

**A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF DONALD TRUMP'S SELECTED  
POLITICAL SPEECHES**

**BY**

**OGBOCHIE, BERNICE NONYE  
PG/MA/16/80579**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES,  
FACULTY OF ARTS,  
UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA, NSUKKA**

**NOVEMBER, 2018.**

**TITLE PAGE**

**A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF DONALD TRUMP'S SELECTED POLITICAL  
SPEECHES**

**BY**

**OGBOCHIE, BERNICE NONYE  
PG/MA/16/80579**

**RESEARCH PROJECT  
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE (ENGLISH)  
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF  
NIGERIA, NSUKKA**

**SUPERVISOR: DR. KADIRI, G.C.**

**NOVEMBER, 2018.**

**APPROVAL PAGE**

This project has been read and approved as having met the standard required for the award of Masters of Arts (M.A.) degree in the Department of English and Literary Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

**By**

---

Dr. Kadiri, G.C.  
**Supervisor**

---

Date

---

Prof. Dieke, Ikenna  
Head of Department

---

Date

---

Prof. Nnanyelugo Okoro  
Dean Faculty of Arts

---

Date

---

External Examiner

---

Date

**CERTIFICATION**

This is to certify that this project is an independent study carried out by Ogbochie, Bernice Nonye with the registration number PG/MA/16/80579 of the Department of English and Literary Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, and this work is original and has not been presented in part or full for the award of any diploma or degree in this or any other university, and that all contributions from any other persons and sources are properly and duly acknowledged.

**By**

---

Dr. Kadiri, G.C.  
Supervisor

---

Date

---

Prof. Dieke, Ikenna  
Head of Department

---

Date

---

Prof. Nnanyelugo Okoro  
Dean Faculty of Arts

---

Date

---

External Examiner

---

Date

**DEDICATION**

This work is dedicated to the loving memory of my late Mother, Mrs. Dorothy Adaeze Chime, who taught me to forge ahead against all odds.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My greatest gratitude goes to the Almighty God, who lives and reigns forever, for His grace and infinite mercies upon me that sustained me through these years of serious and tedious studies. I ascribe all greatness to Him alone.

I also wish to express my profound gratitude to my able supervisor, Dr. Kadiri G.C., a prime mover and a mother indeed, whose accessibility; readiness and willingness to read and edit the different drafts of this work helped me to complete this work in good time. Her constructive criticisms, suggestions and corrections made this work a success. I say thanks a million.

I appreciate the Head of Department of English and Literary Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Professor Dieke Ikenna and all the members of academic staff for their wonderful contributions and constructive criticisms during my seminar and oral defence.

I appreciate in a very special way Dr. Igwedibia Euginia Adaoma (Rev Sr.) who introduced me to the course Pragmatics. It is her presentation of the course content that ignited the desire to dig deep into it to the extent of writing my project on it. I thank her so much.

A special thanks to my husband Ven. A.N.C. Ogbochie and our children. Victory, Favour, Innocent, Emmanuel, Joy and Marvellous, for their understanding and support through the period of this programme.

To my friends and well wishers who in one way or the other contributed both positively and negatively towards this programme, I lack words but not gratitude. May God bless them.

## ABSTRACT

Political speeches usually have great influence on people because politicians use it to sell their views and reshape the minds of the electorate; therefore, an analysis of such speeches is very important. This study focused on the pragmatics of selected political speeches of Donald Trump. A number of works have been done by scholars on the study and interpretation of political speeches of some political leaders and Presidents of nations using the speech act theory and other theories. However, to the knowledge of this researcher, scant attention is paid to the use of Grice's Cooperative Principles and its maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner in analyzing political speeches of Donald Trump. These maxims enjoin speakers to be informative to the expected degree, to say things that are well founded, to be relevant and to be clear. The study seeks to apply these maxims to Donald Trump's political speeches and analyze the extent to which it obeyed or flouted the maxims. Analytic survey design was adopted while the documented speeches of Donald Trump, other published and unpublished works and library materials were the components of the instruments for data collection. Based on the analysis of data using Grice's cooperative principles, it was found out that those selected political speeches of Donald Trump obeyed the maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner to a great extent and flouted same to a lesser degree. This gave rise to a lot of implicatures that affirm the need for the study. Observations from the analyzed data made the following conclusions obvious: Pragmatic principles should be used in analyzing political speeches.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	i
Approval	ii
Certification	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Abstract	vi
Table of Contents	vii
 <b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the problem	5
1.3 Objectives of the Study	6
1.4 Research Questions	6
1.5 Significance of the Study	7
1.6 Scope of the Study	8
 <b>CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</b>	
2.1 Preamble	9
2.2 Works Anchored on Speech Acts Theory	10
<b>2.3 Works Anchored on Conversational Implicature</b>	17
2.4 Summary of Literature Review	18
 <b>CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	
3.1 Theoretical Framework	19
3.1.1 Speech Act Theory	19
3.1.2 Performatives	24
3.2 Conversational Implicature	28
3.2.1 The Maxim of quantity	29
3.2.2 The Maxim of quality	30



3.2.3 The maxim of Relation	30
3.2.4 The Maxim of Manner	30
3.3 Research Design	34
3.4 Population for the Study	34
3.5 Sampling and Sampling Technique	34
3.6 Instruments for Data Collection	35
3.7 Method of Data Analysis	35
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF DONALD TRUMP'S SPEECHES.</b>	
4.0 Pragmatic analysis of Donald Trump's Speeches.	36
4.1 Preamble	36
4.2 The Synopsis	37
4.2.1 Communicative Principle	38
4.3.1 Grice's Theory of Conversational Implicature and Donald Trump's Nomination Acceptance Speech	41
4.3.2 The Maxim of Quantity	41
4.3.3 The Maxim of Quality	42
4.3.4 The Maxim of Relation	43
4.3.5 The Maxim of Manner	46
4.4 Donald Trump: The Inaugural	46
4.4.1 Grice's Theory of Conversational Implicature Applied to Donald Trump's the Inaugural	47
<b>4.4.2 Maxim of Quantity</b>	49
4.4.3 Maxim of Quality	48
4.4.4 Maxim of Relation	49
4.4.5 Maxim of Manner	50
<b>4.5 Donald Trump's First Speech to Congress</b>	52
4.5.1 Grice's Principle Applied to Donald Trump's First Speech to Congress	57

4.6 Trump's 2017 U.N. Speech	59
4.6.1 Grice's Principle Applied to Trump's Speech to the U.N. General Assembly	62
4.7 Donald Trump's US Election Victory Speech	64
4.7.1 Grice's Principle and Donald Trump's US Election Victory Speech	65
4.8 The extent to which Donald Trump's Speeches Obeyed or Flouted the Maxims of – Quantity, Quality, Manner and Relation	67
4.9 Summary of Chapter	68

**CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND  
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES**

5.1 Summary of Findings	69
5.2 Conclusion	70
5.3 Recommendations	70
5.4 Suggestions for Further Studies	71
<b>References</b>	72
<b>Appendices</b>	76

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background to the Study

It is an undoubted fact that in every human affair, language is ranked first. Communication with one another is easy because they share a common code that makes up the language. The use of language distinguishes man from animals because man in the words of Pushpinder, Syal and D.V. Jindal (6) is called “a talking animal” (homoloquens). There are, however, other means of communication used by humans such as flags, horns, gestures, Braille alphabet, morse code, mathematical symbols, sirens, sketches, maps, acting, mining, dancing, and so on. All these systems of communication are extremely limited, they are not so flexible, comprehensive, perfect and extensive as language in structure, its own system of organizing its component units into meaningful patterns (Syal and Jindal 5). Human language is unique in the sense that it has its own structure.

Humans establish and maintain social relationship with the use of language. They equally express their thoughts, feelings and emotions through the use of language. It is through the instrumentality of language that our non-material cultural heritage is preserved, knowledge imparted and disputes settled. This implies that the language to be used must be clear and understood by both the speakers and recipients so that the objective of communication may be achieved. Saussure and Harris see language as a formal system of signs governing the grammatical rules of combinations to communicate meaning (5). This definition stresses the fact that human language can be described “as a closed structural system consisting of rules that relate particular meanings”. Femi Akindele and Wale Adegbite defines language as a system of sounds or the vocal symbols by which human beings communicate experience (2)”.

