.	
By the way, just to interject – so I was told this whole area is Democratic, meaning Democrat.	
And I was told that by a lot of different people outside and then they said I can't believe that you have 10,000 people, you have people outside trying to get in.	
They said, the came up to me, this is – happens to be a Democrat who I happen to know is a good guy – came up to me and said I've never seen anything like it.	
It always goes Democrat.	

<p>(A.2.29) Is that a correct statement? (01:21:15–01:21:16)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: The utterance questions the statement by the Democrat that the whole area vote Democrat. The rhetorical answer is that there is doubt that this is a correct statement because Trump as a Republican will show that not the whole area votes Democrat. Trump uses the RQ to challenge the Democrat's assumption that the area is a Democratic-safe area.</i></p>
<p>Said, you are going to win Erie and the surrounding area – you're gonna win in a landslide.</p>	
<p><i>Gonna</i> be a landslide.</p>	
<p>Because people are tired of lies, they're tired of losing their jobs, they're tired of seeing their companies being ripped out and going to other places.</p>	
<p>They're tired of China coming in and dropping steel all over the place to put your companies out of business, so we have to go to China to get our steel, which is happening very quickly.</p>	
<p>And that's why the steel workers are with me, that's why the miners are with me, that's why the working people, electricians, the plumbers, the sheetrockers, the concrete guys and gals, they're all – they're with us.</p>	

<p>(A.2.30) And I grew up, you know they say, you know you're really rich, how come you sort of relate to these people? (01:22:13–01:22:15)</p>	<p><i>Storytelling</i></p>
<p>Well, <i>you know</i>, my father built houses and I used to work in these houses and I got to know the electricians, I got to know all these people, I got to know the plumbers, the steamfitters – I got to know them all.</p>	
<p>And I liked them better than the rich people that I know.</p>	
<p>I know a lot of rich people.</p>	
<p>It's true.</p>	
<p>They're better.</p>	
<p>I like them better.</p>	
<p>So, anyway – and, we're <i>gonna</i> put people back to work.</p>	
<p>We're not playing games.</p>	
<p>And it's <i>gonna</i> go quickly.</p>	
<p>By the way, it's <i>gonna</i> go quickly.</p>	
<p>But look at this, OK.</p>	
<p>So, Erie, has lost <i>nearly</i> one in three manufacturing jobs.</p>	
<p>You know that, all I – you do – I flew over, you're looking at the plants, plants that 25 years ago, 20 years ago, 15 years ago, some two years ago, were vibrant.</p>	

<p>But no plant two years ago was too vibrant because it was down to half, down to a quarter, down to a tenth, and then ultimately they closed, but you see them.</p>	
<p>They are falling over.</p>	
<p>The rain, the sleet, the snow, the wind.</p>	
<p>These are great buildings that are falling apart.</p>	
<p>Don't feel bad, all over the country.</p>	
<p>Upstate New York is a disaster, which Hillary Clinton said that she was <i>gonna</i> fix.</p>	
<p>OK, so the Washington Post is extraordinarily dishonest and that's fine.</p>	
<p>But they wrote a story, I couldn't believe I saw this story, they talked about Hillary Clinton.</p>	
<p>It was a headline, Hillary Clinton and when she ran for the United States Senator from New York, she said to the people in upstate New York, which was starting to really have problems because of her husband's bill NAFTA.</p>	
<p>And companies were leaving, tremendous unemployment, tremendous problems, making nothing and she said I will turn it around, I will create 200,000 jobs, we're <i>gonna</i> do a great job.</p>	
<p>(A.2.31) Guess what? (01:24:11–01:24:12)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: "Guess-What" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>

She got elected, she did nothing.	
And the only ones that benefited were the consultants and the people that helped her out.	
It is a disaster.	
Upstate New York is right now worse than anything you have in the state of Pennsylvania, she did nothing.	
(A.2.32) And I watched her yesterday, which was hard to do, <i>cause</i> she is boring, OK? (01:24:37–01:24:38)	<i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience's attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i>
(A.2.33) I watched her yesterday talking about – you know what's funny? (01:24:44–01:24:45)	<i>Problematic Case: "You-Know-What" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i>
I said I'm <i>gonna</i> renegotiate NAFTA <i>and what</i> happens if you can't make a deal, I said we're <i>gonna</i> terminate, we're getting out.	
And.	
<i>It's very simple.</i>	
<i>Very simple.</i>	
<i>Very simple.</i>	

So, I've been saying that and I've been saying we're <i>gonna</i> renegotiate different trade deals, and we're <i>gonna</i> make great trade deals and all this and she's never said that.	
All of a sudden, two days ago, I will renegotiate trade deals.	
She's not <i>gonna</i> do it, folks.	
She's going to renegotiate trade deals the same way she was <i>gonna</i> put 200,000 jobs in upstate New York.	
It turned out to be a total fantasy and I have to tell you, I respect the Washington Post for writing one bad story.	
(A.2.34) Because you <i>know</i> what they're doing? (01:25:28–01:25:30)	<i>Problematic Case: "You-Know" and "Embedded" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i>
And Reince was alluding to it a little bit, the only way she gets elected is if they don't report on her.	
They don't show her.	
They have me on so much television.	
There's CNN, you talk about dishonesty, it's called the Clinton – wait – it's called the Clinton News Network, CNN.	
Now, think of it, Clinton is ...	
She's hardly ever on.	
So yesterday, they have yesterday, a scandal with the emails, another one.	

I'm not talking about the 33,000 emails that she deleted or got rid of.	
(A.2.35) Can you imagine what was on those emails? (01:26:11–01:26:16)	<i>Function Focusing: Trump shifts the focus to the emails that Hillary Clinton is supposed to have deleted. Trump shifts the attention to the instance in order to encourage the listeners to think about what might be in the e-mails and why Clinton felt the need to delete them. The rhetorical point is that there has to be something suspicious in the e-mails.</i>
(A.2.36) Can you imagine? (01:26:11–01:26:16)	<i>Problematic Case: "Shortened" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i>
I love that.	
Can you imagine what was on those emails, 33,000 emails were deleted. And she said well it had to do with the wedding and yoga.	
I give two to yoga, I give five to the wedding.	
I'll tell you, the lies, the deception.	
(A.2.37) We're running like they run right now a third world country folks, OK? (01:26:42–01:26:43)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>
You saw what happened, it's running like a third world country, we're being talked about all over the world, nobody can believe it.	

<p>(A.2.38) In fact, when they were going over the charges against Hillary Clinton, one after another after another after another, however, and yet other people, their lives have been destroyed for doing much less, all right? (01:27:04–01:27:04)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question</i></p>
<p>Their lives have been destroyed.</p>	
<p>So now they have a big scandal in New York.</p>	
<p>It's in the New York papers, but very little.</p>	
<p>(A.2.39) Pay, right? (01:27:17–01:27:19)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question</i></p>
<p>Pay for play.</p>	
<p>And it's horrifying, it's horrifying.</p>	
<p>Our government is for sale.</p>	
<p>Our government is for sale by a crooked person.</p>	
<p>And what they're doing is they're trying to not talk about her.</p>	
<p>Take a look.</p>	
<p>You go to CNN as an example.</p>	
<p>Story after story about Trump.</p>	
<p>Story-Trump.</p>	
<p>Trump.</p>	
<p>Trump.</p>	
<p>Trump.</p>	

And yesterday, it was announced that people are tired of negative – the hit jobs and CNN's starting to do very poorly.	
That's good.	
I like that.	
I like that.	
And I have to say, Fox has been treating us fairly.	
Fox has been fair.	
But CNN has been catastrophic.	
It's so dishonest.	
But somebody was explaining to me their theory.	
If they don't report on her, people aren't gonna know how bad she is.	
Look at her news conference.	
She hasn't had a news conference in like 260 days.	
That last one wasn't a news conference.	
That was a few of her friends.	
They asked her a question.	
(A.2.40) What did she say about the circuit, right? (01:28:36–01:28:39)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>
Let me tell you, if I ever said that short-circuited, if I ever said I short-circuited, it would be headlines all over the world.	
They would call for the death penalty.	

<p>(A.2.41) Can you imagine if I said that I short-circuited? (01:28:55–01:28:59)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: The speaker aims to shift the attention again to the topic and additionally expresses his surprise, astonishment, or indignation about the possibility that he might have short-circuited. Thereby, he invites a reasoning process, that it would not be possible. The rhetorical answer is that it is not possible that Trump said that he short-circuited.</i></p>
<p>I mean, I stand up here for months in front of massive crowds, she gets 300 people going to her events.</p>	
<p>She gets 300 people and then she reads something from a teleprompter and then she leaves, and she goes home, and she goes to sleep.</p>	
<p>And then she wakes, and she goes again.</p>	
<p>And I'm telling you – and nobody does anything about it.</p>	
<p>Now me, I stand up here – I'm not looking at notes.</p>	
<p>I'm not reading teleprompters.</p>	
<p>Not easy.</p>	
<p>Not easy.</p>	
<p>Not easy.</p>	
<p><i>But – but – but – remember – but – and if I make one mistake a little thing – ooh, he mentioned something wrong.</i></p>	
<p>He got a wrong date.</p>	
<p>It's like headlines all over.</p>	

She can say she short-circuited up here.	
I don't want a president who short-circuits.	
(A.2.42) Is that OK? (01:30:07–01:30:08)	<i>Function Focusing: Trump aims to strengthen the point that he does not want a president who short-circuits. The paragraph has to be carefully considered because the storyline is abbreviated. Trump complains that if he makes one small mistake, there is a lot of media coverage. Trump continues that Hillary Clinton is able to say that she short-circuited and she will not be criticised to the same extent that he would be. The RQ in A.2.42 refers to the last utterance, whether it is ok that she can say that she short-circuited. Hence, the rhetorical answer is “No, it is not ok” and strengthens the argument that he would be the better president.</i>
I don't want it.	
I don't want a president who short-circuits.	
We've got to deal with ISIS.	
We've got to deal with China.	
We've got to deal with lots of people.	
They're not <i>short-circuited</i> .	
But I don't want somebody that short-circuits.	
So let me just tell you – let me just tell you.	
Over the last little while – you know, every time, it's always a big deal.	

When I said that Obama – and of course, I’m being sarcastic.	
And they know that because after I said that, I said he’s the MVP <sup>1</sup> , he’s going to collect his MVP award.	
OK.	
So, I said Obama is the founder of ISIS.	
The founder.	
And these dishonest media people – they’re the most dishonest people.	
(A.2.43) They said oh, did he mean that? (01:31:00–01:31:01)	<i>Storytelling</i>
(A.2.44) Didn’t he mean that? (01:31:01–01:31:02)	<i>Storytelling</i>
And after that, I’d say a lot – in fact, they like him so much because he’s been so weak and so bad.	
I mean, he let this happen.	
They had eight states.	
They had eight countries.	
They’re now in 28 countries. They’re expanding.	
So I said the founder of <i>IS</i> – obviously, I’m being sarcastic.	

---

<sup>1</sup> Most Valuable Player

Then – then – but not that sarcastic, to be honest with you.	
And they all said, he should not say that.	
They should call him an enabler.	
Call him an enabler.	
He's an enabler.	
I said, that doesn't sound the same.	
He's an enabler.	
People are <i>gonna</i> say what's – these people are the worst.	
But listen, so I said the founder of ISIS.	
And in fact, very soon he's going over to pick up his most valuable player award.	
(A.2.45) Did I say that? (01:32:02–01:32:03)	<i>Function Focusing: Trump states that he said that Obama is the founder of ISIS and questions his own utterance. The presupposed answer is already in the CG that he said it. He expresses his astonishment about whether he said it or not.</i>
I say it all the time.	
So, they knew I was being sarcastic.	
<i>But</i> now they're analyzing.	
(A.2.46) Did I really mean that? (01:32:10–01:32:13)	<i>Storytelling: The question is an imported question and quotes the questions "they" are asking about whether Trump meant and said that Obama is the founder of ISIS.</i>
(A.2.47) How could I say that? (01:32:10–01:32:13)	<i>Storytelling: The question is an imported question and quotes the questions "they" are asking about whether Trump meant and said that Obama is the founder of ISIS.</i>

These people are the lowest form of life.	
I'm telling you.	
The lowest.	
They are the lowest form of humanity.	
Not all of them.	
They have about 25 percent that are pretty good, actually.	
But most of them.	
OK.	
So, here's the story.	
So, Erie has lost a lot.	
(A.2.48) Right? (01:32:35–01:32:35)	<i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience's attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i>
(A.2.49) You know that, right? (01:32:36–01:32:07)	<i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to reinforce his previous statement that Erie has lost a lot.</i>
Hang in, don't leave.	
I promise we can fix it so fast.	
We will stop these countries from taking our jobs.	
We will stop these countries from taking our companies.	
Hold on.	
Our jobs will come back.	
Now, I came up with a great plan.	

I'm lowering corporate taxes, so our companies stay, so I don't even have to make the call.	
The corporate inversions – you know, we have companies that have, they say, two and a half trillion dollars outside of our <i>company</i> – they can't get their money back.	
We don't let them.	
Everybody agrees that we should do it.	
Republicans, Democrats, everybody agrees.	
(A.2.50) What's the – look, why do we not want them to bring money back? (01:33:17–01:33:20)	<i>Problematic Case: "Embedded" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i>
(A.2.51) You know why? (01:33:20–01:33:21)	<i>Problematic Case: "You-Know" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i>
(A.2.52) Because we don't have a president that can sit the leaders of both parties around a table and in about five minutes let them say let's bring this money back in so we can work it in this country, right? (01:33:32–01:33:32)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>
That's what it is.	

<p>So, we're <i>gonna</i> bring that money back in, we're <i>gonna</i> lower taxes, we're <i>gonna</i> keep our companies – and if our companies want to leave, they're <i>gonna</i> pay a nice big beautiful tax to get their product back in.</p>	
<p>(A.2.53) OK? (01:33:45–01:33:45)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question</i></p>
<p>That's what's <i>gonna</i> happen.</p>	
<p>So, the existing U.S. trade deficit with TPP participating nations has already cost Pennsylvania 68,000 jobs, folks.</p>	
<p>No more, folks.</p>	
<p>We're not <i>gonna</i> be the stupid people any more, we're <i>gonna</i> be the really, really smart people.</p>	
<p>It's going to be America first.</p>	
<p>America first.</p>	
<p>America first.</p>	
<p>First.</p>	
<p>So, the destruction of manufacturing in Pennsylvania was caused by Hillary Clinton's and her husband's disastrous trade policies.</p>	
<p>I mean, you take a look at what she's done.</p>	
<p>At the bidding of her corporate funders, Hillary Clinton has backed every job-killing trade deal for decades.</p>	

She has received so much money, she has approved virtually every tax increase put before her.	
Yesterday – you see 1.3 trillion in tax increases.	
We're the highest taxed nation in the land, essentially.	
We're the highest taxed nation in the world.	
Anywhere in the world.	
And of the industrialized nations, we're far and away the highest taxed nation.	
And she's proposing a massive tax increase.	
Folks, we can't do it. It's <i>gonna</i> make our country non-competitive – it's already non-competitive.	
It's gonna make our country non-competitive and we're not <i>gonna</i> do it.	
I'm proposing a massive tax decrease for the middle class, for business, and businesses are <i>gonna</i> pour in – not since Ronald Reagan has anything like this been proposed.	
Businesses instead of leaving because their taxes are so high, they're <i>gonna</i> stay.	
I might not even have to make those calls.	
Now, if I do, I will, meaning my people will.	
I'll do some, I love doing it.	
I would love telling some guy you're not moving.	

<p>‘Well, Mr. President, sir, we would like to move to Mexico.’ ‘You’re not moving and if you do you pay the 35 percent tax.’ You say, ‘Well, in that case, I’m not moving, I’m not moving. In that case, I’m not moving.’ So easy.</p>	
<p>So, your coal industry, your steel industry, which has been ravaged, your General Electrics of the world, which have been ravaged, just ravaged, we’re <i>gonna</i> end it and I’ll tell you why.</p>	
<p>Over the years, I’ve watched.</p>	
<p>For years, for 10 years, for 12 years, for 15 years, beyond Obama, and I’ve watched as politicians talked about stopping countries from leaving – companies from leaving our states.</p>	
<p>You need strength, is right.</p>	
<p>Our states.</p>	
<p>And I watched.</p>	
<p>(A.2.54) Remember they give the low-interest loans? (01:36:59–01:37:01)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: “Remember” Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>

Here's a low-interest loan if you stay in Pennsylvania, here's a zero-interest loan, you don't have to pay, here's a this, here's tax abatement of any kind you want, we'll help your <i>employ</i> – it doesn't work, folks, that's not what they need.	
They have money.	
They <i>wanna</i> go out, they <i>wanna</i> move to another country and because our politicians are so dumb, they want to sell their product to us and not have any retribution, not have any consequences.	
So, all of that's over and I think you understand it and Hillary can't do it.	
Number one, she can't do it because the mentality isn't there.	
She can't do it.	
No, the mentality.	
You know, she said fairly recently, I don't like Donald Trump's tone.	
His tone isn't nice.	
And I said, here we have a country that's being taken advantage of by every country in the world.	
Our businesses are being taken.	
Our jobs are being taken.	
Everything's being taken.	

Here we have a world where ISIS is chopping off the heads of Christians and many others, drowning people in steel cages, burying people in the sand, and we have somebody up there who wants to be our president that says, I don't like Donald Trump's tone.	
Folks, we better get smart, folks.	
Hey, look, let's see what happens.	
We better get smart.	
We better get smart.	
We better get smart.	
We better get tough.	
And if we're not smart and we're not tough, we're not <i>gonna</i> have a country left.	
And one of the things I have to talk to you about before I leave is <i>our</i> – Illegal immigrants are pouring into our country.	
In fact, I brought something for you people.	
I brought – <i>Here is</i> – I brought – I, I had to do this.	
I didn't want to depress you.	
OK, look.	
The Clinton legacy.	
(A.2.55) Nearly one in three manufacturing jobs in Erie, PA – Erie, PA, sound familiar? (01:39:21–01:39:21)	<i>Problematic Case Form: It is a tag question that is attached to the previous statement and appears as an embedded clause. It is excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i>

– have been lost since Clinton allowed a certain deal with China to happen.	
Now, look at this – look at this chart.	
This is 2001, not long ago.	
This is now.	
Congratulations, folks.	
I hope you're doing well.	
(A.2.56) OK? (01:39:36–01:39:36)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>
I hope you're doing well.	
I don't <i>wanna</i> hurt them.	
I hope you're doing well.	
(A.2.57) But you know what? (01:39:47–01:39:48)	<i>Problematic Case: "You-Know-What" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i>
You can't do well.	
When you have a government that is so stupid, that is so – that is so incompetent, you can't do it.	
Here's another one, folks.	
This is what we're talking about.	
Syrian refugees – we have no idea who they are, where they're coming from, no paperwork.	
You saw what happened in San Bernardino.	
You saw what happened – frankly, take a look at all over the world.	

Take a look at what's happening.	
If we don't get smart and we don't get smart fast – Barack Obama is allowing Syrian refugees to come into our country by the thousands. Now, I have as big a heart as anybody in this room and I want to build safe zones and I want, by the way, the Gulf states to pay for it because they've got plenty of money and they're not doing much.	
(A.2.58) OK? (01:40:38–01:40:39)	<i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to strengthen his previous utterance.</i>
We'll supervise it.	
OPM, other people's money.	
(A.2.59) We'll supervise it, right? (01:40:46–01:40:46)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>
We'll supervise it.	
But they're <i>gonna</i> pay for it because we're protecting these people.	
If it weren't for the United States, those countries wouldn't even exist.	
They'd be gone.	
The power we have is so enormous, but we have people that don't know what they're doing.	
We have an incompetent president.	
We have people that don't know what they're doing.	

So, look at this.	
Look at this.	
Syrian refugees admitted to the United States on a monthly basis.	
Look what's happening.	
Look what's happening.	
Now, in all fairness, we want to help people.	
Can't take a chance.	
San Bernardino, they walk in.	
They start shooting.	
Paris, the best, the toughest gun laws, the toughest gun laws in the world, Paris, France.	
They walk in.	
They kill 130 people.	
They wound so gravely hundreds of people.	
Now, let me just tell you because well – we're on the Second Amendment, right, Second Amendment.	
If we had in San Bernardino – if we had in San Bernardino or in Orlando or someplace, somebody in that room like this guy right here, right, or that guy with the blue make America great again hat on or the one with the red make America – or that woman with the beautiful blonde hair.	
I wish I had hair that looked like that.	

	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>
(A.2.60) But if we had somebody and they happened to have a gun, San Bernardino, they see him come in – first of all, if they knew there was a gun where the bullets would be flying in the other direction, they probably wouldn't have got in, OK? (01:42:29–01:42:29)	
But let's assume they did.	
The carnage would not have been what the carnage was.	
We have to protect our Second Amendment. Hillary Clinton wants to kill our second amendment.	
Wants to kill it.	
So, here's our chart.	
And I was thinking about doing a – I bring – every once in a – like, one in ten I do it, you know a lot of these.	
I love the people.	
We have, <i>we have</i> such a movement going on.	

<p>(A.2.61) Who likes the snake? (01:43:01–01:43:03)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question: The speaker addresses the audience and aims to evoke a form of response. In the following context, the speaker repeats the question and again addresses the hearer. “The snake” refers to the song “The Snake”, which is xenophobic and is used by Trump as a metaphor for illegal immigration.</i></p>
<p>(A.2.62) Do you know the snake? (01:43:03–01:43:04)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question: The speaker addresses the audience and aims to evoke a form of response. In the following context, the speaker repeats the question and again addresses the hearer. “The snake” refers to the song “The Snake”, which is xenophobic and is used by Trump as a metaphor for illegal immigration.</i></p>
<p>(A.2.63) Do you like it? (01:43:04–01:43:05)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question: The speaker addresses the audience and aims to evoke a form of response. In the following context, the speaker repeats the question and again addresses the hearer. “The snake” refers to the song “The Snake”, which is xenophobic and is used by Trump as a metaphor for illegal immigration.</i></p>

<p>(A.2.64) Who likes the snake? (01:43:00–01:43:05)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question: The speaker addresses the audience and aims to evoke a form of response. In the following context, the speaker repeats the question and again addresses the hearer. “The snake” refers to the song “The Snake”, which is xenophobic and is used by Trump as a metaphor for illegal immigration.</i></p>
<p>Here we are with this.</p>	
<p>We know bad things are <i>gonna</i> happen.</p>	
<p>We know as we allow more and more people to come in from these terror areas, bad things are <i>gonna</i> happen.</p>	
<p>(A.2.65) Has anybody heard the snake? (01:43:15–01:43:21)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question: The speaker addresses the audience and aims to evoke a form of response. In the following context, the speaker repeats the question and again addresses the hearer. “The snake” refers to the song “The Snake”, which is xenophobic and is used by Trump as a metaphor for illegal immigration.</i></p>

<p>(A.2.66) Not that many? (01:43:15–01:43:18)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question: The speaker addresses the audience and aims to elicit a form of response. In the following context, the speaker repeats the question and again addresses the hearer. The question “Not that many?” refers to reactions by the audience and strengthens the observation that Trump aims to evoke a reaction from the audience. “The snake” refers to the song “The Snake”, which is xenophobic and is used by Trump as a metaphor for illegal immigration.</i></p>
<p>(A.2.67) Should I do it again? (01:43:19–01:43:21)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question: The speaker addresses the audience and aims to elicit a form of response. In the following context, the speaker repeats the question and again addresses the hearer. “The snake” refers to the song “The Snake”, which is xenophobic and is used by Trump as a metaphor for illegal immigration.</i></p>
<p>So, think of this, folks, think of this, think of <i>this</i>.</p>	
<p>This is what is going on in our country with our borders.</p>	
<p>And by the way, we’re <i>gonna</i> have a strong border, we’re <i>gonna</i> have a wall, it’s <i>gonna</i> be a powerful wall that Mexico’s <i>gonna</i> pay for the wall.</p>	
<p>And we have no choice, and we have no choice.</p>	
<p>But think of this.</p>	

<p>This is now a situation, where this was written by Al Wilson many years ago and I read it and I said you know that really pertains to what's happening to the United States.</p>	
<p>(A.2.68) And it has to do with being fooled, it has to do with a lot of different things but when you're listening to this, think of our border, think of the people that we're letting in by the thousands and Hillary Clinton, you saw those numbers, right? (01:44:09–01:44:10)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question</i></p>
<p>With the charts through the roof.</p>	
<p>Hillary Clinton wants to allow 550 percent more coming into our country.</p>	
<p>(A.2.69) How stupid are we? (01:44:19–01:44:20)</p>	<p><i>Function Aligning Beliefs: The rhetorical point is “We are stupid to allow this to happen.” Trump uses the evaluative adjective “stupid” to stress his opinion that illegal immigration is reckless. The speaker aims to align their beliefs about the controversial topic of immigration and especially illegal immigration.</i></p>

<p>(A.2.70) So, are you ready, you ready, you like it, you sure? (01:44:21–01:44:25)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question: The speaker addresses the audience and aims to evoke a form of response.</i></p>
<p>OK.</p>	
<p>On her way to work one morning, down the path along the lake, a tender hearted woman saw a poor, half-frozen snake, his pretty colored skin had been all frosted with the dew.</p>	
<p>Oh well, she cried, I'll take you in and I'll take care of you.</p>	
<p>Take me in, oh tender woman, take me in for heaven's sake, take me in oh tender woman, sighed the broken snake.</p>	
<p>She wrapped him up, all cozy, in a curvature of silk.</p>	
<p>Then laid him by the fireside with some honey and some milk.</p>	
<p>Now she hurried home from work that night.</p>	
<p>As soon as she arrived, she found that pretty snake she'd taken in, had been revived.</p>	
<p>Take me in oh tender woman, take me in for heaven's sake.</p>	
<p>Take me in oh tender woman, sighed the broken snake.</p>	
<p>Now she clutched him to her bosom.</p>	
<p>You're so beautiful, she cried.</p>	

But if I hadn't brought you in by now, you certainly would have died.	
Now she stroked his pretty skin and then she kissed and held him tight.	
But instead of saying thank you, that snake gave her a vicious bite.	
Take me in oh tender woman, take me in for heaven's sake.	
Take me in oh tender woman, sighed the vicious snake.	
I saved you, I saved you, I saved you, cried that woman.	
And you've bit me, heaven's why.	
You know your bite is poisonous and now I'm going to die.	
Oh shut up, silly woman, said the reptile with a grin.	
You knew damn well I was a snake before you took me in.	
Get ready folks, get ready.	
We're led by stupid people.	
We're led by leaders <i>and</i> – and you know honestly, I didn't need this.	
This I didn't need.	
I had a nice life, built a great company – a great company, some of the great real estate assets of the world.	
I may never see them.	
You know if I win, I may never see them again, and I love them – all over the world.	

(A.2.71) But you know what? (01:47:42–01:47:43)	<i>Function Focusing: Trump shifts the attention to the statement that he may never see some of the great real estate assets in the world because he wants to become the next president of the U.S. and thus he decided to give up his nice life. Thus, he stresses his motivation to run for a greater good in order to protect the country.</i>
This is so important.	
And I watched what was happening with the Iran deal, and I watched what was happening with jobs, and I watched what was happening with trade where China makes \$500 billion in trade deficits with us.	
I <i>looked</i> and I saw.	
Take a look at Mexico.	
You know, the politicians say, you'll never, ever be able to get Mexico to allow you to build a wall.	
I say trust me.	
Now, they don't say that anymore. Now they say, they won't put the money up to build a wall. So easy. Mexico – our trade deficit is massive, massive. They make a fortune off the stupidity of the United States.	
Mexico will 100 percent – you hear – 100 percent pay for the wall, 100 percent.	
(A.2.72) OK? (01:48:23–01:48:24)	<i>Invariant Tag Question</i>

<p>One hundred percent. But the story of the snake is what's happening to our country. We're letting people in. Many of these people hate us. Many of these people don't have good thoughts. And you see what one person can do – one sick wacko can do in Orlando.</p>	
<p>(A.2.73) And then you see his father sitting behind Hillary Clinton with a big smile on his face – with a big, fat smile on his face, right? (01:49:00–01:49:00)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience's attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i></p>
<p>And he was wearing a red hat, and I said, I hope that's not one of my hats. It wasn't. I was concerned. I saw that hat. I said, I hope it doesn't say make America great again. Bad guy – bad guy. Horrendous son – horrendous son.</p>	
<p>So, here's the story, folks. We have to win – we have to win Pennsylvania, so important. So <i>important</i>.</p>	

<p>Hillary Clinton is run by people that do this very professionally. They're very good. They keep her out of the spotlight. She doesn't talk to reporters – very rarely. She doesn't do press conferences. She doesn't expose whatever's going on up here. She doesn't – which isn't good. She doesn't expose her mind to questions. And what they <i>wanna</i> do is they <i>wanna</i> try and fake it through.</p>	
<p>We need strength. We need toughness. We need a strong temperament. We need a strong tone. At the same time – at the same time, let me tell you – at the same time, we need real, big, beautiful heart because we have to straighten out healthcare. Obamacare's <i>gonna</i> be repealed and replaced.</p>	
<p>(A.2.74) It's <i>gonna</i> repay – did you see – did you see what's happening with Obamacare? (01:50:31–01:50:38)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: “Embedded” Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>

<p>(A.2.75) Did you see where the – <i>the</i> numbers are going up 30, 40, and 50 percent? (01:50:31–01:50:38)</p>	<p><i>Function Forcing the Accommodation of Pre-suppositions: The speaker shifts the attention to the health care program by Barack Obama in order to strengthen his previous statements that the program needs to be replaced. The rhetorical point is that the health care program is too expensive and Trump refers to this common notion among his supporters in the CG. The numbers have not been introduced before and the numbers have to be accommodated in order to react to the question. The notion that is already in the CG makes it more plausible for the hearer to accommodate the numbers.</i></p>
<p>Wait until you see what happens on November 1st. Now, on November 1st, they're trying to delay it.</p>	
<p>But you're <i>gonna</i> get increases, the likes of which probably no country, nobody has ever seen.</p>	
<p>(A.2.76) OK? (01:50:48–01:50:49)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question</i></p>
<p>Anybody in the history of healthcare – in Texas, through going through Blue Cross Blue Shield, they just had almost a 50 percent increase in their premiums.</p>	

<p>And the deductibles are so high that unless you get hit by one of those General Electric locomotives and you live for like a long time prior to death, you'll never, ever be able to use your healthcare – the healthcare. Because here's what's happened – here's what's happened. The deductible is so high, you never get to use it.</p>	
<p>So, you're spending money, your raises by 17, 18, 19 percent. But now, it's <i>gonna</i> go really bad, really bad. It's gonna die of its own volition, but we have to kill it first. It's killing our country, it's killing our jobs – it's killing our jobs.</p>	
<p>So, here's the story, folks – folks. We have to win Pennsylvania. We have to beat this professional group of people that are running her for her own – for their own purposes. We have to win Pennsylvania. We win Pennsylvania, we're <i>gonna</i> win it. You know, we're up in Florida. We're doing well in Ohio. And I'm hearing we're doing well here. We'll find out.</p>	
<p>Here's the story...</p>	
<p>Here's the story. We have to win the state of Pennsylvania. I went to school here. My kids went to school here. We're <i>gonna</i> win Pennsylvania.</p>	

<p>If we win Pennsylvania, I'll tell you what. We are very much on our way. You know, the Republicans do have a tougher path, just so you – not my fault. Not my fault. It's a tougher path.</p>	
<p>For the presidency, it's just a tougher, winding road. <i>But</i> if we win Pennsylvania, we win Florida where we're doing really well, I think we can win Ohio, it'll be over. It'll be over. It'll be over.</p>	
<p>So, on November 8th, you have to get out and vote or do some balloting, and I don't care – look, here's the story. If you're not feeling well, if you're so sick, if you go to your doctor and he goes, I'm sorry sir, but you've only got a few weeks left. And it's November 1st. And he gives you the ultimate word, not looking good. You haven't got long left. I don't care and nobody else in this room cares.</p>	
<p>(A.2.77) You have to on November 8th get out of bed and get out and vote, right? (01:53:45–01:53:45)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question</i></p>
<p>Get out and vote.</p>	

<p>Now, in a lot of cases, you can do your early ballots too. All I'm telling you though – look, folks. I'm just saying your jobs have been taken. Your military and all of the other things, we're <i>gonna</i> save your Second Amendment, which is protection, we're <i>gonna</i> get of Common Core, you're <i>gonna</i> bring your education locally.</p>	
<p>All things – I'm <i>gonna</i> repeal and replace Obamacare. All these things. We're <i>gonna</i> take care of our vets. But here's the story, folks. For you people in particular <i>cause</i> you have been devastated.</p>	
<p>Supreme Court, he said. Yes. Yes. Thank you.</p>	
<p>(A.2.78) Who did that? (01:54:27–01:54:29)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question</i></p>
<p>(A.2.79) Who said that? (01:54:27–01:54:29)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question</i></p>
<p>Thank you.</p>	

<p>By the way, and I have to just stop for a second. Look, Supreme Court Justice Scalia great. Was supposed to live for a long time. He died. So, you have already an empty. This next president could have the most Supreme Court nominations of any president. Could take more justices than – it could be up to five. Probably <i>gonna</i> be three, could be four, could be five.</p>	
<p>(A.2.80) OK? (01:54:54–01:54:54)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question</i></p>
<p>If Hillary Clinton gets to put hard – leaning left judges on the Supreme Court, number one, your Second Amendment will be gone. Our country will never ever be the same. We will have problems like we’ve never had before and you won’t have – you will have a whole different deal going, which we don’t want, believe me.</p>	
<p>So, here’s the story. If for no other reason, I am <i>gonna</i> put – and you know, I’ve picked through Federalist society – we picked 11 Supreme Court justices. We’re <i>gonna</i> add probably four more, all vetted through Federalists, through Heritage, highly – I actually got very good marks. We’re <i>gonna</i> pick these people or people very like that.</p>	
<p>So, here’s the story, here’s the story.</p>	

	<i>Reaction Question</i>
(A.2.81) You ready? (01:55:45–01:55:46)	
<p>We don't win anymore, you people don't win, that's for sure. You just have to look at the statistics for jobs. We're <i>gonna</i> start winning again. We're <i>gonna</i> win so much that you're <i>gonna</i> get sick and tired of winning.</p>	
<p>You're <i>gonna</i> say Mr. President – you're <i>gonna</i> send the congressman to see me in Washington. He's <i>gonna</i> say, Mr. President, we have to do something. The people of Pennsylvania, and in particular our friends in Erie, they're sick and tired of winning. They can't stand winning so much. Mr. President, we just don't <i>wanna</i> win that much. We really want to give other nations like it used to be, where it's good for them and bad for us, at least a little bit.</p>	
<p>And I'm <i>gonna</i> say – I'm <i>gonna</i> say, Mr. Congressman, I don't think you know your people very well, they <i>wanna</i> win. And we <i>wanna</i> win. And you <i>wanna</i> win. And we're <i>gonna</i> win. We're <i>gonna</i> win so much. We're <i>gonna</i> win with our military, we're <i>gonna</i> knock the hell out of ISIS.</p>	

<p>We're <i>gonna</i> win for our vets. We're <i>gonna</i> take of our vets. We're <i>gonna</i> win at the border, we're <i>gonna</i> build a wall, we're <i>gonna</i> have Mexico pay, believe me 100 percent. We're <i>gonna</i> win with education. We're <i>gonna</i> win for our Second Amendment. We're <i>gonna</i> win on all of the things we discussed. We're <i>gonna</i> win again and you're <i>gonna</i> be proud of your country again.</p>	
<p>We're not <i>gonna</i> be the people that are laughed at all over the world for not knowing what we're doing, for allowing others to come in and just strip us of what we have.</p>	
<p>We are going to win. We are going to be America first.</p>	
<p>We are going to make America great again. And it's going to happen quickly.</p>	
<p>Thank you everybody, thank you. Thank you everybody.</p>	

**Erie Insurance Arena in Erie, PA, 12 August 2016, Speech 5.**

## A.2.2 Speech 12

## Remarks at the Southeastern Livestock Pavilion in Ocala, Florida, 12 October 2016

<p>Thank you everybody. This is a big, big crowd, you know, I'll tell you the sad thing, however, the only people that will be shown on television won't be the 15,000 people, it'll be this group right over here.</p>	
<p>(A.2.82) So, the good news is, you have better seats, or standing room only, but you have better, but they're <i>gonna</i> be more famous, right? (00:00:30–00:00:33)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience's attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i></p>
<p>They're <i>gonna</i> be more famous.</p>	
<p>(A.2.83) Look, we want to have the cameras circle around and show this crowd, <i>would you</i> do that cameras? (00:00:45–00:00:46)</p>	<p><i>Extra-Textual Level</i></p>
<p>Go ahead cameras.</p>	
<p>They never do it. They never do it, so we won't waste our time, it's just the dishonest media. Look.</p>	

<p>We love being here, I love being with you. I love this state, as you know, I'm here all the time.</p>	
<p>In 27 days, we're going to win Florida and we're going to win back the White House.</p>	
<p>And that's what's happening folks, that's what's happening.</p>	
<p>We're going to bring back our jobs, we're <i>gonna</i> end illegal immigration, we're going to renegotiate our totally disastrous I mean these deals, aye, yai, yai, the trade deals the worst. We're <i>gonna</i> renegotiate those trade deals, reduce surging crime. You saw what happened the other day, murders in the United States, the highest level in 45 years. You don't hear that from the press.</p>	
<p>We're <i>gonna</i> cut taxes big league. Crooked Hillary is going to raise taxes. We're <i>gonna</i> cut taxes and regulations. We're <i>gonna</i> reduce the costs of education. By the way, we're <i>gonna</i> end the Common Core, and we're bringing our education local.</p>	
<p>We're going to lift the restrictions on American Energy and deliver real change for our great American people; it's time.</p>	

<p>And when it comes to international government, to massive trade deals, and to America's borders, we're going to defend the freedom and sovereignty of the United States of America like never before. And we are going to once again put America first.</p>	
<p>(A.2.84) The deadline for voter register – who is not registered? (00:03:13–00:03:15)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question</i></p>
<p>(A.2.85) Is there anybody in here not registered? (00:03:15–00:03:17)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question</i></p>
<p>(A.2.86) If you're not registered, get the hell out of here, OK? (00:03:18–00:03:20)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question</i></p>
<p>There's a nice looking young guy, hey listen, leave right now and go and register.</p>	
<p>They just extended it for a little while, so right after you, raise your right hand.</p>	
<p>(A.2.87) Do you promise you're gonna register after this? (00:03:35–00:03:37)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question: Directed to the referred person in the previous sentence "so right after you, raise your right hand".</i></p>

<p>If you like what I say, OK, if you like what I say.</p>	
<p>(A.2.88) Seriously, I'm curious, who is not registered in this room? (00:03:43–00:03:45)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question: The speaker signals by using “seriously”, “I’m curious” that he aims to receive some form of verbal or non-verbal response. However, it is a form of group-binding; it shifts the focus to the importance of registering to vote and is less likely be to intended to acquire new information. The topic of voter registration is a re-occurring topic during the presidential election campaign.</i></p>
<p>OK, all young people. Believe me, the young people like me better than Bernie, I'm telling you.</p>	
<p>Because with me, when you graduate from college, you're <i>gonna</i> come out and you're <i>gonna</i> have a vast array of jobs.</p>	
<p>(A.2.89) OK, right? (00:04:04–00:04:05)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience's attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i></p>
<p>So go out and register, and we're <i>gonna</i> have an awfully big I'll tell you what, honestly, we're <i>gonna</i> have a big four years, eight years, we're <i>gonna</i> have a big, great future for our country.</p>	
<p>Also, you can request an absentee ballot and you can vote by mail, if necessary.</p>	
<p>So, register, request a ballot.</p>	
<p>Thank you.</p>	

<p>I love you. I love you, too.</p>	
<p>(A.2.90) The Hillary Clinton documents have you been seeing this, what's going on? (00:04:38–00:04:43)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: The speaker combines two questions “have you been seeing this” and “what’s going on” in order to insinuate that there is a debate about Hillary Clinton or about her documents. At this point in the speech, the question functions as a way to shift the attention to the topic. During the presidential election campaign, Trump regularly addresses the debate about missing e-mails by Hillary Clinton.</i></p>
<p>Released by WikiLeaks make more clear than ever just how much is at stake in November and how unattractive and dishonest our country has become.</p>	
<p>The election of Hillary Clinton would lead, in my opinion, to the almost total destruction of our country as we know it.</p>	
<p>She would be the most dishonest and the most corrupt person ever elected to high office.</p>	
<p>And I don't think it would be close.</p>	
<p>(A.2.91) The WikiLeaks e-mails show the Department of Justice fed information, did you see this? to the Clinton campaign. (00:05:30–00:05:31)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: The question is an embedded clause.</i></p>
<p>So think of this.</p>	

<p>The Department of Justice, you remember that whole deal with Wild Bill getting on the back of an airplane, just happened to be in Arizona.</p>	
<p>He was <i>gonna</i> play golf.</p>	
<p>It was 110 degrees.</p>	
<p>But he gets on the back of the airplane to meet with the Attorney General to talk about his golf game and to talk about his grandkids.</p>	
<p>He was there for 39 minutes.</p>	
<p>I think most of us know what happened.</p>	
<p>So fed information, Department of Justice fed information think of this to the Clinton campaign about the e-mail investigation so that the campaign could be prepared to cover up her crimes.</p>	
<p>(A.2.92) Now, did you ever hear? (00:06:17–00:06:18)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: The speaker again shifts again the attention to the claim that the Department of Justice provided information about the e-mail investigation to the Clinton campaign. The linguistic marker “ever” strengthens the uniqueness of the circumstance that Clinton is supposed to have received information from the Department of Justice.</i></p>

<p>(A.2.93) Did you ever hear anything like this? (00:06:20–00:06:22)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: The speaker again shifts the attention to the claim that the Department of Justice provided information about the e-mail investigation to the Clinton campaign. The question is similar to the previous one and is thereby a repetition that aims to stress the topic.</i></p>
<p>And, and by the way, these dishonest people, mainstream media, they don't talk about this. They don't talk about this. Now, if I sneeze if Donald Trump sneezes today, it's a major story.</p>	
<p>Here you have Department of Justice coming to see them to brief them prior to their interview.</p>	
<p>Folks, this is out of control.</p>	
<p>And the FBI unbelievable people.</p>	
<p>You have incredible people in the FBI.</p>	
<p>I would be willing to <i>bet</i> that they are so ashamed of what's happened at the upper level.</p>	
<p>I would be willing to bet that they don't even sleep at night.</p>	
<p>These are great people.</p>	
<p>These are great Americans.</p>	
<p>And they can't believe what's going on.</p>	
<p>This corruption and collision is just one more reason why I will ask my Attorney General to appoint a special prosecutor.</p>	
<p>Our country has never been so low.</p>	

In addition to a special prosecutor to look into what happened and all of the corruption, and all of the we'll say so called crime.	
But look, when somebody deletes 33,000 e-mails after getting a subpoena.	
But we have to also <i>remember this, remember this</i> .	
This is maybe in a sense even more important.	
We have to investigate the investigation.	
We have to investigate the investigation.	
We've never <i>had a – a case</i> like this.	
And even Congress, you know, is sort of they've never had this before, because there's no event like this that ever took place.	
Normally, Congress you know she lied to Congress.	
She lied to the FBI.	
And remember, he said she was negligent.	
(A.2.94) She was all the things you needed to be, but she lied to Congress, she lied to FBI, she lied to everybody she even lied in the debates about the gold standard, right? (00:08:57–00:09:01)	<i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience's attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i>
Remember, she said, I never said gold standard.	

<p>(A.2.95) And remember when I said line in the sand? (00:09:01–00:09:03)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: “Remember” Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3. The speaker signals by “remember” that the utterance is shared knowledge and the hearer has to be reminded of it. It remains unclear at this point whether the speaker said it and it is challenging to contextualise it to a specific aspect in the CG. However, the main function is not to ask whether the hearers remember that Trump said it, but to make the hearers believe that they already know that he said it and to create in this way intimacy.</i></p>
<p>She said, I wasn’t secretary of state.</p>	
<p>I said, I think you were, but let’s see even the press said she was secretary of state, so she lied about that.</p>	
<p>But think of this.</p>	
<p>Think of this.</p>	
<p>There’s never been a time like this in our country.</p>	
<p>And Congress, in all fairness and I’m so disappointed in them.</p>	
<p>I am so disappointed in Congress.</p>	
<p>I am so disappointed.</p>	
<p>And I mean both sides.</p>	
<p>I’m not talking Republican Dem I’m talking everybody.</p>	
<p>To allow a thing like this to go this is crime at the highest level.</p>	

She shouldn't be allowed to run for president.	
You know that.	
Other people's lives have been ruined, destroyed, for doing a tiny fraction of what she did.	
You saw the man with the book, he had to give back all the royalties and went through hell.	
You saw the man with the picture of the submarine, his mother goes around, she's devastated, devastated.	
Took pictures of a submarine.	
And you take a look at this.	
So we have to investigate the investigation, and Congress and I speak to Congressmen.	
They don't know what to do.	
Because normally, they vote and they hand it over to the FBI and the Justice Department.	
But the FBI and the Justice Department won't do anything.	
So, they don't know what to do.	
Now, they do make laws.	
Maybe they have to make up a law for a case like this.	

<p>But they take these criminal acts, in my opinion, criminal acts, hand them over to the FBI, the FBI actually acknowledge that even, frankly, could have gone that speech could have been 10 times longer.</p>	
<p>(A.2.96) But all of these things yes, she did this, yes, she did this, yes, she did that, yes, she did that, but we're not <i>gonna</i> do anything, right but what do you do when you hand them over to the FBI and the Justice Department and that's the end of it? (00:10:46–00:10:58)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: “Declarative” Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>
<p>We have never been in a position like this.</p>	
<p>(A.2.97) I'm so embarrassed by what's taken place, and I'm very, very disappointed in Congress because our people, our politicians, I don't know, do they make a deal where everybody protects each other in Washington? (00:11:02–00:11:05)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: “Embedded” Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>

<p>Maybe that's it. I really believe it. I really believe it. I almost say, listen, we're <i>gonna</i> leave you alone, but when it's our turn, you have to leave them alone.</p>	
<p>(A.2.98) Do they make deals like this? (00:11:25–00:11:27)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: The speaker stresses his previous assumption that politicians make deals in order to protect each other.</i></p>
<p>This is the most heinous, the most serious thing that I've ever seen involving justice in the United States in the history of the United States.</p>	
<p>We have a person that has committed crimes that is now running for the presidency, and she has the Justice Department, where she essentially told the AG in the speech or a talk that she'd appoint her AG again.</p>	
<p>(A.2.99) And this is the person that's supposed to be ruling? (00:11:53–00:11:56)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: "Declarative" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>
<p>Folks, whether I win, lose, or draw, I'm ashamed of what's happened to our country and so are you.</p>	
<p>Hillary Clinton bleached and deleted 33,000 e-mails.</p>	
<p>And did you see, two days ago, boxes of e-mails and other things were missing.</p>	

They were missing.	
So she deleted 33,000 e-mails and bleached them.	
By the way, nobody bleaches; nobody I have people that are sophisticated in this world.	
They never even heard of it.	
They called it acid wash, meaning you can never retrieve them, although I have a feeling that the NSA has them.	
They don't want them.	
They don't want to get them.	
I have a feeling.	
So then she did this after, not before.	
Before would be bad.	
She did this after getting a congressional subpoena.	
Now, if your friend is suing you in a regular lawsuit, and you do that, you go to jail.	
(A.2.100) Here's the United States Congress subpoenas her e-mails and other things, and she deletes the e-mails, saying there are 33,000 e-mails, remember? (00:13:26–00:13:37)	<i>Problematic Case: "Remember" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i>
For the wedding and for yoga classes 33,000 e-mails.	

<p>And then and then after all of that, now they're missing two boxes of perhaps the most important of the group.</p>	
<p>(A.2.101) And what about her law firm?</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump shifts the attention to Clinton's law firm. In this way, he invites pragmatic reasoning that there has to be something about it. However, Clinton is not directly mentioned, but as the previous context is about the topic of Clinton's deleted emails, it is likely that she is the person he is referring to.</i></p>
<p>(A.2.102) You know what? (00:13:55–00:13:56)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: "You-Know-What" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>
<p>She's using a phenomenal law firm.</p>	
<p>I know the firm.</p>	
<p>Phenomenal law firm.</p>	
<p>They're the ones that did all this stuff.</p>	
<p>Remember, they said we made a ruling they were work-related.</p>	
<p>You can't do that.</p>	
<p>If they're work – related, what you do is you show them you show them and you get them.</p>	
<p>It's a law firm nobody ever mentions.</p>	
<p>The law firm is unbelievable.</p>	
<p>It's very powerful.</p>	

(A.2.103) OK? (00:14:17–00:14:18)	<i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience's attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i>
Obviously, they've done a great job.	
But that law firm should be implicated in this crime.	
(A.2.104) OK? (00:14:25–00:14:25)	<i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience's attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i>
They're the ones they got rid of all this stuff.	
The law firm got rid of all this stuff.	
And they should be implicated because they have committed a crime.	
They are not supposed to say, "Oh, we got rid of most of it."	
That law firm that I know very well, as I said total professionals, total insiders they got rid of 33,000 and much more than that.	
It is one of the great miscarriages of justice.	
So then she destroyed her phones, some with a hammer, to cover up her crimes.	
(A.2.105) Now, how many of you people have gotten rid of cell phones and you start whacking them with a hammer? (00:15:01–00:15:11)	<i>Reaction Question: Trump signals that he aims to interact with the audience in order to get an overview of opinion as to whether anyone has destroyed their cell phones with a hammer. He signals his aim to directly address the audience with "of you people".</i>

<p>(A.2.106) Has any please raise your hand? (00:15:01–00:15:11)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question: Trump encourages the audience to react to his question.</i></p>
<p>Please. One.</p>	
<p>(A.2.107) What business are you in? (00:15:01–00:15:11)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question: Trump asks the person who raised his or her hand what his or her occupation is. Again, it is rather unlikely that Trump aims to elicit new information but rather to create intimacy with the audience.</i></p>
<p>I see two hands. We have 15,000. Two hands.</p>	
<p>(A.2.108) Anybody else? (00:15:16–00:15:17)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question: Trump again invites the audience to raise their hands if they have destroyed their mobile phone with a hammer.</i></p>
<p>It is so disgraceful.</p>	
<p>It's so embarrassing. And by the way, we're <i>gonna</i> go over some of the WikiLeaks stuff. The press hardly reports it. They hardly report it. She did a big number of Catholics, horrible number on Catholics. She did a horrible number on evangelicals through her people.</p>	
<p>And they hardly report it. While she was secretary of state, she lost or disappeared almost \$6 billion.</p>	

<p>(A.2.109) Does anyone know that? (00:15:48–00:15:49)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump stresses his previous statement that almost \$6 billion were lost during her time as secretary of state.</i></p>
<p>No.</p>	
<p>(A.2.110) How do you lose \$6 billion? (00:15:50–00:15:52)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump aims to further stress the irresponsibility of losing 6 billion dollars. Remarkably, he does not add “almost” in the repetition.</i></p>
<p>Even Chelsea Clinton in the WikiLeaks emails <i>where it shows</i> – expressed, quote, “serious concerns about conflicts of interest at the Clinton Foundation and the State Department.”</p>	
<p>Americans have had it with the years and decades of Clinton corruption. It’s corruption Whitewater, cattle.</p>	
<p>Never is with these people. Remember years ago most of you are too young to remember.</p>	
<p>(A.2.111) Remember the cattle? (00:16:28–00:16:29)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: “Remember” Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>

<p>(A.2.112) She bought some cattle and she had the greatest return, like almost in the history of cattle deals? (00:16:29–00:16:30)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: “Declarative” Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>
<p>And some of these professional cattlemen and cattle women they say, boy, she’s really good at this stuff. They’d been doing it all their lives, they had never had a return like that. It’s corruption, folks. It’s corruption.</p>	
<p>They understood that, by the way. They’re smart, they got it very quickly.</p>	
<p>This will finally be the year the American people say, enough is enough. During a recent trip to Florida, I had a chance to spend some time with the incredible residents of Little Haiti, and you see what’s going on in Haiti, it’s a horrible thing. And you see what’s going on with Clinton, it’s a horrible thing. These are not fans of Clinton. That, I can tell you.</p>	
<p>They despise the Clintons for what they did to the Haitian people. New e-mails revealed by ABC News just yesterday show that during the deadly earthquake in Haiti, which killed over 150,000 people, the Clintons couldn’t stop cashing in. They kept cashing in.</p>	

<p>As people were dying in Haiti, Clinton insiders were separating out requests from friends of Bill or William Jefferson Clinton VIPs so that their business interests or contracts would receive very special treatment, while those who were not special friends would be put permanently on the sidelines.</p>	
<p>And remember this.</p>	
<p>(A.2.113) Hillary’s brother, running a gold mine, put on the gold Tony, you saw Tony? (00:18:14–00:18:16)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: “You-Saw” Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>
<p>Tony.</p>	
<p>(A.2.114) Anybody want to hire Tony? (00:18:14–00:18:16)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump asks whether someone wants to hire Tony and insinuates that he is unemployed for unstated reasons. Again, there is further background knowledge required to fully comprehend the question. Tony Rodham left the gold-mine company in 2016. Trump provides the information in the following utterances.</i></p>
<p>He’s put on the board of a big gold mine company, having to do with Haiti. It’s so bad.</p>	

<p>Look, we're in a rigged system, folks. This is a rigged, rigged system. You <i>saw</i> – <i>you saw</i> so many of the things. I'll tell you, this WikiLeaks stuff is unbelievable. It tells you the inner heart you got to read it. And you got to maybe get it, because they're not putting it out. They want to put it out, but they can't do that, because without the media and without the press, Hillary Clinton would be nothing. She'd be nothing. Zero.</p>	
<p>(A.2.115) And by the way, did everybody see the debate the other day, yes? (00:19:00–00:19:03)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience's attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i></p>
<p>So they had nine online polls. Some of them had us 90 to 10, 80 to 20. "Time Magazine" had like a massive look, "Time Magazine" is no friend of mine except they put me on the cover so much. Not because they like me, because they like selling magazines.</p>	
<p>But "Time Magazine" <i>they all</i> – it was total destruction.</p>	
<p>(A.2.116) And then the next morning, she walks in and says, did everybody see the debate? (00:19:38–00:19:39)</p>	<p><i>Storytelling</i></p>
<p><i>The people go, yes, yes sure.</i></p>	

<p>(A.2.117) Did we beat her or what? (00:19:38–00:19:39)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump shifts the attention to the last debate and invites positive feedback in order to update their shared beliefs that he won the debate.</i></p>
<p>I look so forward.</p>	
<p>I do. I look so forward to the next one in Las Vegas.</p>	
<p>As Haiti’s death toll from Hurricane Matthew is on the rise, we should never forget how Bill and Hillary Clinton handled Haiti the last time. To all our friends in Little Haiti they’re great people. I mean, I <i>spent a long time – these are</i> people that are incredible. They have the warmest feeling, the warmest heart. But to all of our friends in Little Haiti, your day of justice is coming, believe me.</p>	
<p>And it arrives on November 8th. November 8th, get out and vote <i>November 8th</i>.</p>	
<p>The new e-mails also show members of the Clinton team viciously attacking Catholics and Evangelicals. They attacked Catholics and evangelicals.</p>	
<p>Viciously.</p>	
<p>And that won’t be tolerated but it won’t be tolerated by the voters. Tell you what anybody of religion I really think you have to vote for Donald Trump to be honest with you. I really do believe it.</p>	

<p>And in <i>the</i> – all of the primaries you saw that. I wasn't expected to win with evangelicals but once we got started and once they heard my message as opposed to other people's messages we really we won big with <i>the</i> evangelicals. They're incredible people.</p>	
<p>Remember the Johnson Amendment. We're <i>gonna</i> get rid of that Johnson Amendment. Just remember that.</p>	
<p>These emails are just the latest evidence of the hatred that the Clinton campaign has for everyday faithful Americans. True. The Wikileaks email show that Hillary Clinton's staff, even has to give her secret notes on when she needs to smile. Smile Hillary. Smile.</p>	
<p>Hey folks, we have to get back to work. Our country's in trouble. We can't play games anymore. Smile.</p>	
<p>(A.2.118) You believe it? (00:21:43–00:21:44)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: "Declarative" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>
<p>Smile.</p>	

<p>And how about where it said to the public you say this, but to the others that give you the money you say that. I'll tell you. It's so revealing somebody's <i>gonna</i> do a great book on that, because the press <i>just did not – little</i> tiny stories, big, big things. Getting answers for debates and questions for debates, before the debate takes place.</p>	
<p>(A.2.119) How about that? (00:22:09–00:22:10)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump shifts the attention to the next debate.</i></p>
<p>I'll tell you what.</p>	
<p>(A.2.120) Can you imagine me, if any of this stuff pertained to me? (00:22:10–00:22:11)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: By asking whether someone could imagine that this may happen to him, he signals that no one can imagine that.</i></p>
<p>Front page headlines all over the world, Donald Trump oh well, we've been there and we seem to be doing really well.</p>	
<p>Hillary Clinton, commonly referred to as Crooked Hillary, thinks that <i>you, you</i> all of you are deplorable and totally irredeemable.</p>	

<p>I actually think irredeemable is worse, I don't know. I'm the only one. Deplorable and irredeemable. Irredeemable meaning, meaning you can never, ever come back. I call you hard-working American patriots, and together we are going to save this country and we are going to make America great again.</p>	
<p>And it's hot as hell in here but I don't care.</p>	
<p>(A.2.121) Call it Florida, right? (00:22:11–00:22:12)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to strengthen his previous utterance.</i></p>
<p>Florida.</p>	
<p>Emails also show that the DNC vice-chair was feeding information so much information to the candidate.</p>	

(A.2.122) Oh man, I want that why  
can't the Republicans do that?  
(00:22:12–00:22:13)

*Problematic Case: The question is embedded, but it can be seen separately from “Oh man, I want that” and is probably subject to a transcription error. Due to its appearance, it is a problematic case. Considered separate from the first sentence: Problematic Form: Function Forcing the Accommodation of Presupposition: The question presupposes that the Republicans did not provide Trump with “so much” information. Thus, he aims to point to a grievance that either the Republicans did not want to feed him information or could not. It takes more effort to challenge the question’s presupposition that it was the case that the Republicans did not provide him with information than to accept and react to it. Further, it evokes a sense of unfairness not to provide their own candidate with as much information as possible. In this way, the question creates a negative emotional appeal.*

<p>(A.2.123) Why can't Reince feed me information prior to a debate? (00:23:49–00:23:58)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Reince, as the Republican's National Chair, is directly called into question by Trump. Again, it remains unclear whether Reince did not provide him information because he could not or did not want to. Due to the repetition, the speaker also aims to strengthen unfair treatment he has experienced. It is remarkable that Trump attacks his own party and the National Chair, Reince Priebus.</i></p>
<p>I'm so angry at the Republicans I want to be fed information like Hillary gets.</p>	
<p>(A.2.124) And we still beat her badly, right? (00:24:06–00:24:08)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience's attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i></p>
<p>(A.2.125) So I mean what's the big deal? (00:24:08–00:24:10)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: The question is self-addressed. Trump mitigates his attacks against the Republicans since he, nevertheless, won the debate, but stresses the aspect as a matter of principle.</i></p>
<p>But I want information. The Republicans are not doing their job. They should be able to get me all of the questions prior to the debate.</p>	
<p>This all comes after a secret tape that shows Hillary Clinton calling Bernie voters now look Bernie <i>is</i> – I feel sorry for Bernie.</p>	

<p>He made a deal with the devil and he blew his reputation. But she called Bernie voters basement dwellers.</p>	
<p>So all of the Bernie votes out there, join our movement, like all of these young people. We're going to fix our trade deals and get special interests out of government.</p>	
<p>(A.2.126) And by the way, by the time this ends, I'll have over a hundred million dollars of my money in this thing, right, which means that's \$100 million of people that don't have to give me money and say, Donald, will you do this, will you do that, will you do that? (00:25:02–00:25:05)</p>	<p><i>Storytelling</i></p>
<p>That's a lot of money.</p>	
<p>And I asked her the other night, I said, you know, I will have over a hundred million and that's a lot of money. If I lose, I'm going to be so angry at Florida.</p>	
<p>I'll still love you, I think. Maybe not.</p>	

<p>You know, one of the pundits said, and you've heard me say this maybe, but they said, Mr. Trump, it doesn't matter whether you win or lose. You have done the single greatest job. Nobody's ever done a thing like this before. No matter where we go it's like this. But...</p>	
<p>They said it's the single Bill O'Reilly said it, but many peoples said, it's the single greatest political phenomena they've ever seen. I said, wait a minute, you're wrong.</p>	
<p>If I don't win on November 8th, I will consider this the single greatest waste of time, energy and money of anything I've ever done, because we're not <i>gonna</i> be able to reduce your taxes. We're not <i>gonna</i> be able to save your Second Amendment, appoint Supreme Court judges, take care of you vets, fix up your depleted, very depleted the greatest people on earth but our military is so depleted.</p>	
<p>We're <i>gonna</i> take care of a lot of things, including getting the drugs out. A vote for Hillary is a vote for more reckless foreign invasions.</p>	
<p>(A.2.127) What a mess did <i>she</i> do? (00:26:28–00:26:32)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump refers to his previous statement that Hillary Clinton, as secretary of state, approved "reckless" military actions and shifts the attention to it.</i></p>

<p>(A.2.128) Does she go down as the all-time worst? (00:26:28–00:26:32)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump concludes that Clinton will, due to her military actions, “go down as the all-time worst” and aims to update the hearers’ opinion about Clinton’s legacy as secretary of state.</i></p>
<p>More Wall Street cheating, more terrible trade deals. And as WikiLeaks showed, she wants to cut your Medicare and Social Security benefits. You didn’t see that.</p>	
<p>(A.2.129) See? (00:26:35–00:26:38)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience’s attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i></p>
<p>And I’m not going to. The press doesn’t report that she wants to cut your Social Security. And she wants to cut <i>your</i> Medicare and one of the big advantages of me having a rather large microphone, meaning a lot of people are listening, is that I can talk about WikiLeaks and look it’s on all the television networks live. We’re live.</p>	
<p>Amazing.</p>	
<p>I think they are just turning them all off now. Watch.</p>	
<p>(A.2.130) You go home, they’ll say, why did it end so abruptly? (00:27:22–00:27:24)</p>	<p><i>Storytelling</i></p>

A vote for Trump is a vote for America first and it's a vote to protect Medicare and Social Security and lower your taxes.	
Big, big tax decrease. We're <i>gonna</i> lower your taxes. WikiLeaks also shows something I've been warning about for a very, very long time. The media is simply an extension of the Clinton Campaign.	
It's one of the biggest ways that our system is rigged. And I was the first one to use that term when I was running in the primaries when I won Louisiana and I got fewer delegates than people that I beat easily.	
And my people said, oh no, that's the way the system I say, well then the system's wrong!	
(A.2.131) How do you win a state, and you get less delegates? (00:28:13–00:28:14)	<i>Function Focusing: The speaker shifts the attention to the debate about voter registration and possible voter fraud. The example is discussed further in Chapter 3.</i>
And I said, this system is rigged!	
(A.2.132) And it was, but we figured out how to win, right? (00:28:18–00:28:20)	<i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience's attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i>
That's what you need.	