Pragmatics is a subfield of Linguistics and Semiotics developed in the 1970's. It studies the ways in which context contributes to meaning. It studies how people comprehend and produce a communicative act of speech in a concrete speech situation which is usually a conversation (hence conversational analysis). It distinguishes two intents or meanings in each utterance or communicative act. One is the informative intent or the sentence meaning and the other is the communicative intent or meaning. (Leech, 1983; Sperber and Wilson 1986).

Pragmatics studies how the transmission of meaning depends not only on structural and linguistic knowledge (example grammar, lexicon and so on) of all speakers and listeners, but also on the context of the utterance, any pre-existing knowledge about those involved, the inferred intent of the speaker and other factors. In this respect, pragmatics explains how language users are able to overcome apparent ambiguity since meaning relies on the manner, place, time and so on of the utterance. The ability to understand another speaker's intended meaning is called pragmatic competence. This often includes one's knowledge about the social distance, social status between the speakers involved, the cultural knowledge such as politeness and the linguistic knowledge, explicit and implicit.

The Encyclopedia Americana (1994) traced the word 'Prag' as derived from the Greek word 'pragma' which means deed or action. In the light of this Greek origin, Kempson, (56) sees pragmatics as "... The study of the general principles involved in the retrieval of information from an utterance...". In essence, the goals of pragmatic theories should be to explain how utterances convey meaning in context, how meaning is decoded from utterances in context and how people respond to meaning."

Gazdar (2) defines pragmatics as those aspects of meaning of utterances which cannot be accounted for by straightforward references to truth conditions of the sentences uttered". This

position receives tacit confirmation from Levinson's affirmation that "pragmatics is the study of those relations between language context that are grammaticalized or encoded in the structure of language. Pragmatics according to Saeed is the study of how we use linguistic knowledge in context. Pragmatics deals with aspects of individual usage and context meaning. In view of this, pragmatics is the study of how hearers, for example, have to combine semantic knowledge with other types of knowledge and make inferences in order to interpret the speaker's meaning. However, when sentences are viewed as utterances of individuals engaged in communication, a pragmatic approach is assumed.

Some of the aspects of language study in pragmatics include:

### **Deixis**

It is a noun from classical Greek "Deiknymi" which means "to show", "point out". It is a shorthand device which needs various forms of contextual support. John .I. Saeed sees it as "a shorthand naming system for the participants involved in a talk". However, in verbal communication, deixis in its broad sense is what the speaker means by a particular utterance in a given speech context whereas in its narrow sense, it refers to the contextual meaning of pronouns.

### **Presupposition**

In pragmatics, a presupposition is an implicit assumption about the word or background belief relating to an utterance whose truth is taken for granted in discourse. To presuppose something means to assume it. Presuppositions are situations that must exist for utterances to be appropriate. Statements like "The River Niger and River Benue met at Lokoja", presupposed the existence of the two rivers and the town. The presuppositions prevent the violation of the maxim of relevance. When presuppositions are ignored, there is confusion. Utterances like "take some

more tea or have another beer, carry the presupposition that one has already had some. A presupposition must be mutually known or assumed by the speaker or addressee for the utterance to be considered appropriate in context. It will generally remain a necessary assumption whether the utterance is placed in the form of an assertion, denial or question. However, negation of an expression does not change its presupposition. Example; in the following examples, sentence 'A' presupposes sentence 'B'.

1A: I don't regret leaving London

B: I left London

2A: I do regret leaving London

B: I left London.

### **Performatives**

Performatives are sentences that are in themselves a kind of action, thus by uttering a sentence, a speaker makes a promise rather than just describing one; giving information, stating a fact or hinting an attitude. The study of performatives led to the hypothesis of the speech acts theory which holds that a speech event embodies three acts: a locutionary act, an illocutionary act and a perlocutionary act. (Austin, 1963; Searle, 1969).

### **Implicature**

Implicature is a technical term in the pragmatic linguistics, coined by H.P Grice, which refers to what is suggested in an utterance, even though it is neither expressed nor strictly implied by the utterance.

Pragmaticians are also keen in exploring why interlocutors can successfully converse with one another in conversation. A basic idea is that interlocutors obey certain principles in their participation so as to sustain the conversation. One of such principles is the cooperative

principle, which assumes that interactants cooperate in the conversation by contributing to the ongoing speech event (Grice, 1975). Another assumption is politeness principle (Leech, 1983) which maintains interlocutors behave politely to one another, since people respect each other's face. (Brown and Levenson, 1978). Sperber and Wilson (1986) provided a cognitive explanation to social interactive speech events, which holds that in verbal communication, people try to be relevant to what they intend to say and to whom an utterance is intended.

The pragmatic principles people abide by in one language are often different from another. Thus, there has been a growing interest in how people in different languages observe a certain pragmatic principle. Cross-linguistic and cross-cultural studies reported that what is polite in one language is sometimes not polite in another. Contrastive pragmatics, however, is not confined to the study of certain pragmatic principles. Cultural breakdowns, pragmatic failures, among others are also components of contrastive pragmatics. In speech, the choice of words and sentences depend fully on the speaker, leaving the hearer with the information he has passed on.

## **1.2 Statement of the problem**

Scholars focus on researches on political speech making using different pragmatic principles. Krisagbedo (2010) explores the pragmatics of former President Olusegun Obasanjo's speeches on corruption in Nigeria. Igwedibia (2012) studied the pragmatics of Obama's speeches using Gricean theory of conversational maxims. Similarly, Okoro (2016) did a pragmatic study of President Muhammadu Buhari's political speeches. From the foregoing, it is obvious that a lot has been done on political speeches using pragmatic principles, but to the knowledge of this researcher, there seems to be little evidence of any scholarly work on the political speeches of President Donald Trump in this regard.

The gap in scholarship which this researcher recognizes, therefore, is that not much has been done on the political speeches of President Donald Trump using Grice's cooperative maxims. The felt need to fill this gap has led the researcher to embark on the study of President Donald Trump's political speeches using pragmatic principles.

### **1. 3 Research Questions**

This research revolves around and attempts to give answers to the following research questions:

- (a) To what extent can Grice's maxims of the cooperative principles be applied to Donald Trump's political speeches?
- (b) To what extent do Trump's political speeches adhere to or violate the maxims of quantity and quality?
- (c) To what extent do Trump's political speeches adhere to or violate the maxims of manner and relation?

### **1. 4 Objectives of the Study**

This study investigates the pragmatics of selected political speeches of President Donald Trump. The following specific objectives guide this study:

- (a) To find out the degree to which Grice's cooperative principles could be applied to the political speeches of President Donald Trump.
- (b) To find out the degree to which the political speeches of President Donald Trump adhere to or violate the principles of quantity and quality.
- (c) To discover the degree to which the political speeches of President Donald Trump adhere to or violate the principles of manner and relation.



### **1.5 Significance of the Study**

Politics and language cannot be separated. For one to be efficient in political practice, one needs to have a grasp of the language. Beard, A. (2000) suggests that it is necessary to study the language of politics because it enables one to “understand how language is used by those who wish to gain power, those who wish to exercise power and those who wish to keep power” (2). He buttressed this point by saying that, “making speeches is a vital part of the politicians’ role in announcing policies and persuading people to agree with it” (35). However, many people do not understand the underlying pragmatic import of these speeches.

The findings of this study would provide a comprehensive guide to linguists/teachers and learners of English as a second language on how to analyze political and other speeches using Grice’s cooperative principles and the maxims. This study would serve as a reference material to scholars who have interest in studying pragmatics as it would promote a better understanding of speeches. The findings would help immensely in shaping the minds of linguists and students of English as a second language to understand how the cooperative maxims help to project the implicatures in speeches. The study will help students to have a firm grip on the application of context of situation in determining the implied meaning in speeches.

This work, no doubt, will constitute a worthy addition to the inventory of political discourse in Nigeria. It is our hope that the study will awaken linguistic consciousness in Nigerian electorate.

## **1.6 Scope of the Study**

This study will be limited to some political speeches of President Donald Trump.