<p>Won in a landslide. I got more votes than anybody in the history of the Republican Party in the primaries system.</p>	
<p>By far. Wasn't even close.</p>	
<p>Reporters who work for these outlets like the Washington Post or the New York Times may think of themselves as journalists, but they're actually cogs for a corrupt political machine. That's the Clinton machine. The e-mail show the New York Times, the Boston Globe, Univision who I sued I sued Univision, and I was very happy with what they did.</p>	
<p>And this lightweight, you know John Harwood, this lightweight. This guy who came out, he was shaking. He was so nervous.</p>	
<p>He asked me the first question,  (A.2.133) "Mr. Trump, could you answer this question?" (00:29:10–00:29:12)</p>	<p><i>Storytelling</i></p>
<p>What a lightweight. They should have fired him for what he did. John Harwood. I hate to make him famous but 'cause nobody ever heard of him before, but a total lightweight of CNBC all doing favors for the Clintons.</p>	

<p>And reporters smothering the Clintons with praise. The New York Times even gave Clinton a call to give her a veto power over her quotes in a story that was already written. Nobody ever called me and said, Hi, Mr. Trump. We wrote a story. Would you read the story and please give us a little feedback.</p>	
<p>(A.2.134) “Would you like us to take anything out?” (00:29:42–00:29:45)</p>	<p><i>Storytelling</i></p>
<p>This system is so rigged. Now, this is all down in the e-mails. She had veto power over what she said.</p>	
<p>I’ll tell you what. I want to have that, too. I want to have veto power.</p>	
<p>I used to get such good publicity, folks. Now, I mean it’s like it’s incredible. I used to <i>get</i> – <i>my</i> life was so simple.</p>	
<p>My life was so simple. I had a beautiful, simple life. It was going. I built an unbelievable company. And then I decided to do this, and my life became slightly more complex.</p>	
<p>You know, we have people in this audience right now that 18 years ago had one great job, they were making more money 18 years ago than they’re making now. And now they have two and sometimes three jobs. In other words, they’re older and they’re working harder, and they’re making less.</p>	

<p>Not a <i>good</i>, <i>not</i> a good assemblage of facts. Here's the only good news.</p>	
<p>(A.2.135) I'm also older and working harder than I've ever worked before, OK? (00:30:54–00:30:55)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience's attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i></p>
<p>That I can tell you.</p>	
<p>Including being in this wonderful <i>arena</i> at 114 degrees temperature. Which is great 'cause you go home and you lose weight. I mean why you can't be. You go home, you say, "I feel great. I lost a lot of weight."</p>	
<p>By the way, let Hillary Clinton stand up here for an hour and talk the way I talk, and let's see how long she lasts folks.</p>	
<p>Oh, what a joke what a total joke. Our country's in such trouble. That's why <i>I'm, I – it's</i> just so ridiculous.</p>	
<p>The corporate media can't report on the establishment because the corporate media is the establishment, such a big part of it. We're going to break up the special interest monopoly, and we're going to win this country back for the American people. We're <i>gonna</i> do it, too.</p>	

<p>The e-mails also reveal that Hillary Clinton believes in global governments, unlimited immigration unlimited, much more than Obama. From the Middle East, come right in. Come right in.</p>	
<p>550 percent more than President Obama, who is grossly incompetent. He doesn't know what the hell he's doing.</p>	
<p>(A.2.136) And why is he campaigning? (00:32:32–00:32:34)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump insinuates through the linguistic marker “and” that there is a relation between immigration and the fact that Obama is campaigning for Hillary Clinton. Through the question, he shifts the attention to Obama and what he perceives as either an unjust or an inappropriate practice due to the current political situation, which Obama as president should focus on instead of campaigning.</i></p>
<p>We just had a horrible jobs report. We have no growth. You saw GDP at one percent we have no growth. We have a horrible jobs report. China is ripping us off. Japan is ripping us off with the cars. Mexico has a unbelievable deal with us, both on the border I mean, look at our trade deficit with Mexico. And China, and Vietnam, and everybody.</p>	
<p>Last year, our country had a trade deficit of almost \$800 billion. \$800 billion.</p>	

<p>(A.2.137) Who the hell negotiates these deals? (00:33:19–00:33:29)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump shifts the attention to deals that result in a high trade deficit instead of bringing benefits for the U.S. Trump includes an NPI “the hell” to stress his opinion that the deals are badly negotiated. Trump insinuates that no competent person would have negotiated the deals, thus the current government is incompetent. The hearers are meant to update their perception about the deals accordingly.</i></p>
<p>(A.2.138) I mean, can you believe it? (00:33:19–00:33:29)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: Embedded Form because of the introductory “I mean, [...]”. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>
<p>(A.2.139) So, I say, why the hell is Obama allowed to campaign for Hillary Clinton? (00:33:19–00:33:29)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: Embedded Form because of the introductory “So, I say, [...]”. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>
<p>He’s always campaigning, and he’s doing his little thing, you know, having a good time. He ought to be out in the White House. He’s not there long. He ought to be there working and fixing some of these horrible trade deals and bringing jobs back to our country, not campaigning for a crooked person, for a totally dishonest and crooked person.</p>	

<p>Speaking in secret to a foreign bank, Hillary Clinton said, my dream is a hemispheric common market that's not good for your jobs with totally open trade and open borders. 600 million people could pour into the United States. You'll have nothing left.</p>	
<p>Tell you, if that happens, I know the real estate here, I love the real estate here sell fast. Behind closed doors, when she thought no one was listening, she pledged to dissolve the borders of the United States of America. This all came out. She said she wants to dissolve the borders. And here I am saying, we want strong borders. We don't want drugs coming in. We don't want crime coming in. I don't know, maybe I'm wasting my time.</p>	
<p>(A.2.140) Am I wasting my time? (00:34:36–00:34:47)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: The question refers to the previous statement “maybe I'm wasting my time”. The intuitive answer is “no”, however, it appears rather odd that in a democratic election one of the candidates asks whether he or she is wasting their time as it is the normal run of events that one will win and one will lose.</i></p>
<p>I don't think so.</p>	

<p>She doesn't want to have any borders. Total amnesty tell you what, folks. This is the last time you'll ever have a chance to save our country. It's not <i>gonna</i> happen <i>anymore</i>. You won't be able to. The numbers will be too great. Already, the Republican nominee has a massive disadvantage, and especially when you have the leaders not putting their weight behind the people. They're not putting their weight behind the people.</p>	
<p>Instead of calling me and saying, congratulations, you did a great job. You absolutely destroyed her in the debate, like everybody said you know, Pat Buchanan wrote the big article today, you saw it – I'm not bragging, I'm just saying – maybe a little bit, but here – he said it was the single greatest debate performance in the history of presidential politics.</p>	

<p>(A.2.141) So, wouldn't you think that Paul Ryan would call and say, good going? (00:35:54–00:35:58)</p>	<p><i>Function Forcing the Accommodation of Pre-suppositions: Trump insinuates that Paul Ryan did not call him and congratulate him. The information about whether Paul Ryan called Trump or not is neither in the CR nor can it be perceived as background knowledge. One can assume that Paul Ryan certainly supports the party's candidate but Trump insinuates that he does not. Trump attacks his own party, at least the ones who are "not with him". In this way, he publicly questions their loyalty.</i></p>
<p>In front of just about the largest audience for a second night debate in the history of the country. So you know, you'd think that they'd say, great going, Don. Let's go, let's beat this crook. She's a crook. Let's beat her. We got to stop it. No, he doesn't do that. There's a whole deal going on there. I mean, you know, there's a whole deal going on and we're <i>gonna</i> figure it out. I always figure things out. But there's a whole sinister deal going on.</p>	

<p>Crooked Hillary wants to end forever the American independence that our founders gave us. Our great founders are spinning in their graves. Our founders are spinning in their graves like Douglas MacArthur, like George Patton, like our generals. They're spinning in their grave and by the way, General Flynn and all the generals – over 200 admirals and generals have endorsed Donald Trump.</p>	
<p>Two hundred. Over 200.</p>	
<p>Twenty-one congressional Medal of Honor recipients have endorsed Donald Trump.</p>	
<p>(A.2.142) I'll tell you, you know what I like? (00:37:13–00:37:15)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: Embedded Form because of the introductory “So, I’ll tell you, [...]” and “you-know”-clause. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>
<p>They're very smart, tough people like me. I like that. They're smart, tough people, they like Trump.</p>	
<p>American soldiers have fought and died to win and keep America's freedom and now Hillary Clinton wants to surrender that freedom to open borders, open trade, and world government. And I do believe in free trade, but I believe more in smart trade.</p>	
<p>We're <i>gonna</i> make great deals with other countries. We're <i>gonna</i> bring jobs back. We're <i>gonna</i> bring jobs back.</p>	

<p>I'm not running to be president of the world. I'm running to be president of the United States of America.</p>	
<p>Oh, I wish those cameras would turn, so some time our friends back in New York and back in Pennsylvania and back in Ohio and all these different states, they could see the crowds but they do hear it. You know, when you hear the noise, they say they never show the crowd but you hear the crowd. You can't imitate that noise.</p>	
<p>We will never surrender the freedom and sovereignty of the United States. It's going to be America first, America first, America first.</p>	
<p>And yesterday, Hillary had Al Gore – climate change.</p>	
<p>(A.2.143) Now, I want – just so you know – do you know that I've won numerous environmental awards? (00:39:32–00:39:35)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: Embedded Form because of the introductory "Now, I want – just so you know, [...]". Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>
<p>I'm a believer in the environment. It's got to be within reason. I'm a believer. Here's what I want, though. I want immaculately clean water and I want immaculately clean air. That's what I want. That's called climate change. That's called environmental protection.</p>	

<p>But Hillary had this deal. Very, very lightly attended and I watched on television as they said this is the largest crowd that she's had.</p>	
<p>(A.2.144) You know what she's got? (00:40:03–00:40:04)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: "You-Know-What" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>
<p>Like a tiny little fraction. Now, they're not gonna say look at the crowd with crooked Hillary yesterday. She had Al Gore get up, this poor guy.</p>	
<p>I don't know what the hell happened to him.</p>	
<p>(A.2.145) What happened to him? (00:40:19–00:40:20)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: The speaker again shifts the attention to his previous statement that something happened to Al Gore.</i></p>
<p>She had Al Gore get up, because don't forget, Obama thinks that climate change is the single biggest and most dangerous problem for the world today.</p>	
<p>Not nuclear weapons in the hands of maniacs or in the hands of countries that hate us. No, no that's no problem. Climate change is our problem. I'll tell you how this going, how we're doing folks. If we don't win this election, I don't know what I'm going to do.</p>	
<p>I don't know.</p>	

<p>(A.2.146) No, no can you imagine? (00:41:04–00:41:06)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump shifts the attention to Obama, who stated that climate change is the biggest problem. Trump points to other topics that might be considered the biggest problem of the U.S., e.g. nuclear weapons that rival countries may use against the U.S. Trump questions whether his audience can imagine that climate change is a greater problem than nuclear weapons that may be launched against the U.S.</i></p>
<p>Here's a guy where we have ISIS that he essentially founded, if you look. Remember I said, founded and he's going to get the medal for having – and I kiddingly. But it's really not that kiddingly but then they put it on Mo Bisely, he found and I says, let me tell you something. When they pulled out of Iraq the way they – we should have never been in Iraq and I was against it and they know it.</p>	

<p>But we should have never been in Iraq. But when we were, the way he pulled out, he announced when he's leaving, he pulled out everybody instead of leaving groups behind. And they created a vacuum and ISIS was formed. Now think of this because the biggest thing that came out of the debate in my opinion, and it really came out of the first debate, which if I didn't have fixed microphone or a broken microphone, nobody's been able to tell me, but I watched.</p>	
<p>Couldn't talk very good because my mike didn't work. But I watched and I said you know, it's interesting. Hillary said she's gonna do this and this and this but she's been there for 30 years, she never did it.</p>	
<p>And I said to her in the second debate, I said let me ask you a question. Let me – and by the way, you know that so-called Commission on Presidential Debates, the head guy used to work for Bill Clinton.</p>	
<p>(A.2.147) Did you know that? (00:42:22–00:42:23)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump shifts the attention to the close connection between the commission on presidential debates and the Clinton family. Thus, he signals that there might be something suspicious about the presidential debates. This is a topic he frequently refers to, e.g. the idea that Hillary Clinton receives the questions beforehand.</i></p>

<p>I just found that out. The head guy worked for Bill Clinton. What a rigged deal this is. But – <i>but</i> here’s the story. I have no respect for that group by the way, I have none. It sounds good. Presidential commission, give me a break.</p>	
<p>That’s why I was so happy what we did to annihilate the enemy the other day. So happy.</p>	
<p>Because we’re dealing against a very dishonest system. But Hillary, so important, wants to have a radical, and this is very radical, immigration. She wants to radicalize immigration where you have people pouring in. Remember this, the border patrol agents, 16,500 gave me their endorsement. Last week, ICE, ICE, these are great people, you don’t hear great things because they’re not allowed to do their job.</p>	
<p>These are people that frankly, would work a lot less. I mean their job’s easier if Hillary wins because basically all they have to do is stand there and watch people walk in front of them. ICE, these are great people. Tough people, smart people. First time in their history they endorse me, they’ve got to work harder, and they endorse me.</p>	

<p>And one of the things they told me that I thought was terrible is that she refused when she was secretary of state to make foreign countries take back their criminal aliens. In other words, we have somebody in from a foreign country illegally. The person kills somebody, hurts somebody, robs a store, robs a bank, does all sorts – sells drugs all over the place, poisons our youth. And we want to send them back to the country from which they came and they bring them back and the country says, we're not taking them.</p>	
<p>Because they're smart. They don't want them. So they bring them back into the United States and we put them into our society. I guarantee you, and you can mark my words, and there's a lot of tape running, that won't happen once when Donald Trump is president; not once, guarantee you that.</p>	
<p>One convicted criminal alien, she allowed to go free – totally free; killed a young girl named Casey Chadwick; beautiful young girl. The corrupt establishment in Washington wants to surrender America's borders, even as they send our troops overseas to protect the borders of other countries. She'll protect those borders, but not our borders.</p>	

<p>Casey Chadwick was a great example, and he was let free, and she should be alive today. Jamiel Shaw has a son – had a son, a great young man, killed violently. And I don't know if you know, but killed violently by an illegal immigrant, shot three times in the face for no reason; somebody that wasn't supposed to be here.</p>	
<p>And you have – you have case after case after case. We're not <i>gonna</i> have it anymore. We're not <i>gonna</i> be the stupid people anymore. We're not <i>gonna</i> be the stupid, weak people anymore.</p>	
<p>A Trump administration will secure, control, defend and protect the borders of the United States, as sure as you are standing here today.</p>	
<p>We will 100 percent build the wall, 100 percent.</p>	
<p>(A.2.148) Are you ready? (00:46:49–00:46:50)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question</i></p>
<p>(A.2.149) Are you ready? (00:46:51–00:46:52)</p>	<p><i>Reaction Question</i></p>

	<i>Reaction Question</i>
(A.2.150) And who is going to pay for the wall? (00:46:55–00:46:58)	
(Audience: “Mexico” <sup>2</sup> )	
100 percent. They just don’t know it yet. They don’t know it yet, but 100 percent. They’ll pay for the wall.	
Hey, look, we’re <i>gonna</i> have a great relationship with Mexico and China and all of these countries that are ripping us off and now have no respect. They’re <i>gonna</i> make less and they’re <i>gonna</i> like us more. Funny how that works, but it’s true. Mexico is making a fortune with trade. They’re taking our jobs. So many things. They are <i>gonna</i> respect us finally.	
We will stop the drugs from pouring into our country. Florida has seen a 470 percent increase in heroin deaths. Think of that – think if you have a child – 470 percent increase in heroin deaths since 2007. Think of that. Think of your kids and your grandkids.	

<sup>2</sup> The verbalised reply by the audience is included for a better understanding of the next utterance.

<p>We're <i>gonna</i> stop it. And most of it's coming across the southern border. And let me tell you, when we allow ICE and when we allow the Border Patrol agents and when we give them that big, beautiful wall with a door in it so people can come in, but they have to come in legally; we want them to come in, but they have to come in legally. We will stop the drugs from poisoning our youth and others.</p>	
<p>But I have a message for the drug dealers, for the gang members and the criminal cartels: Your days are numbered, believe me; your days are numbered.</p>	
<p>Hillary also wants a 550 percent increase in Syrian refugees. We don't know anything about them.</p>	
<p>This, even though she admitted in private according to WikiLeaks, just out, that she knows terrorists are trying to infiltrate – <i>and</i> she knows it – they're trying to infiltrate our refugee program. So, she said it just yesterday that she knows they're trying to come in through that method, and yet she wants 550 percent more than even Obama's staggeringly high numbers, thousands and thousands.</p>	

<p>We can't let it happen. And <i>you know</i>, we all have a heart, and we'll build safe havens, and we'll have the Gulf States pay because they're not doing their share. Believe me, they're not. They have plenty of money, they'll pay. We can't pay. We owe \$20 trillion. 20 trillion, doubled during Obama years. Doubled. He doubled the debt during his years.</p>	
<p>In fact, the terrorists have already infiltrated our country. There are now 1,000 open ISIS investigations in our 50 states. A record. Attack after attack, including the recent terror strikes in New Jersey, New York, Minnesota, as well as the mall shooting in Washington, were made possible by our extremely open immigration system that's meant only to protect fools, and we're not fools. So let me state this clearly as I can. I am going to keep radical Islamic terrorists the hell out of our country.</p>	
<p>She won't even use the word. She won't even use the term. Our incompetent president – I call him our campaign president – our incompetent president won't use the term radical Islamic terrorism. He won't use it. He tries to explain it. He spends hours trying to explain why. If you don't identify your problem, folks, you're never <i>gonna</i> get rid of it. It's only getting worse.</p>	

<p>And remember, I said it before, we've started off when he became president with no ISIS.</p>	
<p>(A.2.151) Nobody heard the term ISIS, which he calls ISIL, right? (00:51:13–00:51:17)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience's attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i></p>
<p>(A.2.152) You know why he does that? (00:51:18–00:51:19)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: "You-Know-What" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>
<p>Because he likes disturbing all of you. He calls ISIL. But we started off, we had no ISIS. And now, 7 1/2 years later, they're in, they think, 32 countries.</p>	
<p>(A.2.153) And she's <i>gonna</i> get rid of them? (00:51:35–00:51:37)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: "Declarative" Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>
<p>I can tell you this. They are hoping and they are praying – they are hoping and praying that Hillary Clinton becomes president of the United States, because they'll take over not only that part of the world. They'll take over this country, they'll take over this part of the world, believe me. They are hoping. <i>They are hoping.</i></p>	

<p>And by the way, <i>you know</i>, she likes to say, they want me – I will be their worst nightmare. I'm <i>gonna</i> be their worst nightmare.</p>	
<p>And she lied during the debate.</p>	
<p>(A.2.154) Remember when I said the red line in the sand, right? (00:52:13–00:52:15)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: “Remember-x” and Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience’s attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i></p>
<p>She said, I wasn’t secretary of state then, all flustered, all crazy. She was there when they drew the line. I walked out, they said, you know, she was there. Oh, well, she sort of said she wasn’t. She was there.</p>	
<p>It turned out to be a lie. And even the media said that they hated – she lied about that. She lied about many things.</p>	
<p>She put Iran on the path to nuclear weapons. You know, this horrible Iran deal where they gave \$400 million in cash, but it turned out to be \$1.7 billion in cash. You couldn’t fit that in the back of this arena, that’s how much money it is.</p>	
<p>She gave – they gave that much money to the terrorists, to our enemies. And by the way, our enemies aren’t even nice to us. Now they’re emboldened.</p>	

<p>You see the little boats going around our beautiful ships doing all sorts of little things to drive our people crazy. Folks, they're not gonna do that stuff when I'm president, I guarantee you. I guarantee you.</p>	
<p>You see the way they captured our ten sailors 'cause they were a little bit in the wrong waters. And instead of saying nicely, "Hey, listen.</p>	
<p>(A.2.155) You got to be over there a little bit", they humiliated the sailors, humiliated their families, and humiliated our country, right? (00:53:32–00:53:38)</p>	<p><i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience's attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i></p>
<p>And the only reason <i>they let them</i> go is that our payments of \$150 billion started the next day. So stupid they're not. And when they fly – they – they flew right alongside of our – our planes the other.</p>	
<p>(A.2.156) You saw that? (00:53:54–00:53:55)</p>	<p><i>Problematic Case: Declarative Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i></p>
<p>Their jet fighters.</p>	

(A.2.157) Right, you saw that? (00:53:57–00:53:38)	<i>Problematic Case: Declarative Form. Excluded as discussed in Section 3.5.3.</i>
And when Putin is buzzing – you know Hillary’s tough with Russia. You ever notice anything that goes wrong, they blame Russia. Russia did it. They have no idea. We’re being hacked because we have people that don’t know what they’re doing.	
They have people. But they always blame Russia and then they say, “Donald Trump is friends with Putin.”	
I don’t know Putin, folks. I promise. I don’t know Putin.	
(A.2.158) What the hell do I have to do with Putin? (00:54:19–00:54:22)	<i>Function Focusing: Trump shifts attention to his previous statement and also stresses his perception that it is unlikely that he has something to do with the Russian president Putin.</i>
These people are professional con people. They’re con.	
And this country can’t have it. This country can’t have it.	
(A.2.159) And – and by the way, Russia, which is buzzing our ships, right? (00:54:30–00:54:37)	<i>Invariant Tag Question: The speaker uses the tag question to keep the audience’s attention and to strengthen his previous utterance.</i>

<p>You know, tough Hillary, tough Obama, they're buzzing. You saw that two weeks ago, buzzing, planes going by. They took over – yeah, they took over.</p>	
<p>You look at Ukraine. They took over during – that was Crimea. They took that over during Obama's reign.</p>	
<p>You know, tough Obama. He's so tough. He's so tough.</p>	
<p>So, look, we need competence and we need it fast. Hillary Clinton who turned Libya into a nightmare.</p>	
<p>(A.2.160) How about Libya? (00:55:06–00:55:08)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump then refers to the debate about Benghazi. Even though the topic is not in the CR, I assume the topic is background knowledge as it was widely discussed in the news. Again, Trump stresses the aspect of Hillary Clinton's incompetence.</i></p>
<p>(A.2.161) How about Benghazi? (00:55:08–00:55:09)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump subsequently refers to debate about Benghazi. Even though the topic is not on the CR, I assume the topic as background knowledge as it was widely discussed in the news. Again, Trump stresses the aspect of Hillary Clinton's incompetence.</i></p>
<p>How about – how about Benghazi where Ambassador Stevens sent 600 <i>different form</i> messages to Hillary Clinton, and she didn't even respond.</p>	

<p>The only one she spoke to was that sleaze Sidney Blumenthal, her friend who Obama told her you cannot deal with, and she did behind Obama's back.</p>	
<p>A Trump Administration will stop the reckless interventions, and instead focus on defeating and totally destroying ISIS. We're also going to build up our cyber defenses. Cyber's a big thing.</p>	
<p>And keep our power grid and our vital infrastructure modern and safe. And the word "keep" is an incorrect word because we have to rebuild it. It's a mess.</p>	
<p>It's so old, it's falling apart. And we're going to use cyber offense to disrupt the enemy where we need to and keep them from recruiting online.</p>	
<p>ISIS is taking our children, and taking our kids out of our country because they're using the internet better than we know how to use it. And we're the ones that came up with it.</p>	
<p>At the same time, we're going to completely rebuild our very depleted military. We're <i>gonna</i> take care of our people.</p>	
<p>And that includes building state-of-the-art systems of all kind. When it comes to keeping America safe, I believe in three very important words: peace through strength. We don't want to use the military.</p>	

<p>But it's got to be there.</p>	
<p>And just in closing, to be strong, our country has to be rich again. We're a debtor nation. We're poor. I'm going to make America rich again.</p>	
<p>My enemy – our enemies are unbelievable. They love what's happening to our country. They love it. Our energy proposals won't lock the \$50 trillion in energy reserves right here in America under our feet. This means new jobs in Florida and many, many other communities. Pennsylvania, Ohio, we're <i>gonna</i> take care of our miners, we're <i>gonna</i> take care of our steelworkers, we're <i>gonna</i> take care of natural gas. We're <i>gonna</i> have clean coal. We're <i>gonna</i> also have all forms of advanced energy.</p>	
<p>We also have to repeal and replace it. We will do this and it's so important because it's driving everybody and small businesses and big businesses and our country out of business. Repeal and replace Obamacare.</p>	
<p>Bill Clinton, in a rare moment of truth-telling, said last week Obamacare was a crazy system where people wind up with their premiums doubled and their coverage cut in half.</p>	

<p>(A.2.162) What kind of a system is this? (00:58:16–00:58:18)</p>	<p><i>Function Focusing: Trump refers to Obamacare to stress that he is upset about the health programme and seeks confirmation that the hearers are as well.</i></p>
<p>Oh, did he suffer that evening. He went home aye yai yai, poor Bill. He suffered. You see, the next he came back and he said he was only kidding. He was only kidding. It's a disaster.</p>	
<p>Obamacare – you know, your rates are going up 68 percent. In Texas they had 71 percent. In other communities they're gonna go 95 percent and 100 percent, and next year is gonna be worse. We have no choice but to absolutely repeal, replace Obamacare we're gonna come up with a much better plan for much less money.</p>	
<p>As you know also, most counties in the state will only have one insurer to choose from. Obama does that because that way they have a monopoly so they can charge you whatever the hell they want.</p>	
<p>This is our chance to stop the abusive and horrible and—and something that doesn't work, Obamacare, and save American healthcare, but you have to get out and vote.</p>	

At the center of our economic revival, we'll be fixing our terrible trade deals. When I announced, seems like a long time now, June 16th coming down with Melania at the escalator, remember, in Trump Tower, was an amazing – that was an amazing thing and we announced that it was a big part.	
And then I came out and I said Florida and our countries, we have all of these lost jobs. All of our lost manufacturing. We're <i>gonna</i> get it back. We're bringing our jobs back.	
When countries come in and think they're going to steal our companies and our companies are going to go out and fire all of their employees in Florida, in Ohio, in Pennsylvania, in all of these countries.	
All of these – everyone.	
We are not going to allow it to happen.	
We are not <i>gonna</i> allow it.	
We are going to tell it, you are going to have consequences.	
The states are not <i>gonna</i> put up with it anymore. Our federal government is going to help.	
We've built other countries at our expense.	
We have.	
So, if they come in like they did in Indiana – where Mike Pence, by the way, is doing a great job.	
<i>It's great.</i>	

<p>And they take – in the case, they take – Mexico takes care of your air conditioner, and they fire their 1,400 people who were so great to me.</p>	
<p>And they think they're <i>gonna</i> make air conditioners in their beautiful new plant in Mexico, and sell them across the border and make lots of money, and we have all the <i>unemployment</i>. Not <i>gonna</i> happen. We're <i>gonna</i> put a 35 percent tax on and they're staying in the United States.</p>	
<p>And if they don't, we're going to make plenty of money.</p>	
<p>We are going to rebuild our country.</p>	
<p>Our country is going to be a country where you can be proud of again.</p>	
<p>We're <i>gonna</i> use American steel, we're <i>gonna</i> use American labor, we are going to come first in all deals.</p>	
<p>We're not going to make the trade deal where we come in fifth and sixth and seventh and other countries laugh at our stupidity. We are going to build great companies.</p>	
<p>We are going to expand companies that are now doing poorly.</p>	
<p>We are going to make our country very rich again.</p>	
<p>We are going to make our country very safe again.</p>	

We are going to make America strong again.	
And we are going to make America great again.	
God bless you, everybody. God bless you. Thank you.	

**Southeastern Livestock Pavilion in Ocala, FL, 12 October 2016, Speech 12.**

## A.3 Corpus: Trump Political Speeches in 2015–16

### Speech 1

#### Remarks Announcing Candidacy for President in New York City, 16 June 2015

Woah. That is some group of people. Thousands. So nice, thank you very much. That's really nice. Thank you. It's great to be at Trump Tower. It's great to be in a wonderful city, New York. And it's an honor to have everybody here. This is beyond anybody's expectations. There's been no crowd like this. And I can tell you, some of the candidates, they went in. They didn't know the air-conditioner didn't work. They sweated like dogs. They didn't know the room was too big, because they didn't have anybody there.

(A.3.1) How are they *gonna* beat ISIS? (00:00:36–00:00:39)

I don't think it's gonna happen. Our country is in serious trouble. We don't have victories anymore. We used to have victories, but we don't have them.

(A.3.2) When was the last time anybody saw us beating, let's say, China in a trade deal?  
(00:00:53–00:01:01)

They kill us. I beat China all the time. All the time.

(A.3.3) When did we beat Japan at anything?

(A.3.4) They send their cars over by the millions, and what do we do?

(A.3.5) When was the last time you saw a Chevrolet in Tokyo? (00:01:09–00:01:25)

It doesn't exist, folks. They beat us all the time.

(A.3.6) When do we beat Mexico at the border? (00:01:32–00:01:34)

They're laughing at us, at our stupidity. And now they are beating us economically. They are not our friend, believe me. But they're killing us economically. The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems. Thank you. It's true, and these are the best and the finest. When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people. But I speak to border guards and they

tell us what we're getting. And it only makes common sense. It only makes common sense. They're sending us not the right people. It's coming from more than Mexico. It's coming from all over South and Latin America, and it's coming probably – probably – from the Middle East. But we don't know. Because we have no protection and we have no competence. We don't know what's happening. And it's gotta stop and it's gotta stop fast. Islamic terrorism is eating up large portions of the Middle East. They've become rich. I'm in competition with them. They just built a hotel in Syria.

(A.3.7) Can you believe this? (00:03:18–00:03:19)

They built a hotel. When I have to build a hotel, I pay interest. They don't have to pay interest, because they took the oil that, when we left Iraq, I said we should've taken. So now ISIS has the oil, and what they don't have, Iran has. And in 19 – and I will tell you this, and I said it very strongly, years ago, I said – and I love the military, and I want to have the strongest military that we've ever had, and we need it more now than ever. But I said, “Don't hit Iraq,” because you're going to totally destabilize the Middle East. Iran is going to take over the Middle East, Iran and somebody else will get the oil, and it turned out that Iran is now taking over Iraq. Think of it. Iran is taking over Iraq, and they're taking it over big league. We spent 2 trillion dollars in Iraq, 2 trillion. We lost thousands of lives, thousands in Iraq. We have wounded soldiers, who I love, I love – they're great – all over the place, thousands and thousands of wounded soldiers. And we have nothing. We can't even go there. We have nothing. And every time we give Iraq equipment, the first time a bullet goes off in the air, they leave it. Last week, I read 2,300 Humvees – these are big vehicles – were left behind for the enemy.

(A.3.8) 2,000? (00:05:05–00:05:06)

(A.3.9) You would say maybe two, maybe four? (00:05:07–00:05:09)

2,300 sophisticated vehicles, they ran, and the enemy took them. [Audience: We need Trump now.] You're right. [Audience: We need Trump now.]

(A.3.10) Last quarter, it was just announced, our gross domestic product – a sign of strength, right? (00:05:26–00:05:36)

But not for us. It was below zero.

(A.3.11) Whoever heard of this? (00:05:40–00:05:41)

It's never below zero. Our labor participation rate was the worst since 1978. But think of it, GDP below zero, horrible labor participation rate. And our real unemployment is anywhere from 18 to 20 percent. Don't believe the 5.6. Don't believe it. That's right. A lot of people up there can't get jobs. They can't get jobs, because there are no jobs, because China has our jobs and Mexico has our jobs. They all have *our* jobs. But the real number, the real number is anywhere from 18 to 19 and maybe even 21 percent, and nobody talks about it, because it's a statistic that's full of nonsense. Our enemies are getting stronger and stronger by the *day*, and we as a country are getting weaker. Even our nuclear arsenal doesn't work. It came out recently they have equipment that is 30 years old. They don't know if it worked. And I thought it was horrible when it was broadcast on television, because boy, does that send signals to Putin and all of the other people that look at us and they say, "That is a group of people, and that is a nation that truly has no clue. They don't know what they're doing. They don't know what they're doing." We have a disaster called the big lie: Obamacare. Obamacare. Yesterday, it came out that costs are going for people up 29, 39, 49, and even 55 percent, and deductibles are through the roof. You have to be hit by a tractor, literally, a tractor, to use it. Because the deductibles are so high, it's virtually useless. It is a disaster.

(A.3.12) And remember the 5 billion dollar website? (00:08:04–00:08:08)

5 billion we spent on a website, and to this day it doesn't work. A 5 billion dollar website. I have so many websites, I have them all over the place. I hire people, they do a website. It costs me 3 dollars. 5 billion dollar website. [Audience: We want Trump. We want Trump. We want Trump. We want Trump.] Well, you need somebody, because politicians are all talk, no action. Nothing's gonna get done. They will not bring us – believe me – to the promised land. They will not. As an example, I've been on the circuit making speeches, and I hear my fellow Republicans. And they're wonderful people. I like them. They all want me to support them. They don't know how to bring it about. They come up to my office. I'm meeting with three of them in the next week.

(A.3.13) And they don't know – "Are you running? (00:09:12–00:09:13)

(A.3.14) Are you not running? (00:09:13–00:09:14)

(A.3.15) Could we have your support? (00:09:15–00:09:16)

(A.3.16) What do we do? (00:09:17–00:09:18)

(A.3.17) How do we do it?” (00:09:19–00:09:20)

I like them. And I hear their speeches. And they don't talk jobs and they don't talk China.

(A.3.18) When was the last time you heard China is killing us? (00:09:25–00:09:28)

They're devaluing their currency to a level that you wouldn't believe. It makes it impossible for our companies to compete, impossible. They're killing us. But you don't hear that from anybody else. You don't hear it from anybody else. And I watch the speeches. Thank you. I watch the speeches of these people, and they say the sun will rise, the moon will set, all sorts of wonderful things will happen.

(A.3.19) And people are saying, “What's going on? (00:10:04–00:10:05)

I just want a job. Just get me a job. I don't need the rhetoric. I want a job.” And that's what's happening. And it's going to get worse, because remember, Obamacare really kicks in in '16, 2016. Obama is going to be out playing golf. He might *even* be on one of my courses. I would invite him, I actually would say. I have the best courses in the world, so I'd say, you what, if he wants to – I have one right next to the White House, right on the Potomac. If he'd like to play, that's fine. In fact, I'd love him to leave early and play, that would be a very good thing. But Obamacare kicks in in 2016. Really big league. It is going to be amazingly destructive. 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, and it can be – and – and it can be replaced with something much better for everybody. Let it be for everybody. But much better and much less expensive for people and for the government. And we can do it. So I've watched the politicians. I've dealt with them all my life. If you can't make a good deal with a politician, then there's something wrong with you. You're certainly not very good. And that's what we have representing us. They will never make America great again. They don't even have a chance. They're controlled fully – they're controlled fully by the lobbyists, by the donors, and by the special interests, fully. Yes, they control them. Hey, I have lobbyists. I have to tell you. I have lobbyists that can produce anything for me. They're great.

(A.3.20) But you know what? (00:12:22–00:12:23)

It won't happen. It won't happen. Because we have to stop doing things for some people, but for this country, it's destroying our country. We have to stop, and it has to stop now. Now, our country needs — our country needs a truly great leader, and we need a truly great leader now. We need a leader that wrote "The Art of the Deal." 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. Our vets have been abandoned. And we also need a cheerleader You know, when President Obama was elected, I said, "Well, the one thing, I think he'll do well. I think he'll be a great cheerleader for the country. I think he'd be a great spirit." He was vibrant. He was young. I really thought that he would be a great cheerleader. He's not a leader. That's true. You're right about that. But he wasn't a cheerleader. He's actually a negative force. He's been a negative force. He wasn't a cheerleader; he was the opposite. We need somebody that can take the brand of the United States and make it great again. It's not great again. We need — we need somebody — we need somebody that literally will take this country and make it great again. We can do that. And, I will tell you, I love my life. I have a wonderful family. They're saying, "Dad, you're *gonna* do something that's *gonna* be so tough." You know, 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. Just can't happen. And yet that's the kind of mindset that you need to make this country great again. So ladies and gentlemen... I am officially running...for president of the United States, and we are going to make our country great again. It can happen. Our country has tremendous potential. We have tremendous people. We have people that aren't working. We have people that have no incentive to work. But they're *gonna* have incentive to work, because the greatest social program is a job. And they'll be proud, and they'll love it, and they'll make much more money than they would've ever made, and they'll be — they'll be doing so well, and we're *gonna* be thriving as a country, thriving. It can happen. I will be the greatest jobs president that God ever created. I tell you that. I'll bring back our jobs from China, from Mexico, from Japan, from so many places. I'll bring back our jobs, and I'll bring back our money. Right now, think of this: We owe China 1.3 trillion dollars. We owe Japan more than that. So they come in, they take our jobs, they take our money, and then they loan us back the money, and we pay them in interest, and then the dollar goes up so their deal's even better.

(A.3.21) How stupid are our leaders? (00:16:53–00:16:55)

(A.3.22) How stupid are these politicians to allow this to happen? (00:16:56–00:17:00)

(A.3.23) How stupid are they? (00:17:00–00:17:03)

[Audience: We want Trump. We want Trump. We want Trump. We want Trump. We want Trump.] I'm *gonna* tell you – thank you. I'm *gonna* tell you a couple of stories about trade, because I'm totally against the trade bill for a number of reasons. Number one, the people negotiating *it* don't have a clue. Our president doesn't have a clue. He's a bad negotiator. He's the one that did Bergdahl. We get Bergdahl, they get five killer terrorists that everybody wanted over there. We get Bergdahl. We get a traitor. We get a no-good traitor, and they get the five people that they wanted for years, and those people are now back on the battlefield trying to kill us. That's the negotiator we have. Take a look at the deal he's making with Iran. He makes that deal, Israel maybe won't exist very long. It's a disaster, and we have to protect Israel. But... So we need people – I'm a free trader. But the problem with free trade is you need really talented people to negotiate for you. If you don't have talented people, if you don't have great leadership, 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, free trade is terrible. Free trade can be wonderful if you have smart people, but we have people that are stupid. We have people that aren't smart. And we have people that are controlled by special interests. And it's just not *gonna* work. So, here's a couple of stories happened recently. A friend of mine is a great manufacturer. And, you know, China comes over and they dump all their stuff, and I buy it. I buy it, because, frankly, I have an obligation to buy it, because they devalue their currency so brilliantly, they just did it recently, and nobody thought they could do it again. But with all our problems with Russia, with all our problems with everything – everything, they got away with it again. And it's impossible for our people here to compete. So I want to tell you this story. A friend of mine who's a great manufacturer, calls me up a few weeks ago. He's very upset.

(A.3.24) I said, "What's your problem?" (00:19:35–00:19:36)

He said, "You know, I make great product." And I said, "I know. I know that because I buy the product." He said, "I can't get it into China. They won't accept it. I sent a boat over and they actually sent it back. They talked about environmental, they talked about all sorts of crap that had nothing to do with it." I said, "Oh, wait a minute, that's terrible.

(A.3.25) Does anyone know this?" (00:19:53–00:19:54)

He said, “Yeah, they do it all the time with other people.”

(A.3.26) I said, “They send it back?” (00:19:57–00:19:58)

“Yeah. So I finally got it over there and they charged me a big tariff. They’re not supposed to be doing that. I told them.” Now, they do charge you tariff on trucks, when we send trucks and other things over there. Ask Boeing. They wanted Boeing’s secrets. They wanted their patents and all their secrets before they agreed to buy planes from Boeing. Hey, I’m not saying they’re stupid. I like China. I sell apartments for *ten* – I just sold an apartment for \$ 15 million dollars to somebody from China.

(A.3.27) Am I supposed to dislike them? (00:20:28–00:20:30)

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. I love China. The biggest bank in the world is from China.

(A.3.28) You know where their United States headquarters is located? (00:20:49–00:20:52)

In this building, in Trump Tower. I love China.

(A.3.29) People say, “Oh, you don’t like China?” (00:20:58–00:20:59)

No, I love them. But their leaders are much smarter than our leaders, and we can’t sustain ourself with that. There’s too much – it’s like – 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. We’re rebuilding many countries. China, you go there now, roads, bridges, schools, you never saw anything like it. They have bridges that make the George Washington Bridge look like small potatoes. And they’re all over the place. We have all the cards, but we don’t know how to use them. We don’t even know that we have the cards, because our leaders don’t understand the game. We could turn off that spigot by charging them tax until they behave properly. Now they’re going militarily. They’re building a military island in the middle of the South China sea. A military island. Now, our country could never do that because we’d have to get environmental clearance, and the environmentalist wouldn’t let our country – we would never build in an ocean. They built it in about one year, this massive military port. They’re building up their military to a point that is very scary. You have a problem with ISIS. You have a bigger problem with China. And, in my opinion, the new China, believe it or not, in

terms of trade, is Mexico. So this man tells me about the manufacturing. I say, “That’s a terrible story. I hate to hear it.” But I have another one, 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 *gonna* 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 dollars in Mexico instead. Not good. Now, Ford announces a few weeks ago that Ford is going to build a 2.5 billion dollar car and truck and parts manufacturing plant in Mexico. 2.5 billion, it’s *gonna* be one of the largest in the world. Ford. Good company. So I announced that I’m running for president. I would... .. one of the early things I would do, probably before I even got in – and I wouldn’t even use – you know, I have – I know the smartest negotiators in the world. I know the good ones. I know the bad ones. I know the overrated ones. You get a lot of them that are overrated. They’re not good. They think they are. They get good stories, because the newspapers get buffaloed. But they’re not good. But I know the *best* negotiators in the world, and I put them one for each country. Believe me, folks. We will do very, very well. Very, very well. But I wouldn’t even waste my time with this one. I would call up the head of Ford, who I know. If I was president, I’d say, “Congratulations. I understand that you’re building a nice 2.5 billion dollar car factory in Mexico and that you’re *gonna* take your cars and sell them to the United States, zero tax, just flow them across the border.”

(A.3.30) And you say to yourself, “How does that help us,” right? (00:24:46–00:24:47)

(A.3.31) “How does that help us? (00:24:47–00:24:48)

(A.3.32) Where is that good”? (00:24:48–00:24:49)

It’s not. So I’d say, “Congratulations. That’s the good news. Let me give you the bad news. Every car and every truck and every part manufactured in this plant that comes across the border, we’re *gonna* charge you a 35-percent tax, and that tax is going to be paid simultaneously with the transaction, and that’s it. Now, here’s what is *gonna* happen. If it’s not me in the position, it’s one of these politicians that we’re running against, you know, the 400 people that we’re [inaudible]. And here’s what’s *gonna* happen. They’re not so stupid. They know it’s not a good thing, and they may even be upset by it. But then they’re *gonna* get a

call from *their* donors or probably from the lobbyist for Ford and say, “You can’t do that to Ford, because Ford takes care of me and I take care of you, and you can’t do that to Ford.”

(A.3.33) And guess what? (00:25:50–00:25:51)

No problem. They’re *gonna* build in Mexico. They’re *gonna* take away thousands of jobs. It’s very bad for us. So under President Trump, here’s what would happen: The head of Ford will call me back, I would say within an hour after I told them the bad news. But it could be he’d want to be cool, and he’ll wait till the next day. You know, they want to be a little cool. And he’ll say, “Please, please, please.” He’ll beg for a little while, and I’ll say, “No interest.” Then he’ll call all sorts of political people, and I’ll say, “Sorry, fellas. No interest,” because I don’t need anybody’s money. It’s nice. I don’t need anybody’s money. I’m using my own money. I’m not using the lobbyists. I’m not using donors. I don’t care. I’m really rich. [inaudible...] ... [applause] And by the way, I’m not even saying that in a *bragging* – that’s the kind of mindset, that’s the kind of thinking you need for this country. So – ‘cause we got to make the country rich. It sounds crass. Somebody said, “Oh, that’s crass.” It’s not crass. We got 18 trillion in debt. We got nothing but problems. We got a military that needs equipment all over the place. We got nuclear weapons that are obsolete. We’ve got nothing. We’ve got Social Security that’s *gonna* be destroyed if somebody like me doesn’t bring money into the country. All these other people want to cut the hell out of it. I’m not going to cut it at all; I’m *gonna* bring money in, and we’re *gonna* save it. But here’s what’s *gonna* happen: After I’m called by 30 friends of mine who contributed to different campaigns, after I’m called by all of the special interests and by the – the donors and by the lobbyists – and they have zero chance at convincing me, zero – I’ll get a call the next day from the head of Ford. He’ll say, “Please reconsider,” I’ll say no. He’ll say, “Mr. President, we’ve decided to move the plant back to the United States, and we’re not *gonna* build it in Mexico.” That’s it. They have no choice. They have no choice. There are hundreds of things like that. I’ll give you another example. Saudi Arabia, they make a billion dollars a day. A billion dollars a day. I love the Saudis. Many are in this building. They make a billion dollars a day. Whenever they have problems, we send over the ships. We say “we’re gonna protect.”

(A.3.34) What are we doing? (00:28:24–00:28:25)

They’ve got nothing but money. If the right person asked them, they’d pay a fortune. They wouldn’t be there except for us. And believe me, you look at the border with Yemen. You

remember Obama a year ago, Yemen was a great victory. Two weeks later, the place was blown up. Everybody got out – and they kept our equipment. They always keep our equipment.

(A.3.35) We ought to send used equipment, right? (00:28:51–00:28:52)

They always keep our equipment. We ought to send some real junk, cause, frankly, it would be — we ought to send our surplus. We're always losing this gorgeous brand-new stuff. But look at that border with Saudi Arabia.

(A.3.36) Do you really think that these people are interested in Yemen? (00:29:04–00:29:10)

Saudi Arabia without us is gone. They're gone. And I'm the one that made all of the right predictions about Iraq. You know, all of these politicians that I'm running against now – it's so nice to say I'm running as opposed to if I run, if I run. I'm running. But all of these politicians that I'm running against now, they're trying to disassociate. I mean, you looked at Bush, it took him five days to answer the question on Iraq. He couldn't answer the question. He didn't know.

(A.3.37) I said, "Is he intelligent?" (00:29:41–00:29:43)

Then I looked at Rubio.

(A.3.38) He was unable to answer the question, is Iraq a good thing or bad thing? (00:29:44–00:29:48)

He didn't know. He couldn't answer the question.

(A.3.39) How are these people gonna lead us? (00:29:52–00:29:54)

(A.3.40) How are we gonna – how are we gonna go back and make it great again? (00:29:54–00:29:57)

We can't. They don't have a clue. They can't lead us. They can't. They can't even answer simple questions. It was terrible. But Saudi Arabia is in big, big trouble. Now, thanks to fracking and other things, the oil is all over the place. And I used to say it, there are ships at sea, and this was during the worst crisis, that were loaded up with oil, and the cartel kept the price up, because, again, they were smarter than our leaders. They were smarter than our leaders. There is so much wealth out there that can make our country so rich again, and therefore make it great again. Because we need money. We're dying. We're dying. We need money. We have to do it. And we need the right people. So, Ford will come back. They'll all

come back. And I will say this, this is going to be an election, in my opinion, that's based on competence. [Audience: Yes.] Trump: Somebody said – thank you, darlin'. Somebody said to me the other day, a reporter, a very nice reporter, “But, Mr. Trump, you're not a nice person.” [Audience: We don't need nice.] That's true. But actually I am. I think I am a nice person. People that know me, like me.

(A.3.41) Does my family like me? (00:31:21–00:31:22)

I think so, right. Look at my family. I'm proud of my family. By the way, speaking of my family, Melania, Barron, Kai, Donnie, Don, Vanessa, Tiffany, Ivanka did a great job.

(A.3.42) Did she do a great job? (00:31:37–00:31:38)

Great. Jared, Laura and Eric, I'm very proud of my family. They're a great family. So the reporter said to me the other day, “But, Mr. Trump, you're not a nice person.

(A.3.43) How can you get people to vote for you?” (00:31:58–00:32:00)

I said, “I don't know.” I said, “I think that number one, I am a nice person. I give a lot of money away to charities and other things. I think I'm actually a very nice person.” But, I said, “This is going to be an election that's based on competence, because people are tired of these nice people. And they're tired of being ripped off by everybody in the world. And they're tired of spending more money on education than any nation in the world per capita, than any nation in the world, and we are 26th in the world, 25 countries are better than us in education. And some of them are like third world countries. But we're becoming a third world country, because of our infrastructure, our airports, our roads, everything. So one of the things I did, and I said, you know what I'll do. I'll do it. (00:32:51–00:32:54) Because a lot of people said, “He'll never run. Number one, he won't want to give up his lifestyle.” They're right about that, but I'm doing it. Number two, I'm a private company, so nobody knows what I'm worth. And the one thing is that when you run, you have to announce and certify to all sorts of governmental authorities your net worth. So I said, “That's OK.” I'm proud of my net worth. I've done an amazing job. I started off – thank you – I started off in a small office with my father in Brooklyn and Queens, and my father said – and I love my father. I learned so much. He was a great negotiator. I learned so much just sitting at his feet playing with blocks listening to him negotiate with subcontractors. But I learned a lot. But he used to say, “Donald, don't go into Manhattan. That's the big leagues. We don't know anything about

that. Don't do it." I said, "*Dad*, I gotta go into Manhattan. I gotta build those big buildings. I gotta do it, Dad. I've gotta do it." And after four or five years in Brooklyn, I ventured into Manhattan and did a lot of great deals – the Grand Hyatt Hotel. I was responsible for the convention center on the west side. I did a lot of great deals, and I did them early and young. And now I'm building all over the world, and I love what I'm doing. But they all said, a lot of the pundits on television, "Well, Donald will never run, and one of the main reasons is he's private and he's probably not as successful as everybody thinks." So I said to myself, you know, nobody's ever going to know unless I run, because I'm really proud of my success. I really am. I've employed – I've employed tens of thousands of people over my lifetime. That means medical. That means education. That means everything. So a large accounting firm and my accountants have been working for months, because it's big and complex, and they've put together a statement, a financial statement, just a summary. But everything will be filed eventually with the government, and we don't extensions or anything. We'll be filing it right on time. We don't need anything. And it was even reported incorrectly yesterday, because they said, "He had assets of 9 billion." So I said, "No, that's the wrong number. That's the wrong number. Not assets." So they put together this. And before I say it, I have to say this. I made it the old-fashioned way. It's real estate. You know, it's real estate. It's labor, and it's unions good and some bad and lots of people that aren't in unions, and it's all over the place and building all over the world. And I have assets – big accounting firm, one of the most highly respected – 9 billion 240 million dollars. And I have liabilities of about 500 million. That's long-term debt, very low interest rates. ex In fact, one of the big banks came to me and said, "Donald, you don't have enough borrowings.

(A.3.44) Could we loan you 4 billion dollars?" (00:36:21–00:36:23)

I said, "I don't need it. I don't want it. And I've been there. I don't want it." But in two seconds, they give me whatever I wanted. 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 8 billion – 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. So the total is 8,737,540,00 dollars. Now I'm not doing that...

(A.3.45) I'm not doing that to brag, because you know what? (00:37:21–00:37:23)

I don't have to brag. I don't have to, believe it or not. I'm doing that to say that that's the kind of thinking our country needs. We need that thinking. We have the opposite thinking. We have losers. We have losers. We have people that don't have it. We have people that are morally corrupt. We have people that are selling this country down the drain. So I put together this statement, and the only reason I'm telling you about it today is because we really do have to get going, because if we have another three or four years – you know, we're at 18 trillion now. We're soon *gonna* be at 20 trillion. According to the economists – who I'm not big believers in, but, nevertheless, this is what they're saying – that 24 trillion – we're very close – that's the point of no return. 24 trillion dollars. We will be there soon. That's when we become Greece. That's when we become a country that's unsalvageable. And we're gonna be there very soon. We're gonna be there very soon. So, just to sum up, I would do various things very quickly. I would repeal and replace the big lie, Obamacare. I would build a great wall, and nobody builds walls better than me, believe me, and I'll build them very inexpensively, I will build a great, great wall on our southern border. And I will have Mexico pay for that wall. Mark my words. Nobody would be tougher on ISIS than Donald Trump. Nobody. I will find – within our military, I will find the General Patton or I will find General MacArthur, I will find the right guy. I will find the guy that's going to take that military and make it really work. Nobody, nobody will be pushing us around. I will stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons. 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. I won't be doing that. And I promise I will never be in a bicycle race. That I can tell you. I will immediately terminate President Obama's illegal executive order on immigration, immediately. Fully support and back up the Second Amendment. Now, it's very interesting. Today I heard it. Through stupidity, in a very, very hard-core prison, interestingly named Clinton, two vicious murderers, two vicious people escaped, and nobody knows where they are. And a woman was on television this morning, and she said, "You know, Mr. Trump," and she was telling other people, and I actually called her, *but* she said, "You know, Mr. Trump, I always was against guns. I didn't want guns. And now since this happened" — it's up in the prison area — "my husband and I are finally in agreement, because he wanted the guns. We now have a gun on every table. We're ready to start shooting." I said, "Very interesting." So protect the Second Amendment. End – end

Common Core. Common Core should — it is a disaster. Bush is totally in favor of Common Core. I don't see how he can possibly get the nomination. He's weak on immigration. He's in favor of Common Core.