- (a) Acceptance of Nomination speech
- (b) The inaugural speech
- (c) First speech to congress
- (d) Election victory speech.
- (e) 2017 U.N. speech

The area of enquiry was limited to the application of the principles of quantity, quality, manner and relation to the political speeches of President Donald Trump.

## **CHAPTER TWO REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

The literature for this study was reviewed under the following headings:

Preamble

### **2.1 Preamble**

Communication among people, observes Christian Mair (114), especially in spontaneous conversation, is generally successful and surprisingly free from misunderstandings. Pragmatics which is a subset of discourse analysis has received varying degree of attention in recent times because it is a new area of linguistics dwelling on “the study of meaning in relation to situation” Geoffrey N. Leech (6) and “the relationship between linguistic forms and the user of those forms” Yule (4). Furthermore, Yule (1) opines that “pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by the speaker (or writer) and interpreted by the listener (or reader)”. To Fromkin, Rodman and Hyams (199), pragmatics is concerned with the interpretation of linguistic meanings in context. This definition means that pragmatic interpretation operates within the domain of context. When one talks about pragmatics, one is simply talking about meaning beyond the linguistic data. That is to say that pragmatics takes care of the implied meaning of an utterance which could only be inferred within the context.

Politics and political discourse is a complex human activity that deserves critical and in-depth study and analysis because of its central role in the organization and management of human societies. For a while now, studies on presidential speeches as an aspect of political discourse have been carried out by different scholars because it is a domain of language use that has captured the hearts and interests of researchers. Nonetheless, scholars have also dwelt on the pragmatics of literary texts, newspaper editorials and even the communicative strategies employed by politicians through the perspective of critical discourse analysis.

This chapter focuses on the review of some existing literature in the interpretation of discourses using pragmatic approach. This review is not restrained by geography as attempts would be made to review works of both foreign and Nigerian scholars who have contributed to scholarship in the development of pragmatics as a linguistic field.

## **2.2 Works Anchored on Speech Acts Theory**

Toshihiko Suzuki undertakes a pragmatic study of children's pragmatic competence using speech act theory. This project attempted to address the following issues:

1. How speech acts are performed by native English speakers, native Japanese speakers, and learners of English and Japanese as inter-language;
2. What similar or different linguistic features can be found in different types of speech acts;  
and
3. How to apply the research results to language teaching.

The data consists of six English speech acts (viz. Complimenting, Requesting, Thanking, Inviting, Apologizing, comforting) performed orally by the children in the role play with puppets and then transcribed for the examination of their linguistic features in detail. The data analysis results provided the researcher with some significant quantitative insights into the linguistic features or strategies that might sketch out the children's pragmatic competence at the elementary level.

It was also confirmed that the positive direction strategies were commonly adopted in the FEA's (viz apologizing, complimenting, thanking) and negative direction strategies dominated in the FTAs (viz inviting (as a Directive), requesting). These features are commonly found in adult's data as well and this fact may be indicating that people at different ages are following general rules for performing speech acts. This study is similar with the present study is similar

with the present study as both are pragmatic studies but differs with the present study in the theory used. This study used speech acts theory while the present study is using conversational implicature.

Zina Abdul Hussein Khudiler, investigates, pragmatically, the language of five electoral political propaganda texts delivered by Barack Obama using Austin's speech acts, Grice's maxims and the politeness principles. It attempts to achieve the following aims:

- (1) Identifying the speech acts used in political propaganda.
- (2) To show how politicians utilize Grice's maxims and the politeness principles in issuing their propaganda
- (3) Analyzing the rhetorical devices used in political propaganda.

To achieve the aims of this study, it is hypothesized that:

- (1) The speech act of statement, assertion, and advice can be used in political propaganda
- (2) The cooperative principles and the politeness principles are frequently observed in political propaganda
- (3) Persuasion, metaphor, repetition, and manipulation are the rhetorical devices used in political propaganda. The findings of the analysis verify the above mentioned hypotheses.

This study is a shift from the present study because the present study uses a different theoretical framework.

Shevelena Alla undertakes a study of the lingo-rhetorical and socio-pragmatic peculiarities in political speeches of Barack Obama. There are two parts in this study- the descriptions of the lingo-stylistic means used by the speaker, which aims at making speech more bright, expressive, intelligible and emphatic, while the second part contained a brief commentary on the socio-pragmatic peculiarities, typical of Barack Obama's political speeches. The data for the study

were Obama's inaugural address on January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009 and his speech entitled "the change we need" delivered on September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011. These studies were subjected to comparative and descriptive analysis observation, comparison, generalization, description and critical discourse analysis. The analysis of the linguistic and stylistic means revealed that the orator used metaphors, reiterations (restating) and parallel structures which produced a deep impression on the audience while the description of the socio-pragmatic peculiarities of Mr Barack Obama's speech behaviour revealed his communicative strategy in his use of political rhetoric. In this study, the pragmatics of Donald Trump's speeches was not analysed thereby creating a gap in scholarships which this researcher intends to fill.

Agbedo Chris Uchenna investigates the speech act and political discourse in the Nigerian print media. He sought to analyze the speech acts of Bayo Onanuga and Yakubu Mohammed of the News and Newswatch magazines during the reception of the 2005 winner of Pulitzer Prize for international reporting in line with J.L. Austin's felicity conditions in order to determine their status as felicitous or inflections and its implication for journalism as a profession in Nigeria. The result of the analysis revealed that their speech acts were declared to be inflections as they failed to meet the specifications of the felicity conditions of sincerity, fulfillment, execution, and preparation. Their infelicitous speech acts equally failed to meet Grice's cooperative principles and maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner. Thus giving rise to conversational implicature. This study dwells on the speech act of journalism unlike the present study which focuses on the political discourse of President Donald Trump thus filling this gap in scholarship.

Olaniyi Oladimeji and Bamigbola Esther investigates a contextual acts of President Goodluck Jonathan's declaration of presidential candidacy under the political platform of the peoples' Democratic Party (PDP) using context and the speech act theory. The aim of the study

was to examine how contextual illocutionary acts have been used to achieve a coherent speech delivery. Data for the analysis were got from his speech to declare his intention to run as candidate under the platform of the Peoples' Democratic Party (PDP). This speech had over thirty paragraphs and as such scanned through four discrete extractions of the ten speeches which were then used for the analysis of data. The analysis and findings of this study showed that the frequency scale of illocutionary acts revealed that most of the verbs employed expressed actions performed in the form of commissives (50%) and assertive (30%), declarative and expressive acts recorded (10%) each while the verdictives recorded zero percent (0%). The result of the analysis implied that the president successfully exploited the favourable contexts of his speech to persuade and make promises of good governance. This study centred on the contextual act of President Goodluck Jonathan and invariably nothing on President Donald Trump was accounted for, hence, the justification of the fact that there is need for the present study in order to fill this gap in scholarship.

Ijadimine Olamide and Aminu Segun analysed a speech act of editorial comments of TELL magazine. In their research paper, there is an argument based on Searle's speech acts as used by Mey (2006) in the editorial comments of TELL magazine in Nigeria. The various speech acts manifest on the editorial comments have linguistic and pragmatic implications in the interpretation of meaning in the magazine. Four consecutive and recent editions of the TELL magazines that covered from January to February 2014 were selected for the pragmatic analysis. The findings revealed that apart from the cover page, the editorial comments are rich in meaning which can be appropriately explained through speech acts. Thus, the result of the analysis proves further that the editorial comments go a long way to influence the perception of readers about news items through the perlocutionary effects such illocutionary act will have on them. The

study concludes that the editorial comments are important and readers are encouraged to always read so that the purpose of it in the construction of meaning will not be defeated. This study again is a shift from the present study as the present study dwells on the pragmatics of President Donald Trump's using some of his political speeches as data, hence, the need for this study.