(A.3.46) How the hell can you vote for this guy? (00:41:48–00: 41:50)

You just can't do it. We have to end — education has to be local. Rebuild the country's infrastructure. Nobody can do that like me. Believe me. It will be done on time, on budget, way below cost, way below what anyone ever thought. I look at *these* roads being built all over the country, and I say I can build those things for one-third. What they do is unbelievable, how bad. You know, we're building on Pennsylvania Avenue, the Old Post Office, we're converting it into one of the world's great hotels. It's gonna be the best hotel in Washington, D.C. We got it from the General Services Administration in Washington. The Obama administration. We got it. It was the most highly sought after – or one of them, but I think the most highly sought after project in the history of General Services. We got it. People were shocked, Trump got it. Well, I got it for two reasons. Number one, we're really good. Number two, we had a really good plan. And I'll add in the third, we had a great financial statement. Because the General Services, who are terrific people, by the way, and talented people, they wanted to do a great job. And they wanted to make sure it got built. So we have to rebuild our infrastructure, our bridges, our roadways, our airports. You come into La Guardia Airport, it's like we're in a third world country. You look at the patches and the 40-year-old floor. They throw down asphalt, and they throw. You look at these airports, we are like a third world country. And I come in from China and I come in from Qatar and I come in from different places, and they have the most incredible airports in the world. You come to back to this country and you have LAX, disaster. You have all of these disastrous airports. We have to rebuild our infrastructure. Save Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security without cuts. Have to do it. Get rid of the fraud. Get rid of the waste and abuse, but save it. People have been paying in for years. And now many of these candidates want to cut it. You save it by making the United States, by making us rich again, by taking back all of the money that's being lost. Renegotiate our foreign trade deals. Reduce our 18 trillion in debt, because, believe me, we're in a bubble. We have artificially low interest rates. We have a stock market that, frankly, has been good to me, but I still hate to see what's happening. We have a stock market that is so bloated. Be careful of a bubble because what you've seen in the past might be small potatoes compared

to what happens. So be very, very careful. And strengthen our military and take care of our vets. So, so important. Sadly, the American dream is dead. But if I get elected president I will bring it back bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and we will make America great again. Thank you. Thank you very much.

## Speech 2

### Remarks Introducing Governor Mike Pence as the 2016 Republican Vice Presidential Nominee in New York City, 16 July 2016

Thank you, everybody. Great honor. Great honor, thank you. This is a wonderful day. Aww. Wow. On a Saturday morning yet.

(A.3.47) Isn't that nice? (00:00:37–00:00:40)

Thank you, all. And we're going to have an incredible convention. It's really going well. We're going to have an incredible convention. And we're going to get things solved, and we're going to do lots of wonderful things for our country, most importantly. So I'm here today to introduce the man who will be my partner in this campaign, and the White House, to fix our rigged system – we are in a rigged, rigged system – and to make America safe again and to make America great again. I want to also address the Islamic terror attack in France. We've witnessed horror beyond belief, no matter where you look. And now it's happening more and more. And it's never going to stop. We need new leadership. We need new thinking. We need strength. We need in our country law and order. And if I'm elected president, that will happen. I *wanna* express our unyielding support to the people of France, and we mourn their loss as a nation. And as far as Turkey is concerned, so many friends in Turkey, great people, amazing people. We wish them well. It looks like they're resolving the difficulty, but we wish them well. A lot of – lot of anguish last night, but hopefully it'll all work out. Now, as, hopefully, the next president of the United States, I *wanna* refer back to what's happened over the years. The Middle East today is more unstable than ever before. Never been like this. Out of control. After four years of Clinton, who really led the way and led Obama down a horrible path, because I don't even think he could have made these decisions so badly, she led him right down a horrible path. He didn't know what he was doing. Iraq, Syria, all into chaos. And Iran is on a path to nuclear weapons. And on top of that, we gave them back \$150 billion, and we didn't get our hostages until the end. Now we're seeing unrest in Turkey, a further demonstration of the failures of Obama–Clinton. You just have to look, every single thing they touched has turned to horrible, horrible, death-defying problems. We also need to bring back in this country – because we see what happened – our industry,

our manufacturing, our jobs. They've been taken away, like we're babies. Taken away. And we're *gonna* bring them back. I found the leader who will help us deliver a safe society and a prosperous – really prosperous society for all Americans. Indiana Governor Mike Pence was my first choice. I've admired the work he's done, especially in the state of Indiana. And I'm *gonna* go over some of those accomplishments in just a minute. But I also admire the fact that he fights for the people, and he's going to fight for you. He is a solid, solid person. Governor Pence served Indiana with distinction in Congress. He rose to leadership and served as the chairman of the entire House Republican Conference. Number one. He's really got the skills of a highly talented executive, leading the state of Indiana to jobs, growth, and opportunity, in spite of the relentless obstacles put in his way and every state's way by the Obama administration. It's horrible out there. High taxes and regulations. And it's out of control. Mike Pence is a man of honor, character, and honesty. We know that. Hillary Clinton is the embodiment of corruption. She's a corrupt person. What she's done with her e-mails, what she's done with so many things, and I see the ads up – all the time, the ads. She's totally bought and paid for by Wall Street, the special interests, the lobbyists, 100 percent. She's crooked Hillary. And I think that, while she got away with murder, in fact, I think it might be her greatest accomplishment, escaping the recent scandal, and her lies, and the loss of 33,000 e-mails – but it wasn't a loss, she discarded – that in itself is a major crime. Other people have been paying tremendous prices for what they've done, which is peanuts compared to what happened with Hillary Clinton.

(A.3.48) Thirty-three thousand e-mails are missing, and that's OK? (00:06:21–00:06:23)

(A.3.49) Didn't give them to the FBI? (00:06:23–00:06:24)

(A.3.50) Didn't give 'em to the attorney general, and that's OK? (00:06:25–00:06:26)

(A.3.51) Wipes her server clean, that's OK? (00:06:28–00:06:33)

These are crimes. These are crimes. And how she got away with it, I think I understand it, but I think a lot of people don't. But I do believe, while she didn't pay the price she should have paid, she's going to pay that price when November 8th rolls around. She's going to pay it at the polls. I believe that. On top of everything else, Hillary made \$21.6 million giving speeches to special interests in a short period of time. She's totally owned by Wall Street. We believe in Americanism; she believes in globalism. And it's not that she believes in it. The people that give her all of this money believe in it. And she'll believe in whatever they want

her to believe. Believe me. That's it. What a difference between crooked Hillary Clinton and Mike Pence. Mike Pence will never be afraid to speak the name of our enemy: Radical Islam. Radical Islamic terrorism. You saw it the other day with the truck screaming out the window. You heard what he was screaming out the window. You saw it in San Bernardino. You saw it at the World Trade Center. You saw it in Orlando.

(A.3.52) How horrible was that? (00:08:06–00:08:09)

You saw it in Paris. You see it all over. And Hillary is a weak person. We are the law and order candidates, and we're the law and order party. We're going to change things around. There's going to be respect again for law and order. Hillary Clinton's foreign policy helped launch ISIS. You know, she's talking – I see the ads she puts on. If I make one statement, which is fine, she'll take that statement and put on a totally dishonest ad, because she's got a lot of money because it's given to her by the lobbyists and by the special interests. Got a lot of money. But I see the ads on foreign policy. She's talking about Donald Trump doesn't have foreign policy experience. Of course not. I've been a very, very, very successful businessperson. I mean – but – but if you look at my calls, I said, don't go into Iraq. Nobody cared, because I was a businessperson. I was a civilian. Take the oil. Many, many calls I've made. You take a look. I said that in Scotland and in the U.K., that was going to happen. I was the one that predicted it. And everybody said, he's wrong, he's wrong. President Obama said, if it happens, they're *gonna* get to the back of the line, which probably is one of the reasons they lost, of course I consider it a win. I think it was a win for them, actually, because they don't *wanna* be told what to do. And they don't *wanna* be told that when people pour into the country, they have to take them even if they're not qualified, even if they don't have paperwork, even if they have no idea where they come from. And I said that Brexit's going to happen. I said that they are going to break away. And everybody laughed at me. And the odds were 20 percent. And then when it happened, she took an ad saying, oh, Donald Trump said this or that, but I'm the one that said it was going to happen. And some of the more fair reporters – about 30 percent of them – said he was right. I appreciate that. Seventy percent didn't, so that's OK. So Mike Pence will never be afraid to speak the name of our enemy. So important. Now, I think if you look at one of the big reasons that I chose Mike – and one of the reasons is party unity, I have to be honest. So many people have said party unity. Because I'm an outsider. I *wanna* be an outsider. I think it's one of the reasons I won in landslides. I won in landslides.

This wasn't close. This wasn't close. No, this wasn't close. This was *a* – in the history of the Republican Party, history, with 17 people running, you have to understand, other people ran against one, two, and three. With 17. We got – I say we, because I'm the messenger, I'm a messenger – I'm doing a good job, but I'm a messenger – we got almost 14 million votes. That's more than any other person in the history of the Republican Party in the primary system running for president. Think of it. That's more than Ronald Reagan, who we love. That's more than Richard Nixon. It's more than Dwight D. Eisenhower. You know, he won the Second World War, in all fairness. Pretty good. It's more than the Bushes. But I mean by a lot. I don't mean by a little. But that's with 17 people. People don't over-say that. That means our message is unbelievable. And I want to thank all of the loyal people – because I have such loyal, unbelievable people, and they displayed that just yesterday in Cleveland, where it's *gonna* be so amazing. But they displayed it.

(A.3.53) It was on display, where we had this group of people, who – many of whom I've known, and I won't say, because for party unity, I'll say they're wonderful people, OK? (00:12:06–00:12:26)

Never Trump, they said, never Trump, never Trump. Oh, we're going to win. They got crushed. And they got crushed immediately, because people want what we're saying to happen. They're tired of a country that has horrible trade deals, that has no borders, that has taxes that are through the roof, highest taxed nation just about in the world. That has regulations that don't allow you to start a business and destroy your business if you do start – and, by the way, speaking of destroying businesses, we're *gonna* take care of the miners and we're *gonna* take care of the steelworkers. We're *gonna* put 'em back to work. So they're very tired of it. But I want to thank all of those people that – delegates – that were on the different committees, because, boy, was that something. Did we show them something. And unfortunately, the vote was very late. But essentially, we had 112 to 12. This was the vote that was going to put it onto the floor and we're *gonna* have a big fight. We're not *gonna* have a fight. People agree with what we've – they want the wall. They want the borders. They want these things to happen. And what we're doing... And what we're doing that I'm so proud of, so proud – and nobody else would even think about doing it – I fought very hard for it. We'll call it the Johnson amendment, where he took away from the evangelicals – and I want to thank the evangelicals, because without the evangelicals, I could not have won this

nomination. The evangelicals have been unbelievable. I dominated with the evangelicals. A lot of people were surprised. They say he's not perfect.

(A.3.54) But you know what? (00:14:04–00:14:06)

They know I'm *gonna* get the job done, and they're really smart. And I said – and I said for the evangelicals, that we're *gonna* do something that nobody's even tried to do. You have the Johnson amendment passed by Lyndon Johnson and his group. And he was a powerful president. He knew how to get things done. He got bogged down in a war that was a disaster and it destroyed him. But he was a powerful president. And we call it the Johnson amendment, where you are just absolutely shunned if you're evangelical, if you want to talk religion, you lose your tax-exempt status. We put into the platform, we're *gonna* get rid of that horrible Johnson amendment. And we're *gonna* let evangelicals, we're going to let Christians and Jews and people of religion talk without being afraid to talk. I saw this. I had so many great leaders so many times up to my office, the top – the absolute top evangelical leaders, Christian leaders, Jewish leaders.

(A.3.55) Believe it or not, some Muslim leaders – people are *gonna* be surprised to hear that – I had the top leaders up to my office, and I said, why is it that you're so powerful as an individual, and yet when you get out there, you're sort of timid?  
(00:15:21–00:15:34)

And they didn't know how to answer the question. And it took two, three meetings before I figured it out. One great, great gentleman that everybody knows, but whose name I will not reveal, said, Mr. Trump, we live in fear in our churches and our synagogues. We live in fear that we're going to lose our tax-exempt status if we say anything that's even slightly political. And I looked out the window. I was in Trump Tower, and I pointed to people walking down the street. I said, well, they have the right to speak, but you don't. That means they're more powerful than you are. We have to do something about it.

(A.3.56) How did it start? (00:16:10–00:16:12)

(A.3.57) How did it start? (00:16:13–00:16:15)

And they said, it started because of Lyndon Johnson. And he actually had a problem in Texas with a certain religious leader. And he did this, and he got it done. And we're *gonna* undo it, so that religious leaders in this country, and those unbelievable people – and not because

they backed me in such large numbers – but so that religion can again have a voice, because religion’s voice has been taken away. And we’re going to change that.

(A.3.58) OK? (00:16:44–00:16:45)

All right. Back to Mike Pence. So one of the primary reasons I chose Mike was I looked at Indiana, and I won Indiana big. Remember, Indiana was going to be the firewall. That’s where Trump was going down – they agreed I’d win New York, I’d win Pennsylvania, I’d win all these places. But Indiana was *gonna* be the firewall. So I got to study Indiana, and I got to study New York and a lot of other places, and I saw how NAFTA, signed by Bill Clinton, has drained our manufacturing jobs, just drained us like we’ve never been drained before. NAFTA, again, signed by Bill Clinton. NAFTA is the worst economic deal in the history of our country. Manufacturing down in some states 55, 60 percent. It’s a horror show, moving to Mexico, moving to other places. I have a friend who’s a great builder. What he builds is plants. That’s all he does, is build plants. He doesn’t build buildings. He doesn’t – he builds plants. It’s the biggest in the world, from what I hear.

(A.3.59) I said, how’s business? (00:17:56–00:17:57)

I was with him the other day.

(A.3.60) How’s business? (00:17:59–00:18:00)

He goes unbelievable. I said, really, wow, I’m surprised.

(A.3.61) Why is it unbelievable? (00:18:04–00:18:05)

Because I think of him as building in this country. He says, Donald, what we’re doing in Mexico, you won’t believe.

(A.3.62) I said, what do you mean? (00:18:11–00:18:12)

He said, we’re building plants in Mexico the likes of which we’ve never seen.

(A.3.63) I said, what about this country? (00:18:17–00:18:19)

Not much. Not much. That’s the expression. He said exactly that. Not much.

(A.3.64) I said, but Mexico? (00:18:27–00:18:28)

He said, you’ve never seen anything like it. It’s incredible. Folks, that’s *gonna* stop. We’re *gonna* go reverse it. We’re *gonna* bring our jobs back to this country. We can’t be the stupid people anymore.

(A.3.65) OK? (00:18:41–00:18:42)

And he was better than a pollster. He's better than a consultant.

(A.3.66) I would say, how are we doing? (00:18:48–00:18:49)

And you get a big report that costs you millions of dollars. Doesn't cost me millions.

(A.3.67) Me, I give them \$10,000, OK? (00:18:53–00:18:55)

It costs other people millions. It costs other campaigns millions to get a report. Every time they get a report, it's millions. But I'll tell you what, a guy like this is better than anybody you can hire to do a report. And he said it. He didn't say it from the standpoint of he's upset about it. Just fact.

(A.3.68) How are we doing? (00:19:15–00:19:16)

Unbelievable in Mexico. In fact, he actually said, I've never, ever seen anything like it. And if you look, Ford is building massive plants there instead of Michigan. We want them to build them in Michigan. They're going to build them in Michigan. And you know that I know how to do that. So easy. So easy. But they're not *gonna* do and they're not *gonna* take advantage of us without retribution. There are consequences when you fire thousands of people and move to another country and then think you're *gonna* make your product and sell it in here. There are consequences. And those consequences are *gonna* keep companies in our country. It's very simple. And everybody here knows what the consequences are, but I won't say that because I'm much more interested right now in Mike. Indiana's unemployment rate – and this is the primary reason I wanted Mike, other than he looks very good, other than he's got an incredible family, incredible wife and family – Karen is amazing. Incredible family. Highly respected. Expected to go for another four years. He would have won, I think, very easily in Indiana. Indiana, their unemployment rate has fallen. When he was there, when he started, 8.4 percent when he was governor. When he took over, to less than 5 percent in May of 2016. Since January 2013, Indiana's labor force has increased by more than 186,000 jobs. You have to understand, I've gone around to all these states. I've gone to all of them. And every time, I have statisticians. I say give me the stats on a state. And it's always bad, down, down, down. Down 40 percent, 50 percent, 60 percent in some cases. Here's somebody where it's gone up. Private sector job growth is up by more than 147,000 jobs since 2013. That's like very unusual. Governor Pence balanced the budget.

(A.3.69) Can you imagine a balanced budget? (00:21:26–00:21:28)

Our budget's so out of whack in this country, we don't know what we're doing. We're *gonna* owe very soon \$21 trillion. He balanced the budget. They don't know what that means. Governor Pence balanced the budget, produced a surplus, and maintains a \$2 billion reserve fund in the state of Indiana. It's also rated triple-A, their bonds are rated triple-A. Very few states have that. Triple-A. The best. That's as good as you can get, whether you're a company, a state, triple-A. Indiana was recently recognized by Chief Executive Magazine as the number-one state in the Midwest for business. Number one. And it's not even close. There are approximately 34,000 fewer Hoosiers on unemployment insurance now than there were when Mike Pence took office. So you have fewer Hoosiers, fewer people from Indiana. And besides that, Bobby Knight, my friend, who really did help me. I mean, if you want a reference, Bobby Knight in Indiana, we love Bobby Knight. But he agrees with everything I'm saying. He loves the governor. Indiana has the second-lowest unemployment rate in the nation, for veterans, where – nobody's fighting for the veterans like I'm fighting for the veterans, the veterans have been left behind. If you remember a few months ago, Hillary Clinton said the, really – they're doing much better, the V.A. is much better. They're doing a much better job than people give it credit for. People are dying on line waiting for five, six days for doctors. People are dying on – they can't even see a doctor. It's a scandal. Take a look at what's happening with the V.A. in Arizona. Take a look at what's happening with – you know, just the Veterans Administration hospitals. It's a scandal. It's corrupt. It's incompetent. It's a scandal. And Hillary Clinton thought it was just fine. And, boy, am I *gonna* win big with the veterans. I mean, we know that for a fact. So it's now 2.4 percent for veterans. In 2013, when Mike Pence took office, the rate for veterans was 6.7 percent. It was 31st in the nation, one of the bad ones, and now it's almost the best. Got 'em jobs. Got 'em jobs. Indianapolis is ranked second in top 10 metro areas for young college graduates. That's a great thing. They're *gonna* stay there. That's a great thing. And Mike worked hard on that. He was telling me, that was not easy. Under Governor Pence's leadership, Indiana enacted the largest K-12 education funding increase in the state's history. So you're balancing budgets, and yet you're giving more money to education.

(A.3.70) Isn't that a great thing? (00:24:26–00:24:27)

Indiana has just about the largest school choice program in America. School choice is where it's at, folks. You want to get your schools better, you gotta get rid of Common Core fast. Governor Pence enacted the largest income tax cut in the state's history. Think of that. We're cutting taxes and balancing budgets. And along with corporate tax reform, just about number one in the country. CNBC ranked Indiana first in the nation for its infrastructure. So with all of these cuts and all of these balancing budgets, we're spending more money on education, and the infrastructure is kept up. That had so much – look, as a builder, nobody in the history of this country has ever known so much about infrastructure as Donald Trump. I build infrastructure.

(A.3.71) Do I know how to build a wall? (00:25:27–00:25:28)

(A.3.72) Do I know how to build infrastructure? (00:25:29–00:25:30)

You know, it's very interesting. We're building – we're building – I won – the – which is pretty amazing with the Obama administration, but I won the right to have the old post office building on Pennsylvania Avenue, right near the White House, and it's an amazing – probably the best location, one of the most sought after projects in the history of the GSA, General Services. And I really like what's happened. We're *gonna* have an opening very soon. Ivanka and Eric and Don did a fantastic job on it. But I thought the other day, I was going over the numbers, we're under budget and about a year – actually more than a year – but we're a year ahead of schedule, and we're under budget substantially. And the quality of the work is even better than we originally were going to do. And when I explained to a government representative that we're under budget and ahead of schedule, they almost fell off, because they've never heard those words before. They've never heard them. So when I see what happened to Indiana, which was having tremendous problems. When I see what happened to Indiana under Mike's work – also his predecessor did a great job, by the way, great job, who's now at Duke – who's now at Purdue. When I see what happened with respect to the numbers, the state, and everything else, that, to me, was probably the single most important point, because it's something that hasn't happened – almost has not happened in this whole country. The turnaround and the strength of Indiana has been incredible, and I learned that when I campaigned there. And I learned that when I won that state in a landslide. And I learned that when Governor Pence, under tremendous pressure from establishment people, endorsed somebody else, but it was more of an endorsement for me, if you remember. He

talked about Trump, then he talked about Ted – who’s a good guy, by the way, who’s going to be speaking at the convention, Ted Cruz, good guy – but he talked about Trump, Ted, then he went back to Trump.

(A.3.73) I said, who did he endorse? (00:27:49–00:27:51)

(A.3.74) So even though he was under pressure, because I’m so, you know, outside of the establishment, it was the single greatest non-endorsement I’ve ever had in my life,OK? (00:27:58–00:28:01)

I will tell you. So, with that, I would like to introduce a man who I truly believe will be outstanding in every way and will be the next vice president of the United States, Governor Mike Pence. Thank you. Thank you, everybody. Thank you.

### Speech 3

#### Remarks at the KI Convention Center in Green Bay, Wisconsin, 05 August 2016

(A.3.75) So how good is he? (00:13:48–00:13:49)

(A.3.76) How good is he? (00:13:49–00:13:50)

Special. Special. He's a special man and special person. And he's become my friend. Oh, there's a lot of people here. Whoa. Hello, everybody. Your football team is *gonna* have a great year. I watch. I watch. You've got the quarterback, you've got the whole deal. I think it's *gonna* be a very good year.

(A.3.77) OK? (00:14:19–00:14:20)

(A.3.78) And if you get into that Super Bowl, I will be going, all right? (00:14:20–00:14:23)

So, you know, I wrote something down before, and I think it is important, because – I love you too. Because we need unity, we have to win this election. This is truly one of the most important elections, certainly in my lifetime. Because we are about to go – we lose it, we are in the wrong direction, and maybe it's gone. Supreme Court justices, always remember that. But so many different levels, and when you see what happened with crooked Hillary today, it was a disaster. 15.04 A disaster. She had a disaster. She lies folks, she lies badly. So, I want to – I just wrote this out. I wanted to say to *this* group, you know, I had a *really* great time when I was in Wisconsin, and I didn't quite eke it out. I thought I was going to, but after that, it worked out well. You built me up, you taught me about politics. And when I left here, I said, I think I've learned a lot. So, I love it. I love the people. I have many friends in Wisconsin. And they're – they're incredible people. You're incredible people, I have to tell you that. And we're *gonna* have a lot of fun. We are *gonna* have a lot of fun but I had to write this. This campaign is not about me or any one candidate. It is about America. *It's* time for a change. We need a change. A real change, not an Obama change.

(A.3.79) *Remember Obama Change?* (00:16:07–00:16:08)

We don't need an Obama change. We've had enough. It's time to change a rigged political system that works only for the insiders, and *to* replace it with a government that serves the

people. Have to do it. And *I* know both sides. I've been on the other side. Believe me. I actually like this side better; this is a movement.

(A.3.80) This is a movement like they may be have never seen in this country, according to even the political pundits that truly hate me, OK? (00:16:50–00:16:51)

This is a – they – oh, this is a movement that some say, most say is one of the great phenomenon's that they've ever seen in politics. Some say it's the single greatest phenomenon. Though the media doesn't *wanna* talk about it, we've done something – we. All of us, together. I'm a messenger; I'm only a messenger. We've done something truly historic together, standing before you as nominee for president and I am not a politician, proudly. I'm not part of the system. I ran against the system, and I'm probably better off running against the system. I ran against the donors. I'm my own donor, essentially. I have a lot of money under this deal. This is a very expensive crisis, I want to tell you. 18.02 I funded – as you know, I funded the primaries. And *now* I'm in for under \$60 million, and I'm largely funding my campaign as we go forward. In addition to that – in addition to that, *we've* raised tremendous amounts of money, and much of it from small donors, \$61; \$61. As a Republican, that doesn't happen. It happens because of what you are seeing in front of you today. And if you remember, just prior to June, they did a story, “Donald Trump *hasn't* really done too well with fund raising.” Well, that is because I did not even know if I was getting the nomination. I'm not going to raise funds – I would've had enough if I didn't make it. I would have said, “Bye, bye, politics.” 18.50 But I wanted to make sure – so I got it. And then I started raising money for the Republican Party and we raised a lot of money. We started really on June 14th, Flag Day, my birthday. My birthday. And in June, we raised approximately – think of this – \$51 million.

(A.3.81) Can you imagine? (00:19:17–00:19:18)

And those people couldn't believe it; they were really surprised. Big headlines, you know. Because they don't give me too many good headlines. I could do the greatest things. I do things that I think *are* fantastic. I say, good, there is no way they *can* cover this badly. And they cover it badly. I gently tell a woman that I love her baby, and let the baby cry. It is OK. As the baby that had a voice that was superior to Pavarotti continued to cry – I remember, I told her to stay, don't worry *about it*. But after about 3 or 4 minutes, and I'm trying to speak and it was in Jacksonville, we had this massive, massive crowd, filled up the stadium. And the baby's screaming. So, I said, ma'am, I would like to reverse my order. Perhaps you could

nicely take – take the baby out. Your baby is great. I did it so nicely. She was happy. Even the baby was happy. He stopped crying.

(A.3.82) And maybe you could take the baby out, would that be possible? (00:20:17–00:20:19)

The whole place was cracking up. And the next day in the newspaper, it said, “Trump throws baby out of arena.” Terrible. Now, they are very dishonest.

(A.3.83) That was a tough one, when I – and I just had a reporter come up to me, backstage, a reporter come up – “Mr. Trump, sir, but why did you throw that baby out of the area?” (00:20:41–00:20:46)

I said, “I was having fun. I was so nice, I was so nice. Everybody likes me. The baby liked me, the mother liked me. We had a good time. I try to keep the baby in, but the baby was such – had such a powerful voice In fact, I *wanna* find out who that baby is, because I *wanna* sponsor the baby. And that baby will sing someday in Philharmonic Hall. I’m telling you.

(A.3.84) New York City, OK? (00:21:09–00:21:12)

The great Philharmonic. So, I’m not part of the system. I ran against the system. I ran against the donors, because I’m largely my own donor. I’m running against myself. That’s sort of – never thought of it that way. And against the status quo, and the status quo, we have to get rid of, because it is not working, folks, because the country is a mess. And *that’s* why put up a lot of money. But while the Democrats nominated the candidate of special interests, and really a candidate of total corruption, I mean, you take a look at what she is doing, the Republicans made history by choosing a nominee from outside of this very, very corrupt system. It is a corrupt system. 22.07 It’s a corrupt system. You want something done, they can do it for you. And *that’s* not necessarily, and usually it isn’t good for the country. That is why we’re going to be able to deliver real change, and real safety and real opportunity to all Americans. We have to unite. Remember that. Everything I’ve accomplished, I have done by putting together a really fantastic team, including, *of course*, Governor Mike Pence of Indiana, who has done an incredible... Done an incredible job. My wonderful staff of people that really love what we are doing, and they are working so hard. My family, *my* friends, and it’s expanding all the time. But I need a Republican Senate and a House to accomplish all of the changes that we have to make.

(A.3.85) We have to make them, right? (00:23:06–00:23:08)

(A.3.86) I understand and embrace the wisdom of Ronald Reagan’s big tent within the party, big, big tent, remember? (00:23:21–00:23:21)

Ronald Reagan, great man, great guy. Remember he included Reagan Democrats and Independents and Republicans, a lot of people. We’re *gonna* have the same thing.

(A.3.87) There a lot of Democrats perhaps in this room, and there are a lot of Democrats *in this room*? (00:23:37–00:23:41)

Raise your hands. I mean, I don’t think we need too many to be honest with you, but – so I embraced the wisdom that my 80 percent friend is not my 20 percent enemy, Ronald Reagan. Stated by Ronald Reagan, pretty good. We will be the big tent party. We’re *gonna* have a lot of cross help. We’re *gonna* have a lot of Bernie Sanders people coming in because of trade, because Bernie Sanders knew we were being ripped off by trade. Trade is a disaster with China, with Japan, with Mexico, with Vietnam, with so many countries, with every country, every country. We don’t win at any level with anything, and as a unified party, we will lead our country to unity as well, very important. We need the unity, we have to win the election. No we have to win it – have to win it. Otherwise, our big movement was not as big as we thought and that’s not good. That’s why November 8th, you’ve got to get everybody you know – and you know, all this voter ID nowadays, a lot of places aren’t *gonna* have voter ID.

(A.3.88) Now what does that mean? (00:25:11–00:25:12)

(A.3.89) What does that mean? (00:25:13–00:25:14)

(A.3.90) You just keep walking in and voting? (00:25:15–00:25:16)

So you have to be very careful, very vigilant – you have to be careful. But we will have disagreements, but we will disagree as friends and never stop working together toward victory, and very importantly, toward real change. 25.45 So in our shared mission to make America great again, I support and endorse our speaker of the House, Paul Ryan. Paul Ryan, he’s good. He’s a good man. He’s a good man and he’s a good guy. And we may disagree on a couple of things, but mostly we agree and we’re *gonna* get it done and we’re *gonna* do a lot of wonderful things. He’s a good man. And while I’m at it, I hold in the highest esteem Senator John McCain for his service to our country, in uniform and in public office, and I fully support and endorse his re-election. Very important. We’ll work together. I also fully

support and endorse Senator Kelly Ayotte of New Hampshire. A state I truly love, primarily because that was my first victory, but I love New Hampshire. No, I love New Hampshire, one of the most beautiful places. She's a rising star and will continue to represent the great people of New Hampshire so very well for a long, long time. Senator Kelly Ayotte. Working hand-in-hand, we will grow our majority in the House and in the Senate. We need that, we've *gotta* get things done. Arm in arm, we will rescue the nation from the Obama-Clinton disaster, which is exactly what it is, that has bled our country dry and spread terrorism unabated across the world, that's what's happening. You saw it just now, Maps came out yesterday, they said ISIS is far bigger, it's all over the place. It's all over the place. We're *gonna* get rid of it, folks. Our military is depleted. We're *gonna* build up our military, we are *gonna* get others with us. Believe me, we're *gonna* get plenty of others with us.

(A.3.91) And speaking of others, wouldn't it actually be wonderful if we could get along with Russia? (00:28:39–00:28:47)

(A.3.92) Wouldn't that be nice? (00:28:47–00:28:48)

They talk so big and so brave and so tough, they're the tough ones. You know, Hillary's real tough, give me a break.

(A.3.93) Wouldn't that be great? (00:28:58–00:28:59)

(A.3.94) We get along with Russia, we go out together with others and we knock the hell out of ISIS, wouldn't that be great? (00:29:04–00:29:05)

29.10 Together we will lead our country back to prosperity, security and peace.

(A.3.95) OK? (00:29:20–00:29:21)

*Now*, when you look at the world and what's happened – so we have the queen of corruption, she's the queen of corruption. She's a disaster. I said before, if crooked Hillary Clinton becomes president, terrorism will destroy the inner workings of our country. Believe me, they are loving it. She wants to have 550 percent more people coming in from Syria and that region into our nation. And we don't know who they are, we don't know where they come from really, we don't know if they're ISIS, some will be. And look at the damage that's done in San Bernardino with a couple – probably he became radicalized by her – a couple, and these were friends of theirs. These were people that gave a party in celebration of the birth of their child and they were gunned down, 14 people killed, many, many injured. 30.34

Take a look at Orlando – take a look at Orlando, how disgusting that was. Take a look at the World Trade Center and so many other places. Go to the probably toughest gun laws anywhere in the world, go to Paris and take a look at that, 130 people gunned down. You know, if people had guns, on the other side where the bullets are flying in the other direction, like you sir, you sir, you and you, ma’am. First of all, if they knew guns were in the room, they probably wouldn’t have gone there. There were no guns. They were just sitting ducks, 130 people. In San Bernardino you had 14 people. But in Paris, just like this, boom – get over here, boom – get over here, boom – 130 people with many still in the hospital, many so gravely wounded. It’s horrible. And if they had bullets flying in the other direction, maybe they wouldn’t have shown up, and if they did, I’ll tell you what, you wouldn’t have had that kind of carnage. You would have had people lying on the other side of the floor instead. So Hillary Clinton wants to do major damage, as you know, to our Second Amendment. Hillary Clinton wants to put judges – she wants to put justices of the Supreme Court – she’s *gonna* make them nice and liberal, wait *till* – wait *till* you see what that does to your rights. Wait *till* you see what that does to your Second Amendment. You will not recognize it, you will not recognize it. National Rifle Association, NRA, endorsed me. They’re great people, Wayne – they’re great people, Chris, they love this country. They endorsed me very early and it’s really a – it’s really an honor. I’ll tell you what, they are phenomenal people when you get to know them. They love the country – you know, they love the country. They take a lot of heat, but they love the country, I’ll tell you that right now. And I heard Mike, Governor Pence, talking about 1.2 growth – 1.2 percent growth, the lowest in memory, I guess, since the 1940’s. When you think of it, the lowest. So a lot of differences between all of us, but I thought I’d mention – because I’ve known Hillary Clinton over the years – I’ve known her – and she makes statements. *Yeah*. She makes statements and, *you know*, they are statements coming out of her playbook. 33.25 Well, let’s see, “we can’t get them for this – can’t get them for this.” I’ve always heard that I have the best temperament, people tell me I have the best temperament, I have a temperament to win. We got to win. We got to win. She said not so long ago, “I don’t like Donald Trump’s tone”. Now, she is reading it off teleprompters only. “I don’t like Donald Trump’s tone.” And I said, you know, “we need a tough tone today. We have people – we need a kind tone, we need a tough tone though.” We have people being beheaded all over the Middle East and other places. We have crime that’s rampant. We have people in the Middle East being drowned in steel cages. This is like medieval times, and she

is worried about my tone. *She is worried about my tone.* So they chop off heads and they drown people, and they bury people in sand.

(A.3.96) And then they ask me, “Mr. Trump” – at one of the debates, *which they say in which I won, which I’m very happy about that* – “Mr. Trump, sir, how do you feel about waterboarding?” (00:34:38–00:34:44)

So I’m seeing chopped off heads, drowned people, burying in sand – I said, “I’m absolutely OK with it, let me tell you.” *These people.* Can you imagine what the enemy must *said* – can you imagine what the enemy – ISIS in this case – can you imagine what they must say as *they’ve* spent the day chopping off the heads of Christians – “come back, get together, start talking – and they say waterboarding is not allowed in the United States – by the United States, waterboarding is not allowed.” 35.23 So Folks, we better get smart and we better get tough and *we’re* playing games with Hillary, *we’re* playing games. It is just games, she is not the right person. Everybody knows it. Her single greatest achievement is being caught in a crime and getting away with it. This is true, *true. This is true.* 33,000 e-mails. So, I wrote this before on the way over to another rally at *a* also very nice place that’s very full and very nice in Iowa.

(A.3.97) And we love Iowa don’t we, yes? (00:36:22–00:36:24)

(A.3.98) Right? (00:36:24–00:36:25)

*And* I thought it was accurate, unstable – and she is, she is unstable. Hillary Clinton lacks the judgment *That, Bernie Sanders said that. Bad judgment. She got bad judgement. As soon as he said it, I started writing notes. “But she got bad judgment. She lacks the judgment, temperament and moral character to lead this country. Plus, she is a weak person.”* We don’t need a weak person. He just said, “plus, she is a criminal.” 37.12 She is a dangerous liar who has disregarded the lives of Americans, and who has put all of us at great, *great* risk while supporting economic policies that have destroyed our economy. We have a long way to go. She is unhinged, she’s truly unhinged, and she is unbalanced, totally unbalanced. And you can see, in the words of a secret service agent who just wrote a book. I bought the book, I wanted to see what he had ; *“she simply lacks” – this is his words – “she simply lacks the integrity and temperament to serve in the office.”* “From *the* bottom of my soul” he said, “I know this to be true.” He was there. “Her leadership style, volcanic impulsive as it is, disdainful of the rules set for everyone else hasn’t changed a bit. She’s unqualified to

become president.” And she really is, and Bernie said that too. So. True. Thank you. What great people. Wow. 39.02 No, but it is true, *I mean, you know, no games, it is true. It’s true.*

(A.3.99) In one way she is a monster, OK? (00:39:12–00:39:13)

Look at what happened, look at her history. In another way, *she’s* a weak person, *she’s* actually not strong enough to be president. So she’s got both, but she is not strong enough to be president. She will be a be a disaster. *She will be a be a disaster.* She will be so bad for our country, and I’m not just talking about Justices of the Supreme Court. She will be so bad for our country and we can’t let it happen. We can’t let it happen. You know, Mike Pence told me a story, and maybe I *shouldn’t* even say it, but I found it interesting, one of the reasons – I guess *primary* – the primary reason that he’s in politics is because he watched the crookedness of the Clintons when they were in the White House. And he said, *he said* “he ran, he ran *again*, he ran again, and he won.” *And* you have to hand it to him, *I mean, there is a guy, he doesn’t* give up. He does not quit. *Never ever quit.* 40.21 But he watched, *he watched* the Clintons – and I’m sure *they’ll* be thrilled to hear that – but *they* actually got him into politics, which is interesting. So then we make these horrible deals; the Iran Deal, horrible deal, we got \$150 billion – and how about, how about \$400 million – think of it, \$400 million in cash, *in cash*, different currencies, different denominations. Now, *a lot* of people say that money went toward terror. I’m nicer than that, see, I don’t have that horrible thought process that some people have in this room have. *Because* I say, some of it went to terror, but a lot of it went *right* into their bank accounts, believe me, that’s the way *life* is.

(A.3.100) It went *right* into their pockets, *they’re sitting* – can you imagine these guys sitting there with \$400 million in cash? (00:41:28–00:41:34)

You think they’re giving that money to terror, they are giving that money to them and I guess terror got some of it, but most of it they kept. 41.46 I mean, the concept of paying \$400 million in cash is mind-boggling.

(A.3.101) I mean, you wouldn’t think – who can authorize such a thing? (00:41:56–00:41:57)

(A.3.102) Where did they get it? (00:41:57–00:41:58) What did they do, go *up* to a bank teller and say, “give me \$400 million in cash, *I want it in, I want it* in euros, I want it in Swiss francs, wrap it up, *we’ll come back in about 10 minutes.*

(A.3.103) *Okay?”* (00:42:16–00:42:16)

I mean, *it's* just inconceivable. *It's just inconceivable*. So we are witnessing a horror show in this country and throughout the world. You look at what is going on throughout the world with these same people, these people *are* funding terror – these people are funding terror. For us to have given \$400 million to basically free our hostages.

(A.3.104) Now, Obama, just like he lied about Obamacare which was a tremendous lie, that was a tremendous lie, remember? (00:42:54–00:42:54)

“You can keep your plan, you can keep your doctor.”

(A.3.105) Really? (00:42:58–00:42:58)

(A.3.106) How many people have been able to keep *their* doctor or their plan? (00:42:59–00:43:02)

Keep your plan, keep your doctor – not working that way, folks. *It's* a disaster. By the way, it is going to be repealed and replaced 100 percent. And – and honestly, I hope I win, because we will do a great job. We're *gonna* make America great again. We're *gonna* make America great again. But I actually think that regardless of who wins, Obamacare is *gonna* fold in any event. It is so expensive. People can't afford it and the country can't afford it.

(A.3.107) Other than that, it is just wonderful, *alright?* (00:43:44–00:43:44)

So, in Texas, they just had almost a 60 percent increase. Now the increases are starting to come out. The big increase is *gonna* be announced on November 1st. The election is November 8th. Folks, they want to delay it, because it is election-changing. It's a mess. It is election changing, and they want to change it. And we can't let that happen. Because the numbers – and I can see some of the numbers already – the numbers are *gonna* be astronomical. They're *gonna* be astronomical. They're *gonna* be so big, so horrible, and the health care, you know, the plan is terrible. It's terrible. And we're *gonna* take care of everybody, but we're going to end up with a great plan that costs much less money for the people and much less money for the country. This plan is a total rip. It doesn't work, so it's going to fall, because economically, it is a disaster for the country, too.

(A.3.108) But what about people where they said they had a 30, 40, 50, 60 percent increase? (00:44:47–00:44:51)

And it's *gonna* be worse than that, I predict on November 1st. 44.56 So, we'd better get smart and we'd better start thinking properly. Now, I want to talk about *what's* going on at the

borders, because money... Oh, we're *gonna* build it. So, listen, so we have people coming *into* our country that *shouldn't* be coming to our country. We have thousands and thousands of people from certain terrorist states, from certain parts of the world that we are allowing to come into our country. Most of the politicians, almost all of them don't even know where they are, where they are being put, they know nothing about these people. This could be the great Trojan Horse of all time. And Hillary wants thousands more to come in over and above Obama.

(A.3.109) Right? (00:45:59–00:46:00)

So, tall – and the wall is getting taller every day. If you think of this, I just wrote this, the Obama-Clinton foreign-policy has handed huge portions of Iraq, Libya and Syria to ISIS. Huge portions. *It's* undermined stability in Egypt, and you know what they *had* to do over there. And empowered Iran as never before. Iran, three years ago was – was dying. In fact, when they were marching in the streets, if Obama would have just encouraged them a little more, it would have been taken over by the people. But Obama played ball with the thugs that are running it right now. Think of this, think of this. Look, look. We're making a deal, and the deal is not made, and they are dancing in the streets of Iran saying how stupid the Americans are to be making this deal. 47.06 The leaders, and in particular the leader of Iran, is calling us stupid, and the deal means nothing. And yesterday, I think he just said that the United States is essentially nothing. This is our – this is our great, great partner. But when you have somebody – if I was making *a* deal, and if the other side was bragging about it, the deal wasn't made, I'm not making that deal. I'm not making it. I'm walking. But we kept it going, and we should have never ever started negotiating that deal until we had our hostages back.

(A.3.110) OK? (00:47:45–00:47:46)

47.47 We should have walked. We should have doubled up the sanctions and walked. And they would have – and I say it. Before the plane reached New York City or Washington, you could just turn it around, because they'll call you, they'll say, let's go. Take your hostages. But when you think about it, you probably read today and yesterday, one of the hostages was waiting for a very long period of time. Now, Obama said that it had nothing to do with the hostages. That he *wouldn't* do that for kidnappers. He *wouldn't* do that for kidnapping.

(A.3.111) OK? (00:48:21–00:48:21)

No, no, think of that. You *gotta* think about it. He wouldn't do it – now, it was the same day, right, same day.

(A.3.112) We have to be exactly accurate, because they'll catch us, right? (00:48:30–00:48:30)

Same day. 48.33 The money came in, and one of the hostages, good guy, I saw him interview on television. Good guy, hard time.

(A.3.113) But didn't he say he waited forever? (00:48:41–00:48:44)

He waited and somebody said, nope, we are waiting for either something or a plane to come in. And here Obama stands up yesterday, and for seven minutes is telling us one thing had nothing to do with the other. Just a lie. You know, at least be truthful. And we're talking about the same day, \$400 million, and we could have had something that would have been a much better deal. And you know what, I'm all in favor of deals when it gets to nuclear. But we could have made it – we should have walked. And we should have walked with \$150, too; we should have said, sorry, we don't have the money, can't pay. We don't have the money. We owe almost \$20 trillion. 49.31 I'm sorry, fellas, we love you, we think you're the greatest guys on Earth. But we can't give you the money. We don't have it. And they will get angry and they will be upset, and two days later, you'll be back negotiating.

(A.3.114) You just saved yourself \$150 billion, right? (00:49:44–00:49:46)

Hundred and – \$150 billion. So, we have terrorists pouring into our country, we have people coming in. I don't know if you saw this, in Maine – and Maine knows, because Maine is – I was up there yesterday – a great place. A great governor, great governor. Paul is doing a great job. And I think the most important issue facing civilization right now is radical Islamic terrorism. And we have a president that refuses to use the term, and we have crooked Hillary who *doesn't wanna* use it. Now, she's being forced to use it by me. 50.30 Did you notice she gave a speech, she said, I will use it. She called it, I think, radical Islam. But she said, I will use it. I will. Just like Trans-Pacific Partnership. She called it the gold standard. *It's* a horror show. It's almost as bad or maybe it's going to worse than NAFTA, signed by her husband, which cleaned out many of the states in our country, cleaned them out from manufacturing. Moved to Mexico and other places. NAFTA, a total disaster. NAFTA, signed by Bill Clinton. He never suffered the ravages, because he signed it, then he got out and other people did suffer with it. 51.11 But *we're gonna* renegotiate NAFTA, and if they don't want to make a

great deal for us so we get our jobs back, at least a lot of them, if we can't make a great deal – and she can't do that, by the way, if she wanted to. Number one, her donors *wouldn't* let her. Her special interests would never let her. Her lobbyists would never let her. Number three, *she couldn't* do it anyway. Even if she wanted to. But we're *gonna* renegotiate.

(A.3.115) And did you hear her the other day? (00:51:37–00:51:39)

(A.3.116) After years of saying how wonderful it is, even though you look at New England, and you look at New York state and you look at Pennsylvania and Ohio, if you look at a lot of other places, one of the reasons I won Indiana so big – well, one of the reasons was the great Bobby Knight, OK? (00:51:53–00:51:56)

Bobby Knight in Indiana.

(A.3.117) That's gold standard right? (00:52:00–00:52:01)

As she said about TPP. But one of the reasons I won was because Carrier Air Conditioning was moving to Mexico from Indiana, and they let go of 1,400 people. And I've been talking about this, and I know how to stop it, and you've heard me before, so easy to stop. There have to be consequences when Mexico takes our companies. And not only Mexico; there have to be consequences when China devalues its currency so that our companies can no longer compete with China, even though we make better product. I have friends who are manufacturers. We make better product. They can't get their product into China *nowhere*. And when a few times arise where they can, they have to pay an incredible tax, beyond what anybody would even think *possible*. But yet, we open our doors and just throw away your stuff, and we lose our jobs and it's very, *very sad*. 52.57 But look, *as Maine knows*, a major destination – Maine, has become a major destination for Somali refugees. We admit hundreds of thousands of refugees into the United States from many of the most dangerous and unstable regions in the world. And *you're* getting them here too folks, you just don't know it because you don't know.

(A.3.118) Anybody in this room – anybody in this room from a terror territory? (00:53:22–00:53:28)

All right, *so*, a practice – and this is a practice which will continue under Hillary Clinton except it will expand five, six, seven fold. I don't get it. *I don't get it*. I mean, I know *they're gonna* vote Democrat, OK, that's what I know, but they *won't* be voting for a long time.

(A.3.119) I just – I don't get it, how can anybody even think this way? (00:53:52–00:53:56)

Now, the Washington Times reported, “of the Somali refugee – the program in Minnesota – that the effort to resettle large groups of Somali refugees is having the unintended consequence of creating an enclave of immigrants with high unemployment that is both stressing the state safety net” – tremendous problems *with* safety –”. *Tremendous beyond*, and creating a rich pool of potential recruiting targets for the Islam terror groups.

(A.3.120) Aren't we smart? (00:54:37–00:54:38)

We are having this problem across our refugee and immigration programs. Here are some of the examples – *I'll* give you a few examples, and this came out of the Senate subcommittee just recently.

(A.3.121) “The Boston bombers” – remember those horrible, disgusting people? (00:54:55–00:55:01)

“The Boston bombers arrived through the political asylum process. 55.07 The younger brother applied for citizenship and was naturalized on September 11, 2012. The older brother had a pending application for citizenship.” And look what happened, we *take* them in.

(A.3.122) Look what happened, aren't we smart? (00:55:23–00:55:25)

The Moroccan national who came to the United States on a student visa was arrested for plotting to blow up a university *and* a federal courthouse. Great, *great*. A Uzbek refugee living in Idaho was arrested and charged with providing support to a terrorist organization in the form of teaching terror recruits how to build massive and very dangerous bombs. We let him in. 56.05 An immigrant from Syria who later applied for and received U.S. citizenship was accused by federal prosecutors of planning to go to a military base in Texas and kill three or four American soldiers, execution style if possible – more than that, if at all possible. A college student who immigrated from Somalia who later applied for and received U.S. citizenship, attempted to blow up a Christmas tree lighting ceremony in Oregon. An immigrant from Afghanistan who later applied for and received U.S. citizenship, and a legal permanent resident from the Philippines were convicted for plotting to join Al Qaida and the Taliban in order to kill as many Americans as possible – as many as possible. 57.13 An Iraqi immigrant who later applied for and received U.S. citizenship was arrested for lying to federal agents

about pledging allegiance to ISIS, his travels to Syria, and how many Americans he wanted to kill. Two immigrants from Pakistan who later applied for and received U.S. citizenship were sentenced to decades long prison sentences for plotting to detonate a bomb – and a very big bomb, in the middle of New York City. An immigrant from Yemen who later applied for and received U.S. citizenship was arrested for trying to join ISIS. He was also charged with attempting to illegally buy firearms to try *and* shoot as many American military personnel as possible. All right folks.

(A.3.123) So, I just say, *what* – what are we doing? (00:58:25–00:58:27)

(A.3.124) What are we doing? (00:58:28–00:58:30)

And Hillary Clinton wants more *and more and more* to pour in.

(A.3.125) *And you* almost say, you know, politics aside, whether you are a Democrat, whether you are a liberal, a Republican, a conservative; *what* – what are they doing? (00:58:43–00:58:47)

(A.3.126) *What are they doing?* (00:58:47–00:58:48)

(A.3.127) I don't care who you are, what the hell are they doing? (00:58:49–00:58:50)

So we are *gonna* have strong borders, our southern border is *gonna* be very powerful. We're *gonna* stop the drugs from pouring into Wisconsin and every place else. The heroin epidemic is beyond belief. In New Hampshire, a great place, *that's really* where I realized the extent of what is going on. *When I'd meet with the* people of New Hampshire and they tell me, “the biggest problem they have is heroin.” I said, “can't be with the beautiful lakes and streams, *and trees* it so beautiful.” Right, and their biggest problems heroin. I said, “you have to be kidding, that *can't be right*, can't be right ” and it was. Their youth is being poisoned. And then you go to Massachusetts, and you go to North Carolina, and South Carolina, and you come here, you come here – I just left Iowa, you go to Iowa and you see the tremendous problems they have with heroin and drugs that pour in, *they pour* in from the southern border. And look, *look*, here's the story, *we're gonna* have strong borders. *We're gonna* have a wall, *it's gonna* be a big, powerful wall – big, powerful wall.

(A.3.128) You know that, *that* Hillary Clinton wanted a wall a number of years ago? (01:00:21–01:00:27)

She wanted a wall. And the primary *reason*, as we understand it, looking back, not that long ago, she wanted a wall. You know, walls do work folks, all you have to do is ask Israel. All you have to do is ask some of the nations that are in Europe right now that are building walls. You know, it's sort of interesting, Obama talks about, "there will be no wall." But in the White House, which he just said, which is true, they want to build essentially a wall, they want to build a fence a lot bigger, and a lot higher, and a lot stronger. You know, it's sort of interesting. I say, "don't build that fence right, don't build that fence," because they say, "walls don't work" – fences don't work, don't build that fence." When Hillary doesn't want to let you have your guns, she is surrounded by people like this that have more firepower on them than any human beings on earth, and I think she doesn't *wanna* have guns. I think that all of her bodyguards and all of her Secret Service should immediately give up their weapons. OK, *Immediately. Immediately* give up their weapons and if somebody comes at you with a gun, you just try and talk them out of it, I guess. You *gotta* do some quick talking. You got to do some *really* quick talking, Hillary. I don't think even Hillary with her phony lies and disgusting habits, I don't think Hillary could get away with that one. *So, so we're gonna* have a little contrast. And I did this very quickly but *it's* so simple, Hillary wants to raise taxes, Trump is going to lower taxes very substantially, the biggest tax decrease of all on business and on person. Hillary wants to significantly expand regulations. Trump is going to get rid of many, many, many regulations. Which, by the way, are stopping your businesses both small and big from succeeding, from expanding and more than anything, from starting. You can't start a business today, the regulations are so onerous and horrible. Hillary wants to shut down energy production. Trump wants to expand it significantly. And we'll start paying off our debt. Hillary wants to essentially abolish the Second Amendment, take away your right. Donald Trump will protect it more so than any president that has ever served. 1.04.02 Crooked Hillary wants far left *activist* judges forced over there by Bernie and by Pocahontas. Who will destroy our Constitution. I want judges who will support and defend our Constitution.

(A.3.129) As close, by the way, to Justice Scalia who was great as we could get, OK? (01:04:30–01:04:36)

Hillary wants to open our borders, just open them up because her special interests and donors want it that way. There are reasons, I understand that. I want to totally secure our

borders. But I want people to come in. But they come in through a process and they come in legally. Hillary wants to invade foreign countries. *Did you ever* see where she said “Donald Trump with the nuclear” – *I’m afraid* – I didn’t want the war in Iraq. And I’m on record. I didn’t want the war in Iraq. I didn’t want all of – what they’ve done. And I said, if you read Esquire Magazine from a long time ago, you’ll see everything I said was exactly right. It’s going to de-stabilize the Middle East. I said the meanest, toughest group of people, the people that hate the United States and its people the most, they’re *gonna* take it over. That’s exactly what’s happening. They’re taking over the oil, they’re taking over the land, they’re taking over everything. I didn’t want it, but I’m always being accused like the war hog they think I’m a tough guy, the war hog.

(A.3.130) Right? (01:05:43–01:05:43)

They think she wants to be tough with Russia. So she said well, Donald Trump likes Putin. I don’t know Putin, folks. I don’t know. I hope I like him, I hope he likes me because I’d love to get along with Russia.

(A.3.131) OK? (01:05:58–01:05:58)

1.06.00 *I’d* love to. But I don’t know.

(A.3.132) But she goes Donald Trump, Donald Trump – think *of* it – wants to befriend Putin and other things, she said right? (01:06:07–01:06:12)

(A.3.133) And I’m saying to myself what’s wrong with that? (01:06:12–01:06:15)

That’s good.

(A.3.134) But she’s *gonna* be the tough one, see? (01:06:16–01:06:18)

She’s *gonna* be the tough one.

(A.3.135) She’s *gonna* play with nuclear weapons, you know? (01:06:20–01:06:23)

They have all the nukes, nice nukes. She’s *gonna* be the tough one.

(A.3.136) I’ll tell you what, you put her in the office of president – you know, she hates Putin and Putin hates her, right? (01:06:30–01:06:34)

That’s what I hear. No, no – Putin probably doesn’t respect her more than anything else. But Putin hates her. But she’s *gonna* be tough. We’re *gonna* be tough with Russia – oh, we’re *gonna* be tough.

(A.3.137) Right? (01:06:47–01:06:47)

Let me tell you, we're in a different world today, folks. We're in a different world. But she makes it sound like I'm this tough guy that will have a temperament.

(A.3.138) You know, she uses the word – you know who gave her the word? (01:06:56–01:06:57)

Her people that write the speeches, we'll say Trump with a temperament. 1.07.01 They said Trump in a speech with tweets. I've got – I've got between Facebook and Twitter like almost 21, 22 million people. It's an asset, it's an asset. I tweet well. But – but she said – she made the statement during her speech, you know, I heard it barely because I was falling asleep, you couldn't watch it. All right. So remember that one. Hillary wants to invade foreign countries. Look at Libya. Look at that. We did a great job there.

(A.3.139) You know, a spot hit on Gaddafi maybe, but I mean even that, what the hell do we get out of this? (01:07:34–01:07:36)

It's a disaster. Then you have Benghazi, then you have ISIS – then you have ISIS – then you have ISIS taking over the oil, large portions of the oil. And it's some of the finest oil in the world. And you have ISIS grabbing it. 1.07.53 We don't know what we're doing. We have people that don't know what we're doing.

(A.3.140) We have people that militarily – in fact, they said well, who is your military consultants? (01:08:00–01:08:04)

And I *gave* them names. But they're not working now, you know they're not working now. And I said of course they're not working now, look what working now people have gotten us.

(A.3.141) Havoc, who the hell wants the people who are working now? (01:08:14–01:08:16)

I mean... You know, a lot of *it is* common sense and a lot of *it is* instinct and she has very bad judgment, she's got no instinct whatsoever.

(A.3.142) And when I was asked on one of the big networks about NATO, they said what do you think of NATO? (01:08:34–01:08:36)

Now, you know it's not like it was my primary subject in all fairness. I've only been doing this for 12 months.

(A.3.143) Now, it's actually almost 14 months, hard to believe, right? (01:08:43–01:08:45)

But NATO – so I said I know enough. And sometimes knowing a little is better than knowing too much.

(A.3.144) You understand, you can't see the forest through the trees, right? (01:08:55–01:08:58)

So, I said NATO in my opinion is obsolete because it's not covering terrorism. Obsolete for that reason and also you have many countries that aren't paying their fair share, they're not paying what they're supposed to be paying. 1.09.13 And we're protecting those *countries* and we're supposed to get into World War III for all these countries that aren't paying their fair share. And even the commander of NATO – and I so respect what he did.

(A.3.145) He came out the other day and he said Donald Trump is right, we have cut – *that's right* did you see the letter – the big story? (01:09:30–01:09:33)

Donald Trump is right. I'm sure Obama was thrilled when he saw that. Donald Trump is right; you have countries that aren't paying. And he said how he goes in and he talks to them. He says look, you've got to pay your bills. I have budgets – which is true. And I have to go back to Congress and I have to say what's happening. They don't pay their bills though because people don't ask properly. And they probably say to the president or whoever may handle the country. "Sir, we owe the United States millions of dollars. We're ready to pay."

(A.3.146) Oh, have they asked for the money? (01:10:07–01:10:08)

No. They'll pay, OK. 1.10.11 But I will say, the commander of NATO said I was right. And then you have these people back here – stupid people – right here. They said Donald Trump – now they're the worst. They're the worst. They said Donald Trump – Donald Trump doesn't like NATO. He is going to abandon NATO. That's not what I said. I said they've got to pay. They've got to pay. Now, you have to walk. You may have to walk. But they've got to pay.

(A.3.147) We're going to get in World War III for all these countries that are laughing at the stupidity of the United States, right? (01:10:50–01:10:55)

No, they've got to pay. And they probably will, in all fairness.

(A.3.148) But Hillary said about Japan – because Japan, we're defending Japan you know that, right? (01:11:00–01:11:05)

Now, in all fairness before I came alone put yourself back three years ago.

(A.3.149) Did anybody know that we defend Japan? (01:11:10–01:11:12)

Raise your hand who *knew*. *There's* about 12 percent. Not bad.

(A.3.150) I think some of you are lying, OK? (01:11:19–01:11:21)

I think some of you are related to Hillary *rotten* Clinton. I think some of you are lying. But we defend Japan and a man comes up, general or something, few months ago, I remember so vividly. And he said at a news conference because they were embarrassed because I kept saying they've got to pay their way. And if they don't – if they don't, you always have to be prepared to walk you have to do that. You know, we don't want to do that, I understand the reason. It'd be nice to have them but you know this isn't again 40 years ago. We owe \$20 trillion. We're defending all these – we defend Japan. We defend Germany. We defend Saudi Arabia. You think they have the money to pay – how about we have military bases that we rent – we pay rent to Saudi Arabia to protect them. No. No, think of it. Think of it, think of the stupidity. Think of the stupidity. So this general comes up, has a news conference a few months ago. And he said, “Mr. Trump doesn't understand that Japan is paying 50 percent of the cost to defend them.” (1.12.20–1.12.28) So a reporter goes up who I think is there and said to me, “Mr. Trump, we'd like your comment. They say that Japan is paying 50 percent of the cost to defend.”

(A.3.151) And I said why aren't they paying 100 percent? (01:12:41–01:12:42)

The reporter said, “OK.” Not a bad question. Now, here's the problem with the Hillary – Hillary rotten Clinton. Here's the problem. Here is – that's why she changed her last – that's why she doesn't want to use the name anymore, because everybody was saying that. I don't know. I've been saying it.

(A.3.152) But look, here is – here is why it doesn't work for Hillary. She saw that I said that we have to get reimbursed for our costs, at least, right? (01:13:10–01:13:14)

Japan, economic behemoth. Germany – see how well they're doing – economic behemoth. Saudi Arabia, nothing but money. They were making \$1 billion a day with their high oil prices, now they're making a fortune, the same thing. Economic behemoth.

(A.3.153) Why are *we* defending them, and why aren't we being fully reimbursed? (01:13:35–01:13:38)

Now, if we do that, your budget already is starting to look real good, OK. You know, you have budgets, so we losing our assurance; we have an \$800 billion trade deficit, folks. We trade with companies. We have a deficit with other countries, think of it – \$800 billion a year. Trade deficit.

(A.3.154) Do we make *good* deals? (01:14:01–01:14:02)

No. With China, \$505 billion trade deficit. And they cheat us because they devalue their currency all the time. Whenever it gets a little bit tough, devalue, devalue, and our companies can't compete with that.

(A.3.155) Right? (01:14:15–01:14:16)

So, here's the thing.

(A.3.156) So, Hillary says about Japan, how dare he not stay with our allies, how dare he not do that? (01:14:20–01:14:27)

I will never abandon our allies, ever, ever, ever.

(A.3.157) Now, how do you negotiate when you're telling somebody will never going to leave em? (01:14:31–01:14:34)

We may have to leave. Look, Japan has problems because you have the maniac in North Korea making missiles. But I mean, you know, so we'll get it. Now, South Korea, it is an economic behemoth. You can't buy a television that is not made in South Korea, except Sony, which is made in Japan, which has sort of lost its way. Whether it is LG or Samsung. I order thousands of television sets; you can't buy them in the United States. I'd love to. Show me one company. One of the pundits said, they do make them. There's a company. And he showed me *this* little company. What they do is, all the parts come in for – from all over the world; they put them together, and they give you a television that doesn't work and nobody ever heard of it.

(A.3.158) And then I put it into a luxury hotel, and everybody complains, right? (01:15:24–01:15:27)

1.15.28 So, you can't say to people when you're negotiating – cause we're talking about tremendous billions and billions of dollars. You can't say to people – you can't say to people when you're negotiating, we'll never leave you. Think of this, we're going to never leave you; we love you, we'll never leave you.

(A.3.159) Could you pay more? (01:15:49–01:15:50)

No, we're not *gonna* pay anymore. You're not gonna leave us.

(A.3.160) Why should we pay more? (01:15:51–01:15:52)

So, there's a chance we'll have to leave. And there's a chance that, you know, Japan will have to take over this monster and figure it out. We're very far away. It's very expensive. You know, we have a treaty with Japan. And if the United States is attacked, they don't have to do anything.

(A.3.161) But if Japan is attacked, we have to go in there with our full force and might, and who the hell knows what's *gonna* happen, right? (01:16:13–01:16:20)

1.16.21 World War III, who knows what's *gonna* happen. But if we're attacked, they don't have to do.

(A.3.162) You tell me, who makes these deals? (01:16:26–01:16:29)

(A.3.163) It's like Sergeant Bergdahl, right? (01:16:30–01:16:33)

So, we trade a dirty, rotten traitor where five or maybe even six people were killed when he deserted, and we knew that they were killed and we knew that he was a traitor. We trade for five of the greatest killers, the greatest killers in the Middle East, the five people that they wanted the most. That is our deal. So, we get a traitor and they get five people that are right now, most of them, already back on the battlefields trying to kill everybody, including us. No more, folks.

(A.3.164) That is called the five for one president, *right*? (01:17:21–01:17:23)

That's – that's the same guy that made the deal for \$400 million. The other guys couldn't leave the airport, the hostages. And then all of a sudden, they were all able to leave.

(A.3.165) And then you watched him yesterday saying that, can you believe it? (01:17:42–01:17:43)

This had nothing to do with that.

(A.3.166) OK? (01:17:47–01:17:47)

Just a coincidence. No, no, just a coincidence – *just*, no. You know, she is unfit to serve as president for a lot of reasons. He is unfit also. He has done so bad. He has been so

incompetent. We have doubled our debt during his – think of it. Over the years of our country – over the years of our country, he gets in, and in eight years by the time his term is up, we will have doubled our national debt. Think of it. So, we have to win this election. This is a very important election. *I didn't* need to do this, folks, believe me. I could be elsewhere right now, I love being with you. But I could be elsewhere. I could be – I might be in Wisconsin, just a different location.

(A.3.167) OK? (01:18:40–01:18:40)

But I felt I had to do it. I *wanna* give back. I *wanna* give back. I'm *gonna* give back. I'm *gonna* give back. I want to give back. Because our country does not win anymore. Our country does not win anymore. And it is not going to win with crooked Hillary Clinton. Not *gonna* win. It's not *gonna* win. She *doesn't* know how to win. Our country is not gonna win with her. We're going to be worse than we are with Obama. I mean, if you want four more years of what is going on, ISIS, all over the place, ISIS expanding. And by the way, our policemen are great, great people. And we are not going to allow our policemen to be shot down anymore. Anymore. No more. No more. So, November 8th, you have a big election. I promise you this, if I win, we're *gonna* start winning again. We are *gonna* win on trade, we're *gonna* win with our military, we're *gonna* take out ISIS, we're *gonna* win for our veterans who have been totally mistreated. Our veterans are great. We have a great plan for the veterans. We're *gonna* win for our veterans, first time, maybe ever. We're *gonna* win on trade deals. We're *gonna* make the finest, we're *gonna* bring our jobs back. We're not *gonna* make it easy for these companies to leave and fire everybody. It's *gonna* be very, very expensive when they do it. Believe me, it's *gonna* be very, very expensive.

(A.3.168) They're *gonna* say, you know what? (01:20:49–01:20:50)

(A.3.169) Maybe we'll stay *in* Wisconsin, OK? (01:20:52–01:20:53)

Maybe we will stay. No, it's *gonna* be very, very hard. We're *gonna* have strong borders, we're *gonna* have the wall. Mexico's *gonna* pay for the wall 100 percent, 100 percent. We are going to get rid of Obamacare. We're going to get rid of Common Core, we're *gonna* bring our education – local. We're *gonna* have local education. We're going to appoint great Supreme Court justices. And folks, we're *gonna* start winning again. We're *gonna* win at every level. We're *gonna* win so much, you're *gonna* get tired of winning, I'm telling you.

(A.3.170) You're going to be begging me, Mr. President – you will send your great quarterback, right? (01:21:40–01:21:45)

*He'll* come to the White House. Everybody respects him. He'll come to the White House, and he'll say, Mr. President, the people of Wisconsin, they can't stand winning so much.

(A.3.171) Could you tone it down just a little bit? (01:21:56–01:21:58)

I will say, I just can't do that. *We're gonna win* more, and more and more, *we're gonna* win at every level. But we are going to win. *We are* going to make America great again. We are going to make America safe again. Thank you very much, everybody. Thank you. Thank you. *Thank you very much.*

## Speech 4

### Remarks at a Rally at the University of North Carolina in Wilmington, 09 August 2016

*Thank you.* Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you very much. So amazing. Rudy just left. He just said, “I don’t believe this. This is unbelievable.” Nobody believes it. The crowds we’re getting – I’m the messenger, but I’ll tell you what, the message is the right message. We’re tired of incompetence. We’re tired of not taking care of our military. We’re tired of not taking care of our vets, who are being taken care of very poorly. We’re tired of so many different things. And this is what happens. So, our mayor, my friend, Rudy Giuliani just walks, I’m telling you, he said, “I don’t believe this. This is incredible.” And what he hasn’t seen, and your governor, by the way, who’s a great guy. 2.18 And he’s now seeing it, they’re walking outside because there are thousands of people outside that can’t get in. I said, “Rudy, you think this is bad, go take a look outside.” So, I just want to, I *want* to thank Pat and Rudy and I want to thank everybody for being here. And *we’re gonna* have a good time. We love North Carolina. We love North Carolina. We did really well in the primaries if you remember, and I hear we are doing really well now. We have to win. That November 8 *date* is so important. *It’s so important.* You know, I bring things up like the judges.

(A.3.172) Right? (00:02:52–00:02:56)

(A.3.173) Supreme Court Justices, we have to get – you know, you could have as many as four? (00:02:59–00:03:01)

I guess it’s a scenario *in which* this president could pick five Supreme Court Justices. And if you pick two that are left, left, left, it’s going to be a disaster for our country. Your Second Amendment, the National Rifle Association endorsed me and they endorsed *me* early, a long time ago. *But* – and they’re great people, Wayne and Chris, they are great people. But if you – if you do something with these – I’ll tell you what, Justices right now, you lost a great one with Scalia. We want to replace with Justices very much like Justice Scalia and that’s *gonna* happen. And *it’s so important.* So, *so if* for no other reason, I mean it’s such an important – one of the most important elections for a lot of reasons, not just that but for a lot of reasons. *And* – but that’s *so obvious*, because for whatever reason, they say this could be the presidency. This next four years where you will pick more Supreme Court Justices

than anybody has every had the opportunity to do. *And* believe me, I'll make you very proud of those Justices everyday.

(A.3.174) So we had an incident a few days ago with the \$400 million – all cash, right – \$400 million all cash, anybody know what that looks like? (00:04:26–00:04:27)

That's a lot of cash. That's a lot of *cash*. And honestly, it's so sad. Think of it, going to Iran, a terrorist state. Now I happen to think they have plenty of money, *they've got* – we've given *them* \$150 billion, so the \$400 million is just, you know – I happen to think it goes into their accounts in Switzerland personally. Now, a lot of people say, “no, no, it's used for terror,” and they use it for terror because it's the number one terror funder – not even close.

(A.3.175) But I also think that when you have \$400 million in cash, different denominations, do you see the size of this? (00:05:03–00:05:12)

*They did*, I *guess*, release the pictures after all. They released pictures. And interesting I'll tell you, I sort of think it goes into bank accounts.

(A.3.176) Right? (00:05:16–00:05:22)

You know, I sort of think they take it, they probably use some for this, some for that. You can do a lot of things. 5.28 And Obama said that he did it because we don't have a working account with Iran.

(A.3.177) Do you believe it? (00:05:33–00:05:35)

(A.3.178) How long does it take to set up an account? (00:05:35–00:05:38)

(A.3.179) Right? (00:05:38–00:05:39)

(A.3.180) You don't have a working account, you set up an account, right Lara? (00:05:40–00:05:43)

You set up an account and it takes about – look, what's going on in this country – folks, folks, what's going on in this country is insane. And we have people running our country that don't know what they're doing, they're grossly incompetent, and it's time. *I mean*, we have to make change, real change. Not Obama change, we have to make change. Whether it's *sergeant* Bergdahl, we get Bergdahl who was a traitor, and they get five of the greatest killers that they've wanted for eight years. We get Bergdahl – I call it the five for one trade. Or the Iran deal, where we get nothing, we get nothing. 6.31 They get ultimately, they have the

path, beautiful path, they'll get way, way earlier than that. They'll get nuclear weapons, so if you get Trump you're *gonna* see a lot of changes to that deal. That'll happen fast. You're *gonna* see some big changes and what I really – I mean, I saw where President Obama said that the \$400 million in cash was not, had nothing to do with the release of the hostages.

(A.3.181) Right? (00:06:58–00:07:01)

(A.3.182) It really doesn't work, does it? (00:07:05–00:07:07)

(A.3.183) Does it? (00:07:07–00:07:08)

I mean, remember Obamacare, “you're *gonna* keep your doctor, you're *gonna* keep your plan, over and over again, you're *gonna* keep your doctor.” It was a lie. And in fact, if he didn't make the lie, he would have never gotten it approved because most Democrats, many of the Democrats didn't *wanna* do it. It was only that, that got them to sign it and to approve it. And it was a lie. 7.29 And the \$400 million, and from what the rumor is and from what the reports are, the hostages couldn't leave the airport until this other plane arrived. They don't know why, but I think we all have a pretty good reason why. It's all a big lie, it's all a big lie. And it's so sad to see, and let me tell you, Hillary Clinton is going to be four more years of Obama, but maybe worse. Maybe worse. There'll be four more years. Four more years of ISIS, four more years of high taxes. You know yesterday I had a – at a big event, really. It turned out to be a very big event in Detroit. *And* – good event, very good. And we got wonderful reviews and a lot of good comments. But the thing I'm doing, I'm cutting taxes big league. Especially for the middle class and especially for businesses. Because businesses are dying and that means small businesses, businesses period. 8.41 Businesses are leaving our country like they've never left before. They're going all over. They're going to Mexico, that I can tell you. Mexico is like the eighth wonder of the world. You know I've been telling a story, a friend of mine, good friend of mine, good guy. He builds plants, he builds plants for cars, for computers, you know where they make them. Massive plants.

(A.3.184) And I said to him, how are you doing? (00:09:03–00:09:04)

And he's worked in North Carolina, by the way.

(A.3.185) I said to him, how are you doing? (00:09:08–00:09:10)

He said phenomenal. He's like, “I think the biggest in the world at this -” that's what he does. Great guy.

(A.3.186) I said how's it all going? (00:09:16–00:09:17)

He said, “you've got to see Mexico, Donald. It's the eighth wonder of the world. What we're building there is like, never has been built. We've never seen anything like it”.

(A.3.187) And I said, how are we doing in the United States?

(A.3.188) I'm more interested in that, OK? (00:09:26–00:09:30)

It's OK I guess.

(A.3.189) Right? (00:09:31–00:09:31)

We're allowed to. You know, America first, folks. America first. America. Right, America first. 9.43 America first. We get a little tired of these deals where they actually put, *and* – and you know why, because of lobbyists and special interests and people representing and people wanting it to happen. It's just not that they want other countries to benefit over us. There are reasons for it and you know, when I raise money, and I'm putting up a lot of money for my own campaign, I'm funding me. And I'm raising *money* for the Republican party. And we're getting a lot of money from the small donors.

(A.3.190) Remember two months ago? (00:10:16–00:10:18)

Well, I hadn't started; I wanted to make sure I get the nomination before I start.

(A.3.191) Right? (00:10:18–00:10:21)

10.22 Let me get the nomination, please. And then I took a lot of heat from the press, the world's most dishonest people, by the way. Terrible. Terrible. Those cameras will not move and show how many people are in this auditorium.

(A.3.192) Those cameras – those cameras are not *gonna* move unless we have a protester, is there a protester up there in the quota? (00:10:49–00:10:52)

(A.3.193) Any protester? (00:10:52–00:10:53)

If we had a protester that's the only time they move because they're showing something that in their mind is a bad thing, so then they move. But I like that, I've always liked my protesters because the cameras show these massive crowds and people say wow, was that a big crowd.

(A.3.194) You know, I go home to my wife, I say how's it going? (00:11:08–00:11:10)

(A.3.195) She *goes* darling, your speech was very good, were there many people there?  
(00:11:12–00:11:13)

I say yeah, about 7,000. That's a small group. It's only confined – I mean you had to see outside. I felt so badly – I came up – I came up – thank you and I love you too.

(A.3.196) Who said that?

(A.3.197) Who said that, huh? (00:11:26–00:11:28)

Thank you, thank you. But I came up with Rudy from New York and we're driving up and we're going block after block after block the line.

(A.3.198) And I said are those people *gonna* be able to get in? (00:11:42–00:11:44)

They said the place is already full. And Rudy just said: man, I've never seen anything like that. Maybe a couple of days before an election, but this is what's happening. Because of the fact we have a movement going, folks. Because people are so tired of them. They're so tired of them. So – and by the way – and by the way, voter ID, watch with that.

(A.3.199) Watch with voter ID, why aren't we having voter ID? (00:12:16–00:12:21)

In other words, I wanna vote, here's my identification, I wanna vote, as opposed to somebody coming up and voting 15 times for Hillary. Well – and I will not tell you to vote 15 times.

(A.3.200) I will not tell you to do that, OK? (00:12:43–00:12:46)

12.49 You won't vote 15 times. But people will, they'll vote many times and how that could've happened, *is* unbelievable. And the governor just told me that they're going before the United States Supreme Court Justice Roberts and maybe they can get a stay. Let's see what happens.

(A.3.201) OK? (00:13:07–00:13:08)

Let's see what happens. That's a very important thing. But I wrote a few things down and to me, so important – yes, darling thank you. Unstable Hillary lacks the judgment, now; Bernie Sanders said she lacks judgment.

(A.3.202) Right? (00:13:28–00:13:31)

And nobody said anything about it, no problem. He said you lack judgment. And – during one of the debates, nobody said, it was fine. When I say it they say that's terrible the way

you talk. 13.45 She does, she lacks judgment, she lacks temperament and I'm the one that used unfit many, many months ago.

(A.3.203) And now they've turned it around, use it on me, unfit? (00:13:53–00:13:57)

(A.3.204) I'm unfit? (00:13:57–00:13:59)

That's – that's a first. But she lacks the temperament and the moral character to lead this country, its very simple. She really does. She's a dangerous person who doesn't tell the truth which has been proven very loudly. I've never seen a – I don't think we've ever had greater proof of that, of anybody.

(A.3.205) And *she's* disregarded the lives of Americans – you see what's happening – with what *she's* done with her server? (00:14:23–00:14:28)

And you know why she did that. So, I just look at this, and I said that if she gets elected, she will cause the destruction of this country from within. Remember that. Remember that. 14.48 She will – she will allow people into our country that will do damage, they will do damage, folks. You look at what's going on in the world – look at France; take a good look at France. I have friends that go to France. They used to love France. They say, no thank you. They don't expect to be going back anytime for a long time.

(A.3.206) I have one friend, I said, how was your trip this year to France? (00:15:08–00:15:11)

He said, France isn't France anymore. We're not going. And so many people are saying that. Look at what's going on with Germany. Look at what's happening with Germany. Look at the crime; look at the problems. We have enough problems in our country right now. We don't need additional problems, folks. We don't need additional problems. 15.36 And for all we know, this could be the great Trojan Horse. This could be. We don't know who these people are. Now, they're coming in through Obama. And I looked at a chart yesterday, and it's like for years, it's sort of like this, a little uptick. And the last number or period of time, it's like, "Wah, wah, wah, wah." There – I have never seen anything like it. They're letting them in, and again, you can't vet them. You don't know where they come from. We don't know – look at the damage that two people in San Bernardino, probably radicalized the guy – the woman coming in. Look at the damage in Orlando. Look at the damage that was done in Orlando by one wack job, one sick wack job.

(A.3.207) And you know what he was screaming? (00:16:31–00:16:32)

He's screaming what they all scream. 16.35 And we have to get smart, folks. We don't need the problems – and we've already got those problems, just so you understand. Because they're coming into the country, *and* they're being put where nobody even knows where they are. It's like, if I were the enemy, I would say, I can't believe they're that stupid. They're taking my people and they're putting them all over the place, because you have great military right here. And our military... Our military cannot be beaten.

(A.3.208) But you know what could happen? (00:17:13–00:17:14)

When we don't know where they are, where they're coming *from*, you've *got* them all over the place. And folks, it's some. You don't need many; you don't need many. One person in Orlando. Two people – look at in France, 130. Now, they have the strictest gun laws anywhere in the world, France, Paris. *Hundred* and thirty people killed, 130. And I've said 100 times, if this man or if this woman, or if that woman or man had a gun in Paris or in San Bernardino and the bullets were flying in the other direction, would have been a whole different story, folks. 17.55 Would have been a whole different. For those – for those foolish people that say Second Amendment, would have been a whole different – and I'd go a step further. If these people, bad people, bad, sick, sick, sick people.

(A.3.209) If these people knew there were guns in the good guys hands, right, they probably wouldn't have gone in in the first place, all right? (00:18:13–00:18:23)

(A.3.210) All right? (00:18:24–00:18:25)

(A.3.211) Gun free – what do you think of these gun-free zones? (00:18:26–00:18:27)

(A.3.212) Do you know what a gun-free zone is? (00:18:27–00:18:29)

That's like – *that's like that* – they study where the gun-free zones – if they would have known you had guns, if they would have known that they were going to be shot at from the other side, it would have been a whole different story. Maybe it wouldn't have even happened in the first place. So they better not come here. They better not. They better not. So recently a book came out a couple of weeks ago. A Secret Service agent, *and* made a statement because she said the other day she short-circuited.

(A.3.213) Hey, could you imagine if I said that “I short circuited”? (00:19:09–00:19:13)

They would be calling for my execution, – electric chair. They'd bring back the electric chair. It would be a whole different ball game if I said it, believe me. But the Secret Service agent said, "She simply lacks the integrity and temperament to serve in the office".

(A.3.214) Right? (00:19:26–00:19:34)

"From the bottom of my soul," he said, "I know this to be true. Her leadership style, which is volcanic and impulsive, and she makes bad decisions.

(A.3.215) OK? (00:19:47–00:19:47)

Hey, you know, it's one thing to make bad decisions. It's another thing to be wacky and make bad decisions. 20.04 She is disdainful of the rules set for everyone else and she hasn't changed a bit. This is – that was the good thing. I couldn't say the bad things, *that were said*. It was too much. Nobody would even – nobody would even believe it. You've *gotta* see this book. Nobody would believe because it's so terrible, so terrible. And she comes across like this woman – nice, easy – but she's not. And – and she's – *and she's* listen – she's not a leader, not a leader. And she is a liar. Hey, hey – 33,000 e-mails are gone.

(A.3.216) OK? (00:20:52–00:20:53)

33,000 e-mails are gone. They're gone.

(A.3.217) How do you get rid of 33,000 e-mails? (00:20:57–00:21:00)

(A.3.218) Who sends 33,000 e-mails? (00:21:00–00:21:03)

(A.3.219) I mean, 33 – do you know how many that is? (00:21:03–00:21:06)

I think that's like 24 hours a day reading them or sending them, but it wouldn't matter. For years, 33,000 e-mails are missing. 21.16 And she's so guilty. She's so guilty. I think it's a tremendous blot in our country. I really mean that. I think what happened over the last two weeks with respect to her, especially in light of the fact that General Petraeus and many others have suffered unbelievable consequences. I think it's a tremendous blot on our country, a tremendous blot. Just remember that. But I just looked at this – the economic failures of Obama and Clinton, et cetera. Obama-Clinton economic policies have produced 1.2 percent economic growth, the weakest so-called recovery since the Great Depression. Now, this is, like, unbelievable – 1.2. Do you know *if* China goes to 7 percent or 8 percent, it's like a national catastrophe. Now, what they do is they cut their currency. They devalue

their currency, and big league, and then all of our businesses continue to be drained out of the United States. Our money, our jobs. They make our product, they sell our product to us. No tax, no nothing, you devalue – see devaluing is sort of cheating. 22.30 You know, it's sort of like cheating. Now I have great relationships with China. I've done great business with China, I've done really well with China. I have these tenants, I sell condos, I own the Bank of America building in San Francisco with a group, a great group, thank you ma'am. Got to win – got to win North Carolina. Thank you. Thank you. But they – it's cheating, it's really cheating. And when I look at these trade deals – it's so sad – where we lose \$800 billion – billion with a B – dollars a year on trade with China alone, it's \$400 billion and \$500 billion and \$505 billion. This is year in and year out, it's actually amazing that our country keeps going. But what has happened is, we have people in the audience, in 18 years, they're making less money now than they made 18 years ago, in real wages, 18. 23.34 And in many cases, they're working two and three jobs.

(A.3.220) OK? (00:23:34–00:23:37)

But they're making less money now than they made 18 years ago. And those stats come right out, real wages. They're working harder, they're getting older. So in theory it's supposed to be the other way, you know you work and you're young, you don't care.

(A.3.221) Get a little older, it's like, oh by the way, how about me? (00:23:56–00:23:59)

I think I'm working harder too, if you want to know. I never worked this hard in my life. But I like it, I like it, I love it actually because I've met so many incredible people. You know I really got – thank you – I really got a tremendous understanding of this country. Because I'm going to places that I've heard about, I've known about, I'm stopping everywhere. And I see the carnage that NAFTA has caused, I see the carnage. It's been horrible. I see upstate New York, I see North Carolina, but I see every state. You look at New England. New England got really whacked. New England got hit. 24.36 You look at Ohio, what happened there, and still happening. By the way, *this isn't like* – this isn't like it's going to happen or it's all over, it's getting worse. You look at Ohio, you look at Michigan, what's going on with the car plants being built in Mexico, is unbelievable. And more and more, you know they're moving. We were just talking about the autoworkers yesterday. Where they've lost over 100,000 autoworkers in Michigan, the state of Michigan, which is our car capital and it's really not the car capital anymore. Mexico will become the new car capital of the world in

a very short period of time. No, think of it. And that's only because we allow it to happen. And I like Mexico. And I respect the leaders of Mexico because they're much smarter, they're much street smarter, but they're much smarter and more cunning than our leaders. But you have to see what's going on. And one of the reasons I won Indiana was Bobby Knight, because he's the best, he's the greatest. 25.39 But, but one of the reasons is that Carrier Air Conditioning let 1,400 people go and they're building a plant in Mexico. And we're not gonna let it happen. *Folks, look. Right now, as you stand here and you think you have great jobs, companies are negotiating from North Carolina to move to Mexico and other places. It's not just Mexico – by the way, made possible by our federal government. Made possible by the people that enacted this suicidal pact.* It's a suicidal pact for our country. And you know I've watched for years. I was never a politician until 14 months ago. So, I can't believe I'm saying I'm a politician. Can't believe it. But – but I've been watching for years and I've watched as – as the government tries to keep businesses from leaving our country and going to other countries. And I've seen low interest loans, I've seen zero interest loans, I've seen all sorts of subsidies. 26.40 I get it. That stuff's not gonna work, that's not gonna work. What's gonna work is – as an example, Carrier moves to Mexico and you wish him a lot of luck, good luck, have a nice plant. I hope my friend bills it.

(A.3.222) Right? (00:26:52–00:26:53)

(A.3.223) And then you know what happens? (00:26:54–00:26:55)

When they make their air conditioners – and *they* think they're gonna sell that air conditioner, people living in Indianapolis – where they come from – for a similar price.

(A.3.224) And they think they're gonna sell it there and have no repercussions? (00:27:05–00:27:08)

With me, they have repercussions.

(A.3.225) OK? (00:27:08–00:27:09)

With me, they have repercussions. With me, we inform them that if you move, you're gonna pay a 35 percent tax on every single air conditioner that *pours* across our now very secure borders. And two things are gonna happen, one of two things – one of two things are gonna happen. Number one, if you get them in time, they're not moving. Throws it all off-balance, since they're all off-kilter.

(A.3.226) Number one they're not – now, nobody – people would say well, why doesn't anybody use this? (00:27:46–00:27:48)

(A.3.227) Why doesn't anybody mention it? (00:27:48–00:27:50)

I'll tell you why. Because they're controlled by their lobbyists, they're politicians. And Carrier goes out or whoever it might be this – I'm just using Carrier as an example. *It's* hundreds and thousands. *It's* thousands of company. 28.03 And millions of jobs we're talking about. I was looking at numbers – I'm not gonna repeat the numbers because they'll say I was wrong, it can't be that high, I couldn't believe it was that high. But it's thousands of companies and millions and millions of jobs.

(A.3.228) And you'd say why aren't – like, why doesn't somebody else say what Trump is saying? (00:28:17–00:28:21)

So I'm controlled by myself because I'm putting up my money.

(A.3.229) OK? (00:28:21–00:28:26)

I'm putting up my money. But... Although we raised, did you see \$82 million last month, \$82 million last month. And a lot of it – a lot of the money was the small donations which Republicans never get.

(A.3.230) A lot of them – I think it averaged \$61 a head, \$61 can you imagine that? (00:28:44–00:28:48)

The total that we raised and in fact, in May I told you, I was taking heat because they said Donald Trump didn't raise any money. And they told you why.

(A.3.231) Right? (00:28:58–00:28:59)

I didn't raise it because I didn't know – I gotta make sure I got the nomination. If I didn't get the nomination, I would've gone to Turnberry and played golf.

(A.3.232) OK? (00:29:06–00:29:07)

In Scotland.

(A.3.233) But you know what? (00:29:09–00:29:10)

I got the nomination so now I had a start. And we raised \$51 million in June.

(A.3.234) Right? (00:29:13–00:29:18)

A lot of it in small donations and we raised \$82 million in July. People are going, even the haters back there, the people that truly hate Trump – they said, that’s amazing. So we’re doing all right. And people look, they want – they wanna hear this message. Because this is a message this is an important message. But when you say – and when you hear what I just said – you charge a tariff or a tax.

(A.3.235) And guess what? (00:29:46–00:29:47)

(A.3.236) And people said *but* why hasn’t the – why haven’t the politicians, they’re smart, why haven’t they done it? (00:29:51–00:29:52)

Because they’re controlled by people that work for many of these companies and they’re not gonna do it. Whether it’s donors or whether *it’s* special interests or lobbyists they control because they want it to happen. 30.06 And honestly, I think it’s a total disgrace. I think it’s a total disgrace for the millions of jobs, and for the thousands and thousands of companies that have left our country. If I were here to speak to every one of those companies for five minutes – bye, bye. They were so quiet. You know, I like the Hillary protesters.

(A.3.237) You know why? (00:30:46–00:30:46)

They’re so nice and quiet. The Bernie protesters were brutal; they were tough.

(A.3.238) Right? (00:30:51–00:30:52)

The Hillary protesters had no spirit.

(A.3.239) Did you see that? (00:30:55–00:30:56)

She starts screaming and the guy walks up, “I’ll go.” The Bernie ones were – they had a lot more spirit. I think we’re *gonna* get a lot of Bernie voters, you wanna know the truth. Because they do understand that trade is killing us. Trade. So, a few things, a few other facts I wrote, which I think are amazing. One is the 1.2 percent lowest in, you know, forget it. That’s not a recovery. It’s probably much – don’t forget, when they announced 1.2 percent, that means it’s lower. And 1.2 is starting to set records. The national debt – so, we’re up to almost \$20 trillion – \$20 trillion! The national debt under Obama has doubled. Think of it, doubled. Might be, I think by the time he gets out, it’s *gonna* more than double, but again, we have to very accurate. Because I’ll say – they’ll say, well, it hasn’t quite doubled. Believe me, by the time he gets out it will have more than doubled. The national debt has doubled.

(A.3.240) And you know the bad part about that? (00:32:06–00:32:08)

You think if the national debt has doubled, our infrastructure would be great, our country would be in great shape. 32.14 We'd have beautiful roads, beautiful highways. You see where like 50 percent of the bridges are in danger in this country. And the roadways are a mess. I have a friend, he's in the trucking business. He said, you know, for years, he had no *problems*. Now he buys these big, beautiful trucks, and the wheels get wiped out because of the potholes on the highways and things that he never had. So, you think with all of that doubling of the national debt, you'd really think that we'd be in good shape from the infrastructure standpoint.

(A.3.241) Right? (00:32:33–00:32:41)

We're not. We're in very bad shape. U.S. trade deficit, \$800 – almost \$800 billion. Nearly 24 million Americans in their prime earning years are out of the labor force.

(A.3.242) Right? (00:32:48–00:32:55)

In the last seven years, another 14 million people have left the work force. Think of it. These are the real numbers, not the 5 percent nonsense. You know, you look for a job, you can't find your job, you go home, you share, you go to your parents, you go to your friends, you do whatever. You gave up, and now you're considered – statistically, you're considered employed. 33.18 Those people are not employed; these are great people. And there are plenty of them in here. I mean, we have great people. We have the most loyal people. We have the smartest people. You know, so many of my people, they're so smart. They like to say, well, Trump, I don't know if he's got this right – let me tell you, we have the smartest people. We have the people that are the smartest, and the strongest, and the best and the hardest working. We have the smartest people. We'll put I.Q.s among – some of us, we couldn't say all of us, right – against any I.Q.s that we – we have to deal with. *That I can tell you, I would love to do that.* In the last seven years, 14 million people. One in five American households do not have a single member in the workforce. Pretty bad. 34.09 Homeownership – this is one that is amazing to me – today, homeownership is at its lowest rate in 51 years. So you own homes, I mean it always used to be the dream to own a home.

(A.3.243) Right? (00:34:18–00:34:22)

The American home. Lowest that *it's* been in so many years, 51 years. Nearly 12 million people and more Americans are dependent on food stamps and 2 million more Latino Americans live in poverty under Obama and Clinton – under Obama; because Clinton's just gonna carry on. You know, I don't know if you saw. I gave a massive tax decrease yesterday at regulations, we're gonna get rid of so many of them. But Clinton is gonna double your taxes; she's gonna double up your taxes. And she's trying to say well, I don't know like Trump's way – she's gonna double up your taxes. You're gonna have massive tax increases *if* Clinton gets in. Enjoy – enjoy it folks, if that happens. 35.07 Fifty eight percent of African American youth are not employed.

(A.3.244) How sad is that? (00:35:13–00:35:14)

American households are earning \$4,000 less – listen to this one, today – than they were 16 years ago. Many workers are earning less than 1970 in real dollars. So 1970 – that's a long time ago.

(A.3.245) Right? (00:35:30–00:35:33)

They're earning in real dollars less money. So under my plan, we're gonna create millions of new and really good paying jobs. You know, it's interesting because even the pro-Obama people say about the jobs that they're bad jobs. I've heard it from many of the people. They're trying to defend him. But they say they're bad jobs, they're not good jobs. The good jobs – the good jobs have left. But we'll create millions of new good paying jobs but good jobs. That's so important, that's so important. 36.09 Everyone's taxes will go down. Hillary Clinton has supported tax increases on the middle class for her entire career. She's voted for higher taxes, 235 times in the Senate.

(A.3.246) That's all? (00:36:34–00:36:24)

I thought it was more than that, 235 times. I hope there's not a decimal point in there or so, 23.5 times. But I don't think there is – voted for higher taxes, 235 times in the Senate. Now, she's planning another job killing – \$1.3 trillion tax increase, that's what her tax increase is gonna be, folks. Like you're not paying enough.

(A.3.247) Right? (00:36:48–00:36:49)

Her plan will tax many small business – businesses who are already in deep trouble out of business. Then we have – we will make – and this is so important, this was an Ivanka Trump.

(A.3.248) OK? (00:37:01–00:37:04)

My daughter, so great. So great. 37.12 We're gonna make childcare expenses tax deductible for working families. And just many, many other things. I mean, we're gonna make some unbelievable changes and it's – it's so easy. Again, you know regulations – I'm traveling all over and I'm meeting with business owners – and beyond business owners, even people that work at the businesses, they're being laid off because of it. Regulations; if I told you – and I'm so surprised, this is probably the biggest surprise – if you have a small business and I said, you can have one or the other, a major tax cut like we're gonna *be* – we're bringing it down to 15 percent from more than – much more than double that. But if I told you that you could have a massive tax decrease or really substantially – but in a real way – cut regulation – a hundred percent of the people I talk to would take the regulation, if you could only have one or the other. It's amazing, *it's* amazing 38.18 And that surprised me.

(A.3.249) Surprised you too? (00:38:20–00:38:21)

Surprised him, too. A hundred percent. I mean, everybody – businesses can't form anymore, the tax – the regulatory burden is so incredible that you can't form businesses – very hard – and businesses that are in existence are being put out of existence for regulations that don't do anything. We want safety regulations, we want environmental regulations. We're not, you know, people that don't want these things. We have to have that. We want *clean* air, we want clean water. We want clear water. But – but... To do that – and there are certain things that you want to do, but to do that, you don't have to destroy our country and destroy our businesses. 39.14 So you know, I just wrote this down today. Hillary wants to raise taxes. It's a comparison. I want to lower them. Hillary wants to expand regulations, which she does big league.

(A.3.250) Can you believe that? (00:39:25–00:39:26)

I will reduce them very, very substantially. Could be as much as 70, 75 percent. Hillary wants to shut down energy production. I want to expand it. Lower electric – lower electric bills, folks. Hillary wants to abolish – essentially abolish the Second Amendment. By the way, and if she gets to pick... If she gets to pick her judges, nothing you can do, folks. Although the Second Amendment people, maybe there is. I don't know. But – but I'll tell you what. That will be a horrible day. If – if Hillary gets to put her judges – right now, we're tied. You

see what's going on. 40.16 We tied because Scalia – this was not *supposed to* happen. Justice Scalia was going to be around for ten more years at least and this is what happens. That was a horrible thing. So now look at it. So Hillary essentially wants to abolish the Second Amendment. Now, speaking to the NRA folks – who are great – when you – when you – and I'll tell you, *so they endorsed me*. They endorsed me very early. My son's a member. I'm a member. If you—we can add I think the National Rifle Association, we can add the Second Amendment to the Justices—they almost go—in a certain way, hand in hand. Now the Justices are *gonna* do things that are so important and we have such great Justices, you saw my list of 11 that have been vetted and respected. 41.05 And have gotten great. And they *a little bit* equate—but if you don't do what's the right thing, you're not *gonna* have – you're not *gonna* have a Second Amendment or you're not *gonna* have much of it left. And you're *gonna* be able to protect *yourselves*, which you need, *which you need*.

(A.3.251) You know, when the bad guys burst into your house, they're not looking *about* *Second* Amendments, and, do I have the right to do this? (00:41:30–00:41:31)

OK, the bad guys aren't *gonna* be giving up their weapons. But the good people will say, “oh, well, that's the law.” No, no, not *gonna* happen, we can't let it happen. We can't let it happen. Hillary Clinton wants to have totally open borders where people flow into our country. 41.58 Where they flow into our country, and they take your jobs, and they do lots of things. And I want people to come into our country but they have to do it through a process, they have to do it legally.

(A.3.252) Right? (00:42:07–00:42:08)

So you have drugs pouring in. You have everything coming in. You know, in *New Hampshire*, great state, they have a tremendous heroin problem. I said to them, we will stop the drugs from pouring in to our country from the Southern border. They're *gonna* stop. And by the way, we will build a wall. That's legal. Walls do work. Walls do work. Now here's one and you know – I mean she doesn't look that way, but *she* – *she* is – Hillary wants to invade foreign countries. That's what she does and look at the mess. So we've spent – you know for two years, for three years, I've been saying we spent \$2 trillion, right, in Iraq, more now, I guess. Somebody actually said to me the other day that they were talking about four or five trillion in the Middle East. 43.10 And I'm *gonna* get the accurate number. They don't know the accurate number, the truth is they have no idea. They have no idea what we're doing. We're

sending equipment over, the enemies take it in. We sent over 2,300 Humvees that are totally armor plated. They got stolen by the enemy, 2,300. I thought they meant like two or 23. Or 230 was too much, 2,300 Humvees and they got stolen. They got taken by the enemy. You know, shot guns fired in the air, the ones we gave to the so-called allies, these great allies that we always pick, who end up being worse than the guys who we're trying to get out. So, terrible. Hillary and President Obama *refuse* to use the term radical Islamic terrorism. Big problem. Big problem. Hillary wants to release violent criminals and criminal offenders from prison, that's wonderful, enjoy yourselves. I want to work with our police. Our police are so incredible, they're not getting the respect they deserve. 44.33 Not getting the respect they deserve. And we're going to, in our country, restore law and order. We have to, we have to restore law and order. And the police are *gonna* be careful and they're *gonna* be studied and they're *gonna* be – but we have to restore law and order. What happened in Dallas, where all of those people were shot down. Absolutely, absolutely for no reason. Viciously shot down, and so many others. I was with one of the police groups the other day. They're endorsing me. *And I said, "That was terrible in Dallas" and they gave me a list of like, eight other states in the last short while where the same, smaller number, but the same thing was happening where police are being killed. We have to, we have to respect and cherish our police.* 45.37 School choice we want, common core we don't want. We've got to get rid of common core, bring educational... And folks, and we have to re-negotiate with NAFTA. And by the way, going back to the wall, Mexico is going to pay for the wall. That I can tell you. You know these politicians, they don't know me. They don't understand me. And I am, I'm in a group of 50 people, these are real geniuses. These are 50 people that have been running our country forever and they said we can't support Donald Trump. The reason they can't, you know why, because I'm not *gonna* hire these people, I don't want these people. *Take – Take a look.* Take a look at what these people – these are sort of like the people that have been involved with Washington, making decisions militarily on defense, on other things – take a look *what's* happened to our country. Our military is depleted; our vets aren't taken care of. 46.47 We can't beat ISIS. Can you imagine General George Patton, who is right now spinning in his grave, the great General Douglas MacArthur – can you imagine – and I say, because we have so many military people, and this is such a military state and I love it. *I love it.*

(A.3.253) But can you imagine them seeing that we can't beat these 25 or 30,000 people, we can't beat them? (00:47:16–00:47:17)

We're fighting a *politically* correct war. It's a *politically* correct war. I mean, you know what's going on. You know what's going on. These are people that chop off heads. These are people that, in steel cages, drop steel cages into the waters and drowned large numbers of people. These are people that buried people in the sand. We've got to knock them out. 47.45 I was against the war in Iraq. We shouldn't have been to the war in Iraq. It destabilized the Middle East and I said that was *gonna* happen. But we shouldn't have gotten out the way we got out. The way we got out was insane. And Obama gave a date, and he – and that's how ISIS happened, folks. Hence, the birth of ISIS. Congratulations, Hillary Clinton. Congratulate – I mean, she – she should get – if I'm ISIS, I call her up and I give her the most valuable player award.

(A.3.254) OK? (00:48:17–00:48:17)

And I guarantee you with Libya, which was her baby, and all of the other mistakes she has made. Obama talks now, because obviously, for him, that's the better alternative.

(A.3.255) All right? (00:48:27–00:48:33)

But he has been an incompetent president. He has done a horrible job. And I guarantee you that if he had it to do it again – and he would only say this to his wife – but if he had it to do it again, he would not have chosen Hillary Clinton to be his secretary of state, because she made so many horrible mistakes and cost so many lives. 49.01 And I mean lives on both sides. I'm not just saying – I mean lives on both sides. She's inept; she's inept. And to think that she is even allowed to run for the presidency of the United States, when she deleted and got rid of 33,000 e-mails is an embarrassment to our country, and it always will be.

(A.3.256) OK? (00:49:26–00:49:27)

It always will be. So – so, I want to thank all of you for being here. Look, I'm going to be around, and we're going to be coming to North Carolina a lot. Got to win it, very important. But – people are great. My daughter-in-law comes from North Carolina. I'm here all the time. But – but people – the people are great. The military is great. We are going to make America great again. We're going to start winning. We're going to put America first. We're

*gonna* make America safe again. But never, ever forget, we are *going* to make America great again. Thank you. Thank you, everybody. I'll be back soon. Thank you. God bless you.

## Speech 6

### Remarks at the Summit Sports and Ice Complex in Dimondale, Michigan, 19 August 2016

What a crowd. Wow, look at that. Boy. What a crowd. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. We just set a record in this building, folks, so that's good news. That's fantastic. Thank you. I love Michigan, and I must tell you, come November, to be specific, November 8th, with your help, we are going to win and we are going to win big. And we are going to the White House and we are going to bring jobs back to our country and we are going to bring jobs back to Michigan. 3.43 It's going to be a victory for the people, a victory for the wage-earner, the factory worker. Remember this, a big, big victory for the factory worker. They haven't had those victories for a long time. A victory for every citizen and for all of the people whose voices have not been heard for many, many years. They're going to be heard again. It'll be a win for the voters, not for the pundits, not for the journalists, not for the lobbyists, not for the global special interests funding my opponent's campaign. It's going to be your victory. These are hard times for many in this country. I just got back from a tour of the suffering and devastation in Louisiana. Perhaps you can tell by the way I'm dressed. Just got off the plane. It was actually incredible. The spirit of the people is incredible. The devastation, likewise, they've never seen anything like it, but the spirit of the people is incredible. And honestly, Obama ought to get off the golf course and get down there. We mourn for the lives lost and we pledge our help, comfort and support to every last person in need. To the people of Louisiana, we are with you and we will always be with you. In my vision, I saw not only the suffering of our people but also their strength, courage and really unbeatable spirit. Their spirit will overcome. We have a lot to overcome in our country, especially the fact that our jobs are being taken away from us and going to other lands, and we're not *gonna* allow it to happen, and especially it's happening right here in Michigan. It's an amazing spirit that we will need to rebuild our country. It's that strength that we're going to need to create the new American future our children so much deserve. In this new – thank you. Thank you very much. In this new future, millions of workers on the sidelines will be returned to the work force. And if I'm not elected president, that will never happen, believe me. They're talking to you, they're playing you, but believe me, you know the answer. And I have to say that I've been talking about Michigan and the car industry

and how your businesses and plants have been ripped out of your land, and I have been doing it for four years to the people of Michigan. Other people started talking about it last week. They're not *gonna* do anything about it. Crumbling roads, bridges and airports will be replaced with the infrastructure our country needs and deserves. Families strapped in welfare will be provided with jobs and opportunity. Children stuck in failing government schools will be able to attend the school of their choice. 8.03 Government will become lean, effective, responsible and honest. Our border will be protected and our children will be safe, very, very safe. And we will build the wall, don't worry about it. We will build the wall. Law and order will be restored and the poorest places in our country will know safety and peace again. 9.10 American values and cultures will be cherished – and I mean cherished and celebrated once again. But to achieve this new American future, we must break free from the bitter failures of the past, and reject the same insiders telling us the same old lies over and over, and over again. No group in America has been more harmed by Hillary Clinton's policies than African-Americans – no group. No group. If Hillary Clinton's goal was to inflict pain on the African-American community, she could not have done a better job. It is a disgrace. 10.14 Tonight I'm asking for the vote of every single African-American citizen in this country who wants to see a better future. The inner cities of our country have been run by the Democratic party for more than 50 years. Their policies have produced only poverty, joblessness, failing schools, and broken homes. It's time to hold democratic politicians accountable for what they have done to these communities.

(A.3.257) At what point do we say enough? (00:11:02–00:11:04)

(A.3.258) At what point do we say enough? (00:11:10–00:11:14)

11.18 *It's* time to hold failed leaders accountable for their results, not just their empty words over and over again. Look at what the democratic party has done to the city as an example and there are many others, of Detroit. 40 percent of Detroit's residents, 40 percent, live in poverty. Half of all Detroit residents do not work, and cannot work, and can't get a job Detroit tops the list of most dangerous cities in terms of violent crime, number one. This is the legacy of the democratic *politicians, who have* run this city. This is the result of the policy agenda embraced by crooked Hillary Clinton. 33,000 e-mails gone. The only way to change results is to change leadership. We can never fix our problems by relying on the same politicians who created our problems in the first place. A new future requires brand new

leadership. *Look how* much African-American communities are suffering *under* democratic control.

(A.3.259) To those I say the following, what do you have to lose by trying something new like Trump? (00:13:37–00:13:44)

(A.3.260) What do you have to lose? (00:13:45–00:13:46)

(A.3.261) I say it again, what do you have to lose? (00:14:05–00:14:06)

(A.3.262) Look, *what do you have to lose?* (00:14:07–00:14:08)

You're living in poverty. Your schools are no good. You have no jobs. 58% of your youth is unemployed.

(A.3.263) What the hell do you have to lose? (00:14:18–00:14:21)

And at the end of four years, I guarantee you that I will get over 95% of the African American vote. I promise you. Because I will produce, I will produce for the inner cities and I will produce for the African Americans. And the Democrats – *the Democrats* will not produce and all they have done is taken advantage of your vote. That's all they've done. And once the election is over, they go back to their palaces in Washington.

(A.3.264) And you know what? (00:15:04–00:15:05)

They do nothing for you. Just remember it. 15.08 So, you have nothing to lose. One thing we know for sure; *Is that, if* you keep voting for the same people you will keep getting the same, exactly the same, results. My administration will go to work for you as no one has ever done before. We will work. We will bring back jobs. We will work. By contrast, the one thing every item in Hillary Clinton's agenda has in common is that it takes jobs and opportunities away from African American workers. It takes jobs away from all workers because your companies are leaving Michigan. Your companies are leaving every single state in our union. They're going to Mexico. They're going everywhere but here. 16.22 Hillary Clinton supports open borders. Which means many things but it means people pour *in* and they take your jobs. Whether you like it or don't like it. They take your jobs. Her fierce opposition to school choice. You need choice. You have to get your children into good schools. You do that through competition. You need choice. Her plan to massively raise taxes on small business and everyone. \$1.3 trillion tax increase. *Whereas I am* cutting taxes very substantively for

business and for the middle class. Her tremendous opposition to American energy. Her opposition is fierce and her record of giving our jobs away to many, many other countries. America must reject the bigot dream of Hillary Clinton who sees communities of color only as votes, not as human beings worthy of a better future. 17.42 Hillary Clinton would rather provide a job to a refugee from overseas *than to* give that job to unemployed African American youth in cities like Detroit, who have become refugees in their own country. It's time to get our country back to work and that includes an *all-out effort*. To help young African Americans get the good paying jobs that they deserve. Hillary Clinton's plan would bring in an estimated 620,000 refugees in her first term at a lifetime benefit cost of some \$400 billion to our country. According to the Senate Immigration Subcommittee. 18.39 Hillary Clinton wants to be America's Angela Merkel. By the way, for the price of supporting one refugee in the United States, we could support 12 in a safe zone in the Middle East or let's say Syria. The approved refugee screening standards that I have proposed will save countless, billions of dollars. It's called extreme vetting. Extreme vetting. We will invest a portion of the money saved in the jobs program for inner city youth. The African American community has given so much to this country. They fought and died in every war since the Revolution. 19.40 They've lifted up the conscience of our nation in the long march towards civil rights. They've sacrificed so much for the national good. Yet, nearly 4 in 10 African Americans children still live in poverty and 58%, as I said, of *young* African Americans are not working. They cannot find a job. We must do better as a country. I refuse to believe that the future must be like the past. It won't be. Our future *is going to be* a great future for everyone. For everyone. In a Trump administration, all workers of all colors will get priorities for jobs in their own *country, which* is about time. I want higher wages for African Americans, for Hispanic Americans, and for all Americans. We want higher wages 20.44 Many, many workers in our country are making substantially less money today in real wages than they made 18 years ago. They're working two jobs instead of one. They're working much harder as they get older and it's supposed to be the opposite. We're *gonna* stop it. We're *gonna* create great jobs and we're *gonna* get the wages up. Hillary Clinton, is a throwback to an ugly past where politicians preyed on our poorest citizens while selling them out for personal gain. Promises, promises, all talk no action. All talk, no action politicians. They talk, talk, talk. You vote them in with *great fanfare* and then *they do* nothing. With Trump, that is not *gonna* happen. Believe me. 21.50 We must turn the page on yesterday, only a change in leadership will produce a change

in outcomes. And we can't take, as a country, four more years of Obama. And that's what you get with Hillary Clinton but probably worse. In this new American future, American workers will always come first. America first, always come first. This will include a complete revitalization of the Michigan manufacturing sector. Now, you have to understand, the Michigan manufacturing sector is a disaster. Is a disaster. Look at your notes, look at your stats, look at what's happening to your state. You're losing your businesses. 22.49 It's like taking candy away from a baby. And many people right now in this audience that think you have jobs, you're *gonna* find out very soon that your company is leaving for Mexico or some other place and you're not *gonna* have your job for very long. And if Trump gets in, those days are over folks, *those days* are over. We will be bringing back our jobs to Michigan. There will be a very big price to pay for those companies that wanna leave our land, go someplace else, manufacture their goods, and sell *them* back with no retribution. It won't happen. There will be consequence. Won't happen. It will not happen. Michigan lost more than 1 in 4 of its manufacturing jobs since NAFTA. 23.52 As you know, NAFTA, one of the worst trade bills in *history*, maybe, maybe the worst trade bill signed in the history of the world. Not only in our *country*. It's emptied out Michigan, it's emptied out New England. It's emptied out New York State. It's emptied out so many of our great companies. They leave and they fire. We end up with devastation. We end up with unemployment. We end up with nothing. The bill was signed by Bill Clinton. It was supported by Hillary Clinton. Right here in this community, you have lost 1 in 7 manufacturing jobs since Bill Clinton put China into the World Trade Organization. Another Hillary *Clinton backed* deal. She backs all the deals. 24.52 And by the way, she will be backing Trans Pacific Partnership. TPP. If she is elected. Just mark your words. Just remember, you know it's gonna happen. She considered it the gold standard. All of a sudden when she heard me talking about it, she said "I can't win this one" so she went against it. She will go back immediately, and you saw that when the governor of Virginia, who's her friend, said that was going to happen. Detroit lost more than 1 in 3 manufacturing jobs following the NAFTA and WTO agreements *that was* supported very strongly by my opponent. No industry, has been hurt more by Hillary Clinton's policies than the automobile industry or as we call it the car industry. It has been a total disaster. 25.51 According to the Bureau of the Labor of Statistics, before NAFTA went into effect, there were 285,000 auto workers in Michigan. Today, that number is down to only 160,000 and it is going to be a lot lower because if you look at the massive plants

being built right now in Mexico, car plants, folks, you can kiss *a lot of* these jobs goodbye. But not me. Not with me. It won't happen. In 2014, General Motors announced plans to double its investments in *Mexico by 2018*. Not good. In April 2016, Ford Motor Company announced plans to invest another \$1.6 billion constructing an auto plant in Mexico. Mexico will become the car capital of the world very, very quickly. And Michigan is going to end up with lots of empty buildings all over the place unless you elect Donald Trump president. In which case, it's not gonna happen. 27.07 *The* same month, Fiat Chrysler announced 1,300 layoffs. The list goes on and on. We will turn it around, we will turn it around fast.

(A.3.265) We will meet with these companies and we will say, “it will not be easy for you to move your plant to Mexico for you sell your cars through what will be a very strong border, and for you not to pay tax on those cars coming in, okay?” (00:27:33–00:27:36)

And when we tell them that there will be a substantial tax on the cars that they make in Mexico and other places, number one, they're not *gonna* move in the first place, and number two, if they do, our country is *gonna* make one heck of a lot of money. But to save your jobs and do all of the things that I'm talking about, we have to win on November 8th. The destruction that NAFTA started will be finished off if the Transpacific Partnership is approved. It will be almost, nothing is as bad as NAFTA, but it will be almost as bad as NAFTA. We know from Hillary's closest friend, that she is planning to ram through TPP if she's elected. She even called it, as I said, the gold standard. Its passage would be a disaster for Michigan, in particular, for the car industry in particular, for the people of Michigan. I won't let it happen. According to the Economic Policy Institute, the United States trade deficit with the proposed TPP member countries cost over one million manufacturing jobs in our country in 2015. By far the biggest losses occurred in motor vehicles and parts, which lost nearly 740,000 think of that; 740,000 manufacturing jobs. Michigan ranks first for jobs lost as a share of state workforce due to trade deficit with TPP members. Just imagine how many more automobile jobs will be lost if Hillary gets her wish and approves TPP. It will not be pretty. That's why I have announced that we will withdraw from the deal before that deal can ever, ever, ever happen. *I have previously* laid out a detailed seven-point plan for trade reform, available on my website. It includes strong protections against currency manipulation from countries like China and tariffs against any nation that cheats by unfairly subsidizing their goods, of

which many of them do. 30.46 My plan also includes a total renegotiation of NAFTA so our jobs can come back. And if we can't make a much, much better deal than we have right now, we will walk. I'm not in any way, shape or form an isolationist. I don't believe in it, but we have to make great deals for our country. We're losing in our whole trade negotiation with all countries over \$800 billion a year. That's our trade deficit.

(A.3.266) Who negotiates these deals? (00:31:36–00:31:39)

We want great trade deals and we will have them. 31.48 But we want trade deals that work for America, that create jobs and wealth for our country, that work for the American worker. We want to shrink our almost 800 billion dollar trade deficit. We don't want to expand it, and it's been expanding for years. For years and years. You look at the charts up, up, up, up, up.