Okoro Nkechinyere Cynthia undertakes a pragmatic analysis of selected political speeches of President Muhammadu Buhari using the speech acts theory of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) as theoretical framework. The aim of the study was to contribute to the field of pragmatics which is a sub-field of linguistics. It also aimed to show how the features of the speech act theory can be identified in the political speeches of President Muhammadu Buhari. The data for the study was derived and collected from some political speeches of President Buhari starting from his formal declaration of interest for presidency held on October 2014 at the Eagle square, Abuja to his inaugural speech on May 29<sup>th</sup>, 2015 at the same venue. It adopted the qualitative method of analysis to show how the president, through his speeches, was able to encode his intended meaning to the electorates.

The findings of the study revealed that the main thrust of the speech Act theory is to understand what the speaker does with words. The conclusion derived from the result of the analysis clearly show that President Buhari employed the illocutionary acts of directives, declaratives, assertive, expressive, commissive and verdictive which were used for affirming, confirming, assuring, promising, guaranteeing and assessing which produced a deep impression of the audience assessment. This study accounted only for the political speeches of President Muhammadu Buhari and not that of President Donald Trump hence, justifying the need for this study.

Akinwota Samuel Alaba explores a speech act analysis of the acceptance of nomination speeches of chief Obafemi Awolowo (the Presidential candidate of the Unity Party of Nigeria-



UPN- in 1979) and chief M.K.O. Abiola (the Presidential candidate of the Social Democratic Party S.D.P. in 1993), using J.L. Austin's (1962) speech Act theory as modified by Searle (1962 and 1979). The data for the study were selected speeches of these presidential candidates. Chief Awolowo's speech on "the challenge of the New Era" was delivered at the UPN national convention in Lagos on 6<sup>th</sup> October, 1978 which was later published in a collection of his speeches titled *Path to Nigerian Greatness* while chief Abiola's speech on "Hope for Nigerians" was delivered at the national convention of the Social Democratic Party in Jos on 29<sup>th</sup> March, 1993 and was later published as *Hope '93: Farewell to Poverty*. The illocutionary acts of assertive, directive, commissive, expressive and declarative were used for the data analysis. The findings of the study revealed that assertive acts accounted for the largest proportion with 27.3% of the illocutionary acts, expressive and commissive acts had 22.7% each while the directive and declarative acts accounted for 18.2% and 9.1% respectively. The preponderance of assertive, commissive and expressive acts was because of the nature of the data which were nomination speeches of Party flag bearers and as such, the speeches were full of illocutionary acts of thanking, assuring, encouraging, informing and promising. The study was concluded on the note that acceptance of nomination speeches unlike presidential inaugural speeches were mostly used as mobilization strategies especially in political campaigns where it was necessary for candidates to persuade their listeners towards a desired goal of winning the elections. This study is quite different from the present study as their sources of data are not the same. Data for the present study is from the political speeches of President Donald Trump. It is this gap in knowledge that has prompted a research of this nature.

Krisagbedo Celina Ebere examines a pragmatic analysis of former President Obasanjo's speeches on corruption in line with J.L. Austin's (1962) speech Act Theory using the felicity

conditions of sincerity, preparation, execution and fulfillment. Former President Obasanjo's speeches were subjected to pragmatic analysis in order to ascertain the extent to which his speeches on fighting corruption conformed to or violated the felicity conditions during his eight years tenure. The result of the analysis showed that his speeches, to a great extent, violated the felicity conditions and were adjudged infelicitous the study concluded that politicians should try to match their words with actions in order to alleviate the national developmental challenges. This research focused on chief Obasanjo's speeches on corruption using Austin's felicity conditions without exploring that of President Donald Trump. It is this gap in scholarship that necessitated the current study which seeks to dwell on the political speeches of President Donald Trump using conversational implicature.

Aside from researches done in analyzing political speeches pragmatically, researches has also been carried out to investigate literary works pragmatically. In this regard, Onuigbo, Sam explores the theory of pragmatics in Ebele Eko's Bridges of Gold. He adopted Austin's speech Act theory and Grice's conversational implicature to portray how pragmatic theories could be applied in the analysis of literary works. Onuigbo limits his pragmatic interpretation to an African poetry volumn.

Oguegbu Patricia Obiageli explores a pragmatic analysis of the language of stickers using the Grecian cooperative principle. The data for this study was collected from stickers printed in English. The result of the analysis showed that the advertisers' intention to reach their target audience, even if they don't want to be reached, is achieved. In their effort to reach their target audience, and compete for attention at the same time, they flout one maxim or another. This study engages the language of stickers while the present study is on political speeches, hence, justifies the need for the present study.

## 2.2 Works Anchored on Conversational Implicature

Igwedibia Euginia Adaoma carried out the pragmatic analysis of some political speeches of Barack Obama using Grice's conversational implicature. This study sought to do the following:

- (a) Discover the extent to which the principles of quality could be applied to the political speeches of Obama;
- (b) Find out the degree to which the political speeches of Obama violated the principles of quantity and quality;
- (c) Discover the extent to which the political speeches of Obama violated the principles of manner and relation.

The data for this study were drawn from documented speeches of President Barack Obama of America, especially those that concern politics, religion, education and economy. The study revealed that there were fulfillments as well as flouting of the maxims, and the drawing of both the entailed and implied meanings in those speeches. This study focuses on the pragmatics of President Barack Obama without exploring that of Donald Trump. It is this gap in scholarship that necessitated the current study.

Igwedibia also examined Audre Lorde's poetry pragmatically based on the principles of conversational implicature. This study aims at examining the degree at which Audre Lorde's selected poems violated or adhered to the maxims of quantity, quality, manner and relation. It also seeks to provide possible interpretation of the selected poems based on the violation of Grice's cooperative principle. The data for this study were selected poems of Audre Lorde. The study unravels the pragmatic impact of the poems studied and how that impact embraces the totality of the poems combined with its emotional, intellectual and imaginative appeal.

## **2.4 Summary of Literature Review**

The literature review shows that some research works have been done on pragmatic analysis of political speeches. The review also shows that pragmatic principles have not been used, as far as the researcher is aware, in studying Donald Trump's political speeches. This observation has given the researcher a fresh impetus to continue the study so as to fill the existing gap.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

#### **3.1 Theoretical Framework**

##### **3.1.1 Speech Act Theory**

The Speech Act Theory was initiated by the Austrian philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein, but was actually given prominence by the British philosopher, John Langshaw Austin in his William James' lectures at Harvard 1955. Those lectures, twelve in all, were posthumously published as "How to Do Things with Words" 1962 shortly after his death in 1960. This could be considered as one of the central developments of pragmatics, the other being, the theory of conversational implicature by Paul Grice (1962). However, Austin's ideas and thinking were further developed and codified by his pupil, the American philosopher, John R. Searle who subsequently became the main proponent and defender of the former's ideas.

Cutting, Joan (13) states that speech acts are "the actions performed in saying something". Patrick Griffiths (148) defines speech acts as "the basic units of linguistic interaction..." For Wale Osisanwo (55) "an utterance is a speech act". This is because in every utterance a person makes, an act is performed. Acts performed include the following, but are however not restricted to them; stating a fact, an opinion, confirming or denying something, making a prediction or request, issuing an order, asking a question and so on. Jef Verschueren (131) notes that "speech acts are tied to sentences". This, therefore, means that a political speech is not a speech act but a series of speech acts. The speech act aims to do justice to the fact that people do more things with words than what their words ordinarily encode.

Two important characteristics of speech acts are interactivity and content dependence. Interactivity is a crucial feature of communication which involves the speaker in a coordinated

activity with other language users. For some users of language, this interactivity is more explicit than others. An example is one of Austin's well-known examples of bets in English. According to Austin, a bet only comes into existence when two or more parties interact. If I say to someone "I bet you five thousand naira that Nigeria will lose in the world cup", a bet is not performed unless my addressee makes some response like Okay or you are on. On the other hand, speech acts like asking a question or greeting someone, do not need explicit responses to make them questions or greetings. They nonetheless set up the expectation for an interactive response.