(A.3.267) And I say to myself so often, why don't they do something about it? (00:32:23–00:32:25)

And the reason is we have political hacks as our negotiators. 32.30 We have politicians as our negotiators. We have politicians that are controlled like Hillary Clinton by her donors, her special interests and her lobbyists and they won't let her do what's right for our workers and for our country. We want to be leading the world in production, exports and manufacturing. We want jobs to leave from other countries and come into our country for a change. Another major issue in this race is foreign policy. Hillary Clinton has made one bad foreign policy decision after another. Beginning with the support for going to war in Iraq, and I opposed it so strongly. Nobody cared. I was a civilian, but I opposed it. I said you will have a total destabilization of the Middle East. It was such common sense and look what happened. Her tenure as secretary of State may be regarded as the most disastrous in United States history. But she is totally without remorse. Her failed decisions as secretary of State unleashed ISIS onto the world.

(A.3.268) But has she ever apologized for the death and destruction she has caused? (00:34:02–00:34:07)

No. Look at the world before and after she became Secretary of State. Pre-Hillary in the early 2009s, Iraq was seeing a reduction in violence. Libya was somewhat stable. Syria was under control. The group we now know today, ISIS, was close to being extinguished. Iran was being choked by sanctions. Now, take a look at what we have. Fast forward to the

present time. After Hillary, here is what it looks like. Iraq is in total chaos. Syria is in the midst of a disastrous civil war. *And* a refugee crisis now threatens Europe and the United States, where we're taking in thousands and thousands and thousands of people. ISIS has been unleashed unto the entire world. Iran, the world's top state sponsor of terrorism has been put on the path to nuclear weapons, was given 400 million dollars in ransom payment cash. *Where they, just yesterday, caught Obama in yet another lie.* Very much like you can keep your doctor, you can keep your plan, Obamacare a total disaster. It will be repealed. It will be replaced. Hillary Clinton is a legacy of death, destruction, and terrorism. America deserves a better legacy. All of you deserve a much, much, better future. I am the change agent. I am the change agent. I am your messenger. *And I've* said it many times, I'm nothing more than your messenger. It's a message of strong defense, common sense, take care of our vets, great education, get rid of Common Core, great health care, get rid of Obamacare, save our Second Amendment. Which is under tremendous siege right now. 36.55 Hillary Clinton is the defender of the status quo or what we have. While our country lost badly under Hillary Clinton, she cashed in big time. Our country was losing. Our people were losing, but she is cashing in. Bill Clinton's speaking fees surged while Hillary was Secretary of State. *Bill* was paid almost \$50 million for speeches during her tenure, an increase in 44 percent over the previous four years. *And by* the way, things came out today that blow everything away. Then there was all of the money funneled into the Clinton Foundation from foreign governments and corporations. It was pay for play. 37.53 Yet, Hillary Clinton, who is indifferent to the suffering she has caused, has no remorse at all. She offers no apologies *for selling governments* favors. No apologies for unleashing ISIS, no apologies for her open borders, no apologies for lying about her e-mails or about Benghazi. The only way to learn the full depth of her public corruption is to read the 33,000 e-mails that she deleted. And the only way to get justice in this rigged system is to show up and vote on November 8th and vote big, big, big. And I will bring your jobs back.

(A.3.269) So are you ready to vote? (00:38:57–00:39:00)

(A.3.270) And what about your future? (00:39:01–00:39:04)

(A.3.271) Is it going to be great, good, or terrible? (00:39:04–00:39:06)

39.07 Great. So if you're ready to vote for honest government and the honest government that you deserve, a Trump administration will end the corruption and restore integrity

to government service. Remember, I'm funding my campaign, I'm spending tremendous amounts of money on running for office. I'm raising money for the Republican Party and the Republican National Committee, which I think is doing a very good job, but I'll tell you more about that on November 8th. I'll let you know if they do a good job or if they do not such a good job. But I think they're *gonna* do a great job. No one will be above the law in a Trump administration. The State Department will work for the country, not for Hillary Clinton's donors. 40.06 And I will work for you and I will work for no one else. I will work for you. I will never lie to you. I will never put any other interests before you and I will never, ever stop fighting for you. Never. The government will work for the people again. That means we are only going to admit individuals into our country who support our values and we're not going to issue visas where adequate screening controls take place. We are going to make sure that we have total screening, and without it, we cannot continue to have our government run like this. We will also seek to join in partnership with any nation that wishes to join us in defeating and destroying ISIS. 41.13 At home, taxes will go down, especially *for – look*, I mean, it's *gonna* go down for a lot of people, for business they're going down, businesses are *gonna* flourish, they're *gonna* come pouring back. But taxes will go down, especially for middle-income Americans. And small business rates will be lowered to 15 percent so we can put millions of new jobs into our poorest neighborhoods. As I said, Obamacare will be repealed and replaced. Voters, not special interests, will be in *charge, finally*. We are going to bring our country together again. We have a divided country. It's totally divided. The era of division will be replaced with a future of unity, total unity. We will love each other. We will have one country. Everybody will work together. 42.24 We are going to do it by emphasizing what we all have in common as Americans. It's time to break with the failures of the past and to fight for every last child in this country to have the better future they deserve. In my administration, every American will be treated equally, protected equally and honored equally. We will reject bigotry and hatred and oppression in all of its forms and seek a new future built on our common culture and values as one American people. This is the change I am promising to all of you; an honest government with low taxes, a thriving economy and a just society for each and every American. It's time to vote for a new American future. 43.30 Together, we will make America wealthy again, we will make America united again, we will make America proud again, we will make America safe again and we will make America great again. God bless you. Thank you. Thank you very much, Michigan. Thank you.

## Speech 7

### Remarks at the Mississippi Coliseum in Jackson, Mississippi, 24 August 2016

Thank you, everybody. Thank you. Thank you very much. Senator, Governor and Rudy, thank you very much. Wow, what a group! What a group! Very excited, very, very excited to be with you tonight. Thank you very much. The people of Jackson and the state of Mississippi have such incredible energy, that very powerful word “energy,” unbelievable, incredible energy and spirit, folks. Thank you very much. And thank you for all the support you’ve given me right from the beginning. I will not forget it, Mississippi. We love Mississippi right from the beginning, right from the beginning. This is the spirit we need to rebuild our country a hundred percent. And this is our chance to break free from the bitter failures of the past and to create a new American future. To everyone watching across our nation right now, to everyone who has been let down by our terrible, terrible politicians, I am asking for your vote on November 8th. This is your chance to remove the special interests from their throne of power and to once again have a government of, by and for the people. No one will be left behind anymore. I’d like to take this moment to send our thoughts and prayers to everyone at the American University in Kabul, Afghanistan. They are going through a lot. We must defeat radical Islamic terrorism! Anyone who will not name our enemy is not fit to lead our country. Eight years of Obama/Clinton policies have sacrificed our safety and undermined our freedom and independence. Our jobs have moved to other countries. Islamic terrorism has spread within our shores. And an open border has crushed low-income workers and threatened, and I mean totally threatened, our security. The issues we face here in America are similar to the issues faced in Britain during their referendum on membership in the European Union. This is the movement known as Brexit. On June 23rd, the people of Britain voted to declare their independence, which is what we’re looking to do also, folks From their international government which hasn’t worked. They voted to break away from rule by large corporations and media executives who believe in a world without borders. They voted to reclaim control over immigration, over their economy, over their government. Working people and the great people of the U.K. took control of their destiny. The people profiting from the rigged system, and it is rigged, we’re finding it out every single day, the multinational banks, the media celebrities, the big donors tried to scare the British people out of voting for change. The same thing is happening right here in

the United States. It's happening. All the people benefiting from our rigged system don't want things to change. They want you to believe things can't be changed. And they can so easily, so easily and so smartly. And we all know things have to change. We have no choice. And they have to change right now. Before the vote, I said that Britain would leave the EU, sometimes referred to as European Union, and I said it and I took a lot of heat when I said it.

(A.3.272) People said, what does he know, what does he know? (00:06:48–00:06:49)

(A.3.273) And guess what? (00:06:49–00:06:50)

I was very supportive of their right to do it and to take control of their own future, like exactly what we're *gonna* be voting for on November 8th. Hillary Clinton, who has been on the wrong side of history in every major decision, she's only made bad decisions, she's got bad judgment, she doesn't know what she's doing, folks. She got this one wrong, too. She got this one wrong, too, folks. She got this one wrong, too. She gets them all wrong.

(A.3.274) She gets them all wrong, doesn't she? (00:07:48–00:07:51)

She really got the e-mails wrong, that I can tell you. And now Hillary wants to surrender America to globalism, just what we don't want. She wants a country without borders. She wants trade deals written for the benefit of foreign corporations. She wants a government that ignores the will of the people. She wants to sell out American security to the Clinton Foundation for a big, fat pile of cash. It's hard to tell where the Clinton Foundation ends and where the State Department begins. According to the Associated Press, more than half the meetings she took as secretary of state with people outside government were with foundation donors. Hillary Clinton does not believe in America first. We believe in America first. Hillary believes in donors first and special interests and lobbyists. She will never straighten out our country. She doesn't have the strength, the stamina or the ability to straighten out our country. We'll have four more years of Obama and that's just what we don't want. She would rather give a job to a refugee from overseas than an unemployed American veteran or to an unemployed African American or Hispanic. The job of a public official is to serve and protect the citizens of the United States Not illegal immigrants, not foreign nationals seeking entry, but the people living here lawfully today, including millions of African-American and Hispanic citizens, millions, millions being treated very, very unfairly, I can tell you that. My focus will always be on the well-being of more than 300 million American citizens who call this country home and who love their country. I will fight for their security. I

will fight for their jobs. We will not let jobs be taken out of our country, be ripped out of our country and moved to Mexico and many other countries. We will not let it happen anymore. We'll be fighting for their jobs and we'll be fighting for your families, that I can tell you. It ends. What's been going on ends on November 8th. We will have one American nation, not divided, we will be together. Hillary Clinton has betrayed her duty to the people. November 8th is our chance to re-declare American independence. This is a great honor for me. I am going right now to invite onto the stage the man behind Brexit and a man who led brilliantly the United Kingdom Independence Party in this fight and won despite all odds, despite horrible name-calling, despite so many obstacles. Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Nigel Farage. [Nigel Farage: "*Lovely, thank you very much. Well, Thank you and good evening* Mississippi. I come to you from the United Kingdom with a message of hope and a message of optimism. It's a message that says if the little people, if the real people, if the ordinary decent people are prepared to stand up and fight for what they believe in we can overcome the big banks, we can overcome the multinationals. And we did it. We made, *we made* June the 23rd our independence day. When we smashed the establishment. And we did it. Everybody said *we'd* lose but what did we see? We saw experts from all over the world. We saw the international monetary fund. We saw Moody's. We saw Standard and Poor's. We saw global leaders *giving us* project fear. Telling us that if we voted not to be run by a bunch of unelected old men in Brussels. Yeah, well it's okay, they don't like me either so it doesn't really matter does it? But they told us our economy would fall off of a cliff. They told us there'd be mass unemployment. They told us that investment would leave our country. And David Cameron, then our Prime Minister, but no longer, told us that we might even get World War III. And we saw the *commentariat* and we saw the polling industry doing everything they could to demoralize our campaign. On the day of the vote itself, that morning, they put us ten points behind. And actually, they were all wrong. And they were wrong because what the Brexit campaign did is we reached those people who've been let down by modern global corporatism. We reached those people. We reached those people who have never voted in their lives, but believe by going out and voting for Brexit they can take back control of their country, take back control of their borders, and get back their pride and *self-respect*. Now, the big card, the big card the Prime Minister decided to play in the referendum *is* he got a foreign visitor to come to London, to talk to us. Yes, we were visited by one Barack Obama. And he talked down to us. He treated us as if we were nothing.

One of the oldest functioning democracies in the world. And here he was told us to vote remain. So I, having criticized, having criticized and condemned his behavior, I could not possibly tell you how you should vote in this *election*. *But*, but, you know I get it, I get it, I get it, I get it, I'm hearing you, but I will say *this*; if I was an American citizen, I wouldn't vote for Hillary Clinton if you paid me. In fact, I wouldn't vote for Hillary Clinton if she paid me. Folks, the message is clear. The parallels are there. There are millions of ordinary Americans who've been let down, who've had a bad time, who feel the political class in Washington are detached from them, who feel so many of their representatives are politically correct parts of that liberal media elite. They feel people aren't standing up for them and they've actually, in many cases, given up on the whole electoral process. And I think, I think that you have a fantastic opportunity here with this campaign. You can go out, you can beat the pollsters, you can beat the commentators, you can beat Washington. And you'll do it by doing what we did for Brexit in Britain. We had our own people's army of ordinary citizens who went out and delivered leaflets, who went to meet people where they worked and where they socialized, who convinced and inspired people to go out if this was the one and only time in their life, and to vote for change. So my advice to you, if you want change in this country, you better get your walking boots on, you better get out there campaigning and remember, and remember, anything is possible if enough decent people are prepared to stand up against the establishment. Thank you very much, indeed.]" Trump: Wow! Thank you, Nigel. What a job! What a job he did. What a job he did against all odds. Thank you, Nigel. That was some job that he did against all odds. Everybody said it couldn't be done. And by the way, it's looking like a very wise decision right now by the voters, so I really congratulate Nigel and I thank you for being here. Thank you. And if I may, we had some tremendous polls come out today. I won't bring it up, I refuse to mention it, but they were very good. We're leading in a lot of locations. Thank you. It's time for America to recapture, like you just heard, to recapture our destiny. Our government leaders and our media have totally lost touch with the people. They have, they have totally lost touch. You need no better evidence of that than the fact that the media ignores the plight of Americans who have lost their children to illegal immigrants, but spends day after day pushing for amnesty for those here in total violation of the law. We can't allow that. Why do our leaders spend so much time talking about how to help people here illegally, they're here illegally, and they spend and they work and they try so hard to help them, but they don't try helping American citizens, some of whom have been

devastated by what’s happened to their children and their families. Devastated. *My priorities will never change.* Jobs, wages and security for Americans. And the immigration *policy, I support as president,* must pass these three tests. First, it must improve jobs and wages for United States citizens. We have people in this room who were making more money in real wages 18 years ago, were not working as hard as they’re working now and they’ve gotten *older.* Not supposed to be that way, and in many cases and largely because of the disaster known as “Obamacare” they have to hold two jobs, not one, but two jobs and, in some cases, three jobs. Not *gonna* happen, folks, not *gonna* happen. Second, it must improve the safety and security for United States citizens. Third, it must improve the quality of life for U.S. citizens. The quality of life, our quality of life is going down. Our level of security, you look back years, you’re more insecure now in terms of security than you were 10, 15 and 20 years ago. Hillary Clinton’s radical immigration plan fails these tests and it fails them very, very badly. Her push for open borders will lower the wages and kill the jobs of lawful American residents. Her support for catch-and-release will put innocent American lives at risk and already has, just like President Obama released the illegal immigrant at the border who then killed magnificent, magnificent Sarah Root. Yesterday I met with her mom, Michelle. Hillary Clinton only talks about the separation of families who choose to come here illegally. I want to focus on the American families *who’ve been* permanently separated from their children because of the sanctuary cities and open borders that Hillary Clinton so strongly supports.

(A.3.275) Where is the sanctuary for American children? (00:24:18–00:24:24)

(A.3.276) Where is that sanctuary? (00:24:24–00:24:26)

The dreamers we never talk about are the young Americans.

(A.3.277) Why aren’t young Americans dreamers also? (00:24:39–00:24:41)

I want my dreamers to be young Americans. Hillary Clinton also wants to push to bring in 620,000 refugees in her first term. A large number of whom come *from countries* where women and gays are horribly brutalized, which will weaken our tolerant way of life. I only want to bring people to our country who share our values and love our people and are capable of loving America. Importantly, I will also create millions and millions of jobs for our people. We are going to cut taxes, reduce regulations, fix our trade deals, unleash American energy and repeal and replace the horror show known as “Obamacare.” We are going to

create jobs, jobs, jobs! I will be the greatest jobs president that God ever created, believe me. So we're *gonna* have millions and millions of jobs, jobs like you have never seen in this country before, because our jobs are being stolen from us, our companies are being stolen from us, our manufacturing is down by 40 percent and 50 percent and numbers that nobody even believes. Those days will be over if Donald Trump is elected president of the United States, believe me. Rising incomes, higher wages, thousands of new companies all across this nation, they'll come in and they'll form. We are going to renegotiate the worst trade deal ever made, not only in this country, but anywhere in the world, known as NAFTA and signed by Bill Clinton. We're going to stand up to China on trade. We're going to keep out of what will be a disastrous trade deal, Trans-Pacific Partnership, TPP. It will not happen with me. It will absolutely happen with crooked Hillary, believe me. This state has lost more than 40 percent of its manufacturing jobs since Bill Clinton signed NAFTA, and it's lost one in four manufacturing jobs since he put China into the World Trade Organization, both deals supported by Hillary Clinton. Horrible deals, destructive deals, what those deals have done to our jobs and to our country. We are going to bring back jobs to Mississippi And in North Carolina, which has treated me so well, and Ohio and to Michigan where our auto plants are leaving and leaving and leaving and going to Mexico and other places, and to Pennsylvania, where I went to school, and to Maryland and all across this land. We're *gonna* bring our jobs back and we're not *gonna* let our jobs be taken away. Thank you. Thank you. And I'm going to make it my personal mission to bring opportunity, safety and prosperity to our very, very troubled inner cities. The Democratic Party has failed and betrayed the African-American community. Democratic crime policies, education policies and economic policies have produced only more crime, more broken homes and more poverty than we've ever had in those communities before. Nearly four in 10 African-American children live in poverty. Fifty-eight percent of African-American youth are not working. More than 2,700 people have been shot in Chicago since the beginning of this year alone. Violent crime has risen 17 percent, and in America's 50 largest cities it's only going one way, folks, and that's up. Homicides are up nearly 50 percent in Washington, D.C. and more than 60 percent from last year in Baltimore. The Democratic Party has taken the votes of African Americans totally for granted, and they've done nothing in return. They've just assumed they'll get your support and they've done nothing, absolutely nothing to deserve it. It's time to give the Democrats some competition for African– American votes and for Hispanic votes. It's time to rebuild

the inner cities of America and do it properly. It's time to reject the failed leadership of a rigged political system. And I was the first to use that term, it's a rigged, disgusting system.

(A.3.278) To those hurting and suffering and left behind, I say, what do you have to lose by trying something new? 00:32:00–00:32:09)

(A.3.279) What do you have to lose by voting for Donald Trump for president? (00:32:10–00:32:13)

(A.3.280) What do you have to lose? (00:32:15–00:32:16)

I will fix the problem. I will fix the problem. If you keep voting for the same people, you will keep getting the same horrible results.

(A.3.281) But I also want to talk about what you have to *gain*, *what you have* to gain, right? (00:32:47–00:32:48)

(A.3.282) Right? (00:32:48–00:32:49)

(A.3.283) What do you have to gain? (00:32:50–00:32:51)

We will create school choice and allow charter schools to absolutely thrive.

(A.3.284) What else will we gain? (00:32:59–00:33:00)

We will empower young Americans to pursue their dreams of opening a small business and make it easier for them to get the credit that they need. We will renegotiate our horrible trade deals to bring back jobs and opportunity. And the African-American community and the Hispanic community will be our biggest beneficiary of that. We will lower taxes and unleash job creation and we will tap into trillions of dollars in new energy wealth that we never even knew we had before. We will protect your jobs from illegal immigration and broken visa programs. And we will rebuild the roads, the bridges, the infrastructure, the tunnels, the airports in your communities and we will rebuild it with our companies, with our steel and with our labor. Hillary Clinton is a bigot who sees people of color Only as votes, not as human beings worthy of a better future. She's going to do nothing for African Americans. She's going to do nothing for the Hispanics. She's only *gonna* take care of herself, her husband, her consultants, her donors. *These, are* the people she cares about. She doesn't care what her policies have done to your communities. She doesn't care. Remember this.

You've had her policies, Democrats running some of the inner cities for 50, 70, 80, even over a hundred years. And look what you have right now, poverty, no education, crime, you can't walk down the street with your child. We're *gonna* fix it, we're going to fix it. Hillary Clinton has no remorse. I will fight to create a better future for every American. The hedge fund managers and Wall Street donors are throwing money at Hillary Clinton to try and stop our change agenda. Of course, if they start looking at the polls they may stop doing that. They're *gonna* have to start studying those polls. That's why you need to come out and you have to vote, you have to vote. That is why you must make your voice heard on November 8th, have to do it. Another crucial issue in this race is national security. Hillary Clinton may go down as the worst secretary of state that has ever served in that office. Let's look back at the Middle East at the very beginning of 2009 before the Obama/Clinton administration, that I call a catastrophe, took over. Libya was stable. Syria was under control. Iraq was experiencing a reduction in violence. The group that would become what we now call ISIS was close to being extinguished, would never have happened. Iran was being choked off by economic sanctions.

(A.3.285) Fast forward to today. After spending \$4 trillion, maybe \$5 trillion, nobody even knows how much money has been sucked out of our country, what have the decisions of Obama/Clinton produced? (00:37:45–00:37:48)

Libya is in ruins. Our ambassador and three other brave Americans are dead. And ISIS has gained a new base of operations, they're all over the world Syria is in the midst of a totally disastrous civil war. ISIS controls large portions of the territory. A refugee crisis now threatens Europe and is threatening the United States because Hillary is allowing these people to pour into our country and we don't know who they are, where they come from. We know nothing. Iraq is in chaos and ISIS is on the loose. ISIS has spread across the Middle East and into the west. At the same time, ISIS is trying to infiltrate refugee flows into Europe and definitely folks, definitely, *I've been* very good at predicting, definitely to the United States. Iran has become the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, is now flush with up to \$150 billion in cash released by the United States, plus another \$400 million in cash, cash, cash ransom. That President Obama said had nothing to do with ransom, had nothing to do with the hostages, and his own people said he was wrong. He lied. He lied. Just like he said Obamacare, "keep your plan, you'll keep your doctor," 28 times, "keep your plan,

keep your doctor.” And because of that lie, Democrats that would have never passed it, passed it and now they regret that they passed it because it is a total disaster. Worst of all, the nuclear deal puts Iran, the number-one state sponsor of radical Islamic terrorism, on a path to nuclear weapons. In short, the Obama/Clinton foreign policy has unleashed ISIS, destabilized the Middle East and put the nation of Iran, which chants, constantly chants “death to America” in a dominant position of regional power and in fact aspiring to be a dominant world power. And we put them there over the last three years! This is the legacy of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton: death, destruction, terrorism and weakness. But Hillary Clinton’s legacy does not have to be America’s legacy. We’re going to end the era of nation-building, a disastrous concept, a disastrous era, and create new foreign policy joined by our partners in the Middle East that is focused completely on destroying ISIS. We have no choice destroying ISIS. We will extend a hand of friendship to any nation that will work with us in good faith on this vital mission. I have a message for the terrorists trying to kill our people, our citizens, trying to hurt the world, but trying to hurt the United States: We will find you, we will destroy you and we will win! Thank you. Thank you. This is not only a military fight, but it will also require cyber warfare and financial warfare. It’s also an ideological fight. We will confront directly the hateful, it’s just so hateful, ideology of radical Islam and promote American values and American culture and America’s system of government. Only by standing up for and supporting, we have to stand up for and support, our values can we become a united country once again. A country of great jobs and *wealth*. A country of security and *freedom*. A country of strength and unity. The future is limitless. All we have to do is believe in America once again. We have to believe it can happen. It can happen. We will put back our faith in America’s special destiny. We will lift the burdens on small *business*, which is being driven into extinction by what’s happening in our government. We’ll create a level playing field for American workers. We’ll never ever let what’s happened to them happen to them again. We’ll establish justice and opportunity and safety in every community in the land. I am asking for the vote of every citizen in this country, African American, Hispanic, all Americans, all Americans who want a better, brighter and stronger future for yourselves and for our country. I am the change candidate. This is our moment to show the whole world that America is back, bigger and better and stronger than ever before. I am asking for your vote so I can be your champion in the White House. I will be your champion and I will work hard to be your champion. And I won’t be playing golf instead of

going to see the people in Louisiana who have been devastated by floods. I'm *gonna* be the champion to every parent who dreams for their children. And to every child who dreams for their future, I say these words to you tonight: I am with you, I will fight for you, and we will win for you, we will win. *Together, we* will make America strong *again*. *We* will make America safe *again*. Thank you and God bless you. Thank you, Mississippi. We love Mississippi. God bless you. Thank you.

## Speech 8

### Remarks on Immigration at the Phoenix Convention Center in Phoenix, Arizona, 31 August 2016

*What a beautiful crowd. Thank you. Thank you. Wow. That's a lot of people, Phoenix, that's a lot of people. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you, Phoenix. I am so glad to be back in Arizona. The state that has a very, very special place in my heart. I love the people of Arizona and together we are going to win the White House in November. Now, you know this is where it all began for me. Remember that massive crowd also. So, I said let's go and have some fun tonight.*

(A.3.286) We're going to Arizona, OK? (00:01:09–00:01:11)

*Thank you. This will be a little bit different. This won't be a rally speech, per se. Instead, I'm going to deliver a detailed policy address on one of the greatest challenges facing our country today, illegal immigration. I've just landed having returned from a very important and special meeting with the President of Mexico, a man I like and respect very much. And a man who truly loves his country, Mexico. And, by the way, just like I am a man who loves my country, the United States. We agree on the importance of ending the illegal flow of drugs, cash, guns, and people across our border, and to put the cartels out of business. We also discussed the great contributions of Mexican-American citizens to our two countries, my love for the people of Mexico, and the leadership and friendship, *that we have*, between Mexico and the United States. It was a thoughtful and substantive conversation and it will go on for a *while*. And, in the end we're all *gonna* win. Both countries, we're all *gonna* win. This is the first of what I expect will be many, many conversations. And, in a Trump administration we're going to go about creating a new relationship between our two countries, but it's going to be a fair relationship. We want fairness. But to fix our immigration system, we must change our leadership in Washington and we must change it quickly. Sadly, sadly there is no other way. The truth is our immigration system is worse than anybody ever realized. But the facts aren't known because the media won't report on them. The politicians won't talk about them and the special interests spend a lot of money trying to cover them up because they are making an absolute fortune. That's the way it is. Today, on a very complicated and very difficult subject, you will get the truth. The fundamental problem with the immigration*

system in our country is that it serves the needs of wealthy donors, political activists and powerful, powerful politicians. It's all you can do. Thank you. Thank you. Let me tell you who it does not serve. It does not serve you the American people. Doesn't serve you. When politicians talk about immigration reform, they usually mean the following, amnesty, open borders, lower wages. Immigration reform should mean something else entirely. It should mean improvements to our laws and policies to make life better for American citizens. Thank you. But if we're going to make our immigration system work, then we have to be prepared to talk honestly and without fear about these important and very sensitive issues. For instance, we have to listen to the concerns that working people, our forgotten working people, have over the record pace of immigration and its impact on their jobs, wages, housing, schools, tax bills and general living conditions. These are valid concerns expressed by decent and patriotic citizens from all backgrounds, all over. We also have to be honest about the fact that not everyone who seeks to join our country will be able to successfully assimilate. Sometimes it's just not *gonna* work out. It's our right, as a sovereign nation to choose immigrants that we think are the likeliest to thrive and flourish and love us. Then there is the issue of security. Countless innocent American lives have been stolen because our politicians have failed in their duty to secure our borders and enforce our laws like they have to be enforced. I have met with many of the great parents who lost their children to sanctuary cities and open borders. So many people, so many, many people. So sad. They will be joining me on this stage in a little while and I look forward to introducing, these are amazing, amazing people. Countless Americans who have died in recent years would be alive today if not for the open border policies of this administration and the administration that causes this horrible, horrible thought process, *it's* called Hillary Clinton. This includes incredible Americans like 21 year old Sarah Root. The man who killed her arrived at the border, entered Federal custody and then was released into the U.S., think of it, into the U.S. community under the policies of the White House Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton. Weak, weak, *weak* policies. Weak and foolish policies. He was released again after the crime, and now he's out there at large. Sarah had graduated from college with a 4.0, top student in her class one day before her death. Also among the victims of the Obama-Clinton open borders policy was Grant Ronnebeck, a 21-year-old convenience store clerk and a really good guy from Mesa, Arizona. A lot of you have known about Grant. He was murdered by an illegal immigrant gang member previously convicted of burglary, who had also been

released from federal custody, and they knew it was *gonna* happen again. Another victim is Kate Steinle. Gunned down in the sanctuary city of San Francisco, by an illegal immigrant, deported five previous times. And they knew he was no good. Then there is the case of 90-year-old Earl Olander, who was brutally beaten and left to bleed to death in his home, 90 years old and defenseless. The perpetrators were illegal immigrants with criminal records a mile long, who did not meet Obama administration standards for removal. And they knew it was going to happen. In California, a 64-year-old Air Force veteran, a great woman, according to everybody that knew her, Marilyn Pharis, was sexually assaulted and beaten to death with a hammer. Her killer had been arrested on multiple occasions but was never, ever deported, despite the fact that everybody wanted him out. A 2011 report from the Government Accountability Office found that illegal immigrants and other non-citizens, in our prisons and jails together, had around 25,000 homicide arrests to their names, 25,000. On top of that, illegal immigration costs our country more than \$113 billion dollars a year. And this is what we get. For the money we are going to spend on illegal immigration over the next 10 years, we could provide 1 million at-risk students with a school voucher, which so many people are wanting. While there are many illegal immigrants in our country who are good people, many, many, this doesn't change the fact that most illegal immigrants are lower skilled workers with less education, who compete directly against vulnerable American workers, and that these illegal workers draw much more out from the system than they can ever possibly pay back. And they're hurting a lot of our people that cannot get jobs under any circumstances. But these facts are never reported. Instead, the media and my opponent discuss one thing and only one thing, the needs of people living here illegally. In many cases, by the way, they're treated better than our vets. Not *gonna* happen anymore, folks. November 8th. Not *gonna* happen anymore. The truth is, the central issue is not the needs of the 11 million illegal immigrants or however many there may be – and honestly we've been hearing that number for years. It's always 11 million. Our government has no idea. It could be 3 million. It could be 30 million. They have no idea what the number is. Frankly our government has no idea what they're doing on many, many fronts, folks. But whatever the number, that's never really been the central issue. It will never be a central issue. It doesn't matter from that standpoint. Anyone who tells you that the core issue is the needs of those living here illegally has simply spent too much time in Washington. Only the out of touch media elites think the biggest problems facing America – you know this, this is what

they talk about, facing American society today is that there are 11 million illegal immigrants who don't have legal status. And, they also think the biggest thing, and you know this, it's not nuclear, and it's not ISIS, it's not Russia, it's not China, it's global warming. To all the politicians, donors, and special interests, hear these words from me and all of you today. There is only one core issue in the immigration debate, and that issue is the well-being of the American people. Nothing even comes a close second. Hillary Clinton, for instance, talks constantly about her fears that families will be separated, but she's not talking about the American families who have been permanently separated from their loved ones because of a preventable homicide, because of a preventable death, because of murder. No, she's only talking about families who come here in violation of the law. We will treat everyone living or residing in our country with great dignity. So important. We will be fair, just, and compassionate to all, but our greatest compassion must be for our American citizens. Thank you. President Obama and Hillary Clinton have engaged in gross dereliction of duty by surrendering the safety of the American people to open borders, and you know it better than anybody right here in Arizona. You know it. President Obama and Hillary Clinton support sanctuary cities. They support catch and release on the border. They support visa overstays. *They support* the release of dangerous, dangerous, dangerous, criminals from detention. And, they support unconstitutional executive amnesty. Hillary Clinton has pledged amnesty in her first 100 days, and her plan will provide Obamacare, Social Security, and Medicare for illegal immigrants, breaking the federal budget. On top of that she promises uncontrolled, low-skilled immigration that continues to reduce jobs and wages for American workers, and especially for African-American and Hispanic workers within our country. Our citizens. Most incredibly, because to me this is unbelievable, we have no idea who these people are, where they come from. I always say Trojan Horse. Watch what's *gonna* happen, folks. It's not *gonna* be pretty. This includes her plan to bring in 620,000 new refugees from Syria and that region over a short period of time. And even yesterday, when you were watching the news, you saw thousands and thousands of people coming in from Syria. What is wrong with our politicians, our leaders if we can call them that.

(A.3.287) What the hell are we doing? (00:18:53–00:18:55)

Hard to believe. Hard to believe. Now that you've heard about Hillary Clinton's plan, about which she has not answered a single question, let me tell you about my plan. And do you

notice – And do you notice all the time for weeks and weeks of debating my plan, debating, talking about it, what about this, what about that. They never even mentioned her plan on immigration because she doesn't want to get into the quagmire. It's a tough one, she doesn't know what she's doing except open borders and let everybody come in and destroy our country by the way. While Hillary Clinton meets only with donors and lobbyists, my plan was crafted with the input from Federal Immigration offices, very great people. Among the top immigration experts anywhere in this country, who represent workers, not corporations, very important to us. I also worked with lawmakers, who've led on this issue on behalf of American citizens for many years. And most importantly I've met with the people directly impacted by these policies. So important.

(A.3.288) Number one, are you ready? (00:20:23–00:20:24)

(A.3.289) Are you ready? (00:20:25–00:20:26)

We will build a great wall along the southern border. And Mexico will pay for the wall. One hundred percent. They don't know it yet, but they're *gonna* pay for *the wall*. And they're great people and great leaders but they're *gonna* pay for the wall. On day one, we will begin working on intangible, physical, tall, power, beautiful southern border wall. We will use the best technology, including above and below ground sensors that's the tunnels. Remember that, above and below. Above and below ground sensors. Towers, aerial surveillance and manpower to supplement the wall, find and dislocate tunnels and keep out criminal cartels and Mexico you know that, will work with us. I really believe it. Mexico will work with us. I absolutely believe it. And especially after meeting with their wonderful, wonderful president today. I really believe they want to solve this problem along with us, and I'm sure they will.

23.26 Number two, we are going to end catch and release. We catch them, oh go ahead. We catch them, go ahead. Under my administration, anyone who illegally crosses the border will be detained until they are removed out of our country and back to the country from which they came. And they'll be brought great distances. We're not dropping them right across. They learned that. President Eisenhower. They'd drop them across, right across, and they'd come back. And across. Then when they flew them to a long distance, all of a sudden that was the end. We will take them great distances.

(A.3.290) But we will take them to the country where they came from, OK? (00:23:40–00:23:45)

Number three. Number three, this is the one, I think it's so great. It's hard to believe, people don't even talk about it. Zero tolerance for criminal aliens. Zero. Zero. Zero. They don't come in here. They don't come in here. According to federal data, there are at least 2 million, 2 million, think of it, criminal aliens now inside of our country, 2 million people criminal aliens. We will begin moving them out day one. As soon as I take office. Day one. In joint operation with local, state, and federal law enforcement. Now, just so you understand, the police, who we all respect – say hello to the police. Boy, they don't get the credit they deserve. I can tell you. They're great people. But the police and law enforcement, they know who these people are. They live with these people. They get mocked by these people. They can't do anything about these people, and they want to. They know who these people are. Day one, my first hour in office, those people are gone. And you can call it deported if you want. The press doesn't like that term. You can call it whatever the hell you want. They're gone. Beyond the 2 million, and there are vast numbers of additional criminal illegal immigrants who have fled, but their days have run out in this country. The crime will stop. They're going to be gone. It will be over. They're going out. They're going out fast. Moving forward. We will issue detainers for illegal immigrants who are arrested for any crime whatsoever, and they will be placed into immediate removal proceedings if we even have to do that. We will terminate the Obama administration's deadly, and it is deadly, non-enforcement policies that allow thousands of criminal aliens to freely roam our streets, walk around, do whatever they want to do, crime all over the place. That's over. That's over, folks. That's over. Since 2013 alone, the Obama administration has allowed 300,000 criminal aliens to return back into United States communities. These are individuals encountered or identified by ICE, but who were not detained or processed for deportation because it wouldn't have been politically correct. My plan also includes cooperating closely with local jurisdictions to remove criminal aliens immediately. We will restore the highly successful Secure Communities Program. Good program. We will expand and revitalize the popular 287(g) partnerships, which will help to identify hundreds of thousands of deportable aliens in local jails that we don't even know about. Both of these programs have been recklessly gutted by this administration. And those were programs that worked. This is yet one more area where we are headed in a totally opposite direction. There's no common sense, there's no brain power in our administration by our leader, or our leaders. None, none, none. On my first day in office I am also going to ask Congress to pass Kate's Law, named for Kate

Steinle. To ensure that criminal aliens convicted of illegal reentry receive strong mandatory minimum sentences. Strong. And then we get them out. Another reform I'm proposing is the passage of legislation named for Detective Michael Davis and Deputy Sheriff Danny Oliver, to law enforcement officers recently killed by a previously deported illegal immigrant. The Davis-Oliver bill will enhance cooperation with state and local authorities to ensure that criminal immigrants and terrorists are swiftly, really swiftly, identified and removed. And they will *go fast, believe me*. They're *gonna* go fast. We're going to triple the number of ICE deportation officers.

(A.3.291) Within ICE I am going to create a new special deportation task force focused on identifying and quickly removing the most dangerous criminal illegal immigrants in America who have evaded justice just like Hillary Clinton has evaded justice, OK? (00:30:02–00:30:04)

Maybe they'll be able to deport her. The local police who know every one of these criminals, and they know each and every one by name, by crime, where they live, they will work so fast. And our local police will be so happy that they don't have to be abused by these thugs anymore. There's no great mystery to it, they've put up with it for years, and *now* finally we will turn the tables and law enforcement and our police will be allowed to clear up this dangerous and threatening mess. We're also going to hire 5,000 more Border Patrol agents. Who gave me their endorsement, 16,500 gave me their endorsement. And put more of them on the border instead of behind desks which is good. We will expand the number of border patrol stations significantly. I've had a chance to spend time with these incredible law enforcement officers, and I want to take a moment to thank them. What they do is incredible. And getting their endorsement means so much to me. More to me really than I can say. Means so much. First time they've ever endorsed a presidential candidate. Number four, block funding for sanctuary cities. We block the funding. No more *funding*. We will end the sanctuary cities that have resulted in so many needless *debts*. Cities that refuse to cooperate with federal authorities will not receive taxpayer dollars, and we will work with Congress to pass legislation to protect those jurisdictions that do assist federal authorities. Number five, cancel unconstitutional executive orders and enforce all immigration laws. We will immediately terminate President Obama's two illegal executive amnesties in which

he defied federal law and the Constitution to give amnesty to approximately five million illegal immigrants, five million.

(A.3.292) And how about all *of* the millions that are *waiting online*, going through the process legally? (00:33:50–00:33:57)

So unfair. Hillary Clinton has pledged to keep both of these illegal amnesty programs, including the 2014 amnesty which has been blocked by the United States Supreme Court. Great. Clinton has also pledged to add a third executive amnesty. And by the way, folks, she will be a disaster for our country, a disaster in so many other ways. And don't forget the Supreme Court of the United States. Don't forget that when you go to vote on November 8. And don't forget your Second Amendment. And don't forget the repeal and replacement of Obamacare. And don't forget building up our depleted military. And don't forget taking care of our vets. Don't forget our vets. They have been forgotten. Clinton's plan would trigger a constitutional crisis unlike almost anything we have ever seen before. In effect, she would be abolishing the lawmaking powers of Congress in order to write her own laws from the Oval Office. And you see what bad judgment she has. She has seriously bad judgment.

(A.3.293) Can you imagine? (00:35:31–00:35:32)

In a Trump administration all immigration laws will be enforced, will be enforced. As with any law enforcement activity, we will set priorities. But unlike this administration, no one will be immune or exempt from enforcement. And ICE and Border Patrol officers will be allowed to do their jobs the way their jobs are supposed to be done. Anyone who has entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation. That is what it means to have laws and to have a country. Otherwise we don't have a country. Our enforcement priorities will include removing criminals, gang members, security threats, visa overstays, public charges. That is those relying on public welfare or straining the safety net along with millions of recent illegal arrivals and overstays who've come here under this current corrupt administration. Number six, we are going to suspend the issuance of visas to any place where adequate screening cannot occur. According to data provided by the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration, and the national interest between 9/11 and the end of 2014, at least 380 foreign born individuals were convicted in terror cases inside the United States. And even right now the largest number of people are under investigation for exactly this that we've ever had in the history of our country. Our country is a mess. We don't even know what to look for anymore, folks.

Our country has to straighten out. And we have to straighten out fast. The number is likely higher. But the administration refuses to provide this information, even to Congress. As soon as I enter office I am going to ask the Department of State, which has been brutalized by Hillary Clinton, brutalized. Homeland Security and the Department of Justice to begin a comprehensive review of these cases in order to develop a list of regions and countries from which immigration must be suspended until proven and effective vetting mechanisms can be put in place.

(A.3.294) I call it extreme vetting right? (00:38:37–00:38:40)

Extreme vetting. I want extreme. It's going to be so tough, and if somebody comes in that's fine but they're *gonna* be good. It's extreme. And if people don't like it, we've got have a country folks. Got to have a country. Countries *from* which immigration will be suspended would include places like Syria and Libya. And we are going to stop the tens of thousands of people coming in from Syria. We have no idea who they are, where they come from. There's no documentation. There's no paperwork. It's going to end badly folks. It's going to end very, very badly. For the price of resettling, one refugee in the United States, 12 could be resettled in a safe zone in their home region. Which I agree with a 100 percent. We have to build safe zones and we'll get the money from Gulf states. We don't want to put up the money. We owe almost \$20 trillion. *Double* since Obama took office, our national debt. But we will get the money from Gulf states and others. We'll supervise it. We'll build safe zones which is something that I think all of us want to see. Another reform, involves new screening tests for all applicants that include, and this is so important, especially if you get the right people. And we will get the right people. An ideological certification to make sure that those we are admitting to our country share our values and love our people. Thank you. We're very proud of our country.

(A.3.295) Aren't we? (00:40:49–00:40:50)

(A.3.296) Really? (00:40:50–00:40:51)

With all it's going through, we're very proud of our country. For instance, in the last five years, we've admitted nearly 100,000 immigrants from Iraq and Afghanistan. And these two countries according to Pew Research, a majority of residents say that the barbaric practice of honor killings against women are often or sometimes justified. That's what they say. That's what they say. They're justified.

(A.3.297) Right? (00:41:25–00:41:26)

And we're admitting them to our country. Applicants will be asked *for* their views about honor killings, about respect for women and gays and minorities. Attitudes on radical Islam, which our President refuses to say and many other topics as part of this vetting procedure. And if *we* have the right people doing it, believe me, very, very few will slip through the cracks. Hopefully, none. Number seven, we will insure that other countries take their people back when we order them deported. There are at least 23 countries that refuse to take their people back after they've been ordered to leave the United States. Including large numbers of violent criminals, they won't take them back. So we say, OK, we'll keep them. Not *gonna* happen with me *folks*, not *gonna* happen with me. Due to a Supreme Court decision, if these violent offenders cannot be sent home, our law enforcement officers have to release them into your communities. And by the way, the results are horrific, horrific. There are often terrible consequences, such as Casey Chadwick's tragic death in Connecticut just last year. Yet despite the existence of a law that commands the Secretary of State to stop issuing visas to these countries. Secretary Hillary Clinton ignored this law and refused to use this powerful tool to bring nations into compliance. And, they would comply if we would act properly. In other words, if we had leaders that knew what they were doing, which we don't. The result of her misconduct was the release of thousands and thousands of dangerous criminal aliens who should have been sent home to their countries. Instead we have them all over the place. Probably a couple in this room as a matter of fact, but I hope not. According to a report for the Boston Globe from the year 2008 *through* 2014 nearly 13,000 criminal aliens were released back into U.S. communities because their home countries would not, under any circumstances, take them back. Hard to believe with the power we have. Hard to believe. We're like the big bully that keeps getting beat up.

(A.3.298) You ever see that? (00:44:28–00:44:29)

The big bully that keeps getting beat up. These 13,000 release occurred on Hillary Clinton's watch. She had the power and the duty to stop it cold, and she decided she would not do it. And, Arizona knows better than most exactly what I'm talking about. Those released include individuals convicted of killings, sexual assaults, and some of the most heinous crimes imaginable. The Boston Globe writes that a Globe review of 323 criminals released in New England from 2008 to 2012 found that as many as 30 percent committed new offenses,

including rape, attempted murder, and child molestation. We take them, we take them. Number eight, we will finally complete the biometric entry-exit visa tracking system which we need desperately. For years Congress has required biometric entry-exit visa tracking systems, but it has never been completed. The politicians are all talk, no action, never happens. Never happens. Hillary Clinton, all talk. Unfortunately when there is action it's always the wrong decision.

(A.3.299) You ever notice? (00:46:03–00:46:04)

In my administration we will ensure that this system is in place. And, I will tell you, it will be on land, it will be on sea, it will be in air. We will have a proper tracking system. Approximately half of new illegal immigrants came on temporary visas and then never, ever left.

(A.3.300) Why should *they*? (00:46:31–00:46:33)

Nobody's telling them to leave. Stay as long as you want, we'll take care of you. Beyond violating our laws, visa overstays, pose – and they really are a big problem, pose a substantial threat to national security. The 9/11 Commission said that this tracking system *should* be a high priority and would have assisted law enforcement and intelligence officials in *August* and September in 2001 in conducting a search for two of the 9/11 hijackers that were in the United States *on* expired visas. And, you know what that would have meant, what that could have meant.

(A.3.301) Wouldn't that have been wonderful, right? (00:47:15–00:47:16)

(A.3.302) What that could have meant? (00:47:16–00:47:17)

Last year alone nearly half a million individuals overstayed their temporary visas. Removing visa overstays will be a top priority of my administration. If people around the world believe they can just come on a temporary visa and never, ever leave, the Obama-Clinton policy, that's what it is, then we have a completely open border, and we no longer have a country. We must send a message that visa expiration dates will be strongly enforced. Number nine, we will turn off the jobs and benefits magnet. We will ensure that E-Verify is used to the fullest extent possible under existing law, and we will work with Congress to strengthen and expand its use across the country. Immigration law doesn't exist for the purpose of keeping criminals out. It exists to protect all aspects of American life. The work site, the

welfare office, the education system, and everything else. That is why immigration limits are established in the first place. If we only enforced the laws against crime, then we have an open border to the entire world. We will enforce all of our immigration laws. And the same goes for government benefits. The Center for Immigration Studies estimates that 62 percent of households headed by illegal immigrants use some form of cash or non-cash welfare programs like food stamps or housing assistance. Tremendous costs, by the way, to our country. Tremendous costs. This directly violates the federal public charge law designed to protect the United States Treasury. Those who abuse our welfare system will be priorities for immediate removal. Number 10, we will reform legal immigration to serve the best interests of America and its workers, the forgotten people. Workers. We're *gonna* take care of our workers. And by the way, and by the way, we're *gonna* make great trade deals. We're *gonna* renegotiate trade deals. We're *gonna* bring our jobs back home. We're *gonna* bring our jobs back home. We have the most incompetently worked trade deals ever negotiated probably in the history of the world, and that starts with NAFTA. And now they want to go TPP, one of the great disasters. We're going to bring our jobs back home. And if companies want to leave Arizona and if they want to leave other states, there's going to be a lot of trouble for them. It's not *gonna* be so easy. There will be consequence. Remember that. There will be consequence. They're not *gonna* be leaving, go to another country, make the product, sell it into the United States, and all we end up with is no taxes and total unemployment. It's not *gonna* happen. There will be consequences. We've admitted 59 million immigrants to the United States between 1965 and 2015. Many of these arrivals have greatly enriched our country. So true. But we now have an obligation to them and to their children to control future immigration as we have following, if you think, previous immigration waves. We've had some big waves. And tremendously positive things have happened. Incredible things have happened. To ensure assimilation we want to ensure that it works. Assimilation, an important word. Integration and upward mobility. Within just a few years immigration as a share of national population is set to break all historical records. The time has come for a new immigration commission to develop a new set of reforms to our legal immigration system in order to achieve the following goals. To keep immigration levels measured by population share within historical norms. To select immigrants based on their likelihood of success in U.S. society and their ability to be financially self-sufficient. We take anybody.

Come on in, anybody. Just come on in. Not anymore. You know, folks, it's called a two-way street.

(A.3.303) It is a two-way street, right? (00:52:47–00:52:48)

We need a system that serves our needs, not the needs of others. Remember, under a Trump administration it's called America first. Remember that. To choose immigrants based on merit. Merit, skill, and proficiency.

(A.3.304) Doesn't that sound nice? (00:52:16–00:52:18)

And to establish new immigration controls to boost wages and to ensure that open jobs are offered to American workers first. And that in particular African– American and Latino who are being shut out in this process so unfairly. And Hillary Clinton is going to do nothing for the African– American worker, the Latino worker. She's going to do nothing. Give me your vote, she says, on November eighth. And then she'll say, so long, see you in four years. That's what it is. She is *gonna* do nothing. And just look at the past. She's done nothing. She's been there for 35 years. She's done nothing.

(A.3.305) And I say what do you have to lose? (00:54:13–00:54:15)

Choose me. Watch how good we're *gonna* do together. Watch. You watch. We want people to come into our country, but they have to come into our country legally and properly vetted, and in a manner that serves the national interest. We've been living under outdated immigration rules from decades ago. They're decades and decades old. To avoid this happening in the future, I believe we should sunset our visa laws so that Congress is forced to periodically revise and revisit them to bring them up to date. They're archaic. They're ancient.

(A.3.306) We wouldn't put our entire federal budget on auto pilot for decades, so why should we do the same for the very, very complex subject of immigration? (00:55:10–00:55:14)

So let's now talk about the big picture. These 10 steps, if rigorously followed and enforced, will accomplish more in a matter of months than our politicians have accomplished on this issue in the last 50 years. It's *gonna* happen, folks. Because I am proudly not a politician, because I am not behold to any special interest, I've spent a lot of money on my campaign, I'll tell you. I write those checks. Nobody owns Trump. I will get this done for you and for

your family. We'll do it right. You'll be proud of our country again. We'll do it right. We will accomplish all of the steps outlined above. And, when we do, peace and law and justice and prosperity will prevail. Crime will go down. Border crossings will plummet. Gangs will disappear. 57.15 And the gangs are all over the place. And welfare use will decrease. We will have a peace dividend to spend on rebuilding America, beginning with our American inner cities. We're gonna rebuild them, for once and for all. For those here illegally today, who are seeking legal status, they will have one route and one route only. To return home and apply for reentry like everybody else, under the rules of the new legal immigration system that I have outlined above. Those who have left to seek entry – Thank you. Thank you. *Thank you. Thank you.* Those who have left to seek entry under this new system – and it will be an efficient system – will not be awarded surplus visas, but will have to apply for entry under the immigration caps or limits that will be established in the future. We will break the cycle of amnesty and illegal immigration. We will break the cycle. There will be no amnesty. Our message to the world will be this. You cannot obtain legal status or become a citizen of the United States by illegally entering our country. Can't do it. This declaration alone will help stop the crisis of illegal crossings and illegal overstays, very importantly. People will know that you can't just smuggle in, hunker down and wait to be legalized. *Not gonna* work that way. Those days are over. Importantly, in several years when we have accomplished all of our enforcement and deportation goals and truly ended illegal immigration for good, including the construction of a great wall, which we will have built in record time. And at a reasonable cost, which you never hear from the government. And the establishment of our new lawful immigration system then and only then will we be in a position to consider the appropriate disposition of those individuals who remain. That discussion can take place only in an atmosphere in which illegal immigration is a memory of the past, no longer with us, allowing us to weigh the different options available based on the new circumstances at the time. Right now, however, we're in the middle of a jobs crisis, a border crisis and a terrorism crisis like never before. All energies of the federal government and the legislative process must now be focused on immigration security. That is the only conversation we should be having at this time, immigration security. Cut it off. Whether it's dangerous materials being smuggled across the border, terrorists entering on visas or Americans losing their jobs to foreign workers, these are the problems we must now focus on fixing. And the media needs to begin demanding to hear Hillary Clinton's

answer on how her policies will affect Americans and their security. These are matters of life and death for our country and its people, and we deserve answers from Hillary Clinton. And do you notice, she doesn't answer. She didn't go to Louisiana. She didn't go to Mexico. She was invited. She doesn't have the strength or the stamina to make America great again. Believe me. What we do know, despite the lack of media curiosity, is that Hillary Clinton promises a radical amnesty combined with a radical reduction in immigration enforcement. Just ask the Border Patrol about Hillary Clinton. You won't like what you're hearing. The result will be millions more illegal immigrants; thousands of more violent, horrible crimes; and total chaos and lawlessness. That's what's *gonna* happen, as sure as you're standing there. This election, and I believe this, is our last chance to secure the border, stop illegal immigration and reform our laws to make your life better. I really believe this is it. This is our last time. November 8. November 8. You got to get out and vote on November 8. It's our last chance. It's our last chance. And that includes Supreme Court justices and Second Amendment. Remember that. So I want to remind everyone what we're fighting for and who we are fighting for. I am going to ask – these are really special people that I've gotten to know. I'm *gonna* ask all of the Angel Moms to come join me on the stage right now. These are amazing women. These are amazing people. (Family members speak individually.) These are amazing people, and I am not asking for their endorsement, believe me that. I just think I've gotten to know so many of them, and many more, from our group. But they are incredible people and what they're going through is incredible, and there's just no reason for it. So, let's give them a really tremendous hand. That's tough stuff, I will tell you. That is tough stuff. Incredible people. So, now is the time for these voices to be heard. Now is the time for the media to begin asking questions on their behalf. Now is the time for all of us as one country, Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative to band together to deliver justice, and safety, and security for all Americans. Let's fix this horrible, horrible, problem. It can be fixed *quickly*. *Let's secure* our border. Let's stop the drugs and the crime from pouring into our country. Let's protect our social security and Medicare. Let's get unemployed Americans off the welfare and back to work in their own country. This has been an incredible evening. We're *gonna* remember this evening. November 8, we have to get everybody. This is such an important state. November 8 we have to get everybody to go out and vote. We're *gonna* bring – thank you, thank you. We're *gonna* take our country back, folks. This is a movement. We're *gonna* take our country back. Thank you. Thank you. This is an incredible movement.

The world is talking about it. The world is talking about it and by the way, if you haven't been looking to what's been happening at the polls over the last three or four days I think you should start looking. You should start looking. Together we can save American lives, American jobs, and American futures. Together we can save America itself. Join me in this mission, we're going to make America great again. Thank you. I love you. *Thank you.* God bless you, everybody. God bless you. God bless you, thank you.

## Speech 9

### Remarks to the 11th Annual Values Voter Summit in Washington, D.C. Omni Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., 09 September 2016

Thank you. Thank you very much. Oh, Jon. Jon is such a great actor and such a great person. He is such a great person. And he's really been with me a long time in a lot of different ways. He's been incredible. So I just want to thank Jon. And I hope he makes another movie very quickly, because I love his movies. In particular, I wanted to thank our host, Tony Perkins, for his years of leadership. And we know all about that. And we all express our support for Tony as he deals with the aftermath of the terrible floods in Louisiana, where two weeks ago I spent some time, and I saw some incredible, incredible people.

Thank you. Amazing, amazing group. One of the greatest privileges of my journey has been the time I've spent with the evangelical community. And the support they gave me in those primaries was absolutely incredible, I have to tell you. All across the nation. A lot of people said: I wonder if Donald will get the evangelicals. I got the evangelicals. I'm going to make it up to you too, you watch. There are no more decent, devoted, or selfless people than our Christians brothers and sisters here in the United States. True. So true. I've witnessed that incredible generosity all across this land, gotten to know so many people. I saw it during my trip to Louisiana, where Christian volunteers raced to help their fellow citizens in need. Franklin Graham is an example. He brought the most incredible people and equipment to Louisiana. And he didn't want anything for it. He's a great man. It's that spirit of giving that we will need to rebuild Louisiana and to rebuild this country, which is in serious, serious trouble. Yet, our media culture often mocks and demeans people of faith. And you understand that. All the time I hear from concerned parents how much harder it is for a Christian family to raise their children in today's media environment.

(A.3.307) It is right, isn't it? (00:02:47–00:02:47)

Yeah, it is right. Not even close. Your values of love, charity and faith built this nation.

(A.3.308) So how can it be that our media treats people of faith so poorly? (00:03:02–00:03:08)

One of the reasons is that our politicians have really abandoned you, to a large extent. And Hillary Clinton, you can forget about her. So let me say this right up front: A Trump

administration, our Christian heritage will be cherished, protected, defended, like you've never seen before. Believe me. I believe it. And you believe it. And you know it. You know it. And that includes religious liberty – remember, remember. I recently had a chance to visit a church in Detroit, Great Faith Ministries International. Stand up if you're member. That's good. That was a great – that was an amazing experience. And the bishop, what a great guy. In my remarks, I spoke about how African American church – and this is all across the country – for centuries have been the conscience of our nation. Their unbreakable faith and spirit overcame some of the most difficult periods in our history, leading us all to a better future. Very true. Amazing. This was such an amazing experience. This is the power of faith. It's the power to heal. It's the power to unite. It's the power to make all of us live better lives – all of us. Our nation today is divided. Nobody likes to say it, but we're living in a very, very divided nation. It will be our faith in God and his teachings, in each other, that will lead us back to unity. Each of us here today has a role to play in bringing our country together, united in common purpose and in common values. So let's talk today about some of the things – and these are great things – that we can do together to create the American future for everybody, not just a certain group of people, but for everybody. The first thing we have to do is give our churches their voice back. It's been taken away. The Johnson amendment has blocked our pastors and ministers and others from speaking their minds from their own pulpits. If they want to talk about Christianity, if they want to preach, if they want to talk about politics, they're unable to do so. If they want to do it, they take a tremendous risk that they lose their tax-exempt status. 6.45 All religious leaders should be able to freely express their thoughts and feelings – on religious matters. And I will repeal the Johnson amendment – if I am elected your president, I promise. So important. Thank you. That's so important. And I must tell you from the heart, this started, a building of mine in Manhattan. I had 50 pastors in a big conference room. And we actually had 50 pastors, two rabbis, a couple of priests. We were all talking. And we were there for two hours. And at the end, it was a love-fest. We all agreed. It was like a love-fest. And I said to them – we were high up in a building on 5th Avenue – and I said to them I'd love your support. And I know when I can get support. I'm quite sophisticated. And I know they wanted to give me their total support, 100 percent, just like I had in the primaries. And I said I really would like your support. And they didn't really know what I was talking about.

(A.3.309) And I said, what's going on here? (00:08:07–00:08:08)

They said, well, sir, we can't do that because we would be violating the laws.

(A.3.310) And I said, what's the punishment? (00:08:17–00:08:18)

Well, we could lose our tax-exempt status, which, of course, is a, you know, massive penalty.

I said, tell me about this. And we sat down. They talked about it.

(A.3.311) When did it happen? (00:08:29–00:08:29)

1954 or so. Lyndon Johnson was having problems – powerful guy. I actually, as just own way – you have to gain respect for what he was able to do. Can you imagine that this man single-handedly – he was having problems with churches. And there was a church in Houston that was giving him a hard time, maybe for very good reason. And he put in an amendment that basically stopped our great pastors and ministers and others from talking, under the penalty of losing their tax-exempt status. So we were looking down onto the sidewalk and there were people walking on the sidewalk. And I said, so, folks, what you're telling me is those people walking way, way down there on the sidewalk have really more power than you do, because they're allowed to express their feelings and thoughts openly and without penalty. And one of the pastors, who I knew very well – and these are powerful people; these are strong people with magnificent voices and just – and magnificent hearts, much more importantly – they looked at me and they said, that's actually right. They have more power than we do. We're not allowed to express. And that's what I said. We have to start thinking about this. And I thought about it. And then we had a large group of pastors again. I said I have thought about it. If I become president, we're *gonna* knock out the Johnson amendment. We're *gonna* do that. And it's not *gonna* be hard. It's not *gonna* be hard. When you – when you think, from the standpoint of political, you have more than men – let's say men are 50 percent, women are 50 percent. You're much more than 50 percent, added together.

(A.3.312) And I actually believe that's one of the reasons why you haven't seen Christianity and other religions within the United States going like a rocket ship – like our polls have been going in the last four weeks, a rocket ship, right? (00:10:31–00:10:31)

I really believe that, because you're great people. The people that you rely on on Sunday and all during the week, they've been stopped from talking and speaking by a law. And we're *gonna* get rid of that law and it's *gonna* get rid of – we're *gonna* get rid of it so fast. And I'm

so proud to say – honestly, I don't want to take credit, but you had 50 people in that first meeting and many more in the second. I am so proud – I was just telling this to Tony – to say that was my idea. I figure it's the only way I'm getting to heaven, so this is *gonna* be very – the only way.

(A.3.313) So we're *gonna* get rid of it, and we're *gonna* let your great people speak, and you're *gonna* see something happen that's *gonna* be very, very good, OK? (00:11:15–00:11:18)

So important. I hope – which means you have to get out and vote on November 8th. You cannot – you didn't vote four years ago. You didn't vote.

(A.3.314) You did? (00:11:32–00:11:32)

Well, you did. A few of you did. Believe me, I know. I look at the stats. You didn't vote. But this time you really have – and this is your last chance. This is it. I mean, we'll never have this opportunity again.

(A.3.315) So I hope you can get every one of your friends and just get up – your family and your friends, and get out and vote, OK? (00:11:51–00:11:51)

November 8th. Thank you. And if you do, we're *gonna* win by a lot. That's not *gonna* even be a close election. And if you don't, could be a very unhappy November 8th. We're also going to repeal and replace disastrous Obamacare – which gives the government control over the lives of everyday citizens. And the numbers are horrendous. Your premiums are going up by 50, 60, 70 percent. The deductible is so high you never get to use it unless you are going to lead a very long and very complex bad period – very, very long. It is a disaster. It's a disaster, and everybody knows it. And it's *gonna* die of its own weight anyway, but we're *gonna* get rid of it and we're *gonna* replace it with some great, great alternatives – much better health care at a much lower price. Hillary Clinton wants to have completely government-run health care, which would be a disaster for the liberties and freedoms of all America. That's what she wants. That's what she's aiming at. That's what Obama wanted. He didn't quite get there, but he got this, and you see how bad this has been. One of the biggest issues in this race is going to be the issue of school choice. And I can't possibly emphasize this enough. Millions of poor and disadvantaged students are trapped in failing schools. This education crisis afflicts all communities, but none more so than the African-American community – none. The

Democratic Party has run the inner cities of America for 50, 60, 70 years, some cases over a hundred years – over a hundred years. Their policies and their politics, and in particular the politics of people like Hillary Clinton, have produced only poverty, joblessness, and rising crime. When she was running for the Senate in New York State, she said she was *gonna* produce jobs, jobs, jobs in Upstate New York. It's a disaster. She *gonna* produce jobs, big thing – jobs, we're *gonna* bring back jobs. Been a catastrophe. We've lost tens of thousands of jobs. She never did a thing. It was all talk, no action, just like what she's doing right now is all talk, no action. She'll talk and talk, and nothing will happen. Only bad will happen. But you just have to ask the people in Upstate New York. She won because of them, and she produced absolutely nothing. Jobs left. It's today one of the worst, one of the most depressing places in this country. So just remember that when you hear her talking about jobs. I know jobs. She doesn't know jobs. That I can tell you. I have outlined a new civil rights agenda for our time – the right to a safe community, a great education and a secure job. And I say to African-American parents, I say to Hispanic American parents – and I say it with great respect – our inner cities are a disaster – crime, no jobs, education is the worst, in many cases almost worldwide bad and in many cases actually worldwide bad.

(A.3.316) I say, with great respect, what do you have to lose? (00:15:49–00:15:50)

It can't get any worse. It can't get any worse. You choose Donald Trump, I'm *gonna* fix the problem. You're *gonna* have safety. You're *gonna* have good education. We're *gonna* get jobs, because we're *gonna* bring our jobs back. Mexico's taking our jobs. So many other places, they're taking our jobs. What China's doing to us is horrible. We're *gonna* have jobs.

(A.3.317) What do you have to lose? (00:16:09–00:16:10)

I'm *gonna* fix it. I'm *gonna* fix it. School choice is at the center of this civil rights agenda, and my goal is to provide every single inner-city child in America that is trapped in a failing government school the freedom to attend the school of their choice. Competition – the schools the schools will get better and better and better. And that means a private school, a religious school, a charter school or a magnet school. School choice also means that parents can home-school their children. Hundred percent. Hillary Clinton opposes school choice because she is controlled totally, totally, like a puppet, by special interests. Her policies will force millions of African-American and Hispanic children to remain stuck in failed government schools, leading to higher unemployment and more poverty. The

poverty levels in this country nobody will believe, nobody will believe. My plan will break the government monopoly and make schools compete to provide the best services for our children – including every African-American and Hispanic child in this country, every single one of them. This proposal begins with a \$20 billion block grant from the federal government for states to pursue school choice programs.

(A.3.318) However – that’s good, right? (00:18:05–00:18:05)

However, because 90 percent of education spending is at the state level, I will campaign to get the states to reallocate another \$110 billion of their education budgets to school choice programs. 18.28 If we do this, that would mean \$12,000 in school choice funds for every disadvantaged student in America. What a difference this is going to make. The money will follow the student to the public, private or religious school that is best for them and their family. In so many ways, you’re going to have choice. My administration will partner with the leadership of any inner-city – anybody – anybody in the inner cities of America willing to run a pilot program – and there will be a lot of them – to provide school choice to every child in that community. In Baltimore, for instance, that would mean more than \$15,000 in funds available per student. As your president, I will be the biggest cheerleader for school choice you’ve ever seen. This means a lot to me, because I know it can turn things around. Again, the education can’t get worse. Common Core – we’re *gonna* end it. We’re bringing education local. I will fight for every child in this country who deserve better futures. The African-American community has heard my message that I am going to make the inner city safe again, and I’m going to bring back jobs, and I’m *gonna* bring back the great education. Don’t be surprised – remember this, November 8th – don’t be surprised, because we have been given a lot of support over the last three or four weeks, if on November 8th I get more African-American and Hispanic votes than anyone thought possible about a month ago.

(A.3.319) You see what’s going on? (00:20:24–00:20:25)

They’re starting – people are starting to hear about this. And they’re saying, wow. Wow. They’re liking it. And again, can’t get any worse. It’s *gonna* get a lot better. But only if I do it. They can’t do it. The Democrats, they have – what they’ve done is incredible. And Hillary Clinton will be absolutely more of the same – rigid. It’ll never change. Remember, a hundred years, 70 years, 50 – it’s not *gonna* change. Not *gonna* happen. Now, let’s talk about another issue that will define the future of this country for generations to come, the

United States Supreme Court. Earlier this year, we lost the great justice, Antonin Scalia. The next president will not only have to fill this seat, but as many as four others. It could even be – I mean, we could end up with a total of five judges by one president. It would be record-setting. Probably be three. Could be four. Could even be five. And you pick the wrong people, you have a country that is no longer your country. It will be a disaster. One of the most important issues, frankly – other than maybe defense, because we're *gonna* build up our military, it's so depleted. We're *gonna* take care of our vets. We're *gonna* protect your Second Amendment, so many things. But one of the most important – some people think it's actually the most important – is the filling of the seats, United States Supreme Court.

(A.3.320) You see what's happening right now? (00:22:10–00:22:11)

Essentially it's four and four. And you see what – how bad it is. We're going to pick great judges. I've already put a list of 11 Federalist Society, highly recommended, got uniform great reviews on these 11 people. And we are going to put truly great people.

(A.3.321) Maybe we use Judge Scalia as the ultimate example of what we're looking for, OK? (00:22:39–00:22:40)

This will determine whether or not we remain a constitutional republic, frankly. That's what's *gonna* happen. I have pledged to appoint judges who uphold the Constitution, to protect your religious liberty, and apply the law as written. We reject judges who rewrite the Constitution to impose their own personal views on 300 million-plus Americans. We're not *gonna* have that. I've made public a list of judges, as I said, that will guide my selection process. Hillary Clinton has refused to provide such a list. And we brought it up. Let's see a list. You ever saw the list you would walk out of here not feeling very well. Because she knows the extremist judges she would pick would be rejected by the overwhelming majority of the American public. They'd be rejected. Clinton's judicial picks would allow her to completely take over American health care, the American economy, and Americans religious liberty – not to mention your Second Amendment, which is on very thin ice right now, as you know, because of the fact that we're at four-and-four. If they even pick one judge who's wrong you can probably – as you know it – you can kiss the Second Amendment goodbye. And we don't want to see that. Another issue in this race of great importance to everyone in this room is the issue of course of national security. Just today it was announced that North Korea performed its fifth nuclear test – its fourth since Hillary Clinton became secretary of state.

It's just one more massive failure from a failed secretary of state. Failed at everything. Her policies have also put Iran onto a path of nuclear weapons, and I have to say made them overnight an absolute power. They were dying three years ago. The sanctions were choking them. They would have fallen. But Obama didn't support people that would have taken over, and I think in this case probably would have taken over the right way; had no support. 25.24 But you look at what's happened to Iran in such a short period of time. But remember the ransom payments. Remember, it was \$400 million two weeks ago. But then they made a mistake. This is cash. Remember, they said they paid cash because they couldn't open a bank account. There was no way of sending it into a checking account.

(A.3.322) All lies, just like Obamacare was a big lie, remember? (00:25:47–00:25:49)

(A.3.323) You can use your plan. You can use your doctors – 27 times, right? (00:25:52–00:25:53)

Twenty-seven times. Use your doctors, use your plan; turned out to be a lie. It's all a lie. It's all a big lie. It's a rigged system and it's a lie. And I'll tell you what. I'll tell you what. The 400 million, for those that haven't been reading the papers over the last two days, turned out to be 1.7 billion in cash – cash. And I actually said – they said, oh, that money's *gonna* be used for terror. I said, no, they don't need it for terror. They've got 150 billion (dollars). That's in addition to the \$150 billion that we're giving back. I said they don't need it. This is going into their Swiss accounts and going into their accounts. They're not *gonna* use it for terror. They have plenty of money for terror. Think of it – \$1.7 billion (dollars) in cash – massive, big vats of cash. You saw them – cartons. I never saw anything like it. I've seen a lot of cash. Hey, never saw anything like this – \$1.7 billion (dollars).

(A.3.324) Can you imagine these guys? (00:26:48–00:26:50)

Planes get – they stop. Remember, they wouldn't give back the hostages. They waited there for hours and hours. And Obama kept saying, no, no, this has nothing to do – even the hostages said they kept us waiting for a certain plane to come in, not to take them back, because they were waiting for something. It was this – just another lie.

(A.3.325) But can you imagine these people sitting there and they see \$1.7 billion (dollars) in cash? (00:27:11–00:27:18)

Ai, yai, yai. They think we're stupid. They think we're stupid. They won't be thinking it for long. Very sad. At the same time, ISIS is hunting down and exterminating what it calls the nation of the cross. ISIS is carrying out a genocide against Christians in the Middle East. We cannot let this evil continue – can't let it. ISIS must be destroyed – have to; have no choice. To defeat ISIS, we must use military warfare, but also cyber warfare, financial warfare and ideological warfare. It's a whole different ballgame today than it was 50 years ago and 200 years ago – different world. We must also establish a bipartisan goal in the United States and an international goal with our allies of defeating radical Islamic terrorism – words that our president won't use and words that Hillary Clinton won't use. Just like we won the Cold War by identifying our enemy and building a consensus to guide a long-term strategy, so too must we do the same with Islamic terrorism. By the way, President Obama has allowed Syrian refugees to pour into our country at unbelievable rates. And Hillary Clinton wants to allow 550 percent more. But it's almost impossible to get a Christian in from Syria. They take others, but they don't take Christians – very rare, very rare. So I said that we need to make safe zones in the region. We want to take care of people. But we absolutely cannot allow this potential tremendous threat to continue, and we have to stop this. This is going to be potentially a catastrophe for our country. It's from within. This could be the all-time great Trojan horse. This could be it. You ever notice on the – you look at the migration trail and you see people with cellphones. cellphones. And some of the cellphones have the ISIS flag printed on them. And some of them have things far worse than that – scenes far worse than that. So it was the failed policies, you have to remember, of Hillary Clinton and Obama that unleashed ISIS in the first place. If they did the right thing, you wouldn't be talking about ISIS right now. Now she wants to get rid of – oh, we're *gonna* get rid of them. You know, she tells them already there will be no boots on the ground. Now, even if you don't want boots on the ground, you don't want to say it. Don't say it! Now they're saying, oh, I hope she wins. Oh, boy, would they dream of having her as president. Can you *imagine* – they dream about it every night, having Hillary Clinton. But even if you believe – and I can understand that. No boots on the ground, I can understand. You don't say it! Let them think they're *gonna* go through hell. Don't say it! Can you imagine the great General Douglas MacArthur, can you imagine the great General George Patton, or one of our great generals that we have today – General Flynn, who's here someplace – I love General Flynn – but can you imagine these

people saying – I mean, they’re basically giving out the strategy: there will be no boots on the ground. If you don’t want that, I fully understand. Don’t say it! Don’t say it!

(A.3.326) Could you imagine MacArthur saying we’re *gonna* fight the enemy, and we’re *gonna* move our troops in in about a month, we’re *gonna* hit from behind?  
(00:31:55–00:32:03)

(A.3.327) We’re *gonna* hit them from the front, then – and everything they say turns out to be true? (00:32:08–00:32:10)

You know, I hate to say this because we have a lot of Evangelicals in this room, but maybe we shouldn’t be so honest when it comes to military strategy.

(A.3.328) Does that make sense? (00:32:19–00:32:20)

Hope I didn’t lose your vote for saying that. Just look at what her policies have left us with in Iraq, Syria and Libya. The problem is Hillary Clinton is trigger-happy. She really is. She’s trigger-happy, and yet she says no boots, which is sort of – probably will be boots, you know. Probably will turn out to be another disaster. Her tenure has brought us only war and destruction and death. She’s just too quick to intervene, invade, or to push for regime change with people we don’t even know who they are. And they take over, and they’re far worse. This creates the power vacuums that are filled by terrorist and groups like ISIS. My administration, on the other hand, will work with any country that is willing to partner with us to defeat ISIS and halt radical Islamic terrorism. And by the way, that includes Russia. If they want to join us on knocking out ISIS, that is just fine as far as I’m concerned. It’s a very imperfect world, and you can’t always choose your friends. That’s life. But you can never fail to recognize your enemies. We have some real enemies. Unfortunately for our country, our enemies probably hacked into Hillary Clinton’s emails. These are the same emails she destroyed after receiving a federal subpoena.

(A.3.329) What’s that? (00:34:14–00:34:15)

Using software in order to bleach the emails so you can never, ever see them. She even mysteriously lost 13 different phones before the FBI got them, and many were destroyed with a hammer.

(A.3.330) Did anybody ever hit a hammer? (00:34:42–00:34:44)

– you know, maybe two or three people, but they were just released from prison, those two people.

(A.3.331) Can you believe this? (00:34:52–00:34:53)

Destroyed them with a hammer – the old-fashioned way, I guess.

(A.3.332) The other night in the Commander in Chief Forum – did anybody see that?  
(00:35:03–00:35:04)

(A.3.333) How did I do? (00:35:07–00:35:08)

Good. Well, we have a big debate coming up.

(A.3.334) Who knows what's *gonna* happen there? (00:35:14–00:35:15)

But I will say, every poll has me winning big league at the Commander in Chief. We had – the polls came out after that event and we won big league. Now we have a debate coming up.

(A.3.335) I don't imagine any of you *gonna* be watching the debate, right? (00:35:31–  
00:35:31)

[Audience: Don't take her bait. Don't take her bait.] I won't; I promise. Hillary Clinton answered questions on her emails horribly. That's why she lost. That's why she did so poorly. She was terrible. She was – honestly, I shouldn't be saying this – she was terrible. She keeps talking about the emails. Every time she talks about them, she talks about them differently. It seems each week, true, she has, like, a different answer. But there can be no answer when she deletes 33,000 emails, bleaches them so they can never be recovered – an unheard-of practice – hammers them into total silence. You know *what's happening*. You know what's happening. I always say, getting away with that will be the single greatest accomplishment of her career. It's true. It's true. So her answers were bad. They were bad. And a lot of people said they were so totally dishonest. And you know, she was blaming Matt Lauer. I thought Matt Lauer did a very good job. I mean, his questions to me were very tough. But the gentleman who stood up and said: Honestly, you should be in prison for what you did – [jeers] – to me, that was the tough one.

(A.3.336) That was the tough – hey, that was a tough question. It was sort of a question in the form of a statement, right? (00:37:10–00:37:10)

Hillary Clinton is unfit to be our president, for many reasons. True. True. She's unfit for many reasons, the biggest of which is her judgement. It's just so bad. It's time to *restore honesty* and integrity to our government. Have to do it. And one more issue, final issue I want to discuss today is the economy, and helping those in need. There is no more charitable group in this country than Christians. And all of us, true – and all of us here today are determined to lift suffering Americans out of poverty. *Gonna* do it, with a lot of other people *gonna* help. As your president, I will pursue a complete reform of our economy to bring back millions of new jobs into our country – millions of new jobs. We've lost our jobs like we're a bunch of babies. They've gone to other countries. They've gone to Mexico. They've gone to many other countries. China's taking massive advantage of us. It's all so easy, believe me. It's all so easy. That includes, we will be doing massive tax cuts for working families and for businesses. It includes, very importantly, the elimination of all needless job-killing regulations. It includes lifting the restrictions on American energy, which is under siege. I will also renegotiate NAFTA. And if they don't want to renegotiate it so it becomes a two-way highway, not just a one-way highway out of the United States for our companies and our jobs, we will terminate NAFTA, believe me. We'll stand up to China, and we're *gonna* fight for every last job. It's *gonna* be America first, and it's *gonna* be the American worker first. Crucially, I will also fight for the American family and American family values. The family must be at the center of any anti-poverty agenda. Has to be. Thank you. Our country just lost one of the great champions for the American family, Phyllis Schlafly. Great woman, really great woman. We send our thoughts and prayers to her loved ones. I will be going to her funeral tomorrow in St. Louis. Phyllis fought very hard to the very end for a free and prosperous America. She understood that, to be truly united as a country, we can't simply turn to government or to politicians. The bedrock of our unity is the realization that we are all brothers and sisters created by the same God. Phyllis understood that. Phyllis understood that. And by the way, Phyllis endorsed me a long time ago, when it wasn't necessarily – something that was so easy to do. And she was incredible. She was so brave. She endorsed me, and that was not the thing to do at the time.

(A.3.337) People said, Trump? (00:41:46–00:41:46)

She said, he's going to win, you don't understand. He knows how to win. He's going to win. They said, Phyllis, not *gonna* be Trump. And we went boom, boom, boom. But I will tell you,

Phyllis endorsed me at a time when it wasn't necessarily the thing to do, even the popular thing to do, and I will never forget that. That had a huge impact. She was a great, great, powerful woman with a tremendous heart. And I look forward to being with her family tomorrow, because you really – that's a celebration. She was 92 years old. We are all equal, and we all come from the same Creator. If we remember that simple fact, then our future is truly limitless. There is nothing we as Americans can't do. There's a biblical verse that *I've* often read, and I want to repeat it again because I think it is so important to what we're trying to achieve right now for our country. It's from 1 John, Chapter 4: "No one has ever seen God; but if we love one another, God lives in us, and His love is made complete in us." [Audience: Amen.] So true. So true. Imagine what our country could accomplish if we started working together as one people under one God, saluting one flag. It's time to stop quibbling over the smallest words and time to start dreaming about the great adventures that lie ahead for our country. This is my promise to all of you: starting in 2017, we will be one American nation. It's time to break our ties with the bitter failures of the past and to embrace a new American future. Have to do it. Together, we will make America believe again, we will make America united again, and we will make America great again. Thank you very much, and God bless you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much.

## Speech 10

### Remarks to the Economic Club of New York at the Waldorf Astoria in New York City, 15 September 2016

*Well, thank you very much ladies and gentlemen. It's a great honor to be with you. And we had some really incredible things happened today. The polls are coming out, we're leading in so many polls, I can tell you. I don't know where to begin. But that's a good feeling. And we are – I guess CNN just came out – we're leading nationwide with CNN. We're leading in Ohio and we're leading just – I think it just came out. We're leading in, we're leading in North Carolina, Florida, we're leading and we're having a lot of fun. We're having a lot of fun on the campaign and on the trail. I just wanted to say that, and it's always a lot of fun when you come up and the people don't have the teleprompter working, but that's okay. Lucky I brought some notes. But today I do wanna outline a plan for American economic revival. And it's a bold and ambitious and forward looking plan to massively increase jobs, wages, income and opportunities for the people of our country. Great people of our country, I will tell you. My plan will embrace the truth that people flourish under a minimum government burden. And we'll tap into the incredible unrealized potential of our workers and their dreams. Right now, 92 million Americans are on the sideline, outside of the workforce, and they're not a part of our economy. It's a silent nation of jobless Americans. And look no further, and I mean no further, all you have to do is look at Flint, where I spent a lot of time. The city of Flint. and what a disaster has taken place. The jobs have been stripped from the community, and its infrastructure has totally collapsed. In 1970, there were more than 80,000 people in Flint working for General Motors – today it is less than 8,000 dollars. We have 8,000 people and that's going down. And they're making very, very little. And people are trying to go down to that \$8,000 mark. What we're doing is – Ford, Ford has announced, just yesterday, that they're moving their small car production facilities to Mexico. And I've been talking about this a long while and I think that's maybe one of the reasons that we're doing so well in Ohio and Michigan and lots of other places where cars and parts are involved. But to think that Ford is moving its small car division is a disgrace. It's disgraceful. It's disgraceful that our politicians allow them to get away with it. It really is. It used to be cars were made in Flint and you couldn't drink the water in Mexico. Now, the cars are made in Mexico and you can't drink the water in Flint. But we are going to turn this around. My economic plan rejects the*

cynicism that says our labor force will keep declining, that our jobs will keep leaving, and that our economy can never grow as it did once before. *And boy, oh boy did it use to grow.* We reject the pessimism that says our standard of living can no longer rise, and *that's all there is, really, left to divide.* Because frankly, we're looking at an economy now of no growth and redistribution of wealth and that's not going to work. Everything that is broken today can be fixed, and every failure can be turned into a *truly* great success. *Just look at the way I just melted into the teleprompter that just went on.*

(A.3.338) *Who else is gonna pull that off, okay? (00:04:49–00:04:52)*

(A.3.339) *Who else? (00:04:49–00:04:52)*

Jobs can stop leaving our country, and *they will just absolutely* start pouring in. *Can happen.* Failing schools can become flourishing schools. Crumbling roads and bridges can become gleaming new infrastructure. Inner cities can experience a flood of new jobs and investment. And rising crime can give way to safe and prosperous communities. All of these things, and so much more, are possible. But to accomplish them, we must replace the present policy of globalism – which has moved – *it just has taken so many jobs out of our community* and so much wealth out of our country – and replace it with a new policy of Americanism. *America First. Remember that.*

(A.3.340) Under this American System, every policy decision we make must pass a simple test: does it create more jobs and better wages for Americans? (00:06:03–00:06:07)

*It's a test.* If we lower our taxes, remove destructive regulations – *and we have to do that* – unleash the vast treasure of American energy, and negotiate trade deals that put America First, then there is no limit to the number of jobs we can create and the amount of prosperity we can unleash. America will truly be the greatest place in the world to invest, hire, grow and to create new jobs, new technologies, and entire new industries. 6.43 *Instead – Thank you.* Instead of driving jobs and wealth away, America will become the world's great magnet for innovation and job creation. My opponent's plan rejects this optimism. She offers only more taxing, – *and her tax increases are unbelievable* – more regulating, more spending and more wealth redistribution – a future of slow growth, declining incomes, and dwindling prosperity. The only people who get rich under Hillary Clinton's are the donors and the special interests. *But bad for a country.* In Hillary Clinton's America, we have surrendered our status as the

world's great economy, and we have surrendered our middle class to the whims of foreign countries. *We take care of them better than we take care of ourselves.* Not one single idea *she's got* will create one net American job, or create one new dollar of American wealth for our workers. The only thing she can offer is a welfare check. *That's about it.* Our plan will produce paychecks, and they're going to be great paychecks for millions of people now unemployed *or underemployed.* In the course of this campaign, I've travelled all across *the* country and I've met the most amazing people. Every day, I've seen the goodness and character of our country, and brave citizens proudly fighting through hard times and difficult circumstances. *I have been all over this country folks and we have unbelievable people. But they need leadership. The country needs leadership.* In many parts of our country, the hard times never seem to end. I've visited cities and towns in upstate New York where half of the jobs have left and moved to *Mexico and* other countries. *The businesses are gone, they'd been taken away like taking candy from a baby.* Politicians have abandoned these places all over the country and the people who live there. *Are just there. No hope.* Worse still, politicians have heaped scorn and disdain on these wonderful Americans.

(A.3.341) My opponent described tens of millions of American citizens as deplorable and irredeemable, *just last week* – so how can Hillary Clinton seek to lead this country when she considers its citizens – *tremendous, tremendous numbers of them* – beyond redemption? (00:09:43–00:09:54)

The hardworking people she calls deplorable are the most admirable people I know: they're cops *they're cops* and soldiers, teachers and firefighters, young and old, moms and dads, blacks *and* whites, Latinos – above everything else, they're American. *Some are rich Americans, some are poor Americans. They're Americans.* They love their families, they love their country, and they want a better future. These are the forgotten men and women *of our country. And they have been forgotten.* People who work hard but don't have a voice. I'm running to be their voice, and to fight and bring prosperity to every part of this country. Too many of our leaders have forgotten that it's their duty to protect the jobs, wages and well-being of American workers before any consideration. *Before anything. We have to do that.* I'm not running to be *the* President of the world. I'm running to be *the* President of the United States *of America* – and as your President, I will fight for every last American job *and every American company which really* – *a lot of companies in this room, I can tell you. We're*

*gonna be fighting for you. Because you bring in the jobs. We are a nation that tamed the West, dug out the Panama Canal, and won two World Wars, and put a man on the moon. It's time to start thinking big once again. That's why I believe it is time to establish a national goal of reaching 4% economic growth. And my great economists don't want me to say this but I think we can do better than that. Now they're upset, they'll be very upset. But I think we can do and maybe substantially better than that.* In working with my economic team, we've put together a plan that puts us on track to achieve that goal. Over the next ten years, our economic team estimates that under our plan the economy will average 3.5% growth and create a total of 25 million new jobs. You can visit our website, *just look at the math. It works.* This growth means that our jobs *and plans*, including our childcare reforms, *that Ivanka Trump, my daughter is so involved in, will be complete – I like her too –* will be completely paid – for in combination with proposed budget savings. It will be deficit neutral. If we reach 4% growth, it will reduce the deficit. It will be accomplished through a complete overhaul of our tax, regulatory, energy and trade policies. Right now, under *the* Obama-Clinton policies, the economy grew only 1.1 percent last quarter – *a number that was shocking to people that do this professionally and for life. It translates into millions of lost jobs. And certainly millions of lost good jobs. Because we don't have good jobs anymore. Those jobs are gone and going.* This is the weakest so-called recovery since the Great Depression. Over the last 7 years, the economy grew only 2.1 percent, the slowest period in seventy 7, 0, *seventy* years. Had the economy grown under Obama at the same rate as Reagan, it would have meant 10 million more jobs. Perhaps most shockingly, 1 in 6 men aged 18-34 are either in jail or out of work. Meanwhile, another 2 million Hispanic-Americans have been added to the ranks of those in poverty. On top of it all, the Obama-Clinton policies have doubled the national debt. It took more than 230 years for the United States to accumulate its first 10 trillion dollars in debt – it took President Obama *less than* eight years to add another \$10 trillion. Now, it would be one thing if that money had been used to completely rebuild our nation, our military, our infrastructure. *But, that didn't happen.* Instead, the opposite happened. We doubled our debt and, in return, we have dilapidated infrastructure, failing schools, a badly depleted military, – *greatest people on earth and they have a badly depleted military. Its equipment, old and tired.* And another 14 million people who have left the workforce. Never has so much money been spent so poorly *and so unwisely.* But we're going to turn that all around. *And here's how.* It begins with bold new tax reform. *Don't worry they're going down not up.*

*They're going down. Think you were concerned they're going up.* As outlined in Detroit, our tax plan will greatly simplify the code and reduce the number of brackets from 7 to 3. The new brackets will be 12, 25 and 33 percent, but low-income Americans will pay no income tax at all – in fact, our plan will remove millions and millions of workers from the income tax roll entirely. *So that all of that work that we're doing in Washington can be discontinued. They'll pay tax. They'll pay tax but they'll pay tax when they start making a certain amount of income.* By lowering rates, streamlining deductions, and simplifying the process, we will add millions *and millions* of new jobs. In addition, because we have strongly capped deductions for the wealthy and closed special interest loopholes, the tax relief will be concentrated on the working and middle class taxpayer. They will receive the biggest benefit – and it won't even be close. *They have been forgotten. We are not going to forget them. They have built our country. We will not forget.* This is a working – thank you– This is a working and middle class tax relief proposal. The tax relief for these workers will be expanded by my childcare proposals that I have worked on with my daughter, Ivanka. These proposals are a central *and a very, very powerful central* element of our comprehensive tax reform and economic growth plan. Families will be able to fully deduct the average cost of childcare from their taxes, including stay-at-home parents. Because this deduction is capped, it will *be disproportionately and it will* benefit working and middle class families. *Gonna take care of our middle class families.* The less you make, the larger a share of your income you can exclude from taxation. Parents will also be able to enroll *a* tax-free dependent care savings accounts for their children or elderly relatives. Low-income households will benefit from both an Expanded Earned Income Tax Credit – in the form of *Childcare rebates* – and a matching \$500 contribution for their savings accounts. A married couple earning \$50,000 per year with two children and \$8,000 in childcare expenses will save 35% from their current tax bill. *That's a tremendous saving. And they'll have a better life.* A married couple earning \$75,000 per year with two children and \$10,000 in childcare expenses will receive a 30% reduction in their tax bill *from what they're paying right now.* By contrast, someone earning \$5 million – *like the people in this room* – will receive virtually no change in their tax bill at all. One of our greatest job creation measures is going to be our 15% business tax rate – down from the current 35% rate, a reduction of more than 40 percent. *I know that's what you people have been waiting for.* An explosion of new businesses and new jobs will be created. It will be amazing to watch. *You watch and it will happen.* We will also allow U.S.-based

manufacturers to fully expense the cost of new plants and equipment. *Big, big deal.* On top of that, we will bring back trillions in business wealth *and this is wealth that's parked overseas, nobody knows how much it is. They say it's 2.5 trillion, I have people that think it's 5 trillion dollars. We'll bring them back and it'll be taxed only at the rate of 10%, instead of 35%*

(A.3.342) *And who would bring it back at 35%? (00:21:02–00:21:05)*

*Obviously nobody because nobody is doing it. I think it's going to be something that will be so phenomenal, far beyond what people even think. By taxing it at 10% instead of 35% all of this money will come roaring back into our country and lots of good things will start to happen.* We will turn America into a *new* magnet for new jobs – and that means jobs in our poorest communities. *So important. And right now, we have companies leaving the country because taxes are too high but we actually have companies leaving the country to get their money. And that's a first. Nobody has ever heard of that one before but believe me that's happened.* Next, comes regulations. One of the keys to unlocking growth is scaling-back years of disastrous regulations unilaterally imposed by our out-of-control *bureaucrats.* Regulations have grown into a massive, job-killing industry – and the regulation industry is one business I will *absolutely put to an end, day one.* In 2015 alone, federal agencies issued over 3,300 final rules and regulations, up from 2,400 the prior year. Every year, overregulation costs our economy 2 trillion dollars a year and reduces household wealth by almost 15,000 dollars. I've proposed a moratorium on new federal regulations that are not compelled by Congress or public safety, and I will eliminate all needless and job-killing regulations now on the books *and there are plenty of them.* This includes eliminating some of our most intrusive regulations, like the Waters of The U.S. Rule. It also means scrapping the EPA's so-called Clean Power Plan which the government itself estimates will cost 7.2 billion a year. This Obama-Clinton directive will shut down most, if not all, coal-powered electricity plans – *I mean all over the country they're shutting down.*

(A.3.343) Remember what Hillary Clinton said? (00:23:37–00:23:39)

She wants to shut down the miners, just like she wants to shut down the steel mills *and shut down the steel workers and we're not gonna let it happen.* We're going to put our great miners and steel workers back to work. Energy reform is central to our plan as well According to Heritage Foundation, by 2030, President Obama's energy restrictions will eliminate another half a million manufacturing jobs, reduce economic output by 2.5 trillion dollars, and reduce

incomes by 7,000 dollars per person. *And today you have workers, and I see them all the time and I meet them all the time. And they're part of this massive group of people that have just come onto this movement. But you have workers making less money today than they made 18 years ago in real wages. They're working much harder, oftentimes because of the disastrous Obamacare that we're gonna to repeal and replace. Oftentimes, they're working two jobs. So they're working harder, they're older and they're making less. It's like me, I'm working harder than I've ever worked also. But these are minor – nobody cares about that.*

(A.3.344) *That's not – who cares about that? (00:25:02–00:25:03)*

Hillary Clinton wants to go even further, and her plan could cost the economy 5 trillion dollars. A Trump Administration will lift restrictions on all sources of American energy production. According to the Institute for American Energy Resources this will: increase *the GDP* by more than \$100 billion annually, add over 500,000 new jobs annually, increase annual wages by more than \$30 billion over the next 7 years, increase federal, state, local tax revenues by almost \$6 trillion over 4 decades, increase total economic activity by more than \$20 trillion over *a 40 year period*. In addition, we will streamline the permitting process for all energy infrastructure projects, *which are desperately needed*, including the billions of dollars in projects held up by President Obama – *currently being held up, they just wanna proof anything* – creating countless more jobs in the process.

(A.3.345) Finally, comes trade – the foundation for everything America's annual trade deficit with the world is now almost \$800 billion a year – *who is negotiating these deals?* (00:26:35–00:26:39)

(A.3.346) Anybody in this room negotiating these wonderful deals? (00:26:35–00:26:39)

Think of it; we have a trade deficit of almost \$800 billion a year. That's gonna change so fast. Between World War I and the year 2000, the United States averaged a 3.5% growth rate. But, after China joined the World Trade Organization, our average growth rate has been reduced to only 2 percent. Predatory trade practices, product dumping, currency manipulation – *which is a big one*- and intellectual property theft have taken millions of jobs and trillions of dollars in wealth *right out of our country. Right out of our country. So sad that we allowed this to happen. Our incompetent politicians were not watching. And the ones that were watching were taken care of in some form because this should have never allowed – been*

*allowed to have happened.* It is no great secret that many of the special interests funding my opponent's campaign are the same people profiting from these terrible trade deals. *They are terrible, they're terrible for everybody.* The same so-called experts advising Hillary Clinton are the same people who gave us NAFTA, China's entry into the World Trade Organization, the job-killing trade deal with South Korea, *another disaster,* and now the Trans-Pacific Partnership *that they're pushing so strongly.* The verdict is in. All of the special interests that the media race *and they just raced the comment and raced to get comment from* – have been proven wrong over such a long period of time. Every single deal they've promoted – every lie and every prediction has crashed, *it just crashed, they've been so absolutely wrong and they've been so bad for our country.* Our manufacturing base has crumbled, communities have been hollowed out, wages have declined, and households are making less today than they were in the year 2000. I've proposed a detailed plan to reform our trade policies and bring vast new jobs and wealth to America. *We need our wealth back. We don't have wealth, we are a deader nation.* This includes the following steps: I'm going to direct the Secretary of Commerce to identify every violation of trade agreements *that a foreign country is using to harm our country and our workers. And that's what's happening. They're being harmed and our country is being harmed.* I will use every tool under American and international law to end these abuses, and *I will use our greatest business leaders and finest negotiators – and I will tell you; some of them are in this room right now. Not all of them but some of them. And I know who you are and, honestly, we're gonna be calling on you because we have people negotiating the biggest deals in the world, far bigger than your company deals, your company deals are like little deals by comparison. We have – it's true. You take some of these big companies and you look at some of these trade deals. I hate to say it, but your companies are peanuts. But we're going to use our best. Right now we have political hacks, negotiating the biggest most important deals in the world.* We are going to start with NAFTA, which is causing so much damage to our country. We will entirely renegotiate NAFTA into a deal that will *either be a good one for us as a country and for our work or we will terminate it* until a brand new and productive deal can be signed. *We'll also, and we have to, we're going to keep America out of Trans-Pacific Partnership unless we can do something that's phenomenal and I'm not seeing it right now, I can tell you that. I'm not seeing it.* Next, I am going to instruct my Treasury Secretary to label China – *and I like China, they're my tenant. They buy condos all the time. They're just fine.*

(A.3.347) *But you know what? (00:31:24–00:31:25)*

*They are a currency manipulator, and we're gonna apply tariffs to any country that devalues its currency to gain an unfair advantage over the United States. They are a manipulator, grand master level, we can't allow it to happen and our people and our representatives and our politicians don't have even a little clue as to how to play the game. We have a trade deficit this year with China of approximately \$500 billion.*

(A.3.348) *What kind of a deal is that? (00:32:03–00:32:05)*

*And this has been going on for years. 200 billion, 300 billion, 400 billion, for years. I am going to instruct the U.S. Trade Representative to bring trade cases against China. China's unfair subsidy behavior is prohibited by the terms of its entrance into the WTO, and I intend to enforce the rules. And I'm sure we'll make a deal somewhere along the way. But they're not playing fairly and our politicians don't understand how to play the game. If China does not stop its illegal activities, including its theft of American trade secrets and intellectual properties, I will apply countervailing duties until China ceases and desists. You know what that means. Just the single action of enforcing intellectual property rules alone, just alone, would add millions of new American jobs. According to the U.S. International Trade Commission, improved protection of America's inter – just think of this; improved protection of Americas intellectual property in China would add 2 million jobs a year within the United States every single year. And we do nothing. We allow them to get away with it.*

(A.3.349) *Who can blame them? (00:33:35–00:33:36)*

*And I don't blame them at all. If you can get away with it – They gonna get away with it. We are going to stop the outflow of jobs from our country, and open a new highway of jobs back into our country. Here is how the plan adds up. We are proposing a \$4.4 trillion tax cut that will score as \$2.6 trillion under dynamic growth models, which is how taxes should be scored. This includes the childcare plan that we announced the other day. Our economic team has further modeled that the growth – induced savings from trade, energy and regulation reform will shave at least another \$1.8 trillion off of the remaining debt. That leaves around \$800 billion dollars. This money can all be saved through simple, common sense reforms. If we just save one penny of each federal dollar spent on non-defense, and non-entitlement programs, we can save almost \$1 trillion over the next decade – one penny, we can all do that*

– *save over a trillion!* Again this is spending that does not touch defense, *because we have to build up our military which is so terribly depleted.* And that does not touch entitlements. If our plan exceeds the 3.5% ten-year growth average, then our jobs proposal will actually reduce – *and start really strongly* reducing the deficit. Savings will be compounded by the fact that people who are currently receiving unemployment or welfare will finally be able to find jobs. This is the most pro-growth, pro-jobs, pro-family plan put forth perhaps in the history of our country. This is what our new future will look like: I am going to lower you taxes – *very, very substantially.* I am going to get rid of massive amounts of unnecessary regulations, *all of these regulations on your* business and in your life; I’m going to unleash American energy; I’m going to repeal and replace Obamacare. I’m going to appoint Justices of the Supreme Court who will follow the Constitution. I’m going to rebuild our depleted military and take care of our vets *who are treated so badly. In many cases our vets are treated not nearly as well as people who come into our country illegally. We can’t have that.* I’m going to save your 2nd amendment which is under siege; I’m going to stop illegal immigration and drugs *from pouring* into our country, and *totally poisoning our youth and others. It’s a tremendous problem.* And yes, we will build the wall, *the wall will be built and just in case you’re worried about who’s gonna pay for it; Mexico will pay for it. I’m being totally serious about that. Mexico will pay for that and you understand. Mexico by the way we’ll look at the trade deficit we have with Mexico, it’s massive. The wall is peanuts compared to what we’re talking about. Mexico will pay for the wall.* And I’m going to renegotiate our disastrous trade deals, especially NAFTA – and we will only make great trade deals that put the American worker first *and put the American worker back to work. That includes* our miners and our steelworkers. *They’re going* back to work. We will rebuild our roads, *our* bridges, *our* tunnels, *our* highways, our airports, schools, hospitals. *We’ll rebuild everything.* American cars will travel the roads, American planes will *soar the skies*, and American ships will patrol the seas. American steel will send new skyscrapers into the clouds. American hands will rebuild this nation – and American energy, harvested from American sources, will power this nation. American workers will be hired to do the job. We will put new American metal *and new American steel* into the spine of this country. Jobs will return, incomes will rise, new factories will come rushing back to our shores. We will make America wealthy again. *We will make America strong again. And we will make America great again. Thank you very much. God bless you! Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you.*

## Speech 11

### Remarks at Prescott Valley Event Center in Prescott Valley, Arizona, 04 October 2016

Thank you *everybody*. Thank you. I am so thrilled to be back in Arizona. *And I just wrote the line, I went outside. They say they have 15,000 to 20,000 people outside, I've never seen anything like it. Except at other Trump Rallys. Pretty amazing. And they're watching on a big screen and I just wanna thank them very much. They're all outside, it's a little bit hot. That line is very long but all of the folks outside, we wanna thank you very much. We love you, thank you. And if anybody in this room would like to give up their place to some of the people outside, please raise your hand. Raise your hands.* In 35 days, we are going to win this state and we are going to win *back* the White House. *We're going to make America Rich again. We're going to make America Rich again* I am going to end illegal immigration, stop the massive inflow of refugees, keep *the* jobs from pouring out of our country – *they're going one way and it's only out – our* disastrous trade deals, and massively reduce taxes – *and I will tell you; we are going to reduce taxes big league.* And regulations on our workers and small businesses *will be cut in half or more than that.* Thank you. My economic agenda is very *very* simple: jobs, jobs, jobs. I want to send our best wishes to *our* great governor Mike Pence, as he prepares for his debate tonight. *Great guy.* The debate will be a contrast between our campaign of big ideas and bold solutions for tomorrow, versus the small and petty Clinton campaign that is *totally* stuck in the past. *Totally stuck in the past.* We are change – she is *for* four more years of Obama *and we can't take that.* Clinton can't talk about the real problems facing our country because she's the one who helped create all of *those* problems in the first place. *They're not gonna be able to do anything about it.* To hide her corruption, she deleted 33,000 emails after *getting* a congressional subpoena.

(A.3.350) *Wow, how did she get away with that one?* (00:04:36–00:04:54)

(A.3.351) *How did she get away with that?* (00:04:36–00:04:54)

*It's a disgrace.* Hillary Clinton has been there for 30 years, and hasn't fixed anything. *She talks and talks and talks.* In fact, she's just made things *a lot* worse – she failed *in* upstate New York, promising to create 200,000 jobs, but manufacturing is down *in New York state* by almost 40 percent. She failed overseas, unleashing death and destruction. And she failed Latinos and African-Americans, producing only more poverty in *our* inner cities.

(A.3.352) *By the way; Is there any place that's more fun or creative to be than a Trump Rally?*  
(00:06:47–00:06:53)

(A.3.353) *Right?* (00:06:47–00:06:53)

*And there's no place safer, believe me. There's no place safer. So now, after years of failure, she complains about how I've used the tax laws of this country to my benefit. Then I ask a simple question; why didn't she ever try to change those laws so I couldn't use them.*

(A.3.354) *You know why?* (00:07:26–00:07:27)

*She could have changed the laws when she was in the United States Senate but she didn't. She named a few buildings, that's all she did. The reason that she did not do that is her donors and contributors have used those same tax laws as I did. The same way. I know all of their names, and I know who they are, but it's not up to me to make them public figures. But just check it out. Two public Hillary supporters who are known are George Soros, who declared losses of \$1.5 billion. Soros declared 1.5 losses, \$1.5 billion in just six months, and Warren Buffet declared \$873 million.*

(A.3.355) *Ask him; did they write of those losses?* (00:08:27–00:08:30)

(A.3.356) *Oh, I doubt it. Right?* (00:08:27–00:08:30)

*Oh, I doubt it. And there are many many more. Many many more. We could go through a long list but just take a look at her donors. I know how the tax code works better than anyone, and I am going to fix it so it is fair, and just, and works for you, works for you. These politicians, folks, don't have a clue and if they do, they can't do it because their donors won't let them. Remember, I'm my donor. I'm my donor. We have created a movement. A movement like has never been seen in this country before. A movement that even our enemies back there, look at all that press. Among the most dishonest people in the world. But even our enemies in the press say it's one of the great political phenomena's of all time in the history of our country. But we have to get out and vote on November 8th or frankly, this movement was just a waste of time, energy and money. We have to get out and vote. And do your early ballots if you can. I've made my money as a very-successful private businessperson following the laws of our country. Hillary Clinton made her money as a corrupt public official violating the law and putting her government office up for sale. Remember she left the White House, they said they were broke and now they're worth \$250 million.*

(A.3.357) *How did that happen?* (00:10:13–00:10:14)

The problems we face as a country are immense, and it is going to take bold action to turn things around. Right now, we owe \$20 trillion in debt. It doubled under President Obama. *Doubled.* Our infrastructure – *roads and everything* – is like a third-world country. The homicide rate last year experienced *in its largest cities* single-year increase, *it's the biggest* in 45 years. *Think of that; The biggest single increase, 45 years. Homicide, 45 years biggest increase.* Our border is wide open, and drugs and criminal cartels are pouring into the country. *And nobody knows that better than the people of Arizona. Nobody. And we're gonna stop it. We're gonna stop it, fast. We're gonna build the wall. Mexico's gonna pay for the wall. We're gonna stop the drugs from pouring into Arizona and every other state in our union. Poisoning our youth. We're gonna stop it and I want to thank Sheriff Joe who has been a supporter right from the beginning. Thank you Sheriff Joe. And I wanna thank the border patrol and ICE, both of them gave us their endorsement. They've never done it to any president or candidate before. So Sheriff Joe, border patrol 16,500 border patrol agents and ICE. We wanna thank you for your endorsement. Amazing. They've never given it before. Thank you. Thank you.* Thousands of refugees are being admitted, with no way to screen them, and *they* are instantly made eligible for welfare and free healthcare – even as our own Veterans die waiting for medical care *that they desperately* need. Our annual trade deficit with the world is nearly \$800 billion a year.

(A.3.358) *Who the hell negotiates these deals?* (00:12:52–00:12:54)

*Oh it's gonna change, it's gonna change. Think of it; trade deficit almost \$800 billion a year. It's gonna change so fast.*

(A.3.359) *Have you watched the stock market?* (00:13:10–00:13:12)

*Whenever I do well in the polls, other countries their sort of stock goes down a little bit. Their stock goes down a little bit. It's not gonna be much but we wanna have a fair deal.*

(A.3.360) *We don't wanna lose \$800 billion, for what?* (00:13:26–00:13:31)

(A.3.361) *For what?* (00:13:26–00:13:31)

*Remember this folks; America first, America first. It's about time. America first.* The federal budget is *a complete and total* disaster. Our State Department, mostly under the watch of

*crooked* Hillary Clinton, misplaced – *listen to that, misplaced* – or lost \$6 billion in taxpayer funds.

(A.3.362) *How do you misplace \$6 billion?* (00:14:22–00:14:25)

We have the worst recovery – *and I say so-called recovery* – since the Great Depression. *The worst. We're not growing as a nation. We're down to 1%. You know if China goes down to 7% or 8% it's like a national catastrophe. They start devaluing their currency, they do all sorts of things to take more business out of our heights. We're at 1%, 1% and we act like; Oh it's wonderful. Let me tell you folks; we're in a bubble and we have to be very very careful. And we need strong leadership and smart leadership. We need leadership that knows what's happening.* We are a nation divided, with race riots in the street. *You look at what's going on. Race riots in the street.* Our college students graduate, loaded with debt, only to discover they can't find jobs – or certainly not the jobs they're trained for. *Or the jobs they want.* Overseas, our failed leaders have empowered Iran, *Iran was nothing three years ago. And now, they're telling us what to do.*

(A.3.363) *How do you figure that?* (00:15:43–00:15:44)

*They were nothing. And they are on their way very easily to nuclear weapons because of one of the dumbest deals in the history of our country. That deal with Iran is a disgrace. We've unleashed ISIS that came out of the vacuum created by Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton the way they got the troops out. We've turned Iraq, Libya and Syria into total chaos. 16.13 Our allies aren't paying their fair share for military protection, foreign countries like Russia and China do not respect us, you saw just today; Russia broke the deal on peace in Syria. Russia. No respect for this country. They have no respect for our leadership, they have no respect. Putin has no respect for Hillary Clinton and no respect for Obama. Russia broke the deal and now they're shooting, they're bombing. Something like that should end and it should end fast. It's very sad. But they don't respect us and our taxpaying citizens send troops and foreign aid all over the world even as their own cities can't provide the most basic services. America needs a turnaround and needs a turnaround fast. America needs a comeback. America needs change, change. And that's why I am running. That's why I'm running.* First, we are going to repeal and replace Obamacare. The architect of Obamacare – *you remember this from two years ago* – , Jonathan Gruber, admitted – *in front of a group of his so-called friends.*

*Unfortunately, one of his friends wasn't so friendly – admitted that the whole sales pitch on Obamacare was a lie – he called it the “stupidity of the American voter.”*

(A.3.364) *Do you remember that?* (00:18:17–00:18:18)

But the only stupidity was the stupidity of our leaders who passed this disaster into law over the objections of the American people. *And it was all a big lie because without the lies it would have never passed. Even the democrats would not have voted for it.*

(A.3.365) President Obama said ‘if you like your doctor you can keep your doctor’, *remember?* (00:18:38–00:18:43)

He promised his plan would reduce premiums by \$2,500 dollars. Instead, they *went up by over \$5,000 and people can't afford it.*

(A.3.366) Now, *did you hear yesterday?* (00:19:00–00:19:03)

(A.3.367) *Did you hear yesterday?* (00:19:00–00:19:03)

*Of all people, maybe he's not a very good surrogate. I don't think so.* President Bill Clinton *came out* and told the truth about Obamacare. *This was yesterday.* He has absolutely trashed President Obama's signature legislation. Remember, Hillary Clinton called Obamacare “one of the greatest accomplishments of President Obama, of the Democratic Party *and* of our country.” *Give me a break.*

(A.3.368) *You see what's happening with your premiums?* (00:19:41–00:19:43)

*They're going through the roof. Somewhere up 60, 70, 80%. But* Bill Clinton has a *much* different view. *This was yesterday.* Here is what Bill said: He just said it *was* a “crazy system,” where people end up with “premiums doubled and coverage cut in half.” *He's right.* He said “it's the craziest thing in the world.” *These are exact quotes by the way, I'm not like you know like – these are exact.* Bill Clinton said: “people out there [are] busting it, sometimes 60 hours a week, [and] wind up with their premiums doubled and their coverage cut in half... the people getting killed in this deal are the small business people and the individuals who make just a bit too much money” – *and just they need the subsidies.* They have to get help. He said; they're making just a bit too much. He's actually right. Right? Clinton added that it “doesn't make any sense,” and that “the insurance model doesn't work.” *Now, I've been saying that for a long time. At least he's honest, he's very late. In the meantime, she wants to double down on Obamacare. I'll bet he went through hell last night.*

(A.3.369) *Can you imagine? (00:21:08–00:21:21)*

(A.3.370) *Can you imagine? (00:21:08–00:21:21)*

(A.3.371) *Can you imagine what he went through after making that statement? (00:21:08–00:21:21)*

*He went through hell. But you know, honestly, there had been many nights when he's gone through hell with Hillary, in all fairness. True. Well, I wanna thank him, honestly, for being honest. I wanna thank him. For – cause that's it! It's not a great secret, that's it! Exactly what he said is it! Which is why, on my first day in office, I am going to ask a Republican Congress to send me a bill to immediately repeal and replace Obamacare.*

(A.3.372) *Right? (00:22:04–00:22:05)*

*This is essential for Arizona. Because of Obamacare, most of the state will only have one carrier next year, if you can believe that, they're all leaving all the insurance companies are pulling out and premiums are expected to go way above 50% next year. Good luck, folks. You better hope Trump wins, I'll tell you what. You better hope. You better hope. You better get out there and vote. 50%. And by the way above 50% and your deductible is so high, you'll never be able to use it, hopefully. Unless it's a really low, slow, violent death. Because otherwise you'll never be able to use it. Your deductible is so high that you'll never be able – see, you're paying far more and you're getting nothing. You never gonna be able to use it. Deductibles do high – early ballots are mailed out on October 12th in Arizona, and you need to mail them back as soon as you can. Next – and very important for this state, and I love this state. You know this was were I made my first major speech when I decided to run for president. And we had, we had a massive crowd. And everybody was, like, surprised. Except for the people that were in the room and me. But everybody was surprised. You remember that – we had a crowd, I guess almost the size of this one. Because when we're double up outside and triple up, nothing is the size of this one. But we had a massive crowd. And a lot of people, like real professionals, like Drudge – he's a great guy – and others said; "I think we just met your next president." They couldn't believe it. And we went around. We had 17 people running. And one by one by one, and now we're down to one person. One person. One person! And it's a difference between making America great again and having a failed nation. Because she will create a failed nation. Four more years of Obamacare, we cannot take it. And I think she'll be*

worse. *I think she will actually be worse than President Obama. If that's possible. So next, we're going to unleash American energy. I just met with energy producers in Colorado, was in Colorado for the last day and a half, by the way the crowds were like this. The people here, the people there. The people in our country are amazing, they are great. They are great. Such incredible people. And these leaders in the energy field are pleading with the government to let them create jobs and wealth for the United States. But it's virtually impossible. As part our plan to reach 4% growth – and I think we can do much better than that – and create at least 25 million new jobs, we are going to lift the restrictions on shale, oil, natural gas, clean coal, and all forms of job-producing American energy. Fixing our trade deals will be the foundation of our economic revival. Do you remember in June 16th of last year, I ran. And one of the primary thing was immigration, illegal immigration, wall, okay. We know that. The other thing was fixing our trade deals. Because we are the worst, you know, we have the greatest negotiators in the world in our country but we don't use them. We use political hacks. And we're gonna fix our trade deals. China, Japan, and Europe are printing huge sums of money – the devaluation of currencies is staggering as to what it represents for our country, our businesses, and our citizens. They're taking our businesses away. They're taking our jobs away. We're not on a level playing field, and our politicians don't understand what the hell is going on. They don't understand it.*

(A.3.373) *And the ones that do aren't gonna do anything about it because they're taking care of by the companies that are benefiting. Okay? (00:26:38–00:26:45)*

*They're not gonna do anything. Our jobs are being lost in massive numbers, and we are not making things in America anymore like we used to. Not even close, and we're gonna change that. Too much is being made in other countries. When I am President, we will start making things in America again. Companies like Apple and others, will start making their computers and iPhones in our country. Our nation has lost one-third of its manufacturing jobs since Bill Clinton signed NAFTA – one of the worst trade deals anytime, anywhere, any place And I'll tell you, that was a deal that was heavily supported by Hillary Clinton. The signing of NAFTA was perhaps the single worst trade deal ever made – not in this country, anywhere in the world. It wiped out huge sections of our manufacturing and other things. And believe me we're gonna do a lot about that. That's easy. Hillary's Korea deal also cost us another 100,000 jobs. She signed the deal with Korea, you know that, with South Korea And it was supposed to*

*be a wonderful deal. It turned out to be a wonderful deal. For South Korea. For us, it turned out to be catastrophic. Take a look at the jobs we lost on that one. Since China entered the World Trade Organization – another Bill and Hillary-backed deal – 70,000 factories have shut down or left the United States. When I saw that, I said; “Wait a minute. That has to be a misprint.*

(A.3.374) 70,000?