The second feature, context dependence, has two aspects. The first is that many speech acts rely on social conventions to support them. Sometimes, this is very explicit, where the speech act is supported by what Searle (1969) called institutional facts. Thus, every society has procedures and ceremonies where some participants' words carry a special function. Examples commonly used in the literature include a judge saying, 'I sentence you to hang by the neck until dead', a priest in a marriage ceremony saying, 'I now pronounce you man and wife,' a chairperson in a meeting saying 'I declare this meeting open' and so on. These speech acts of sentencing prisoners, pronouncing a couple married, declaring a meeting open and so on can only be performed by the relevant people in the right situations, where both are sanctioned by social laws and conventions. Again, though these are just the most explicit cases; it is clear that social conventions also govern ordinary uses of language in society. Sociolinguistic and ethnographical studies have shown us how the forms of asking questions, making greetings and so on are influenced by a particular society's conventions for the participants' age, gender, relative social status, degree of intimacy and so on.

The second aspect of context dependence is the local context of a speech act. An utterance may signal one speech act in one situation and another elsewhere. Questions in English

are notoriously flexible in this way. Questions in English which, of course, include several types, usually have a special rising information pattern and an inverted subject verb word order which differentiates them from statements. Examples:

- (a) He is leaving.
- (b) Is he leaving?
- (c) When is he leaving?

In the above examples, b and c are distinguished from a.

Austin's work is in many respects a reaction to some traditions and influential attitudes to language. The attitudes can be said to involve three related assumptions as follows:

- a. That the basic sentence type in language is declarative (that is a statement or assertion);
- b. That the principal use of language is to describe state of affairs (by using-statement)
- c. That the meaning of utterances can be described in terms of their truth or falsity.

Among Austin's contemporaries, these assumptions are associated with the philosophers known as logical positivists. An important issue for logical positivists approach is how far the meaning of a sentence is reducible to its verifiability, that is, the extent to which, and by which, it can be shown to be true or false.

Austin's opposition to those views is the common sense one that language is used for far more than making statements and that for the most part utterances cannot be said to be either true or false. He makes two important observations. The first is that not all sentences are statements and that much of conversation is made up of questions, exclamations, command and expressions of wishes as can be seen from the following examples:

- (a) Excuse me!
- (b) How are you?

- (c) Hello!
- (d) How much?
- (e) Are you serious?

The above sentences are not descriptions and so cannot be said to be true or false.

Austin's second observation was that even in sentences with the grammatical form of declaratives, not all are used to make statements. Such declaratives that are not used to make true or false statements are exemplified below:

- (a) I promise to take a taxi home.
- (b) I bet you five thousand naira that Nigeria will loose the match.
- (c) I declare this meeting open.
- (d) I warn you that legal action will ensure.
- (e) I name this baby John.

According to Austin, these sentences are in themselves a kind of action and he called them performative utterances because they perform the action named in the first verb in the sentence. A speaker would not expect the uttering of a or b in the next example to constitute the action of frying or starting.

- (a) I fry this egg.
- (b) I start this car.

They are constatives. They are used to state a fact or describe a state of affairs, and it contains no performative verb.

These sentences describe actions independent of the linguistics act. Accordingly, the use of the adverb 'hereby' with these sentences sounds odd.

- (a) I hereby fry this egg.



(b) I hereby start this car

Austin argued that it is not useful to ask whether performative utterances are true or not, rather we should ask whether they work or not; do they constitute a successful warning, bet, naming and so on. In Austin's terminology, a performative that works is called felicitous and one that does not work is infelicitous. For them to work, such performatives have to satisfy the social conventions. There are social conventions governing the giving of orders to co-workers, greeting strangers and so on. These enabling conditions for a performative Austin calls felicity conditions.

To describe the role of felicity conditions, Austin (1975:25-38) wrote a very general Schema:

A1. There must exist an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect, the procedure to include uttering of certain words by certain persons in certain circumstances.

A2: The particular persons and circumstances must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular process invoked...

B1. The procedure must be executed by all participants correctly... **B2 .....and completely....**

Austin went on to add sincerity clause: firstly, that participants must have the requisite thoughts, feelings and intentions, as specified by the procedure, and secondly, that if subsequent conduct is called for, the participants must so conduct themselves. If the speech act is unsuccessful by failing A or B conditions, then Austin described it as a misfire. If the act is insincerely performed, then he described it as an abuse of a speech act. For example if I say I bet you... with no intention to pay, or I promise .... When I already intend to break the promise.

### 3.1.2 Performatives

Performatives can be explicit or implicit. Explicit performatives are performatives that have “a doing verb”. That is to say that those verbs are obvious because of the presence of performative verbs like promise, warn, baptize, admonish, convict, order, query, prescribe, and so on, in utterances where it occurs. An example can be seen in this sentence “I promise to give one thousand naira”. The explicitness of this performative can be seen in the presence of the performative verb ‘promise’, which makes explicit the kind of act being performed. Implicit performatives on the other hand, contains no performative verb. An example can be seen in this utterance “Smokers are liable to die young”. This sentence can either be an advice or a warning because its performativity is not made explicit in the sentences in which it occurs.

Osisanwu (65) notes that speech act types are also distinguished on the “basis of their structure and the function the structure is performing”. In this case, we have the direct and indirect speech act types. Basically, English sentences are grouped into three types, which are: the declarative, interrogative and the imperative sentence types which are typically associated with three basic illocutionary forces, namely, asserting/ stating, asking/ questioning and ordering/ requesting. Sadock (1975) opines that “in the case of direct match between a sentence type and an illocutionary force, we have a direct speech act but if there is no direct relationship between the sentence type and an illocutionary force, then we have an indirect speech act”. An example of an indirect speech act is when an interrogative is used as a request in a sentence. “can you pass me the salt?” while a declarative that is used to make a statement is a direct speech act as in “you are cooking”. John I. Saeed (230) describes the direct speech act as ‘the conventionally expected function’ while the indirect speech act is the “extra actual function”.

The import of Austin's thesis is that for a speech act to be valid, the speaker must have the power to do so, there must be the right circumstances and right intentions, and the intentions must be actualized. Again, the parties involved must have "the right intentions" Mey (97). Onuigbo, (7-9), observes that the problem with Austin's thesis is that it is not always clear and conclusive on what counts as performative verb and what does not. This led to his discussion of what kind of things we actually do with words. The triad of "locutionary, 'illocutionary' and 'perlocutionary'" act which is the most crucial part of speech act theory came as a response. The illocutionary act refers to the use of language in making a sentence, statement, or linguistic utterance by the speaker. Illocutionary act is the act performed in saying something. It is the intention of the statement, which goes beyond the locutionary act. Perlocutionary act is the act performed by saying something, the effect the utterance has on the psychological state of the hearer/ addresses which could be inspiring, motivating, persuading, consoling and so on. This is otherwise known as response to intention.

Austin (92) is of the opinion that the locutionary act is composed of three components which are the phonetic act, the phatic act and the rhetic act. Osisanwu (58) opines that the locutionary act is "the formal and literal meaning of an utterance which includes the phemes and rhemes" Yule (48) sees it as "first basic act of utterance which involves producing a meaningful linguistic expression". Thus, subscribing to Sadock's opinion, locution is the "uttering of certain sounds, making of certain marks and the construction of certain speech in conformity with the grammatical rules of a particular language...."

Etuko Oshi (3-4) states that the phonetic acts are "acts of pronouncing sounds, phatic acts are acts of uttering words or sentences in accordance with the phonological and syntactic rules of the

language to which they belong and the rhetic acts are acts of uttering a sentence with sense and ...reference”.

Again, Austin (10) quoted in Sadock (55) distinguishes between these speech act kinds with his famous example “shoot her”.

Locution: He said to me “shoot her” meaning by shoot “shoot” and referring by ‘her’ to her.

Illocution: He urged (or advised, ordered and so on) me to shoot her.

Perlocution: He persuaded me to shoot her.