*That’s the correct number. 70,000 factories. Shut down. That’s 15 factories closing a day, on average. She did a great job. And you know, Bill Clinton, people think nicely – we all think nicely – what he did, he made it very tough for the people that followed him. That I can tell you. Never in history has a country surrendered so much of its wealth and jobs to foreign countries. As the factories leave, our money leaves with them. And our jobs disappear. Stores close, schools suffer, the tax base erodes, wages fall and the quality of life totally declines. We have people right now in this room who were making more money 18 years ago with one job, one good job that they loved. Their company laughed, their company fired them and left.*

(A.3.375) *Now they’re working harder, they’re older. Right? (00:29:53–00:29:57)*

(A.3.376) *They’re older, they have two jobs and sometimes three jobs instead of one and you know what?*

*They’re making less money. And the only thing I can say is; I’m also working harder, folks. Believe me. Believe me. If you think this isn’t work – this is work. But I see the end, I see the result and the result is; we are going to win on November 8th and we’re gonna make America great again. We’ve rebuilt other countries at the expense of our own. That’s not gonna happen anymore. And we’re gonna get along. We’re gonna get along with countries. I mean, look at China. China drains money out of us like we’re a bunch of babies. And yet, they built a massive military base in the South China Sea which they’re not supposed to be doing. So they take our money and then they do whatever they wanna do. Same thing – I mean look at Iran. We’ve given them, we’ve made them rich, we’ve made them strong, we’ve made them powerful so quickly. And then they taunt us, they capture our ten sellers/ (not sure), they taunt us. And they would have never given them back, except all of those payments started. The \$150 billion that they get back. Sorted. How about with Iran the \$400 million in cash and then it turned out to be wrong, it was actually \$1.7 billion, they say. In cash. That much cash will fill up that side of the arena. I wanna tell you; Nobody’s ever seen stupidity like it.*

(A.3.377) *And now? (00:31:42–00:31:45)*

(A.3.378) *What do they do? (00:31:42–00:31:45)*

(A.3.379) *What do they do? (00:31:42–00:31:45)*

*They were in such bad shape.*

(A.3.380) *What do they do? (00:31:47–00:31:48)*

*They taunt us by having their boats going around our cruises. They taunt us by having their jet fighters near our planes. So they feel emboldened instead of saying “thank you very much”. They feel emboldened. Well, we’re gonna make sure they do the right thing. I can tell you that folks. Gonna be a whole different ball game. Gonna be a whole different ball game. It is so sad to see what’s happened to our country. And that’s why I like Mike, our congressional medal of honor winner, what a great guy. We flew in together, what a great guy. The recipient of the congressional medal of honor – we have 21 and 200 admirals, think of this, 200 admirals and generals are endorsing us. Because they’re sick and tired of us being the weak and very stupid country. We are led by people that don’t have a clue. We’re led by a man that can’t use the term radical Islamic terrorism. It’s sad. Companies like Carrier, General Electric, Motorola, Mattel, Fiat Chrysler, and so many others are moving their jobs to Mexico, and other countries. And as you’re standing here right now, many of these companies are negotiating to leave the United States. Not gonna happen. And now, Ford has announced two weeks ago that it’s moving all of its small car transportation and production to Mexico. Think of it. That’s on top of the massive \$2 billion that they’re of /off – and you saw two years ago. And I think that’s why I’m gonna win Ohio and Michigan because two years ago – Alright, get him out. Get him out.*

(A.3.381) *Oh, doctor, is there a doctor in the house please?*

*Get a medic please. Thank you.*

(A.3.382) *A doctor please?*

*Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you very much.*

(A.3.383) *Is he okay?*

*He looks like a tough guy to me. Okay, thank you, thank you. Thank you very much. Good. Great guy. You know some of these people here have been waiting here ten hours. So, and it’s*

*hot. The other day they said on television; “Donald Trump was making a speech and it looked like he was sweating”. It was 109 degrees in the room I’m –*

(A.3.384) *What am I gonna do? (00:35:34–00:35:35)*

*It’s hot in this room too. Thank you very much, we love you man. Thank you. And that’s why I think we’re going to win the state of Michigan and Ohio because I’ve been talking about the car business and the car production capacity, moving to Mexico. I’ve been talking about it for six years. And you look at what’s happening. Mexico is like the eighth wonder of the world in terms of the factories they’re building. You know the story, I have a friend that builds plants. And he tells me what’s going on in Mexico is unbelievable, I say; What about the United States? He goes; Not so much. We’re gonna have that changed. We want Mexico to do great. I met with the president of Mexico, great guy. But we want Mexico to do great but you know, it’s gotta be a two way highway, doesn’t it? Has to be a two way highway. So we’re gonna bring back our car production, we’re gonna win Michigan, we’re gonna win Ohio. We’re way up in Ohio by the way. And we’re way up in Arizona from what I hear. We are going to renegotiate NAFTA and if we don’t get the deal we want, we will withdraw immediately from NAFTA and start all over again and we will create a much better trade deal. You know NAFTA is under a different tax system. They’re under a VAT system. And the deal is defective and it’s been that way for many years. And when we sell it to Mexico, we could charge the big fat tax. And what they’re selling to us, they get no tax. It’s a defective deal. That’s why you don’t see deals coming the opposite direction.*

(A.3.385) *So it’s been so defective, why didn’t people like Hillary Clinton and those people in office renegotiate that deal with Mexico right away? (00:37:40–00:37:47)*

(A.3.386) *Okay? (00:37:47–00:37:47)*

*Because you can’t have the deal that way. We are also going to stand up to foreign currency manipulation which is the single greatest threat that we have on our trade and there is nobody, nobody, that does it better than China. They are grant master. And we’re gonna apply tariffs and taxes to countries that cheat. It’s very simple. Jobs will leave from other countries and come back into the United States. Believe me. Factories will come rushing home, our schools and communities will be revitalized, and our poorest citizens will get new jobs at higher pay – and have brand new hope for their lives. And I wanna thanks – he’s here some place – governor Jan.*

(A.3.387) *Where's Jan?*

(A.3.388) *Where the hell is? (00:38:49–00:38:51)*

*Thank you governor. Thank you. But that's a good group with Sheriff Joe and that's a good – and Jeff and everybody. Thank you. And Joe, thank you. She's been such a great supporter right from the beginning and I wanna thank her. Really, thank you. But to be a rich nation, we must also be a secure nation.*

(A.3.389) *Security begins at the border, right Joe? (00:39:14–00:39:18)*

A nation that doesn't control its borders is not a nation *at all*. A country that doesn't protect its people *just* isn't a country. Our government that doesn't put its own – *and remember this – when a government doesn't put its own citizens first this is a government unworthy and unfit to lead its people. Totally. Look at the crime, look at the drugs, look at how our youth is being poisoned. Just poisoned. And not only our youth. But look at our youth has been poisoned by the drugs that flow in from our border. We're gonna stop that so fast, your heads will spin.* Here are some heartbreaking examples of how our government has failed our citizens. Countless Americans who have died in recent years would be alive today if not for the open border policies of *Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama*. – *She wants totally open – come on in everybody, come on in. Enjoy yourself. Pick up your healthcare, pick up your healthcare better than your veterans. Better than our veterans in many cases.* This includes incredible American lives like 21-year-old Sarah Root, *whose parent I've gotten to know and they're incredible people. Heartbreaking.* The man who killed her arrived at the border, entered federal custody, and then was released into a U.S. community under the policies of *Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton and this Administration*. He was released again after the crime, and now *he* is at large. *And nobody has any – any clue as to where he is.* Sarah had graduated from college *just the day before* with a 4.0 grade average, *she was number one in her class. And she died. A day after graduation. Killed by a vicious animal that should never ever have been out.* Also among the victims of the Obama-Clinton open border policies was Grant Ronnebeck, a 21 year-old convenience store clerk *from Mesa, Arizona*. He was murdered by an illegal immigrant gang member – *and by the way, day one: the gang members, the drug lords, all of – they're out! They're out. Day one. They're going back to the country that they came from. Which Hillary Clinton refused to do. She refused to pressure those countries to take these bad ones back. Because when we brought them back they said “we don't want them. We*

*don't want killers, we don't want them." She refused to take them – She refused to press. And so we take them back. Okay. Those countries will take these people back so fast you'll not even believe it.*

(A.3.390) *Okay? (00:43:06–00:43:07)*

*But he was killed by an illegal immigrant gang member previously convicted of burglary and other things who also had been released from Federal Custody. Another victim is Kate Steinle, gunned down in a Sanctuary City city. San Francisco by an illegal immigrant deported five previous times. Sanctuary cities will be defunded quickly quickly.. Then there is the case of 90 year-old Earl Olander, who was brutally beaten, savagely attacked and left to bleed to death in his home. The perpetrators were illegal immigrants with criminal records who did not meet the Obama Administration's priorities for removal. Even though everybody said get them out and get them out fast. In California, a 64-year old Air Force Veteran, Marilyn Pharis, was sexually assaulted and beaten to death with a hammer, violently. Her killer had been arrested on multiple occasions, but for whatever reason and nobody knows why, he was never deported. Also in California, my good friend, Jamiel Shaw, great guy, many of you have gotten to know Jamiel, lost his amazing son at the age of 17. Great football player, wonderful student going to get scholarships to colleges; He was walking home to see his father. He was viciously shot and killed by an illegal immigrant with three gun charges, as well as battery of a police officer – but he was not deported from our country and nobody knows what's even happening with him. A 2011 report from the Government Accountability Office found that illegal immigrants and other non-citizens in our prisons and jails together had around 25,000 homicide arrests to their names. Homicide arrests. There are more than 2 million criminal aliens in this county right now – when I am President, we are getting them out, and we are getting them out fast. We are going to build the wall. Believe me. Believe me.*

(A.3.391) *Okay, are you ready? (00:46:21–00:46:22)*

(A.3.392) *Who's going to pay for the wall? (00:46:22–00:46:26)*

(A.3.393) *Who? (00:46:22–00:46:26)*

*They are. They don't know it yet but they are. And you have to understand; They're great people. The Mexican people are incredible people. Their leaders are a lot smarter than our leaders. And between the border and trade tremendous advantages taken of the United States.*

*Tremendous. Joe knows that, everybody knows that. And we don't do anything about it. Because we're led by people that don't know – honestly they're incompetent they don't know what they're doing. Now, we have a massive trade deficit with Mexico. When you look at the trade deficit and when I say they're gonna pay for the wall you'll understand it exactly. Because the wall is peanuts compared to the trade deficit that we have. So when you have that kind of a trade deficit and you want something build, it's going to be paid for in one form or another by Mexico. You can count on it 100%. On top of that, illegal immigration costs our country more than \$113 billion a year. For the money we are going to spend on illegal immigration over the next ten years, we could provide one million at-risk – and you know this is something that I think is very important– at risk students with a voucher, with an education. We can help rebuild our inner cities, we can do so much with that money. So much. At the same time, our country is being infiltrated right now by terrorists. We're taking thousands and thousands of people into our country. We have no idea who they are, where they come from. Just yesterday, an immigrant from Bangladesh was charged in another plot having to do with ISIS. Hundreds of immigrants from high-risk regions have been implicated in terrorism inside the United States since 9/11. The terrorists who planted the bombs in New York and New Jersey, and who carried out the mall stabbings in Minnesota, were foreign nationals admitted into our country – as was the mall shooter in Washington.*

(A.3.394) Or look at the cases like the Boston Bombers, here on asylum, or the San Bernardi–no Shooter – *you remember the San Bernardino?* (00:49:00–00:49:02)

(A.3.395) *Where they gave a baby, they gave a shower for the baby?* (00:49:02–00:49:06)

*The same people that gave that beautiful shower for the baby, for their baby were shot and killed. And they were here on a fiancé visa from Saudi Arabia. Whoever heard of a fiancé visa. And she probably radicalized him. Or the Orlando shooter, the son of a Taliban supporter from Afghanistan. I am going to keep the terrorists the hell out of our country. Hillary Clinton wants a 550% increase in Syrian Refugees. Hillary is for open borders. Just come on in folks, come right on in. Just take whatever you want. I am not running to be President of the world. I am running to be President of the United States. America First. For the first time in American history, thank you. For the first time in American history we have the endorsement as I said of the ICE officers, the Border Patrol people. Sheriff Joe, so many. Jan. So many. So many people have endorsed us especially over the last short period of time. They*

*see what's happening. They see what's going on. They see a movement. By the way the press is being driven crazy. They are being driven crazy. They've never seen anything like it. They are not happy. They have never seen anything like what's happening right now in our country. And it's a great thing. It's a great thing that's happening. They've never seen anything like it.*

(A.3.396) *Don't we love it?* (00:51:12–00:51:14)

(A.3.397) *Don't we love it?* (00:51:12–00:51:14)

We are going to build a wall, *we are going to* enforce our laws, and *we are going to* keep our people safe. The chaos, the violence and the crime will come to an end – beginning in January of 2017. We are going to end the government corruption Hillary Clinton put her emails on an illegal server open to foreign hacking. Then she bleached and destroyed 33,000 emails – after the subpoena. She lied to Congress, under oath, and her staffers took the fifth amendment and got immunity deals. It's worse than Watergate. *It's worse than Watergate.* The investigation of Hillary Clinton was rigged, and it's a shame, and it's one of the saddest things that *I've ever seen* taken place *in our country and now she's running for president of the United States.* We have become a Banana Republic. *And today,* we learned that the FBI made a *deal and it was a side deal that people didn't know about, with Clinton's top aides that was okay for them to DESTROY their laptops. This was just reported.* Hillary Clinton is the ringleader of a criminal enterprise that has corrupted our government at the highest levels, and the American people have one chance to stop *what's going on – send your ballots in now and get out and vote on November 8th. Get out and vote. Have to vote. Don't let them take this away from us folks.*

(A.3.398) *Because they may talk about this great movement like they've never seen but you know what?* (00:53:29–00:53:34)

*If we lose, it was a big fat waste of time, energy and at least in my case a lot of money, I tell you.* We are also going to fix our inner cities. 45% of African-American youth live in poverty. 58% of African-American youth don't have jobs. More than 3,000 *people* have been shot in *the city of Chicago* since the beginning of the year. *Think of that. Since January. 3,000 people have been shot. Obamas hometown.* Homicides are up nearly 50% in Washington, D.C. and more than 60% in Baltimore. *And all other cities, it's a disaster.* The Democrats, like Hillary Clinton, have run the inner cities *for 50, 60, 70 and in some cases even more than a*

*hundred years. They've produced only more joblessness, failing schools, and rising crime. They've horribly failed and abused our African-American and Latino communities. To those African-Americans and Latinos suffering in our country I say,*

(A.3.399) *very simply: What the hell do you have to lose? (00:54:51–00:54:53)*

*Vote for Donald Trump. I am going to fix it. I am going to fix it.*

(A.3.400) *It can't get much worse and I say it, what do you have to lose? (00:55:06–00:55:07)*

*I'm going to fix it. To everyone in the country I can almost say the same thing. You look at our massive debt. You look at our depleted military – greatest people on earth. Our depleted military. You look at how badly our vets have been treated. You look at what they want to do to our second Amendment. You look at so many things, if you look at our borders that are in some cases nonexistent. And I could say the same thing:*

(A.3.401) *What the hell do YOU have to lose? (00:55:34–00:55:36)*

(A.3.402) *You look at \$400 million in cash being paid, you look at the \$1.7 billion because when they said 400, they made a mistake? (00:55:37–00:55:48)*

*You look at the people that were going to be deported. 800 people. They were going to be deported for very serious reasons. But they made a mistake. And instead of deporting these people, guess what; they made them, proudly, United States citizens.*

(A.3.403) *But like the \$400 million in cash, can you imagine what that looks like? (00:56:08–00:56:15)*

*But like they were wrong with that, they were wrong on the 800 people. Because now they're saying it was 1700 people that were going to be deported and are now United States citizens.*

(A.3.404) *So I really do, I say to you folks too, I don't wanna be negative; What the hell do you have to lose? (00:56:36–00:56:38)*

*We will have safe communities for EVERYONE. School choice for your children. We're going to, by the way, end common core and bring education local. We're going to make great trade deals that bring jobs into our country and not out of our country. They're gonna come into our country folks. Into our country. Everyone will be included in the new American Dream. Here are the amazing things that we are going to do for our country starting in 2017: We*

are going to have the biggest job-creating tax cut since Ronald Reagan *and in some ways even bigger. Hillary Clinton is going to raise your taxes very substantially. We are going to eliminate every unnecessary regulation, which is choking our companies, and she wants to increase regulations. Stop the jobs from leaving our country and going to other countries. If they wanna do that it's fine. But there will be retribution. There will be consequences to be paid. It's not gonna be very easy or cheap for them to send their product back into our country. After all those people were let go. We are going to repeal and replace job-killing Obamacare; We are going to make childcare affordable; We are going to save our 2nd amendment which is under cease. We are going to support the great men and women of law enforcement; We will rebuild our depleted military and take great care, finally, of our veterans; and we're going to appoint Justices to the Supreme Court who will uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. We are going to rebuild America. We are going to revitalize America. We are going to unite America. Imagine what our country could accomplish if we started working together as One People, under One God, saluting One American Flag. You're going to look back at this rally for the rest of your life. You're going to remember this day. We're going to make history. This is a movement like nobody has ever seen before. History will be made. You're going to look back at this event, and you're going to look back more importantly on November 8th, when you cast your vote and you are going to say; It is the single greatest vote that you have ever cast, that it is the most important vote that you have ever cast. You are going to be proud of your country again, and you are going to be proud, hopefully, of your President again. A vote for me is a vote for change, and a vote for me is really and truly a vote for you. That's what it is. You are voting to believe in yourselves. A vote for commonsense government, solutions to problems. That's what we need. It's a vote for jobs. It's a vote for a government of, by and for the people. All together, we are going to make America wealthy again. We are going to make America strong again. We are going to make America safe again. And we are going to make America great again. We love you. November 8th. God bless you. God bless you. Thank you everybody.*

## Speech 13

### Remarks at Radisson Armory in Manchester, New Hampshire, 28 October 2016

Thank you very much. We love New Hampshire, I can tell you that. I need to open with a very critical breaking news announcement. The FBI has just sent a letter to Congress informing them that they have discovered new e-mails pertaining to the former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's investigation And they are reopening her case into her criminal and illegal conduct that threatens the security of the United States of America. Hillary Clinton's corruption is on a scale we have never seen before. We must not let her take her criminal scheme into the Oval Office. I have great respect for the fact that the FBI and the Department of Justice are now willing to have the courage to right the horrible mistake that they made. This was a grave miscarriage of justice that the American people fully understood. And it is everybody's hope that it is about to be corrected. So that is a big announcement that I heard 10 minutes ago and I guess obviously most of you folks have heard about, and in all fairness for all of the people that have suffered for doing so much less, including just recently four-star General James Cartwright, General Petraeus and many others. Perhaps finally justice will be done. With that being said, the rest of my speech is going to be so boring.

(A.3.405) Should I even make the speech? (03:28:07–03:28:09)

(A.3.406) We will talk about borders, right? (03:28:11–03:28:14)

We will talk about trade.

(A.3.407) We'll bring back our jobs, we'll strengthen our military and let's get going. OK?  
(00:28:24–00:28:24)

I want to thank General Flynn, he's a great general and I want to thank you for being here, General. Thank you very much. Just before General Flynn was going up we heard this news. I said, "General get up there and keep them busy. *Let's* – We want to digest what just happened here." Thank you General. In 11 days we are going to win New Hampshire the state of my first victory. And we are going to win back the White House. Seventy-five percent of the American people think our country is on the wrong track and we are going to fix it. We are going to get our country back on the right track, and very, very quickly. Real change begins with immediately repealing and replacing Obamacare. *And that is big news, that*

*is big news.* We can't forget how big a news that is, we can't lose track. It's a disaster, just like everything else in this administration. It has just been announced that Americans are going to experience another massive double-digit hike in Obamacare premiums, including a 116 percent premium hike to our very good friends in the great state of Arizona. Even Bill Clinton admitted Obamacare is the craziest thing in the world, where people wind up with their premiums doubled and their coverage cut in half. In Minnesota, where the premium increase will be almost 60 percent, the Democratic governor said the Affordable Care Act is no longer affordable. Jonathan Gruber, the architect of Obamacare admitted it was all a fraud and he said it was passed because of the stupidity of the American voter.

(A.3.408) Hey, we're doing a lot of good work, aren't we? (03:30:47–03:30:50)

We're catching all of these people. We're doing a good job. Jonathan Gruber, there's another. See, we didn't forget. I never forgot Jonathan Gruber. I said you know, if I do this, we're *gonna* run and his name came up and people forget after a week or two. I said I am never *gonna* forget Jonathan Gruber, the architect of Obamacare and what he said. So we *didn't* forget. Almost can you imagine, it's like a little more than a week before the election. We didn't forget the name Jonathan Gruber. But the only real stupidity is that shown by our politicians who passed this monstrosity over the furious objection of certain politicians and the American voter. Job-killing Obamacare is just one more way the system is rigged. *But what* – what I've just announced previously it might not be as rigged as I thought.

(A.3.409) Right? (03:31:50–03:31:51)

(A.3.410) Right? (03:31:50–03:31:51)

The FBI I think they're *gonna* right the ship, folks. I think they're *gonna* right the ship. And they're *gonna* save their reputation by doing so. Hillary Clinton wants to double down on Obamacare, destroying American health care forever. She wants to expand Obamacare and make it even more expensive. I will repeal and replace Obamacare and we will replace it with a much less expensive plan and a plan that is much, much better. Just this year, Hillary Clinton declared Obamacare is one of the greatest accomplishments of President Obama, the Democratic Party and our country. Well, that was that's turned out to be wrong.

(A.3.411) Do they do anything right? (03:32:47–03:32:48)

We don't win anymore. We don't *do* – I mean, you're *gonna* have such a good time starting in '17. We're *gonna* start winning again. We're *gonna* start winning again. Because it's turned out, and I've been saying this from before it passed, Obamacare is a catastrophe beyond imagination. Insurers are leaving, doctors are quitting, companies are fleeing, workers' hours are being cut, part-time jobs are all over the place. Those beautiful full-time jobs that you used to have don't exist and deductibles are through the roof. You don't get to use it. We don't get rid of Obamacare, we have no choice. But if we don't get rid of it, our health care system is gone forever. We'll never have another chance. And by the way, if we don't win this election, you're never *gonna* have another chance either, that I can tell you. Never *gonna* happen again. Repealing Obamacare is one of the single most important reasons we must win on November 8th. But real change also means getting rid of the corruption in Washington, and again, maybe that's happened. Wow. We have a big day. No think of it, I won my first primary in New Hampshire and I am getting here and the news this morning is this is bigger than Watergate. This is bigger than Watergate in my opinion. This is bigger than Watergate Hillary bleached and deleted 33,000 e-mails after receiving a congressional subpoena.

(A.3.412) That alone to me there were more serious things done, but how does it get much more? (03:34:45–03:34:46)

But that was so obvious. She gets the subpoena and she bleaches and deletes 33,000 e-mails.

(A.3.413) That to me because it was so simple, you know? (03:34:58–03:35:00)

*Not* – it's not about the sale of the uranium that nobody knows what it means I know what it means to Russia. Then she talks to me about Russia. 20 percent of the uranium in our country to Russia. But you know, the deletion of 33,000 e-mails, boy, that just sort of is so out there, after receiving a subpoena from the United States government. She lied to Congress, she lied to the FBI, she made 13 phones disappear, some with a hammer. The Clinton crew gave more than \$675,000 to the wife of the deputy director of the FBI and the man who was overseeing the investigation into Hillary's illegal server, but maybe *now* that takes care of itself. Right now that takes care of itself I think, I think. Very proud that the FBI was willing to do this actually, really, very proud. Just yesterday we learned that Bill Clinton's right-hand man pushed for Clinton's foundation donors and other large corporations to funnel as much as \$66 million in personal profit to Bill and Hillary Clinton. This man explained that the cozy

relationship between his consulting firm to foundation and Clinton's personal income had helped Bill and Hillary enrich themselves, and obtain in-kind services, including personal travel, hospitality, vacations, and the like. The same people paying Bill Clinton for speeches were lobbying Hillary Clinton at the same the same time, same time. And these people are seriously corrupt. Terribly conflict. Hillary's pay for play included defense contracts. Take Raytheon, when the contractor wanted big foreign arms deals, they hired three lobbyists that raised hundreds of thousands of dollars for Hillary's last campaign, and are raising money for her current campaign. And by the way 50 to 1 in ads, 50 to 1. And if you look at Florida, we're winning. Ohio, we're winning. Iowa we're winning. Doing great in New Hampshire. I think we're *gonna* have a tremendous victory in Pennsylvania. We better have a great victory in New Hampshire, please. OK, we will. In fact when this news when this news of the FBI's investigation, when it just happened a little while ago, they said Mr. Trump, I think they'd understand, we could skip your speech in New Hampshire this is so big. I said I don't have the courage to skip the speech in New Hampshire. Believe me, I don't have the courage. I'm not skipping New Hampshire, I never will. You know, when I won, and you remember because I go around and we had the big rallies, and they said oh, the big rallies will never work in New Hampshire, you have to sit down and have dinner with everybody. I said that's like that's a lot of dinners. They don't expect that. But you remember when *we* – we met, and I'd have a lot of small meetings too with people, we'd talk, and New Hampshire more than any other place taught me about drugs flowing into this country. And your police department, so great, the police departments in New Hampshire, they told me. I went to some, I became friendly with some. And I never knew I never knew, honestly, I knew it was bad, I never knew it was so bad.

(A.3.414) And I said to the people of New Hampshire, because more than any other place, you look at the beautiful little roadways and lakes and streams, and everything is so beautiful, the trees, and you say how could they have a drug problem here?  
(03:39:19–03:39:21)

It doesn't fit.

(A.3.415) But I'd sit down with groups, and I said what's your biggest problem? (00:39:24–00:39:26)

And I figured they'd say maybe the veterans which are suffering greatly in this area, we understand that. But it was always – and we'll solve that problem. But it was always, you know what, it was always heroine.

(A.3.416) I'd say heroine? (03:39:38–03:39:40)

(A.3.417) What do you mean? (03:39:38–03:39:40)

And I learned so much. And I said to the people of New Hampshire that if I win, which I did with New Hampshire, if I win, and I also said and if I go all the way, we are going to stop the inflow of drugs into New Hampshire and into our country 100 percent And I gave the people of New Hampshire my pledge, more than anybody else in this case, because they really taught me about what's happening with the world of drugs pouring in. Hard to believe. It's just so, so strange when you look and you see the beauty of this place and then you see that heroin and drugs are your number one problem, by far. Anyway, *within* months these lobbyists sealed over \$26 billion in foreign arms deals, including over \$19 billion in Qatar, some people would say Qatar, which happened to be off Bill Clinton. \$1 million as a birthday gift for a few minutes of face time. \$1 million. The lobbyists, one of whom was the sister-in-law to Hillary Clinton's current campaign chairman, received hundreds of thousands of dollars in fees, the contractor got billions of dollars in contracts, and Hillary Clinton got her campaign cash and money for her foundation. And you know I'm putting up tremendous amounts of money. Today I wrote another check for \$10 million. I'm spending money like crazy. I'll probably have over maybe close to or over \$100 million of my money spent on the campaign. But there's something nice about that.

(A.3.418) Unless I lose, in which case I say, "What was that all about?" (03:41:28–03:41:32)

But we're gonna do what's right for you, not what's right for some contributor or special interest. Hillary put the office of the secretary of state up for sale and if she ever got the chance, believe me she would put the office and you know what office I'm talking about the office called the Oval Office up for sale too. I propose a contract with the American voter, which will end the corruption and give government back to our great people. I want the entire corrupt Washington establishment to hear and heed the words I'm about to say, and I never loved this expression but now I love it because it's become *it's become* the hottest expression. If we win on November 8th, we are going to Washington, D.C. when we win, OK

– *when* – and we are going to drain the swamp. At the core of my contract is my plan to bring back our jobs. You’ve been suffering with the jobs. The jobs have gone like candy being taken from a baby. New growth numbers just released put the average growth rate for this year at a disastrous 1.5 percent. If China goes down to 7 or 8 percent GDP, you know it’s like a national catastrophe. Last *month* – *last* quarter we were at 1 percent. Our job numbers last week were horrible. They were anemic, as the expression goes. They like to say anemic, that was the word they used. Obama is the first president in modern history not to have a single year of 3 percent growth. And they say it’s hard because we’re a large country. Well India is a much larger country and they’re at 8 percent. China is at 7 percent. And China’s not happy. So we’re at around 1 percent and we just keep going along, just keep going along losing our jobs to Mexico and every other place. Forty-seven million Americans are on food stamps, and 45 million people think of it, this is our country are living in poverty. Meanwhile our trade deficit with the world is now nearly \$800 billion a year. You say,

(A.3.419) “Who negotiates these contracts?” (03:44:20–03:44:22)

We’re living through – *it’s true* – Obama. *Obama*, It’s true. You know instead of campaigning for Hillary Clinton he ought to be in the White House in the Oval Office negotiating trade deals, beating ISIS, taking care of our veterans, which he does not do. We’re living through the greatest jobs theft in the history of the world. They’re stealing our jobs. Greatest in the history of the world. New Hampshire has lost one in three manufacturing jobs since NAFTA, a deal signed by Bill Clinton and supported strongly by Hillary. We’ve lost 70,000 factories since China entered the World Trade Organization, another Bill and Hillary disaster. The Trump administration will immediately begin negotiating and we will start this negotiation so fast. We will start a negotiation on NAFTA, and if we don’t get the deal we want, we will terminate NAFTA and get a much, much better trade deal. And I won’t go into the details, but because they’re different tax systems, they’re under a VAT system and we’re under our system, but because of the fact that they’re under a much different tax system, the day the deal was signed it was a defective deal, with us having a massive, at least 17 percent disadvantage. So it’s complicated. I’m not *gonna* bother you or bore you with it, but we’ve been working with a defective deal for years, and nobody, no politician ever went back to renegotiate it. We’re going to get it done, folks, so easily. If a company wants to fire their workers and go to Mexico or another country and then they think they’re *gonna* ship their

products back into the United States, we will charge them a tax of 35 percent. So when you think these companies, which right now are out there negotiating to leave here, they'll leave New Hampshire, they'll leave Pennsylvania, they're gonna leave Ohio, they're gonna leave all of these places, all of our great places and great states. And right now as we're talking, they're negotiating deals. Mexico is the eighth wonder of the world in terms of the new plants. A friend of mine, Bill Plants, he's the biggest, he said the eighth wonder of the world what's happening in Mexico.

(A.3.420) And I say, and I tell this to people, what about us? (03:47:00–03:47:05)

He said meh, not gonna be it's gonna be the other way around. But there will be consequences.

(A.3.421) And you know, when they realize that they've got to now pay a tax, all of that, to come through our very strong border, because there will be a strong border with their product, you know what they're gonna say? (03:47:23–03:47:24)

They're gonna say "let's stay, we're not gonna move", and they're gonna stay. It's very simple. But the politicians don't want to do that because they're controlled they're controlled by the people that give them their campaign contributions and probably other things.

(A.3.422) We will does anybody know what I mean by that? (03:47:38–03:47:40)

We will also stand up to Chinese currency manipulation and we will stop the Trans-Pacific Partnership. We will become a rich nation again, but to be a rich nation, we must also be a safe nation. Hillary Clinton unleashed ISIS onto the world and it has now spread into our country. There are right now 1,000 open ISIS investigations across the United States, more than at any time that we've ever had. Now, Hillary wants to increase by 550 percent the massive number of Syrian refugees flowing into our country. That's over the Obama numbers, and those are thousands and thousands of people. A Trump administration will suspend the Syrian refugee program. And we'll help them *with* safe havens and we'll get other countries over there, like the Gulf states who have nothing but money, we have \$20 trillion in debt. We'll get them to pay, they gotta do their share.

(A.3.423) We'll lead it, we'll help, they'll pay, but you know what? (03:48:55–03:48:59)

We can't let people into this country that we don't know about we don't know. Let me state this as clearly as I can. If I'm elected president, I am going to keep When... We love New

Hampshire, I love this place. I love this place. By the way, you know, we're leading in Florida, we're leading in all these places. The recent poll said we're two down in New Hampshire.

(A.3.424) You know what I said? (03:49:43–03:49:44)

I don't think so, I don't think so.

(A.3.425) These polls, these polls, these are called dirty polls, you know what that is?  
(00:49:47–00:49:53)

These are false. I don't think so. She comes up here, she has four people, and it's like oh, we have a wonderful crowd. I don't think so. I think we're winning New Hampshire big. OK. So we'll change it. When I'm elected president I am going to keep radical Islamic terrorists the hell out of our country. A Trump administration will also secure and defend the borders of the United States. Boy, you people have energy, you're great.

(A.3.426) Well, let's face it, it's been a long time, right? (03:50:35–03:50:38)

It's been a long time. You've been waiting a long time for the right person, but you do have energy.

(A.3.427) You know what's happening? (03:50:45–03:50:46)

A lot – *a lot of* these places A lot of – *a lot of* the different places, reports are coming out. They hate to write it, you know the dishonest media. But people by the way, great people, oh they're the worst, they're so dishonest. They are so dishonest, folks. But a lot of these reports coming out in the early voting states, people are coming up that have never voted. These are great Americans, these are great people, but they've just never seen anybody that they wanted to like they've never heard people say we're actually *gonna* bring back your jobs. We're not *gonna* let companies leave us and fire everybody and move and then let the product pour into our country with no tax. No, no, just go ahead, leave, fire all our people, move to Mexico, make the product, sell your air conditioners Carrier's an example, they're leaving they might not leave, they're probably all about ready to change their mind. But – *and* just let your product come right in, no tax, no nothing.

(A.3.428) I mean, how stupid is this? (03:52:01–03:52:04)

(A.3.429) How stupid? (03:52:01–03:52:04)

And I'm a free-trader, I'm a fair trader. But we have the wrong people represent us. So what's happening is these lines in Florida are four blocks long. They were never like that. They've never seen anything like it. And in Tennessee, a great congressman, been there for 25 years, said to me, "I've never seen we have never seen anything like it." People are coming out *that hadn't voted* in years. People are coming out, they literally they hadn't voted in years. So they're not polled because, you know, unless you voted like in the last election, they don't want to poll you. So, people are coming out that hadn't voted in years. Happening in Texas. They haven't voted in years. And people that have never even voted, and yet they're great Americans. They just never saw somebody that they wanted to vote for. And they're coming out and they've got the Trump shirt and they've got the hat, they've got buttons all over the place, you know.

(A.3.430) Now, who knows who knows? (03:52:58–03:53:00)

They may have all of the Trump stuff and you never know.

(A.3.431) Maybe they're voting for crooked Hillary Clinton, but I don't think so. Right?  
(03:53:04–03:53:08)

I don't think so. History has taught us that we don't think so. So, I think we're doing great. And yes, on the border, we have no choice, we will build a wall and Mexico will pay for the wall. Got to stop the drugs. Got to stop the drugs. Remember my pledge to everybody but in particular to New Hampshire, because I know what you're going through with the drugs. I know what your incredible law enforcement, your police and your fire departments, because I see where they're helping so much. Believe me, they're – they're not spoken about.

(A.3.432) And how about where they're shooting? (03:53:50–03:53:51)

During fires, they're shooting at the firemen. Now, this is a new phenomenon. They're shooting at firemen. They're shooting bullets at firemen going to fires and fighting fires. So, we have a divided country and we're *gonna* make our country love again. We're *gonna* bring it like this room. Countless Americans who have died in recent years would be alive today if not for the open border policies of this administration. This includes incredible Americans like 21-year-old Sarah Root. You've heard that story, you've seen it, you've read about it. The man who killed her arrived at the border, entered federal custody and then was released into the United States community under the policies of this White House. He was released again

and again, after crime after crime and now is at large. Sarah graduated from college just the day before with a 4.0 grade point average, top in her class. She was violently, violently killed. Outstanding young woman. I know her parents; they're incredible. Also among the victims of Obama-Clinton open borders policy was Grant Ronnebeck, a 21-year-old convenience store clerk in Mesa, Arizona. He was murdered by an illegal immigrant gang member previously convicted of burglary, who had also been released from federal custody. And so many people said please, please, please don't release him, he's violent. And he shot Grant through the head. Another victim who we've all read about and known about, Kate Steinle, gunned down in the sanctuary city of San Francisco by an illegal immigrant. And this person was deported five previous times. And now, he's got a good lawyer and the case will go on and on and on. He's got a lawyer, I see them in court all the time. The case will go on and on. Shot in the back while standing with her father. Great parents, great brother. Then there is the case of 90-year-old Earl Olander, who was brutally beaten and left to bleed to death in his home. The perpetrators were illegal immigrants with criminal records a mile long but who did not meet the Obama administration's priorities for removal. People begged that they be incarcerated or be moved out of the country, but our geniuses wouldn't listen. In California, a 64-year-old Air Force veteran, Marilyn Pharis, was sexually assaulted and beaten to death with a hammer. Her killer had been arrested on multiple occasions but was never deported. People asked please, please deport him. This is what happened. This is a crime wave that never ends. I can tell you it's thousands of cases like this. When I'm president, believe me, it will end. Not only will a wall keep out the dangerous cartels and criminals, but will also keep out the drugs, remember New Hampshire, and the heroin poisoning our youth. Our youth is being poisoned before they get a chance. And by the way, I've met plenty of people in New Hampshire that are not our youth that have a tremendous problem, and I want to tell you, we're *gonna* work with people, we're *gonna* set up programs, we're going to try everything we can to get them unaddicted, unaddicted. So as I said, when I won the New Hampshire primary, I promised the people of New Hampshire that we would stop drugs from pouring into your community and I guarantee you we will. You will be so proud of your president, you will be so proud of your community. You will be so proud. I just want to say in closing I just want to say in closing that we have an amazing movement going on. A movement like they've never seen before, a movement that hopefully won't be stopped. We have a movement that the biggest people in the world of the media, the biggest,

have said they've never seen anything like it before. Every, every crowd, every auditorium. The other night, we had a situation.

(A.3.433) We had thousands and thousands of people and I said to the fire marshal, isn't it possible to let more in? (03:58:47–03:58:49)

(A.3.434) We had thousands of people in this massive field and we had many thousands outside of the gates they wouldn't let in and I said, couldn't we let them in? (03:58:52–03:58:55)

And they said, we can't. I said, but there's no fire, we're outside. He said, it's stampede, Mr. Trump, we're worried about a stampede. And it's a stampede of love. It's true. It's not a stampede it's a stampede of love. Because there *were* so many people. They said we have very strong security guards, but Mr. Trump, they're not nearly as strong as 45,000 people come charging forward. So, I fully understood it. But we have something going on that's so special. It's so special. We're *gonna* reduce your taxes, we're *gonna* simplify your taxes. We're *gonna* make your businesses welcome in our country. We're *gonna* reduce the taxes for middle-income people. We call them the forgotten men and women. Greatly simplify your returns. The only company that I can think of that won't like us is H&R Block, they will not like us. They're not gonna like Trump too much. But we'll greatly simplify your taxes. And your businesses we're taking it from 35 percent, which is one of the highest in the world, just about the highest, down to one of the lowest in the world, 15 percent. We're getting rid of a lot of the regulations that are stopping growth. Tremendous amounts of regulations are killing your small businesses and your big businesses. So, we're gonna have a very tax-friendly country again, and it's gonna mean jobs, it's gonna mean expansion, it's gonna mean new companies growing. We are going to create the border. We are going to stop the drugs. We're gonna have people come into our country. We want people to come into our country, but they have to come in legally. They have to come in through a legal process. We want a lot of people to come in. And they're going to come in, but they'll come in legally. And we're gonna streamline the process. People are waiting on line now 10 years. We're gonna streamline because we want people to come in, but we want them to come in legally. And we want merit, too. We want to take wonderful, great people that love our country, they want to get out and they want to do a great job. We want to have them also come in based on merit. A word you don't hear anymore. A word you don't hear any more.

It's too bad. We're also going to very importantly appoint justices to the Supreme Court. Who you can be proud of and who will respect the Constitution of the United States. We're going to save our Second Amendment, which is under unbelievable siege. We're going to help big league on education, we're going to go with choice, so important, and we're going to terminate Common Core and bring education local. Our military is depleted. We're *gonna* rebuild our military. We are going to lead through strength. And hopefully, we're not gonna have to use our military but I will say this. *ISIL* – We're getting rid of ISIS. We're getting rid of ISIS. ISIS is – we have no choice. By the way, not since medieval times has anyone seen chopping off of heads, drowning in steel cages, burying in sand. Not since, not since medieval times. It all grew during the tenure of Obama and Hillary Clinton. ISIS *and* you know she stands up and she says what she's gonna do. Well, she was there. It came out of the vacuum because we should have never gone into Iraq, but once we did, we should have gone out the right way, not the wrong way. And the way they went out was so bad, so bad, including giving back Mosul, which now they're fighting to take back. And it would have been nice the element of surprise.

(A.3.435) Do we agree? (04:03:24–04:03:26)

(A.3.436) Does anybody not agree? (04:03:24–04:03:26)

The element of surprise. We don't use the element of surprise. We use the element of tell them everything we can possibly tell them, give them plenty of time to get ready and then attack. And it turns out to be a lot tougher than they ever thought. But we're going to have a country that you're going to be proud of again. We're going to have a president that hopefully you will be proud of. I will work so hard for every community. I'll be working very hard for the African-American community, for the Hispanic community. I'll be working hard for every community. And we're gonna have this divided nation come together. And I just want to say we're gonna make America strong again, we're gonna make America doesn't sound nice, but we have no choice wealthy again. But we are going to make America great again. And I want to thank everybody in New Hampshire. Get out and vote. You're very special people. You're very, very special people. God bless you, get out and vote. Thank you. Thank you, New Hampshire.

## Speech 14

### Remarks at the Central Florida Fairgrounds in Orlando, Florida, 02 November 2016

Thank you everybody, thank you. Wow. These crowds. These crowds are terrific. Thank you very much. In six days, we are going to win the great state of Florida. And we are going to win back the White House. That will happen. But you have to get out, you have to vote, we have to get out there. We don't want to blow it. That I can tell you because we have worked very hard, all of us, you, me, everybody. And it's very historic what's happening. I'd like to begin today by thanking all of you for joining me. This has been an incredible journey and we've all done it together. We're almost at the end. But we're really at the end of the beginning if you think about it.

(A.3.437) Aren't we? (00:02:28–00:02:29)

The end of the beginning. Our magnificent historic movement has surprised the world and defied expectations at every single turn. And now, next Tuesday, we will have one last glorious surprise for the pundits, the politicians and the special interests *when we win* and return the power back to the people. It's gonna happen. It's *gonna* happen. It's been the honor of my life to share this journey with you, it has absolutely been. There are two people, however, who I did not really get to share this with but who are in my thoughts often. And that's my mother and my father, great people. I had great parents. Great parents. I know they're up there watching, I just felt that nice breeze. It's hot, but I just felt that nice breeze. So they're helping us out. And I just want to say thank you to both of them. Special, special people. I've had a great life and now I want to give back to the country that I love. It's time, we have *to – we* have to give back, folks I've seen how the career of politicians, the big donors and the special interests have bled this country dry and stripped our middle class and stripped our companies of its jobs and its wealth. But we're just six days away from delivering justice for every forgotten man, woman and child in this country. Justice for every child trapped in poverty in the inner cities, for every family that's born – and you know that, they've been born into a situation in some case; they can't get out of it. We're *gonna* get them out of it. We're *gonna* get them out of it. We have endless wars. Every community's hopes and dreams have been shattered and we're not *gonna* let that happen. Our inner cities are *gonna* come back and they're *gonna* come back strong and you're *gonna* see what I mean. And the

African-American community and the Hispanic community are really understanding what's going on and you see that right now. You see that right now in what's happening at the polls. We're winning in Florida, we're winning in Ohio, we're winning in Iowa, in North Carolina. We're doing great in Pennsylvania. A lot of people are saying Pennsylvania's looking very good. So many different places. We just got a poll with three up in Virginia. But we are seriously up in Florida. That's very important And I will never, ever let you down. Real change begins immediately with repealing and replacing Obamacare, a disaster. A disaster. It is a disaster. It's just been announced that the residents of Florida are going to experience a massive double digit premium hike. I will not tell you what the number is. I know the number very well, but I want you to leave happy. You don't want to hear the number, go home, relax, wake up good and strong tomorrow morning. You'll learn, you're not *gonna* like it. In the great state of Arizona, where we just left, the premiums are going up more than 116 percent. Over 90 percent of the counties in Florida and by the way, in the primaries, I won 66 out of 67 primaries. That's good. I was going to try and exaggerate and say I won them all, but I can't do that. Over 90 percent of the counties in Florida are losing Obamacare insurers next year, they're leaving. They're all leaving. In Minnesota where the premium increase will be close to 60 percent, the Democratic governor has said the Affordable Care Act is no longer affordable. Obamacare is a total catastrophe. Yet Hillary Clinton wants to double down on Obamacare, making it even more expensive. I'm asking for your vote so we can replace Obamacare and save healthcare for every family in Florida, so important. Real change also means restoring honesty to our government. As you know, the FBI has reopened its investigation into crooked Hillary Clinton. Hillary wants to blame everyone else for amounting legal troubles and I don't see if you've watched her last few speeches over the last few days. She has become totally unhinged, unbelievable. What she's saying and what she's doing is actually, it's unbelievable. But she has no one to blame but herself. Hillary is the one who set up the illegal private e-mail server to shield her criminal activity. Hillary is the one who engaged in a corrupt pay for play scheme at the State Department. Hillary is the one who lied so many times to Congress and to the FBI. Hilary is the one who made 13 phones disappear, some with a hammer and who destroyed 33,000 e-mails after, after, after receiving a congressional subpoena, think of that. Unbelievable. And as you know, they just found—listen to this one and I guess you know it, 650,000 e-mails. And I would say that classified, confidential, I think they're probably all over the place. I think

they're – I think they're gonna find a treasure trough. I can't even imagine. In fact, they said well, this is OK they're duplicates.

(A.3.438) How could there be duplicates when its many more times what we thought was stolen in the first place, right? (00:09:04–00:09:06)

You know, when they deleted 33,000 I thought that was a lot.

(A.3.439) They have 650,000? (00:09:15–00:09:17)

Hillary is the one who accepted debate questions given to her in advance and used them to cheat. Instead of reporting the breach. That's a big deal. You know, to me that's a big deal. Some people say oh, that's fine, that's a big deal.

(A.3.440) That's really—that's a real cheater, OK? (00:09:36–00:09:38)

That's a cheater. And she was given the questions by a woman that frankly should resigned from the DNC or be fired. But that's a really big deal. And you notice, they never *the* – the dishonest prospect, the most dishonest. If you notice, they never go after Hillary. They always talk about Donna Brazile, Donna Brazile didn't do it. But can you imagine if I got—can you imagine, they gave the questions to Donald Trump before a debate. You know it would be the electric chair. They'd reinstitute the electric chair. No. It'd be headlines all over the world. This isn't headlines. I bring it up; it's brought up a little bit. But this isn't like a big deal. She got the debate questions and answers. But she got the debate questions prior to a debate.

(A.3.441) Now, Bernie Sanders should be angry right? (00:10:39–00:10:42)

(A.3.442) Shouldn't he be angry? (00:10:43–00:10:44)

Now, I'll tell you what folks. The system is rigged. The system is rigged. I've been saying it for a – it's rigged, and we're gonna straighten it out. But the system is rigged. Hillary is not the victim; the American people are the victims of this system. So corrupt in so many ways.

(A.3.443) And this is your one chance to change it because you know what? (00:11:03–00:11:05)

In four years, *it's* not gonna happen. There's no way. The numbers won't work. In four years, there's no way. Hillary Clinton is the most corrupt person ever to seek the presidency. And if

she were to be elected, it would create an unprecedented constitutional crisis. I mean before you go into phase two – let’s call what happened on Friday phase two. Phase one, she’s so guilty. She shouldn’t be allowed to run for the presidency. That’s why I say the system is rigged. She shouldn’t be allowed to run. But I have a feeling in the 650,000 e-mails, they’re gonna find things that you will not even believe. Who knows. 650,000 e-mails. No wonder she can’t do anything. No, no.

(A.3.444) How do you work? (00:11:56–00:11:58)

(A.3.445) How do you do it? (00:11:57–00:12:00)

650,000. They’ll have to explain that to us some day. But they’ll have some things in there that I can just imagine are going to be unbelievable. Hillary’s likely to be under investigation for many years. Probably concluding in a criminal trial. Out today, WikiLeaks just came out with a new one. Just a little while ago. It’s just been shown that a rigged system with more collusion, possibly illegal between the Department of Justice, the Clinton campaign, and the State Department. You saw that. The e-mails show that the Assistant Attorney General who’s involved in the investigation has been feeding information directly to John Podesta and the Clinton campaign.

(A.3.446) Can you believe this? (00:12:48–00:12:50)

She shouldn’t be allowed to run. By the way, behind me, the great Johnny Damon. The curse of the Yankees, but ultimately he helped the Yankees. Johnny Damon. Stand up Johnny. *Stand up*. Now, I’ll tell you. George Steinbrenner was a good friend of mine. Oh, he didn’t like Johnny too much. Then he ultimately signed him and then he was fine. He did great. But Johnny Damon was a champ. He was a winner. And he loves this area, you know that. My contract with the American voter begins with a tough ethics reform, and it ends – I’ll tell you what. We are going to end – we have no choice. We really have no choice – government corruption. It’s going to end. I want the entire corrupt Washington establishment to hear and to heed the words we all will say right now when we win on November 8th. We are going to Washington, D.C. and we are going to drain the swamp. At the core of my contract is my plan to bring back our jobs. Florida has lost one in four of its manufacturing jobs since NAFTA, a deal signed by Bill Clinton with the support of crooked Hillary. America has lost – *and* this is so hard to believe – 70,000 factories since China entered the World Trade

Organization. Another Bill and Hillary backed disaster. We are living through the greatest jobs theft in the history of the world. A Trump administration will stop the jobs from leaving America, and we will stop the jobs from leaving Florida. They're leaving. We're *gonna* stop it. And you have an excellent governor, by the way. He's fighting hard for you folks. I don't know – I don't know. All I can tell you is he is a worker, he is a worker, and he's fighting very hard. The theft of American prosperity will end and it'll end, I'll tell you. We are – it is being stolen from us folks. It is – we have a one-way highway right into Mexico, right into other countries. And we're *gonna* stop it. From now on, it's going to be America first. America first. It's *gonna* be America first. A Trump administration will renegotiate NAFTA and we will stand up to foreign product dumping, currency manipulation, and all of the unfair subsidy behaviors. It's horrible what's happening to us. Our politicians don't have a clue, they don't know what they're doing – or other things, OK. We will also immediately stop the job killing Trans-Pacific Partnership. As part of our plan to bring back jobs, we're going to lower taxes on American business from 35 percent to 15 percent. We're the highest taxed nation in the world. Killing our jobs. Our companies are leaving. Killing our jobs. We will become a rich nation once again. But to be a rich nation, we must also be a safe nation.

(A.3.447) In Orlando, the murder rate doubled, you know that? (00:17:07–00:17:09)

Doubled last year.

(A.3.448) Can you believe it? (00:17:10–00:17:12)

We will support our police, and I met you police of Orlando, they are unbelievable people and they've been through a lot. I met the police and these are unbelievable people. We will bring this crime wave to an end. We will also keep our community safe from terrorism. Just a short time ago, Orlando was the victim of the worst mass shooting in American history during the Islamic terror attack on The Pulse nightclub. It was also the worst attack on the LGBTQ community in our country's history. Can't let it happen, can't let it happen. Hillary wants to increase by 550 percent Syrian refugees pouring into our country. Her plan would mean generations of terrorism, radicalism, and extremism spreading in your schools and throughout your communities. When I'm elected president, we will suspend the Syrian refuge program. And we will keep radical Islamic terrorists the hell out of your community. Got to keep them out. And we'll build safe zones in Syria. We have to help the people. We're *gonna* build safe zones, but the Gulf States haven't been doing their thing. And believe

me, they have plenty of money. They'll help us, they'll fund it, I'm sure they'll be thrilled. They're *gonna* be funding it, and that will be OK. We want to help people. But we have enough problems in this country. We don't need Orlando and problems. We don't need what happened in San Bernadino. We don't need what's happening in Paris, in Nice and in Germany – which is a disaster. We don't need it.

(A.3.449) We have enough problems right now, do we agree? (00:19:10–00:19:13)

We have enough problems. We don't need it. A Trump administration will also secure and defend the borders of the United States. And yes, we will build a great wall. We received the first ever endorsement from our ICE and border patrol officers, great people. The officers that warned that Hillary's plan is the most quote, radical immigration proposal in United States history, and that it will lead to the loss of thousands and thousands of lives, quote. "As Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton allowed thousands of the most dangerous and violent criminal aliens to go free because their home countries were intelligent, they wouldn't take them back." We bring them to their countries – murderers, drug dealers, gang members, we'd bring them to their countries and their countries would say: get them out, we're not taking them back. They call up the State Department, and the State Department under Hillary Clinton would say: oh, bring them back, we don't want to make waves. I guarantee you, whether it's four years or eight years, that will not happen once under a Trump administration. Hillary wants totally open borders and strongly supports sanctuary cities. Like San Francisco, where Kate Steinle – incredible young woman—was murdered by an illegal immigrant who had been deported five times. A Trump administration will cancel all federal funding to sanctuary cities immediately. We will end illegal immigration, deport all criminal aliens – the ones we just spoke about – and we will save American lives. We will also repeal Obama–Clinton defense sequester and rebuild our very badly depleted military. That includes major new investments in resources from Pensacola Naval Air Station at MacDill Air Force Base.

(A.3.450) Have you ever heard of those places? (00:21:39–00:21:42)

Pretty good places. A lot of people here, lot of people. I'm honored to have the endorsement of 200 – more than that now, much more than that – top Admirals and Generals and 22 Medal of Honor recipients. Great people, I've met so many of them, they're incredible. Incredible people. Our new foreign policy will put America first. Hillary and our failed Washington

*establishment have spent \$6 trillion on wars in the Middle East that we never won and that never end. And it's now in worse shape than ever before. The Middle East is a catastrophe, it's far worse off than had we spent nothing. They've dragged us into foreign wars that have made us less safe. They've left our borders wide open at home. And they've shipped our jobs and wealth to other countries. And yes – it's disappearing. Our country, in a certain sense, is disappearing. Prosperity – real prosperity is disappearing. We owe \$20 trillion. Our trade deals, we lose \$800 billion a year on trade. We have trade deficits. Think of that.*

(A.3.451) Who negotiates these deals? (00:23:00–00:23:01)

(A.3.452) You know who does? (00:23:01–00:23:02)

Stupid people. Stupid people. With very stupid leadership. Who, by the way, they campaign all the time. He's campaigning right now for crooked Hillary.

(A.3.453) Why is he campaigning? (00:23:16–03:20:17)

She's under federal investigation, and *you've* got a president campaigning for her. And that's all he does is campaign. He ought to be working on your jobs that are leaving and going to Mexico. And your military. I'll tell you what, first of all, she's got bigger problems. But four more years of Obama, we can't take it, folks. Four more years of ISIS, that's what it is. Four more years of no jobs. Now, she wants to start a shooting war in Syria and conflict with a nuclear-armed Russia that could very well lead to World War III. Russia is heavily armed, doesn't like her. Putin does not respect her, doesn't like her.

(A.3.454) What are we doing, folks? (00:24:02–00:24:03)

She's a mess. To all Americans, I say it's time for new leadership. Just think about what we can accomplish in the first 100 days of a Trump administration. Thank you. It's so beautiful over there. I just noticed the water. Let's go in for a swim. It's about 200 degrees out *here*.

(A.3.455) Anybody want to go swimming? (00:24:34–00:24:35)

Let's go. We are going to have the biggest tax cut since Ronald Reagan. And Hillary wants to increase your taxes by a tremendous amount. You know, we're already the highest-taxed nation in the world. She wants to increase your taxes, if you can believe that one. We're going to eliminate every unnecessary job-killing regulation. Killing your companies. Killing them. One of the reasons they're leaving. Cancel every illegal Obama executive order. We're

going to rebuild our military and take care of our great, great veterans. They're not being taken care of. You know that. A lot of veterans here. We're *gonna* take care of our veterans finally. They have been mistreated for many, many years. We're going to support the men and women of law enforcement. We will save the Second Amendment, which is, as you know, under tremendous siege. We will appoint justices to the United States Supreme Court who will uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. We will show the world that there is no challenge too great, no dream outside of our reach. There's no dream – no dream outside of our reach. We have all these people telling us what to do. Politicians – they know nothing. I've dealt with them all my life, folks. All talk, no action. *I mean, look*. I have some friends that are politicians. So let me just say there's some good ones.

(A.3.456) OK? (00:26:10–00:26:12)

There are some good. I'll tell you what, you take a look at the media. These are the most dishonest people anywhere. These are the most – they – the media – the media is a part and one of the vital cogs in the rigged system under which we live. They're a big fat cog in the – and they never show the crowds. They never show what's happening.

(A.3.457) But you know what? (00:26:37–00:26:38)

You hear – when you hear 20,000, sometimes 30,000, when you hear people, sounds like you're at an Ohio State football game. But they never show it. They never show it. They never show it. People of Florida, we love you. All we have to do *is*; cut our ties with these failed politicians of the past. Hillary is a candidate of yesterday. We are the movement of the future. We are. We're asking for the votes of Republicans, Democrats, independents and first-time voters, of which we're finding out there are many. You probably heard over the last couple of weeks “Texas is in play”; “Texas – that Georgia is in play.” And I'm saying, “Gee, that's too bad.” Let me tell you, they're setting records in Texas, and they're voting for Trump, just so you understand that. And they know it. But when they see those numbers coming, they don't want to announce them. But we are winning almost everywhere. I think – give us two more days, I think we're *gonna* be winning everywhere. And I'm almost starting to think that the least important problem that Hillary has is the fact that we're winning. I think she's got perhaps bigger problems than even that. We're fighting for every citizen who believes that government should serve the people, not the donors and not Hillary's special interests. We are fighting to unlock the potential of every American community and every

American family who hope and pray and yearn for a much better future. I am asking you to dream big – I got to dream big.