Ruth Kempson in her book *Presupposition and the Delimitation of Semantics* (51) succinctly distinguished between these three speech act types thus: “speakers utter sentences with a particular meaning (locutionary act) and with a particular force (illocutionary) in order to achieve a certain effect (perlocutionary act) on the hearer”. It should be noted that illocutionary acts occupies the middle ground between locutionary and perlocutionary acts. It is the proper domain of pragmatics- which is the study of meaning in context- and the central focus of the speech act theory as it centres on the speaker and what the speaker intends to achieve in the course of producing an utterance. Sandy Petrey (3) captured this view when she notes that the speech act theory “shifts its focus from what language is to what it does and sees a social process where other linguistic philosophers see a formal structure. Because of the importance of the illocutionary act to the speech act theory, it has now come to be used synonymously with the theory. Examples of illocutionary acts include warning, threatening, claiming, advising, blaming, accusing, promising, thanking and congratulating. These actions are commonly referred to as the illocutionary force of an utterance. Rimer (109) captured the importance of the illocutionary act to the speech act theory in the following words, “the speaker...does not simply say something, instead(s) he does something (thank, congratulate, or advice) by engaging in a

certain verbal behaviour". Dada, S.A. (149) posits that illocutionary act are the core of a theory of speech act as it deals with what is performed through the communicative force of an utterance.

Numerous scholars, notably Austin (1962) Searle (1969) and Keith Allan (1986) have contributed to the classification and categorizing the illocutionary force of utterances. This study will concentrate on Austin's and Searle's classificatory features since it is its focus. Austin (1962) classified speech act into five categories thus:

Verdictives: Typified by the giving of a verdict by the jury, arbitrator or umpire. It may also include giving an estimate, assessing, reckoning or appraisal.

Executives: Typified by the exercising of power, rights or influence. They include appointing, voting and urging.

Commissives: it commits a speaker to a certain course of action. It is typified by promising.

Behaviors: has to do with social behaviour and attitudes. They include congratulating and challenging.

Expositives: Makes plain how our utterances fit into the course of an argument or conversation. Examples are denying, stating, and affirming.

After Austin's original explorations of speech act theory, there has been a number of works which attempt to systematize the approach. One important focus has been to categorize the types of speech act possible in languages. J.R. Searle (1969) while allowing that there is a myriad of language? Particular speech acts, improving on Austin's classification, proposed that all acts fall into five main types.

1. Representatives: This class of illocutionary act is also called assertive. It commits the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition. They are statements that describe a state of

affairs in the world, which could be true or false. (Ajeomimi and Akinkuolere 463).

Paradigm cases include: asserting, stating, claiming, reporting, announcing and concluding.

2. Directives: These are attempts by the speaker to get the addressees to do something. They tend to bring an effect through the action of the hearer. Paradigm cases: requesting, questioning, ordering, and begging.
3. Commissives: This group tends to commit the speaker to some future course of action. Paradigm cases include promising offering threatening and swearing to do something.
4. Expressives: This class of illocutionary act expresses a psychological state which include thanking, apologizing, welcoming congratulating, and greeting.
5. Declaratives: These effect immediate changes in the institutional state of affairs and also tend to rely on elaborate extra-linguistic institutions.

Paradigm cases: excommunication, declaring war, Christening, marrying, firing from employment.

### **3.2 Conversational Implicature**

Grice introduced, as terms of art, the verb implicate and the related noun implicature (implying) and implicatum (what is implied). If something is implied, it means that the thing is folded in, and for it to be understood, it has to be unfolded.

Grice, in his work, identifies two prominent implicatures. Conventional and nonconventional (conversational) implicatures. “A conversational implicature is, therefore, something that is implied in conversation, that is, something which is left implicit in actual language use” (Mey, 45). Conversational implicature is about how we understand an utterance in conversation in line with what we expect to hear. Mey (2006) observes that “... if we ask a question, a response

which, on the face of it, doesn't make 'sense' can very well be an adequate answer" (46). He illustrated with the following: if a person asks me: what time is it?

It makes perfect good sense for me to answer:

'The bus just went by' in a particular context of conversation. This context should include the fact that there is only one bus a day, that it passes by our house at 7:45am each morning, furthermore, that my interlocutor is aware of this and takes my answer in the spirit it was given, viz, a hopefully relevant answer. Grice (1975) adopts what he labels cooperative principles. He argues that speakers should intend to be cooperative when they talk (Grundy). Grice says that one way of being cooperative is for a speaker to give as much information as is expected" (Grundy, 95). Grice formalized his observation that we should be cooperative when we talk into what he labeled 'cooperative principles". This principle holds that you make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. Within this principle, Grice proposed four maxims as follows:

**3.2.1 The Maxim of quantity:** This is the first maxim of the cooperative principle which says that speakers should

1. Make your contribution as informative as required (for the current purposes of the exchange)
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required. This means that they should give neither too little nor too much information (Joan Cutting 34). For instance:

A: Did you drink all the bottles of beer in the fridge?

B: I drank some

This gives the implicature that “B” didn’t drink them all (Margarita Goded Rambaud 102). Some speakers like to point to the fact that they know how much information the hearer requires or can be bothered with, and say something like, “well, to cut a long story short, she didn’t get home till two”. People who give too little information risk their hearer not being able to identify what they are talking about because they are not explicit enough; those who give more information than the hearer needs, risk boring them (Cutting Joan 34-35).

**3.2.2 The Maxim of quality:** This is the second maxim and it says;

1. Do not say what you believe to be false;
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. This means that speakers are expected to be sincere, and to say what they believe corresponds to reality.

**3.2.3 The maxim of Relation:** This is the third maxim and it says, make your contribution relevant. This means that speakers are assumed to be saying something that is relevant to what has been said before. Thus, in the following exchange;

A: There’s somebody at the door.

B: I’ m in the bath

B expects A to understand that his present location is relevant to her comment that there is someone at the door, and that he cannot go and see who it is because he is in the bath (Cutting Joan 35).

**3.2.4 The Maxim of Manner:** This is the fourth and last of the maxims and it says, Be perspicuous and specifically :

1. Avoid obscurity
2. Avoid ambiguity
3. Be brief



#### 4. Be orderly.

Grundy (97) states that the four maxims “enjoin speakers to be informative to the expected degree (Quantity), to say things that are well founded (Quality), to be relevant (relation) and to be clear (Manner)”. According to Grice, “hearers assume that speakers observe the cooperative principle, and that it is the knowledge of the four maxims that allows hearers to draw inferences about the speakers’ intentions and implied meaning’ Cutting Joan quoting Grice opines that the meaning conveyed by speakers and recovered as a result of the hearers’ inferences, is known as ‘conversational implicature.

Levinson (1983) throws more light on the nature and power of pragmatic explanations on linguistic phenomena. He argues that it is possible to mean more than what is actually said. This is possible, according to him, because the apparent sharp difference between logic and natural language vanishes as soon as pragmatic implications are taken into account in text analysis. It is clear from the on-going, that the cooperative principles and the conversational maxims are the central tenets of the theory of implicature especially as outlined by Grice. As Grundy rightly observed “the implicature...arise because the addressee assumes that the speaker is abiding by Grice’s maxims; that is, the contribution is as informative as is possible, is well founded, is maximally relevant in context, and is to be read in a way that assumes perspicuity” (97).

Christian Mair (114) observes that communication among people, especially in spontaneous conversation, is generally successful and surprisingly free from misunderstandings. He comes in terms with Grice that the cooperative principle accounts for this observation. To Mair, “most implicatures are conversational, they are context bound and hold for a particular conversational context only (115).

Jenny Thomas (56) opines that Grice's theory is an attempt to explain how the hearer gets from what is said to what is meant; from the level of expressed meaning to that of implied meaning. He observes that Grice distinguishes two kinds of implicatures- conventional and non-conventional (conversational) implicatures. He observes that both implicatures have the property of conveying additional meaning beyond the semantic meaning of words uttered. He points out their lines of divergence thus: conventional implicature convey the same implicature regardless of context; whereas in conversational implicatures, the implicatures varies according to the context of utterance.

Kempson outlined five characteristics of the cooperative principles and maxims therein thus:

- (a) Conversational implicatures are dependent on the recognition of the cooperative, principles and its maxims.
- (b) They will not be part of the meaning of the lexical items in the sentence.
- (c) The implicature of an utterance will characteristically not be the sole possible interpretation of the utterance.
- (d) The working out of an implicature depends on the assumption about the world which the speaker and hearer share.
- (e) The assumptions and interpretations of the implicature are cancellable.

Onuigbo acknowledged Kempson's emphasis on the fact that "in actual use, sentences will not be restricted to an interpretation by the form and meaning of the sentence itself" but noted that "these characteristics do not provide an information radically different from the original approach" (12). He pointed out that the fifth characteristic which talks about possible cancellation of assumptions and interpretations is not in any way different from Grice's position

that communication and interpretation are intelligent activities which we arrive at by a reasoning process called “inference to the best explanation”.

Levinson further noted that the address probably has the thought already gone through his mind that speakers do not always abide so rigorously by these maxims. Hence, the maxims are sometimes flouted. He pointed out that the headline of a fashion magazine feature article “Brown is the new black as far as shoes are concerned is clearly obscure and so flouts the maxim of MANNER. In such a situation, we just have to provide a little more of the context ourselves by doing a little more reasoning than would have been necessary had the speaker abided by the maxim. The point here is that even when speakers flout the maxims, implicatures still obtain. This is because the hearer takes it that the speaker is essentially cooperative, in spite of flouting a maxim, and so must be intending to convey an implied meaning.

It is obvious that some self-evident statements, regarding their truthfulness or falsity, have to be uttered for some other purposes outside their stated meaning. When such occurs, then there is need to look out for an implicature. For instance, the statement “ I am a woman” is self evidently true, when it is spoken by a woman and, therefore, flouts the maxim of QUALITY. Such self-evidently true or false statements are signals to the hearer for the need to look out for an implied meaning.

Grundy further introduced what he called hedging maxims. Hedges are used by speakers to let the hearers know the extent to which they are abiding by the maxims. Hedges, generally, do not add truth value to the utterances because they are attached to them. They are more of a comment on the degree or extent to which the speaker is abiding by the maxims which guide contributions to conversation than being a part of the utterance. For instance, in the statement “they say cigarettes are bad for you”. “They say” would be understood as a hedge on the maxim

of quality. It serves as a warning to the addressee that the speaker's information might not be well founded as would normally be expected (97). The implication here is that we not only send messages as we talk, but also regularly "inform each other how informative, well founded, relevant and perspicuous these messages are" (Grundy 101).

In summary, all that has been said point to the fact that the principles provided by Grice to guide our utterances in conversation do really exist and that speakers orient themselves to these principles, Hence, the employment of hedges.

### **3.3 Research Design**

The design of a study is "the blueprint which specifies how data should be collected and analyzed" (Nworgu, 67). The design used, therefore, is the analytic survey, it is concerned with the collection and analysis of data with special reference to their implications in relation to the variables of interest.

### **3.4 Population for the Study**

A population refers to the limits within which the research findings are applicable. In other words, a population has to do with the elements to which the results of investigation are generalizable (Nworgu, 94).

The population for this study, therefore, is, the selected political campaign speeches of President Donald Trump of the United States of America.

### **3.5 Sampling and Sampling Technique**

Sampling is the selection of some members or elements from the population for actual investigation. This selection was necessitated by the impracticability of studying the entire population in most cases (Onaja, 2003).

The sample for this study is comprised of five political speeches made by President Donald Trump as listed below:

1. Acceptance of Nomination speech
2. The inaugural speech
3. First speech to congress
4. Election victory speech.
5. 2017 U.N. speech

Purposive sampling technique was used to arrive at the selection of these speeches. Purposive sampling technique means the selection of specific elements for research investigations. According to Nworgu, B.G, “in purposive sampling, specific elements, which satisfy some predetermined criteria, are selected” (107).

### **3.6 Instruments for Data Collection**

The researcher made use of the documented speeches of President Donald Trump. Library materials were extensively consulted for detailed information on the speech act theory and the conversational implicature in order to carry out a detailed analysis of the selected speeches.

### **3.7 Method of Data Analysis**

This involves the analysis of President Donald Trump’s five political speeches using Grice’s Conversational Implicature to see how these speeches could be applied to the maxims of quantity, quality, manner and relation and how they violate or adhere to these maxims.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### 4.1 Preamble

Katz (1977) states that, “pragmatic theories explicate the reasoning of speakers and hearers in working out the correlation in the context of a sentence taken with a proposition”. In this respect, a pragmatic theory is part of performance.

In pragmatics, it is widely held that the reality we perceive is a creature of the word. In using the word to create the desired reality, the veil of discourse is suspended between our faculties of perception, by metaphorical extension, expands or narrows down the possible versions we may have of the real world. Monsuld (2007), holds that “to determine the way we perceive the world through discourse is to possess the decisive instrument of affecting control”. Language is a powerful tool in the hands of politicians and almost all their activities and achievements depend on how well they utilize this powerful resource at their disposal. One thing common among politicians is that, they make use of language that demands a measure of persuasion which requires people to take some form of decision, so that, the aim of communication can be achieved. Beard, A (2000). captures it thus:

...although political campaigns, with their speeches, their written texts, their broadcast, need to inform and instruct voters about issues that are considered to be of great importance, ultimately, all the written and spoken texts that are produced during an election campaign are designed to persuade people to do one thing: to vote in a certain way (57).

Lycans (1984) observes and it is indeed worthy of note that... politicians are masters of conversational implicature because they exploit the provision of the theory to mislead, deceive, cheat and hoodwink other people.

In other words, to appreciate the success or otherwise of President Trump's speeches is to determine those factors in his speeches which have enabled him to configure the American world before the Americans in what Foucault (1994) termed "the game of truth". By game, Foucault means "a set of procedures that lead to a certain result, which as the basis of its procedure may be considered valid or invalid, winning or losing".

The analysis will attempt to examine President Trump's five selected political speeches using Grice's conversational implicature to see how these speeches Obeyed or flouted the maxims.

## **4.2 The Synopsis**

### **Donald Trump's Nomination Acceptance Speech.**

Donald Trump's nomination Acceptance speech was a compendium. Trump talked on a lot of issues presenting facts and figures. The use of language as an instrument of social interaction is clearly conveyed in this speech. Donald Trump, in using language to interact with the people, demonstrated the attitude of gratitude and appreciation.

### **Appendix 1**

#### **Extract 1**

Friends, delegates and fellow Americans: I humbly and gratefully accept your nomination for the presidency of the United States.

Donald Trump made an assessment of the state of the nation of America. He talked on a lot of issues ranging from high increase in crime and violence, poverty and youth unemployment especially of the African-Americans, the economic state of affairs and humiliations abroad, making it clear that all these are as a result of the incompetence of Obama's administration.

He further shared the sympathy of the laid-off factory workers and the communities crushed by their unfair trade deals. He empathized with the families who have lost their loved ones as a result of crime and violence heaping the blame still on the leader's incompetence.

### **Appendix 1**

#### **Extract 2**

This administration has failed America's inner cities. It's failed them on education. It's failed them on jobs. It's failed them on crime. It's failed them in every way and on every level.

Finally, he drew a road map for a peaceful, violence and crime free, independent and strong America presenting a message of hope for all, promising to put America interest first in everything and pledging to be their voice. He concludes by promising America that the problem they face now will last only as they continue to rely on the same politicians that created them. He states categorically in succinct language that only a change in leadership is required to produce a change in outcomes. That change will only come when (he) Donald Trump takes up the mantle of leadership in America.

#### **4.2.1 Communicative Principle**

Communication being the process by which people exchange information or express their thoughts and feelings, Watzlawick (1967) is of the opinion that it is impossible for anyone not to engage in communication. Leech (1983) adds that in communication, interlocutors often mean more than what they say. By the contention that people engage in communicative activity, it is assumed that communication is a bilateral activity. Though one can communicate with oneself when soliloquizing, communication is usually an activity that involves two or more people.



Donald Trump talked to the Republicans instead of communicating with them. There was no dialogue. This is so because it is a public speech and also the reason turn-taking, which characterizes discursive events, is absent.

Public speeches have the primary aim of convincing and Donald Trump made good use of this opportunity to bring to lime light the failures of President Obama’s administration. Donald Trump lives out the axiom of communicative principle which states that speakers want to be understood clearly when communicating. His speech adapts well to the “strength scale” of expression enunciated by Levinson (1983). In his speech, some pragmatic force is attached to the choice of certain quantifiers to include or exclude some Americans. The strength scale is identified with such makers as: “we”, “many”, “some”, and “all” as shall be seen. “All” is inclusive, “many” exclude, “all”, “some/ many” is vague.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Extract 3**

Who would have believed that when WE started this journey on June 16<sup>th</sup> of last year WE –and I say WE because WE are a team.... together, WE will lead our party back to the White House and WE will lead our country back to safety, prosperity and peace. WE will be a country of generosity and warmth. But WE will also be a country of law and order.