(A.3.458) Because with your vote, we are just – can you believe this? (00:28:30–00:28:32) – six days away. Think of that. From the change you’ve been waiting for your entire life. We’re *gonna* work together. We’re *gonna* vote. You’re *gonna* vote now or you’re *gonna* vote by the 8th. But you’re *gonna* vote. Thank you. I love that guy. He’s a tough guy, but he just screamed out, “You’re *gonna* win.” We’re *gonna* win. Thank you, man. Thank you. We have great, great love. You know, we’re in a divided nation. We are a divided nation. We’re not *gonna* be divided. We’re *gonna* have such love in this country. We’re *gonna* have such love and such respect. Together, we will make America wealthy again. We will make America strong again. We will make America safe again. And we will make America great again. Thank you very much. Thank you, folks. God bless you, everybody. God bless you. Thank you. Get out and vote. Get out and vote. Thank you.

## Speech 15

### Remarks at the Bayfront Park Amphitheater in Miami, Florida, 02 November 2016

Thank you *very much everybody*. Thank you. *Thank you*. I love that sign, “Blacks for Trump.” I love that sign, thank you. There are a lot of those signs. Thank you. “Women for Trump.” “Hispanics for Trump.” There’s one “Women and Hispanics for Trump.” Thank you very much. In six days, we are going to win the great state of Florida and we are going to win back the White House 100 percent. We’re on the cusp of an incredible historic change that transfers power from a failed political establishment and returns that power to our families, communities and citizens, to you. The system is rigged, remember that. The system is rigged. Right now it’s rigged. We’re *gonna* change it. There’s some breaking news about that subject that we’re going to discuss right now. As I mentioned yesterday, on of the – and you probably saw this and maybe some of you have just read it. One of the top Department of Justice officials involved in the e-mail investigation, Assistant Attorney General Peter Kassig is a close associate of John Podesta. The two met for dinner after Clinton testified about Benghazi and Podesta, who by the way said Hillary Clinton has terrible instincts on WikiLeaks, described him as the man who kept him, Podesta, out of jail. 13.41 Kadzik is also the one who helped lead the effort to confirm Attorney General Loretta Lynch.

(A.3.459) Now, today, in a newly released e-mail – through WikiLeaks again – we learned that Kadzik was feeding information about the investigation into the Clinton campaign and that, *right?* (00:13:50–00:14:05)

And that Kadzik said quote “It will be a while before the State Department posts the e-mails.” Remember they were waiting for the e-mails. Podesta forwarded the e-mails to Clinton’s top staff and said, additional chances for mischief. These are the people that want to run our country, folks. The spread of political agendas into the Justice Department – there’s never been a thing like this that has happened in our country’s history – is one of the saddest things that has happened to our country. But with your vote you can beat the system, the rigged system, and deliver justice. 14.57 So, show up early and vote. Show up early. You know, the lines are incredible. The polls are all saying we’re *gonna* win Florida. Don’t believe it. Don’t believe it. Get out there and vote. Pretend we’re slightly behind. You got to get – we don’t want to blow this. This is the one chance we have, it’ll never happen again. It’s not *gonna*

happen. In four years, it's not *gonna* happen – it can't happen again. This is a movement like we have never seen in this country before. These crowds, the enthusiasm, the love. Got to get out and vote. Real change begins with immediately repealing and replacing Obamacare. And Hillary is not going to be the answer because she wants to make it more expensive. She's doubling down. It's just been announced that the residents of Florida – sorry to tell you this, folks – are going to experience a massive, massive double digit premium hike. 16.06 Now, I know what that hike is, but I want you to leave here happy, I want you to be happy people. I want you to think about the future after we take back the White House so I'm not *gonna* tell you what your hike is, but let me just say it's going to be very substantial. And Obamacare doesn't work on top of everything else. As an example, in the great state of Arizona – which I just left – premiums are going up more than 116 percent. It's out of control. Over 90 percent of the counties in Florida are losing Obamacare insurance next year. Lots of luck in your negotiation. In Minnesota where the premium increase will be close to 60 percent, the Democratic governor said, the Affordable Care Act is no longer affordable. Premiums are surging, companies are leaving, insurers are fleeing, doctors are quitting and deductibles are absolutely through the roof. Wasn't supposed to be like this, but I said it was going to be like this before it was passed because I understand how business works. 17.20 Obamacare never had a chance. It's a catastrophe. Yet Hillary Clinton wants to double down on Obamacare making it even more expensive. It's *gonna* go up a lot. People aren't *gonna* be able to afford it so I'm not sure that it matters, they're just not *gonna* be able to pay. I'm asking for your vote so we can replace Obamacare and save health care for every family in Florida and the United States. Real change also means restoring honesty to our government.

(A.3.460) As you know, the FBI has – did you hear about this little event? (00:17:54–00:17:58)  
The FBI re-opening the investigation. They're re-opening the investigation into Crooked Hillary Clinton. Crooked Hillary, she's crooked. She is a crooked one, there's no question.

(A.3.461) Crooked Hillary Clinton, you know that term has really stuck, everyone's calling her – has anyone seen Crooked Hillary Clinton today? (00:18:31–00:18:34)

18.36

(A.3.462) That's *gonna* be a great term for a president, right? (00:18:36–00:18:39)

Boy, oh boy, what a mess. This is the biggest scandal since Watergate. And now it's been reported that there are FBI inquiries probing virtually all of Hillary Clinton's inner circle and many of the things she's done over the years. It's about time. Remember, it's a rigged system, remember it's about time. She wants to blame everyone else for her mounting legal troubles, but she really has no one to blame but herself. Hillary is the one who set up the illegal private e-mail server to shield her criminal activity. The woman screaming exactly, exactly, it is exactly. Hillary is the one who engaged in a corrupt pay-for-play scheme at the State Department and who ripped off the people of Haiti, the people of Haiti were ripped off. And I met with the people of Little Haiti.

(A.3.463) Anybody here? (00:19:45–00:19:46)

These are great people, great, thank you. Hillary is the one who endangered national security by sending classified information on an insecure server. Hillary is the one who lied so many times to Congress and the FBI. Hillary is the one who made 13 phones disappear, some with a hammer. And she's the one who destroyed 33,000 e-mails after receiving a Congressional subpoena. She also accepted debate questions given to her in advance by Donna Brazile. 20.40 And then used those debate questions to cheat. It's cheating, the worst level. Instead of reporting this breach to an ethics committee or whoever would listen to the breach. So, she got the answers, cheating. She got the questions, cheating. And then she – rather than reporting them, rather than saying this shouldn't be happening – she used them against Bernie Sanders. Can you imagine. she probably got them against me too except we won the debate so easy I don't think it mattered. We won those debates.

(A.3.464) Did you see her at the end of the debates? (00:21:20–00:21:22)

Folks, she was exhausted.

(A.3.465) You know what she did? (00:21:27–00:21:28)

She immediately went home and went to sleep. Hillary is not the victim, and the American people, frankly, are the victims of this rigged and corrupt system in every way. But this is your chance finally to change it, November 8th. Now in Florida's case, earlier. Now, just so you understand, record turnout, unbelievable numbers, unbelievable. We're doing great with the African-American community. 22.05 We're doing great with the Hispanic community. And the lines are four, five and six blocks long. They've never seen anything like it. And the

polls have just come up. We're way up in Florida. I shouldn't say that, because I want you to go vote.

(A.3.466) OK, ready? (00:22:24–00:22:25)

We're *gonna* pretend we're down. We're down.

(A.3.467) Pretend, right? (00:22:28–00:22:28)

We'll pretend we're down. No, we got to win. We got to win big. We got to beat her. Got to beat her. We're up in Ohio, we're up in Iowa, we're up in North Carolina. I think we're doing great in Pennsylvania; from what I hear. Folks, you're *gonna* be so proud. You're *gonna* be so proud. We're *gonna* make America great again. You're *gonna* be so happy and you're *gonna* be so proud of your country again. If Hillary Clinton were to be elected, it would create an unprecedented and protracted constitutional crisis. 23.10

(A.3.468) Haven't we just been through a lot with the Clintons, right? (00:23:10–00:23:17)

(A.3.469) Remember when he was impeached for lying? (00:23:10–00:23:17)

He can't practice law. He doesn't have the right to practice law.

(A.3.470) Didn't we just go through this? (00:23:23–00:23:25)

And the last thing we need is another four years of Obama. That's the last thing. And this will be worse. That means ISIS, that means high taxes, that means bad health care, that means no border. Without a border, we don't have a country. The work of government would grind to a halt if she were ever elected. She'll be in court for her entire tenure and she'll be convicted. Because look, the first time – I mean, frankly, forget about this time.

(A.3.471) The first time she gets a subpoena from the United States Congress and she deletes everything? (00:24:00–00:24:07)

There shouldn't have been a second time. 24.10 But I have respect that the FBI has given it a second chance. And this time, I have no doubt that in that 650,000 e-mails – did you see where they said, oh, we're not worried. They're duplicates.

(A.3.472) How can there be duplicates if there are hundreds of thousands more than you started off with? (00:24:27–00:24:33)

So today, I guess WikiLeaks, it sounds like, is *gonna* be dropping some more, and if we met tomorrow, I'll tell you about it tomorrow, but one beauty that's been caught was, and this was just recently, newly released, where they say having a dump. We're having a dump of all of those e-mails. 25.10 In another communication, Bill Clinton's chief of staff says foreign government – right, this should be another one. Just like swamp – you know the swamp little statement – this one, this one.

(A.3.473) Do you remember what it is? (00:25:23–00:25:24)

(A.3.474) Right? (00:25:26–00:25:30)

(A.3.475) All the money is in, right? (00:25:26–00:25:30)

They said all the money is in. They're talking about foreign money pouring into their pockets. They said all the money is in. This is what is running for office. Honestly, she should be ashamed of herself. She should be ashamed of herself. My contract with the American voter begins with a plan to restore honesty to our government. That includes a ban on foreign lobbyists raising money for American elections. Makes sense. I want the entire corrupt Washington establishment to hear and to heed the words we all will be saying right now. When we win on November 8th, we are going to Washington, D.C. and we are going to drain the swamp. 26.22 Gonna drain the swamp. We're gonna drain the swamp, folks. We're gonna drain that swamp. Another important issue for Americans is integrity in journalism. These people are among the most dishonest people I've ever met, spoken to, done business with. These are the most dishonest people. There has never been dishonesty – there has never been dishonesty like we've seen in this election. There's never been anywhere near the media dishonesty like we've seen in this election. Don't worry, they won't spin the cameras and show the kind of massive crowds. They won't do that. 27.34 The very talented Michael Goodwin of the New York Post just wrote today that 2016 presidential race will mark the low-water mark of journalism that is worthy – think of it – of the First Amendment. Never before have so many media organizations, old and new, abandoned all pretense of fairness to take sides and try to pick a president. It's unbelievable. It's un-honestly. For instance, we have a great story. We give it out to the media. They'll make it look as bad as possible – as bad as possible. Parenthetically. 28.34 So sad. Parenthetically and very sadly, earnings for the New York Times are down 97 percent this year. They just announced that. So bad. I feel so badly for them. Just announced – 97 percent. Oh, they're doing great.

(A.3.476) And then they tell you who to vote for, you know? (00:28:53–00:28:56)

Who to vote for. They want crooked Hillary. This isn't about me; it's about all of you and our magnificent movement to make America great again all over this country. And they're talking about it all over the world. At the core of my contract is my plan to bring back jobs. Right now, 70 million American women and children live in poverty or near the brink of poverty. Forty-three percent of African-American school-aged children live in poverty. Thirty-two percent of Hispanic school-aged children live in poverty. 29.40 This is America, this is the United States, this is unacceptable. As your president, I will go into the poorest communities and work on a national plan for revitalization. We will replace decades of failure with generations of success. Florida has lost one in four of its manufacturing jobs since NAFTA, a deal signed by Bill Clinton and supported by Hillary. And here's a number that you should remember because it's not even a believable number, and it's correct. America has lost 70,000 factories since China entered the World Trade Organization. Another Bill and Hillary-backed disaster. We are living through the greatest jobs left in the history of the world. Our jobs are going to Mexico, our jobs are going to other countries. China and others are making our product. We don't make it anymore. A Trump administration will stop the jobs from leaving America and we will stop the jobs from leaving Florida. 30.57 My second home, you know that, I'm here all the time. My second home, great place. The theft of American prosperity will end. So they are stealing our prosperity, horribly stealing our prosperity. A Trump administration will renegotiate NAFTA and we'll stand up to foreign product dumping all over the place. Currency manipulation by China and many other countries and all of the unfair subsidy behavior that's going on all over the world against us. We will also immediately stop the job-killing, Trans-Pacific Partnership, a disaster. And Hillary wants it to happen, she called it the gold standard, then she rejected it. But she's *gonna* approve it. Then she lied during the debate.

(A.3.477) Right? (00:31:47–00:31:49)

She lied. 31.51 She lied during the debate. She said "she never called it the gold standard", she lied. And she lied about the line in the sand.

(A.3.478) Right? (00:31:55–00:31:57)

She lied. As part of our plan to bring back jobs, we're going to lower taxes on American business from 35 percent to 15 percent. We will also cancel billions in global warming pay-

ments to the United Nations. *And* use that money to support America's vital environmental infrastructure and natural resources. We're spending hundreds of billions of dollars. We don't even know who's doing what with the money. We're gonna spend the money here. We're gonna work on our own environment. That includes repairing the Herbert Hoover Dike at Lake Okeechobee and protecting the Florida Everglades. We will become a rich nation again, but to be a rich nation, we must also be a safe nation. 32.59 A terrible tragedy today has occurred in Iowa. You read, you saw. Early this morning, two Iowa police officers, outstanding, outstanding people, were murdered, ambushed, ambushed violently while sitting in their squad cars. We send our thoughts and prayers to the family of the fallen. I just left Iowa, most beautiful place. The treatment was so incredible, the crowds, the police officers were so incredible the job they did. *Now, two* of them are dead. An attack on our police is an attack on all of us. Law enforcement is the line separating civilization from total chaos, you have to remember that. According to the national law enforcement officers, Memorial Fund, firearm related police *there*, were up 48 percent this year, the highest they've ever been. And there have been 14 ambush style attacks this year alone, never had anything like this. 34.07 And what it is, is a lack of respect for our nation, it's a lack of respect for our leadership. To all the great men and women of law enforcement I want you to know, we're with you, we support you and we will stand by you. We will restore law order and justice in America – justice. [Audience: USA! USA! USA! USA!] Thank you. Thank you, so good luck to the people of Iowa. We will also work with our federal and local law enforcements to keep America safe from terrorism. Hillary Clinton wants a 550 percent increase in Syrian refugees pouring into our country. 35.02 Her plan would mean generations of terrorism and extremism spreading in your schools and all throughout your communities. When I'm president, we will suspend the Syrian refugee program and we will keep radical Islamic terrorist the hell out of your community. Now, we all have heart and we're gonna build safe zones and we're gonna have some of the Gulf States that have nothing but money, they'll put up the money, we'll lead it, we'll build safe zones. But we have enough problems in our country. She wants to increase the thousands and thousands that are pouring in right now. She wants to increase that number by 550 percent. And then, you wonder why Podesta says, she has bad instincts and you wonder why Bernie Sanders says, she's got bad judgment, they're right. She's got bad judgment, personally I think she's a very unstable person, if you wanna really know the truth. 36.13

(A.3.479) And we're gonna repeal and replace Obamacare, but you wanna know something? Honestly, I think for herself she's got much bigger problems right now than Obamacare. She's got bigger problems. Let's see what's on all those e-mails that they just found, see what's on those e-mails. [Audience: Lock her up! Lock her up! Lock her up!] Thank you.

(A.3.480) It's too bad those cameras aren't turning around to see this incredible group of people with thousands more outside, isn't it too bad? (00:36:50–00:36:58)

They don't do it. But you know, if Hillary speaks and there's 30 people in the line they say, the crowd is massive. 37.08 She's never had a crowd like this in her life. President Obama shouldn't be campaigning for any longer, it's really a conflict.

(A.3.481) Right? (00:37:12–00:37:16)

He *ought* to be working on jobs, on the border, on building up our military instead of campaigning for crooked Hillary Clinton, is what he *ought to be* doing. He's in North Carolina, but we're going to North Carolina right after this, so. But we have *two* more today in Florida, and we have massive crowds. There's something happening. They're not reporting it. Katie, you're not reporting it, Katie. But there's something happening, Katie. There's something happening, Katie. A Trump administration will also secure and defend the borders of the United States. And yes, we will build the wall. Thank you. 38.20 We've received the first ever endorsement from our ICE and Border Patrol officers. First time they've ever endorsed a presidential candidate. They tell us the border crisis taking place right now is the worst it's ever been. Now, in all fairness, people probably figure that I'm *gonna* win. So, they're racing across the border. I don't know. I'm sorry to do this to you, folks. Hillary has pledged totally open borders, meaning you don't have a country anymore.

(A.3.482) And she strongly supports sanctuary cities like in San Francisco where *K*– Right? (00:38:57–00:39:04)

Where Kate Steinle was killed by a five time deported illegal immigrant. The immigration officers warn that Hillary's plan is the most radical immigration proposal in U.S. history and that it will lead to the loss of thousands of lives. And I believe that. As secretary of State, Hillary Clinton allowed thousands of the most dangerous and violent criminal aliens to go free because their countries would not take them back. 39.41 Countless innocent Americans have been killed by illegal immigrants. Last year, as an example, 17-year-old

Starlett Pitts, her boyfriend and her mother were stabbed to death in their Lee High Acres home by an illegal immigrant. The killer had been convicted of assaulting a police officer and was wanted for double murder and robbery. And the people that knew him were begging that he be incarcerated. They were begging. He was released from custody pending his court appearance, enabling him to commit murder. A Trump administration will stop illegal immigration, deport all criminal aliens and save American lives. And I want to thank, by the way, I see all these signs “Cubans for Trump.” Cubans. I love Cubans. 40.54

(A.3.483) So they gave me last week the Bay of Pigs Association, right? (00:40:54–00:41:01)

You know. They gave me their award last week and it was a great honor. And we’re gonna fight very hard for the Cubans and we’re gonna fight very, very hard for the Hispanics because they have not been properly taken care of. What’s happened with the Hispanic population in our country is not right. What’s happened with the inner cities of our country, the African-American community, the Hispanic community, is very, very unfair. Thank you. Thank you. We’re *gonna* take care of it. The crime is horrible, the education is terrible, and you can’t get a job. We’re *gonna* fix the inner cities – we’re *gonna* fix the inner cities. Thank you, fellows, that’s so good. Blacks for Trump. That’s so nice. 41.55 We will also repeal the Obama-Clinton defense sequester and rebuild our badly depleted military. That includes total support for homestead air reserve base. A Trump administration will stand in solidarity with the suffering people of Cuba and Venezuela all surrounding Dural – all surrounding Dural against the oppression of the Castro and Maduro regimes, you know what I’m talking about. We will cancel Obama’s one-sided Cuban deal made by Executive Order. If we do not get the deal we want, and the deal that people living in Cuba and here deserve. Including protecting religious and political freedom.

(A.3.484) Right? (00:42:00–00:43:00)

I’m honored to have the endorsement of over 200 top admirals and generals, and 22 Medal of Honor recipients. 43.05 You know it’s really called peace through strength. Peace through strength, that’s what we’re *gonna* have, *we’ll*, hopefully. Have to get rid of ISIS – we’re *gonna* get rid of ISIS, don’t worry, we’re getting rid of ISIS. But we have to get to rebuild our country. We’ve spent six trillion dollars in the Middle East – six trillion dollars. And it’s in far worse shape, by a factor of 10, from when we started. Six trillion – we lost lives, the most incredible, great people. Our new foreign policy will put America first. Hillary brought disaster to Iraq

and Syria and Libya. And she empowered Iran, remember, she's got bad judgment. And she unleashed ISIS, came right out of the vacuum. Now she wants to start a shooting war in Syria in conflict with nuclear-armed Russia. Frankly, it could lead to World War III and she has no sense. She's got no instinct, but that's decided. Hillary and our failed Washington establishment, they've spent that six trillion dollars. I mean, I'd love to have that money back, but I'd much rather have all those lives back – rather have all those lives. Love to have those lives back. But the Middle East is in bad shape folks, and it's getting worse, totally getting worse. They've dragged us into foreign wars that have made us less safe. They've left our borders wide open at home and they've shipped our jobs and wealth to other countries. And these are foreign wars that we don't win — we don't win. We don't win anymore, we don't win with trade, we don't win with wars, we don't win anymore. We're *gonna* start winning again, you watch. We're *gonna* start. To all Americans I say it's time for new leadership. Just think about what can be accomplished in the first 100 days of a Trump administration. We're going to have the biggest tax cut since Ronald Reagan. 45.22 And she is going to raise your taxes very substantially, I think you know that. We will eliminate every unnecessary job-killing regulation, cancel every illegal Obama executive order, rebuild our military and take care of our great veterans. Provide school choice and put an end to Common Core; we're bringing our education local. Support the men and women of law enforcement. We're going to save our Second Amendment, which is under siege and appoint justices to the United States Supreme Court who will uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. Clinton wants us to think small, wants us to believe things can't change and wants our lives to revolve around Washington. I wonder if she's *gonna* be there much longer.

(A.3.485) What do you think? (00:46:20–00:46:27)

46.27 I don't think so. I don't know. I'm not sure she's *gonna* be there. But she wants – she wants our lives to revolve around Washington, D.C. I'm asking you to dream big, to push for bold change and to believe in a movement powered by the people and by their love for this great country. I'm tired of politicians telling Americans to defer their dreams to another day when they really mean another decade. America is tired of waiting. The moment is now. All we have to do is stop believing in our failed politicians and start believing in each other and in our country. There is no challenge too great, no dream outside of our reach. Don't let anyone tell you it can't be done. The future lies with the dreamers, not the cynics,

not the critics, certainly not the media. Hillary has been there for 30 years and she has accomplished nothing. She's just made things worse. Look at her record.

(A.3.486) She's the candidate of yesterday; we are the *mo* – right? (00:47:46–00:47:51)

(A.3.487) Is that right? (00:47:46–00:47:51)

We are the movement of the future. Our movement represents all Americans from all backgrounds and all walks of life. We are asking for the votes of Republicans and Democrats and independents and first time voters. And believe me, there are a lot of first time voters that are standing on line right now. We're asking for the vote of every American who believes truth and justice, not money and power, should rule the day. And I understand the other side very well. I've been there for a long time, but I love our country and I understand what has to be done. We are going in the wrong direction, and if we keep going in this direction, we won't have a country any longer. 48.46 We're fighting for every citizen who believes that government should serve the people, not the donors and not the special interests. We're fighting to unlock the potential of every American community and every American family who hope and pray and yearn for a better future. With your vote, we are just – think of it – six days away. This started on June 16th of last year. It's a long time. Seems like a long time ago. But we're six days away from the change you've been waiting for your entire life. It'll never happen again. It'll never, ever happen. It's not *gonna* happen in four years. When I see Cubans for Trump, it'll never happen again. I'm telling you. This whole thing will never happen again. There's never been a movement like this in the history of our country – there's never been a movement like this. [Audience: We want Trump! We want Trump! We want Trump!] Thank you. Thank you. There has never been a movement like this in the history of our country — it's never happened. Even the pundits, even the ones that truly dislike Donald Trump have said, it's the single greatest phenomena *they've* ever seen. We have to close the deal. We have to close – get out and vote. November 8th is fine, better if you vote now. Maybe you don't feel good on November 8th, you don't want to get out of bed, *you got to get up, you got to vote*. Together we will make America wealthy again, we will make America strong again, we will make America safe again, and we will make America great again. Thank you very much, everybody. Thank you. Thank you. Get out and vote. God bless you, everybody. Thank you.

## Speech 16

### Remarks at J.S Dorton Arena in Raleigh, North Carolina, 07 November 2016

*Thank you very much.* This is amazing. What a great place. Thank you very much. *So*, we have thousands of people outside trying to get in. But we should start.

(A.3.488) Do we agree? (00:01:15–00:01:16)

We should start. So they'll come in. They'll come in. First of all I want to thank you. Special, special place. It's a special place with incredible people.

(A.3.489) In one day, do you believe this? (00:01:29–00:01:31)

One day we are going to win the great state of North Carolina... And we are going to win back the White House. This election will decide whether we are ruled by a corrupt political class – you're seeing what's happening, everybody's watching – or whether we are ruled by the people. We're *gonna* be ruled by the people, folks. 02.04 That is going to be the choice. A failed political establishment has delivered nothing but poverty, nothing but problems, nothing but losses. Nothing but losses. We don't win anymore as a country. We're *gonna* start winning again. They get rich by making America poorer in many cases. It's time to reject the media and political elite that has bled our country dry. And these are among the most dishonest people. They don't give you the truth, folks. They don't give you the truth. They rarely give you the truth. You know it. And they know it. That's the scary part. They know it. It's time to fight for America. I'm not a politician, I can say proudly. My only special interest is you. It's you. 03.08 We're going to bring back the jobs that have been stolen from you. We're going to bring back the wealth that has been taken from our country. We're going to bring back the miners and the factory workers and the steel workers. We're going to put them back to work. The economic policies of Bill and Hillary Clinton have destroyed manufacturing in your state and throughout the entire country. The corrupt Clintons gave us NAFTA. China's too horrible entry into the World Trade Organization. One of the disasters. The job-killing deal with South Korea. That was a Hillary Clinton beauty. And the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which will be a total disaster. That Hillary Clinton said this is the gold standard.

(A.3.490) And you know what? (00:04:06–00:04:07)

It is the gold – she lied. She lied during the debate.

(A.3.491) She said – hey, by the way, who won the debate? (00:04:08–00:04:09)

(A.3.492) Did we win that debate? (00:04:10–00:04:12)

But she lied during the debate. She lied during the debate. She said it's the gold standard. And then she said she never said it. Don't worry about coal. We're bringing back coal, sir. He's holding up a couple of... Clean coal. Clean coal.

(A.3.493) Right? (00:04:29–00:04:29)

We're *gonna* do clean coal, the miners. The miners are *gonna* be back. Not if Hillary Clinton gets in. The miners, I guess you got to start thinking about something else. But the miners are *gonna* be back. Clean coal. Clean coal. You know, thinking about it, though. Also, people, the press doesn't talk about it. Donna Brazile gets the questions through a debate...but then it turns out to be a number of debates.

(A.3.494) Who cares about Donna Brazile? (00:04:55–00:04:57)

She's turned out to be not what people thought. She gets, illegally – illegally – she gets the questions to the debate. She then takes those questions and gives them to crooked Hillary Clinton. 05.13

(A.3.495) Now, does crooked Hillary report it? (00:05:13–00:05:24)

(A.3.496) Does she say I shouldn't have these questions or these answers? (00:05:13–00:05:24)

(A.3.497) I think they gave them the answers also, right? (00:05:13–00:05:24)

No, she doesn't. They doesn't. I wonder if she had – I wonder if she had the questions in my debates. I don't think so because she didn't do that well. I don't think so. I don't think so. But the years of betrayal will end. And they will end. And they're *gonna* end quickly. They're *gonna* end as of the day we take office, which is going to be very, very soon. The theft of North Carolina jobs will end. You've taken in harder than most states. Real change begins with immediately repealing and replacing Obamacare. Sadly, it's just been announced that the residents of North Carolina are going to experience massive double-digit premium hikes. Ninety-five...of the 100 North Carolina counties will only have one insurer in the Obamacare exchange next year. Lots of luck negotiating. Honestly, it's not *gonna* matter because we're

*gonna* win and we're *gonna* terminate it. You're gonna have such great health care...for much less money. It won't matter. Premiums are searching. Companies are leaving. Insurers are fleeing. Doctors are quitting. By the way, doctors, they're leaving. They're quitting. I have a friend who's a doctor. He said that I have more accountants than I have nurses, it's so complicated. And deductibles are going through the roof. Yet Hillary Clinton wants to double down and expand Obamacare and make it even more expensive. I'm asking for your vote so we can repeal and replace Obamacare, and save health care for every family in North Carolina. Thank you. Thank you. [Audience: Trump! Trump! Trump!] Thank you. People are pouring in, folks. They're pouring in.

(A.3.498) Did you see last night in Michigan the crowd we had? (00:07:51–00:07:54)

And the crowd we had – by the way, how about 24,000 maybe 25,000 right next to Fort Bragg.

(A.3.499) You saw that, the other night? (00:07:53–00:07:54)

And we went to Minnesota. Minnesota's been treated very, very badly. We went to Minnesota where we're doing very well.

(A.3.500) Everyone said why Minnesota? (00:08:12–00:08:14)

That doesn't go Republican. It's going Republican this year, I'll tell you. Minnesota. Great place. 08.23 And you know, you've been watching and you've been seeing and these people are being driven crazy, the dishonest media. We're winning Ohio. We're winning Iowa. We're winning, we think, New Hampshire. We're *gonna* do great in New Hampshire. I hear we're winning North Carolina big... I hear. We're winning Florida, winning Florida, doing really well. Headlines today are on drudge. How well we're doing in Florida. And I think we're *gonna* win the great state of Pennsylvania, I do. And we're winning plenty of other places. So we have to go. The big key, you have to go. You don't win a rigged system, folks. We're in a rigged system. You got to go. You got to vote. Got to make sure that vote gets registered *in there*. 9.20 Real change also means restoring honesty to our government Thank you. Wow. Great, great spirit. I have a job right next to – we have a beautiful, beautiful property right next to – right near Charlotte.

(A.3.501) You know about it, folks? (00:09:47–00:09:51)

(A.3.502) It's great right? (00:09:47–00:09:51)

Some of the people. But it's an amazing place. It's an amazing place to work and to live, and we love it. Hillary Clinton is the most corrupt person ever to seek the office of the presidency of the United States. She threatened national security, she sold her office to the highest bidder. And then to cover her tracks.....she deleted 33,000 emails after receiving a congressional subpoena, and nothing happens to her. Nothing happens. 10.29 She's being protected by a totally rigged system, *folks. She's being protected – you know James Cartwright, General James Cartwright, current General.* A four-star general, two weeks ago. Probably going to jail for up to five years for doing nothing by comparison. But he said he did it for national security reasons and I can understand that. Go to jail for up to five years. General betrayers, his life was destroyed and here she is she is running for president, *she's done* 25 times worse than anybody has ever dreamt. It's a rigged system. It is a rigged rigged system. Don't worry, folks. The cameras will never spin around and show this crowd. They never do. They show my face and the two people behind me, not the thousands behind me. They never do. They never do. 11.43 So dishonest. There they are. There they are. My group. Women for Trump. Women for Trump. They've been following me, these ladies, for a long time.

(A.3.503) How are we doing? (00:11:59–00:12:00)

(A.3.504) Are we doing well? (00:12:00–00:12:01)

Great people. Women for Trump. And now it's up to the American people to deliver the justice that we deserve at the ballot box tomorrow. At the ballot box. We're *gonna* win. I think it's a great way of showing what we have to show in light of what's going on with justice in this country. I really do. I think it's a great way. You show it tomorrow. *You* show it tomorrow. My contract with the American voter begins with a plan to end government corruption and to take our country back from the special interests. And folks, I was on the other side for a long time. It's a very good place to be. But I love the country. I love this country. I've really gotten to love the people of this country because I have been everywhere. We have the greatest people on earth. But I love this country. 12.59 And I couldn't watch it when they made the Iran deal. They gave them \$150 billion, a terrorist state. A state that was ready to collapse until we made them rich and powerful. We gave them a path to nuclear weapons. They were ready to collapse.

(A.3.505) We gave them, remember, \$400 billion, right? (00:13:22–00:13:22)

We gave them \$400 million. Then we found out that was *wrong* – it wasn't \$400 million. It was \$1.7 billion in cash. In cash.

(A.3.506) Do you know what \$1.7 billion in cash is? (00:13:34–00:13:38)

You could take that whole side of the arena and you wouldn't have enough room.

(A.3.507) How stupid are we to allow this to happen? (00:13:43–00:13:45)

Our leaders are incompetent. President Obama is campaigning today with Hillary Clinton because she can't campaign. She can't campaign. 13.59 So Obama is taking Air Force One, which costs a fortune. You know he's very much into the environment. And he'll take a massive, old engine 747. Very much into the environment. Very much into the ozone layer. And yet he'll fly that 747 all over the place to campaign for crooked Hillary. And I don't think it's *gonna* work. And she's not getting any crowds. So she gets Beyonce and Jay-Z. I like them. I like them.

(A.3.508) And you know what they do? (00:14:35–00:14:36)

I get bigger crowds than they do. It's true. I get far bigger crowds. Look at this place. I mean, look at the crowds we had in Michigan. By the way, Michigan is in play. *You know*, it hasn't been in play for Republicans for 30 something years. Michigan is in play because they're tired of watching their car factories be taken out. They're tired of losing their jobs to Mexico. 15.01 Ford. Ford right now moved all of its small – *small* car production to Mexico. They're building the biggest plants in the world in Mexico. And Michigan *is gonna vote for Trump because I've been* complaining about it for five years to Mexico. No, we're *gonna* have some – tomorrow's *gonna* be a very historic day. I really believe that. I think it's *gonna* show – I think it's *gonna* be a Brexit plus, plus, plus.

(A.3.509) Does that make sense? (00:15:28–00:15:29)

Plus, plus, plus. *Gonna* be amazing. *Gonna* be amazing. I want the entire corrupt Washington establishment to hear the words we're all about to say. This is a phrase, I told you. I didn't like it. I thought it was hokie. But it's not hokie. It's called – “drain the swamp.” We're *gonna* go to Washington. We're *gonna* drain the swamp. Can't believe it. I told the story. I hated that expression. I said no way I'm *gonna* say that, no way. That's so hokie. And I said it. The place went crazy. Then I said it to another place. It went crazier. Then I said it

with more confidence because you know confidence is – and it went wild. Now I love the expression. I think it was genius. Drain the swamp. Drain the swamp.

(A.3.510) Is there any place better to be than a Trump rally? (00:16:37–00:16:39)

(A.3.511) Are we having fun? (00:16:39–00:16:41)

(A.3.512) Are we having fun? (00:16:42–00:16:43)

(A.3.513) No? (00:16:43–00:16:44)

And I don't have a guitar. And I don't have a piano. All we have is great concepts for our country, which is the most important thing. Because frankly, when people get on stage, and they're entertainers, and they entertain in order to get people to fill up a room for Hillary Clinton. And by the way, they use the dirtiest language the other night. And it was – many of the people left. You know they're political people. They heard words they've never heard before. They left. 17.16 So the place was half empty by the time – actually, it never got full, even with them. Then it was pretty much empty midway through. And then most of the people just left. And when Hillary got up there was practically – she might as well just have started with a few people. It would've been easier. But you know she hears those words. I won't use the words. I won't even address the words.

(A.3.514) Because if I do the crooked media will say “did you hear what Donald Trump said today?” (00:17:40–00:17:42)

But honestly – yes. Those words were disgusting.

(A.3.515) If I ever said those words that Jay-Z said or that Beyonce said the other night, you know what would happen to me? (00:17:59–00:18:00)

The reinstatement of the electric chair.

(A.3.516) It would be – how about if I got the answers to the debate? (00:18:08–00:18:12)

(A.3.517) Or if I got the questions? (00:18:08–00:18:12)

Supposing instead of Hillary getting the questions to the debate, which is cheating. She's a cheat. She is a cheat. She never reported it. She is a cheat. 18.22 So supposing instead of her – supposing somebody gave Donald Trump the questions to the debate. Headlines all over the world. He must withdraw from the race. You don't even hear anything about

crooked Hillary. She got the questions. To me that's such a *big deal*. Some people say, my people, oh don't mention that, it's just – I say to me it's a big deal. It's a big deal. But it's not a big deal for the dishonest media to say. They don't want to report it. But just think about it, supposing it was us. At the core of my contract is my plan to bring back our jobs. Bring them back to America. And by the way, you have a great governor. Support your governor. He's a great guy.

(A.3.518) Where is he? (00:19:13–00:19:14)

He's here someplace. He's a great guy and he's in a tough fight. And he's *gonna* win that fight. But he's a great guy. So hopefully you'll support your governor. 19.28 North Carolina has lost nearly half of its manufacturing jobs since NAFTA, a deal signed by Bill Clinton and his lovely wife, Hillary. Well think of it. Think of it. Think of the numbers of jobs. Here's the one that gets me the most. Two things get me the most. Two things that just don't seem real.

(A.3.519) Because we're *gonna* take care of our veterans, right? (00:19:49–00:19:50)

Like big league. Because our veterans are great. But two – *two* statistics I can't believe. Twenty-two suicides a day for our veterans. Think of it. You wouldn't think that's possible. Because they're treated so badly. They wait on line for six, seven, eight days for simple procedure that could solve their problem or for a prescription. But two – *two* numbers I don't – it just doesn't make sense. Twenty-two suicides a day for our veterans.

(A.3.520) OK? (00:20:18–00:20:19)

It doesn't make sense. And here's another one. America has lost 70,000 factories. Now I thought they meant 700 or 7,000 maybe. It's 70,000 factories since China entered the World Trade Organization, another Bill and Hillary Clinton-backed disaster. 20.38 Think of it though. Think of what 70,000 factories is. So those are the two numbers. They just don't seem to be real. Sad numbers. Sad numbers. Especially the vets, to be honest with you. We're living through the greatest jobs theft in the history of our world. There's never been anything happened to a country like has been happening to the United States. Our jobs are fleeing. Our companies are being taken. And leaving. And leaving. A Trump administration will stop the jobs from leaving America. And we will stop the jobs from leaving North Carolina. Believe me. If a company wants to fire their workers and leave, as an example North Carolina, and move to another country, and then ship their products back

into the United States through what will be a very strong border, by the way. 21.35 We will make them pay a 35 percent tax on every product that they ship back here. And here's what's going to happen. They're not *gonna* leave. They're not *gonna* leave. Now your politicians, some of them don't understand it. And the one [we will negotiate, not for us, Mexico, I don't know who the hell they are]<sup>3</sup> 22.59 *I love that sign. Now, it's all over the place. Yeah, yeah, there is for Trump, I like that. But, now I saw that sign. We're gonna stand up to China, we're gonna stop the job killing Trans Pacific Partnership, you know, look, as part of our plan the taxes – we're the highest taxed country in the world we're gonna be among the lowers as part of our plan to bring back our jobs. We are going to lower taxes on American businesses from 35% to 15%. It's gonna be a big engine. We will massively cut taxes for the middle class. And by the way, Hillary Clinton wants to raise your taxes, and you know that Substantially. So we're the highest taxed in the world, she wants to raise your taxes. Same old story. We will unleash the power of American energy including shale, oil, natural gas and clean coal. Our plan will end the EPA intrusion into your family farms, and stop double taxation of a family farm at that debt. 24.13 We will cancel billions in global warming payments to the United Nations. Billions and billions of dollars. And we have no idea what they do with that money. I actually have a pretty good idea. You're not gonna like it. And use that money – we're gonna use that money to rebuild the infrastructure of our country. And we will rebuild our inner cities. The African-American community, the Hispanic community...have had such lies told to them. They live – many, many people living in the inner cities of our country, they're getting worse and worse. The crime is unbelievable. You can't walk to the store and get a loaf of bread. Often you get shot. Chicago. Thousands and thousands of shootings since January 1st. You read it. The murder rate of the United States is the highest it's been in 45 years. The dishonest media doesn't tell you that stuff because they want you to like Obama. They want you to think Obama is doing a good job. And he's not. And he's not. And he's not. So you live in the inner cities. You're African-American. You're Hispanic. The schools are no good. There are no jobs. And it's totally unsafe. And I say I will fix it.*

(A.3.521) What the *hell* do you have to lose? (00:25:42–00:25:44)

I'm going to fix it. We are all *gonna* fix it. We're *gonna* fix it. We're *gonna* bring back jobs. We're *gonna* bring back safety. And we're *gonna* get really good education going. There

<sup>3</sup> C-Span and YouTube video recordings partly broken.

is tremendous potential, folks, in the inner cities, believe me, tremendous potential. We will become a rich nation again. But to be a rich nation, we must also be a safe nation. Hillary Clinton wants a 550 percent increase in Syrian refugees flowing into our country. Unbelievable. It's unbelievable. Her plan will import generations of terrorism, extremism and radicalism into your schools and throughout your communities. And you don't even know where they're going. Your government doesn't even know where they're going. When I'm elected president, we will suspend the Syrian refugee program.....and we will keep radical Islamic terrorists the hell out of our country. Have no choice. We have no choice. We have no choice. But we're *gonna* work because we all have hearts and it's a big problem, caused to a large extent by Obama and Hillary Clinton. The migration, caused to a large extent – ISIS was caused by them. They left a big vacuum. There was no ISIS when she first served as secretary. There was no ISIS. She created it. 27.30 Now she stands at the debate, "I will fight ISIS." She's got no chance. She's *gonna* fight nobody. She wants to go home and go to sleep. Unbelievable. She's *gonna* fight ISIS. So we're *gonna* build – we're *gonna* build, we are going to build safe havens. We're *gonna* have the Gulf States who have nothing but money, they're *gonna* pay for it. We have \$20 trillion in debt. If it's OK, I'm not *gonna* spend *that because* – We have \$20 trillion in debt. And we – *we* still have to rebuild our country. You know it's one thing like when you buy a company and it's got some debt. We have \$20 trillion in debt. But the country's a mess. The roads are bad. The bridges are bad. The schools are bad. The hospitals are bad. The tunnels are bad. Everything's bad. The military needs massive amounts of money. So we have all this horrible debt. It's one thing if we had it and everything's in tippy top shape. I like to say. You know I like the properties tippy top. I want them *tippy top*. But we have them and they're a mess. And *the – and yet* we have \$20 trillion, which is far too much. 28.36 So we're *gonna* get it down. And we're *gonna* rebuild our instances, we're *gonna* do. We have so many things we're *gonna* be doing. We're *gonna* be a rich nation again. A Trump administration will also secure and defend the borders of the United States. And yes, we will build a great wall and Mexico will pay for the wall 100 percent. One hundred percent. Mexico will pay. If you look at the incredible – if you look at the incredible deficits we have with Mexico, it's unbelievable. What we have, the cost of that wall is peanuts, is peanuts compared to the numbers you're talking about on trade with Mexico.

(A.3.522) And the numbers with China? (00:29:30–00:29:32)

(A.3.523) Trade deficit? (00:29:32–00:29:33)

I mean we will have a trade deficit with China of close to \$500 billion this year. We are going to lose in worldwide trade of goods, we're going to lose worldwide close to \$800 billion.

(A.3.524) What are we doing? (00:29:53–00:29:54)

(A.3.525) You really ask, who is negotiating these deals? (00:29:56–00:29:58)

(A.3.526) Where do these people come? (00:29:59–00:30:00)

(A.3.527) You know where they come from? (00:30:00–00:30:02)

They're political hacks. *They're political hacks.* You're dealing with the smartest people in the world. You have Chinese people, every – you have from Japan, you have from all these other countries. They put their smartest and the best. We put political hacks that don't know what they're doing. So we have an – and we have the greatest in the world. We have the greatest business people. We have the greatest negotiators. We don't use them. We don't use them. We use political people. Some of them got their job because they give campaign contributions. We're going to get it straightened out, folks, starting tomorrow. Go vote. Go vote.

(A.3.528) Right? (00:30:39–00:30:39)

My women. Hillary supports totally open borders. There goes your country. And strongly supports sanctuary cities like San Francisco where Kate Steinle was murdered violently by an illegal immigrant deported at least five times. We will cancel all federal funding to sanctuary cities. 31.10 We will stop illegal immigration, deport all criminal aliens and dismantle every last criminal gang and cartel threatening our citizens. We will also repeal the Obama-Clinton Defense sequester, and rebuild our badly depleted military. There have been few times in our history where we've needed it more, few times. North Carolina will be at the very center of this effort with brand new advanced fighters flying from Seymour Johnson Air Force Base. Beautiful. Beautiful. Beautiful, beautiful new fighters from Seymour Johnson. And we're going to have more battalions. You know the Marines are way, way off in terms of numbers. You know that. I *don't* know.

(A.3.529) Has there ever been? (00:32:06–00:32:07)

Yes, there have been. But rarely do we have times when we need this strong presence like now. The world hates us. The world hates us. So we're *gonna* increase – thank you. We're *gonna* increase Marine battalions at Camp Lejeune. I've been to Camp Lejeune. *I love Camp Lejeune*. And make major new investments. Where I was the other night, right next to it. I guess like 25,000 or 27,000 people at Fort Bragg. Great people. *They are*. *Those* soldiers are tough. A couple of them shook my hand. It was like oy, whoa. Take it easy, fellas. They are tough cookies. They are strong. They don't know how strong they are. These are great people. And new military technologies will be researched and developed right here at the Research Triangle. Right here. I'm honored to have the endorsements of more than 200 top admirals and generals, and 22 Medal of Honor recipients. And every day those numbers go up big league. Big league. 33.26 And I asked some of the generals and admirals the other night by Fort Bragg. I asked them. I said fellas, let me ask you a question. They want to take over Mosul.

(A.3.530) Am I getting something wrong? (00:33:36–00:33:37)

(A.3.531) Whatever happened to the element of surprise for us? (00:33:38–00:33:40)

I'm talking to admirals now and generals. That's what they do. I do other things. But you know it's called like common sense. You got to say we've made a lot of right calls.

(A.3.532) I said why is it that four months away from going into Mosul they're announcing "we are going into Mosul?" (00:33:48–00:33:54)

We're going into *Mosul*, we want to get the leaders of ISIS and they're staying in Mosul. And then three months they're saying "we are going in, in three months to Mosul." And then we're going in, in two months. And every time I hear, I put my hands, I go like this. I don't want to hear this, please. And as you know, they've been met with tremendous resistance, much more than they would've been. And I guarantee you this.

(A.3.533) I can't say it with certainty, only about 99.9 percent, OK? (00:34:22–00:34:24)

I can't say *100* – nothing's 100 percent. Even our victory isn't 100 percent.

(A.3.534) But it's starting to look pretty close, isn't it? (00:34:30–00:34:30)

Those numbers. Those numbers. 34.35 Oh, these guys are unhappy. Look at them. They're not happy. They are unhappy campers. Starting to look good. Starting to look good. But wouldn't it be nice if instead of announcing four months ago and *three* months ago. Then they have *less* – two weeks ago *they're going* 'next week we're getting ready to raid'. The leaders all left. They're gone. And the other people are putting up much more of a fight. Horrible. They're using human shields. It's a horrible situation. I mean it's hell. It's hell. *But why don't we just shut up, do the job, have a news conference next week and say we—we had this wonderful victory.* (00:35:10–00:35:19)

(A.3.535) *Wouldn't that be nice?* (00:35:20–00:35:21)

(A.3.536) *Where is General Douglas MacArthur?* (00:35:23–00:35:25)

(A.3.537) *Where is General George Pattern?* (00:35:26–00:35:29)

*You know where they are, they're spinning in their graves right now. They're spinning in their grave when they watch what's going on.* 35.37 Hillary and her failed establishment have *spent – listen to this – six* trillion dollars on wars in the Middle East that we never win. We just keep fighting and fighting. It's like a hose. The money just keeps pouring out. We never win. And now the Middle East is in worse shape by far than it's ever been. We have the Great Migration, the whole thing. They've dragged – thank you. I don't even want to look. I'll get myself. I don't want to look. They'll make it – I won't even say I love you too because they're going to make it a major headline if I said that. World's most dishonest people. The world's really dishonest people. They dragged us into foreign wars that have made us less safe. Shipped our jobs and wealth all over *the world and left our borders wide* open at home. *You've* ever notice we send these incredible troops, so much death, so much injury, in order to create a border for a country that most people have never even heard of. And yet we don't protect our own borders.

(A.3.538) *Isn't it an incredible thing?* (00:36:51–00:36:53)

36.54 That will change starting tomorrow. Because from now on it's going to be America first, America first. So just in summing up, to all Americans I say it's time for a real leadership and time for change. We have to have change.

(A.3.539) *Can you imagine having Hillary for four years?* (00:37:21–00:37:25)

I'm being serious about that. I wouldn't want to watch the news every night. I mean look at – *look at* what she's done with the e-mails as an example.

(A.3.540) I mean did you ever see a mess like this? (00:37:40–00:37:42)

Did you ever see – of course the FBI – the director was obviously under tremendous pressure. So they went through 650,000 e-mails in eight days. *Yeah*, right. 38.02 So sad what's going on. And she still deleted them after getting a subpoena from Congress. I mean that's a crime.

(A.3.541) What happened? (00:38:13–00:38:14)

That's a crime. You don't even need the new stuff. She shouldn't be allowed to run. Shouldn't be allowed to run. Just think about what we can accomplish in the first 100 days of a Trump administration. We're going to have the biggest tax cuts since Ronald Reagan. And Hillary is going to raise your taxes substantially. We're going to save and protect your Social Security and Medicare. And Hillary is going to cut your Social Security and really injure Medicare. That's what's going to happen. We will eliminate every unnecessary, job-killing regulation. We'll cancel every illegal Obama executive order. 39.22 By the way, a man that loves this state. It's his birthday today. Billy Graham, 98. The father of Franklin. Billy Graham.

(A.3.542) What a great one, right? (00:39:39–00:39:40)

Ninety-eight years old. He is a fantastic man. Franklin's a fantastic man. And it's so wonderful to have support of people like that. We're *gonna* protect religious liberty.....rebuild our military and take care of our great veterans. We're *gonna* take care of our veterans. We will provide school choice and put an end to Common Core. We move our education locally. We will support the men and women – these are great people, the men and women of law enforcement. 40.23 We're going to save our Second Amendment. And appoint justices to the United States Supreme Court who will uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. This sounds so good to me because I started this on June 16th of last year because I couldn't stand when I looked at what was going on with our country, I couldn't stand it. I couldn't stand it. Coming down the escalator, right, with Melania. Coming down that escalator June 16th of last year. And they were all saying – there were all the dishonest pundits. Actually a few of them thought I had a hell of a chance if you want to know the – the smarter ones. But they were all saying but he's not involved with – I've been involved with

politics all my life, on the other side. But I've been involved. 41.26 *But* we had 17 people – by the way, one of the great people are here tonight, Mike Huckabee.

(A.3.543) Where is Mike Huckabee? (00:41:31–00:41:32)

(A.3.544) *Where are you?* (00:41:31–00:41:32)

(A.3.545) He's such – is he here someplace? (00:41:35–00:41:36)

He is here. He is so great. Mike, wherever you are, come on out because you are great. I just saw him. But we had 17 people of great talent. Ben Carson endorsed us. Mike... Mike endorsed us. Tremendous – I mean very talented people. And one by one by one – and they used to say – well I remember we were down to like 13 or 14. In one state I got 49 percent. And one of these clowns said “he has not reached the 50 percent mark.” I got 49 percent with like 14 people.

(A.3.546) How do you get 49 percent with 14 people? (00:42:16–00:42:20)

And they said he hasn't reached the 50 percent mark. *Now*, they're very dishonest people. 42.25

(A.3.547) So we ended up with 17 people, right? (00:42:27–00:42:28)

Don't forget that's hard because nobody else ever had a field that big or that violent, or that violent. And we have a couple that didn't endorse and that's too bad. You know they signed a pledge. They didn't honor it. But... But – no. But for the most part... No. For the most part they were very honorable. But it was rough. They said it was the roughest primary every. I would say this is the roughest election. You know the NFL ratings are way down.

(A.3.548) You know why? (00:42:51–00:42:52)

Because everyone's watching this. It's actually tougher. It's actually tougher. Everyone's watching. The NFL ratings are way down. A lot of people say it's because of this. So you had 17 people. *It* came down – but we *got* – and this is a tribute to everybody in this room. We got the highest number of voters in the history of the Republican primary system. *That's a long time*. That's a long time. You know, starting with Honest Abe Lincoln, right. That's a long time. I got more than Honest Abe. That's *probably* the only thing I did better than Honest Abe. Honest Abe was pretty – he was pretty good. So here's the beauty. You have one day until the election. And it's not even one day. It's a half a day. To make every dream you've

ever dreamed for your country and for your family to come true. You have one magnificent chance. And honestly, in four years it's over, folks. There has never been a movement like this. Even these dishonest people in the media say *it* there has never – Bill O'Reilly. He said it's the single greatest political phenomena that he's witnessed in his life. That's a pretty good statement. But others have said it. Others have said it. Others have said it. And it's not going to happen again. It won't be able to happen again. Four years it'll never happen. So you got to get out there and you got to vote. Got to get out. 44.35 Somebody said what you've done has never been done before. It doesn't matter if you win or lose. I said believe me, it matters. No, they said that. It'll be down in the history books.

(A.3.549) I said you know what? (00:44:44–00:44:45)

You may be right about that. But if we don't win I will consider this the single greatest waste of time, energy. Wow do I – you need energy for this. The single greatest waste of time, energy and money. I have over \$100 million. That's a lot of money that I don't take in from the special interests because I don't need it. That's nice.

(A.3.550) And we have the biggest Internet – you know the small donors? (00:45:12–00:45:14)

The small donors are giving us money at record clips. I think we had \$82 million and then we had close to \$100 million. And it comes in. And I think the average was like \$61 each. I love those people. Those are people that love this country. And usually that's for the Democrats. You know in all fairness, that's usually for the Democrats to do that. But we're beating everybody. Nobody's seen anything like what we're doing. So we don't want to blow it. We don't want to waste it. Go vote. Go vote. Because believe me, if we don't win, all of us, honestly we've all wasted our time, I'll be honest. Because nothing's going to happen. They may say good things about us as a movement. Won't mean a damn thing, folks. You got to go out. We got to vote and we got to win. Change. Change. So you have one magnificent chance to beat the corrupt system that you're witnessing today, and to deliver justice for every forgotten man and woman and child in this nation. Do not let this opportunity slip away. We're fighting for every citizen who believes that government should serve the people, not the donors and not the special interests. And we're fighting, we're fighting to bring us all together as Americans. We're a very divided country. People don't realize we are an unbelievably divided country. We're *gonna* come together. Just imagine what our country

could accomplish if we started working together as one people under one God, saluting one American flag. Just imagine. I'm asking you to dream big because with your vote we are just one day away from the change you've been waiting for, for your entire life. Because if we win tomorrow, we will be able to make America wealthy again, to make America strong again, to make America safe again, and to make America great again. God bless you, everybody. Thank you. God bless you. Thank you, North Carolina. Thank you, folks. Thank you.

## A.4 All Political Speeches Donald Trump 2025–16

Date	State	Electoral Tendency
16 June 2015	New York	Democrat
21 March 2016	Washington, D.C.	Democrat
27 April 2016	Washington, D.C.	Democrat
13 June 2016	New Hampshire	Swing State
22 June 2016	New York	Democrat
11 July 2016	Virginia	Swing State
16 July 2016	New York	Democrat
21 July 2016	Ohio	Swing State
5 August 2016	Wisconsin	Swing State
8 August 2016	Michigan	Swing State
9 August 2016	North Carolina	Swing State
12 August 2016	Pennsylvania	Swing State
15 August 2016	Ohio	Swing State
16 August 2016	Wisconsin	Swing State
18 August 2016	North Carolina	Swing State
19 August 2016	Michigan	Swing State
20 August 2016	Virginia	Swing State
22 August 2016	Ohio	Swing State
23 August 2016	Texas	Republican
24 August 2016	Mississippi	Republican
25 August 2016	New Hampshire	Swing State
30 August 2016	Washington	Democrat
31 August 2016	Arizona	Republican
1 September 2016	Ohio	Swing State
1 September 2016	Ohio	Swing State
3 September 2016	Michigan	Swing State
6 September 2016	North Carolina	Swing State
7 September 2016	Pennsylvania	Swing State

---

8 September 2016	Ohio	Swing State
9 September 2016	Washington, D.C.	Democrat
9 September 2016	Florida	Swing State
12 September 2016	North Carolina	Swing State
12 September 2016	Maryland	Democrat
13 September 2016	Pennsylvania	Swing State
13 September 2016	Iowa	Swing State
14 September 2016	Ohio	Swing State
15 September 2016	New York	Democrat
16 September 2016	Florida	Swing State
17 September 2016	Texas	Republican
20 September 2016	North Carolina	Swing State
22 September 2016	Pennsylvania	Swing State
22 September 2016	Pennsylvania	Swing State
24 September 2016	Virginia	Swing State
28 September 2016	Iowa	Swing State
28 September 2016	Wisconsin	Swing State
29 September 2016	New Hampshire	Swing State
30 September 2016	Michigan	Swing State
3 October 2016	Colorado	Swing State
3 October 2016	Colorado	Swing State
4 October 2016	Arizona	Republican
5 October 2016	Nevada (Henderson)	Swing State
5 October 2016	Nevada (Reno)	Swing State
11 October 2016	Florida	Swing State
12 October 2016	Florida	Swing State
13 October 2016	Ohio	Swing State
13 October 2016	Florida	Swing State
15 October 2016	Maine	Democrat
15 October 2016	New Hampshire	Swing State
17 October 2016	Wisconsin	Swing State

18 October 2016	Colorado	Swing State
20 October 2016	Ohio	Swing State
21 October 2016	North Carolina	Swing State
21 October 2016	Pennsylvania	Swing State
22 October 2016	Pennsylvania	Swing State
23 October 2016	Florida	Swing State
26 October 2016	North Carolina	Swing State
27 October 2016	Ohio	Swing State
28 October 2016	New Hampshire	Swing State
29 October 2016	Colorado	Swing State
29 October 2016	Arizona	Republican
31 October 2016	Michigan	Swing State
1 November 2016	Pennsylvania	Swing State
2 November 2016	Florida	Swing State
2 November 2016	Florida	Swing State
4 November 2016	Ohio	Swing State
5 November 2016	Nevada	Swing State
5 November 2016	North Carolina	Swing State
5 November 2016	Florida	Swing State
6 November 2016	Michigan	Swing State
6 November 2016	Virginia	Swing State
7 November 2016	North Carolina	Swing State

**Table A.3:** All Political Speeches by Donald Trump during the Presidential Election Campaign 2015–16.