In the above excerpt, “WE” is inclusive of all Americans and “WE” excludes “NONE”. In talking about violence and chaos in their streets and communities, Trumps did not include everyone when he used ‘many’:

**Appendix 1****Extract 4**

Americans watching this address tonight have seen the recent images of violence in our streets and chaos in our communities. MANY have witnessed this violence personally.

Here, the use of MANY excludes ALL. The use of MANY does not commit the speaker in associating the attribute with every listener. More so, the listener does not know for certain whether what is true of him is also true of the other members of the audience.

Donald Trump selects segments of the society to buttress his point when he says:

**Appendix 1****Extract 5**

...some have even been its victims.

The use of SOME signifies NOT ALL. The use of SOME here indicates part of WE. Donald Trump appealed to the majority by informing them that the problems they face now will only be repealed by a positive change in leadership which will only come when he becomes the president.

**Appendix 1****Extract 6**

...when I take the oath of office next year, I will restore law and order to our country...in this race for the White House, I am the Law and order candidate.

### **4.3.1 Grice's Theory of Conversational Implicature and Donald Trump's Speech on Nomination Acceptance**

Grice is of the opinion that speakers tend to be cooperative when they talk by conveying as much information as is expected. Grice further formalized this observation into what he called the "cooperative principle". This principle states that: make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grundy 95). He further again developed four maxims within this principle, viz: maxim of quantity, enjoining that "you make your contribution as informative as is required, and that you do not make your contribution more informative than is required". Maxim of quality- "try to make your contribution one that is true," that is, do not say what you believe to be false, and do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence". Maxim of manner requires one to "be perspicuous" in order to avoid obscurity of expression and avoid ambiguity, and maxim of relation enjoins speakers to convey information that are relevant in every context of utterance.

### **4.3.2 The Maxim of Quantity**

This maxim requires speakers to make their contribution as informative, not saying too much or too little but making the strongest statements they can. It is clear that Donald Trump adhered to this maxim by giving the needed information backed up with facts that spurred the Americans into action. For example, Not only have our citizens endured domestic disaster, but they have lived through one international humiliation after another. We all remember the images of our sailors being forced to their knees by their Iranian captors at gunpoint. This was prior to the signing of the Iran deal, which gave back to Iran 150 billion dollars and gave us nothing- it will go down in history as one of the worst deals ever negotiated. Another humiliation came when President Obama drew a red line in Syria- and the whole world knew it meant nothing. In

Libya, our consulate- the symbol of American prestige around the globe-was brought down in flames. Thus making the Republican Party to get 60 percent more votes than it received four years ago and the Democrats, on the other hand, received almost 20 percent fewer votes than they got eight years ago.

### **4.3.3 The Maxim of Quality**

This maxim enjoins speakers not to say what they believe to be false and not to say that for which they lack evidence. There is ample evidence in the speech to prove that Trump adheres to the maxim of quality.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Extract 7**

In the President's hometown of Chicago, more than 2,000 people have been victims of shootings this year alone. And almost 4,000 have been killed in the Chicago area since he took office...Nearly 180,000 illegal immigrants with criminal records, ordered deported from our country's are tonight roaming free to threaten peaceful citizens ...one of such border-crosser was released and made his way to Nebraska. There, he ended the life of an innocent young girl named Sara Root. She was 21 years old, and was killed the day after graduating from college with a 4.0 Grade Point Average.

There is sufficient evidence to justify that what he said actually happened. Trump mentioned places where it happened and the number and name of who was involved. He equally quoted the

newspapers and Television news where they were captured in the news. From these instances, it is evident that Donald Trump has not said anything for which he lacks adequate evidence.

#### **4.3.4 The Maxim of Relation**

This maxim holds that a cooperative speaker should not convey any information that is not relevant in the context of utterance. This relevance of a speech can be explicit or implicit. Once a speech is relevant, the speaker himself becomes relevant. This maxim enjoins the speaker to be relevant to the situation and people he is addressing. For instance, the notice outside a shop which specialized in currency exchange reads, “Bring in your currency here”. Explicitly, the notice invites the reader to exchange his currency in the shop. On the other hand, a notice, which reads, “Do not forget your kids on children’s day”, just outside children’s entertainment centre, is implicitly telling you to bring your kids to the recreational and entertainment centre on children’s day.

The question now is: Did Trump’s speech on nomination acceptance obey or violate the maxim of relation.

### **Appendix 1**

#### **Extract 8**

I have a message for all of you. The crime and violence that today afflicts our nation will soon come to an end. Beginning on January 20<sup>th</sup> 2017, safety will be restored. The most basic duty of government is to defend the lives of its own citizens. Any government that fails to do so is a government unworthy to lead.

Looking at the above statement, one can identify the following implicatures:

- (a) That there is high rate of crime and violence in the nation.
- (b) The government is not worthy to lead because it cannot defend its citizens.
- (c) That safety will be restored when he (Trump) takes over as the president.

Explicitly, the statement is a passionate appeal to the audience to vote him into office as the next President because they would not want the insecurity they are witnessing to continue. The above statement of Donald Trump can be said to be relevant since it brought out the only way out of all their troubles and to safety, which is, change in leadership that will bring about change in outcomes.

Donald Trump employed much astuteness, often with a combination of challenging statements to make his speech relevant both to the concrete situation and to the Americans themselves:

### **Appendix 1**

#### **Extract 9**

It is finally time for a straight forward assessment of the state of our nation. I will present the facts plainly and honestly. We cannot afford to be so politically correct anymore. So if you want to hear the corporate spin, the carefully-crafted lies, and the media myths-the Democrats are holding their convention, there will be no lies. We will honour the American people with the truth, and nothing else.

The following implicatures can be identified from the above statement:

- (a) There has not been a straight forward assessment of the nation.

(b) There has not been plain presentation of facts

(c) The Democrats tell lies.

(d) The Republicans say the truth.

About the economy, Trump presented facts and figures to make his speech relevant.

### **Appendix 1**

#### **Extract 10**

Again, I will tell you the plain facts that have been edited out of your nightly news and your morning newspapers. Nearly four in 10 African –American children are living in poverty, while 58 percent of African- American youths are not employed. 2 million more Latinos are in poverty today than when President Obama took his Oath of office less than eight years ago. Another 14 million people have left the workforce entirely... President Obama has almost doubled our national debt to more than 19 trillion dollars, and growing yet, what do we have to show for it? Our roads and bridges are falling apart, our airports are in Third World condition, and fifty-three million Americans are on food stamps.

From the above instances, it can unarguably be said, that Donald Trumps nomination acceptance speech is relevant having obeyed Grice’s maxim of relevance.

#### **4.4.5 The Maxim of Manner**

This maxim enjoins the speaker to be perspicuous. This entails avoidance of obscure expressions, avoidance of ambiguity, being brief and orderly. Was Donald Trump's speech on nomination acceptance in line with these entailments?

Donald Trump after appreciating the people (the Americans) for nominating him, made the following statement.

#### **Appendix 1**

##### **Extract 11**

The most basic duty of government is to defend the lives of its citizens. Any government that fails to do so is a government unworthy to lead... the problem we face now-poverty and violence at home, war and destruction aboard-will last only as long as we continue relying on the same politicians who created them. A change in leadership is required to produce a change in outcomes.

The message in the above statement is simple, clear and straight forward. There is no ambiguity.

Without mincing words, Donald Trump made it clear to the Americans that the root of all their problems and troubles is the incumbent government then- Obama's administration. He did not give room for unnecessary details. He hit the nail on the head.

In the light of the above observation, it can be argued that Donald Trump's speech on nomination acceptance obeyed the maxim of manner.

#### **4.4 Donald Trump: The Inaugural**

What makes this speech spectacular is that Trump did not only communicate but went beyond the frontiers of everyday communication to weave in uncommon features of everyday communication that turned his speech into an emotional, but yet educative speech that the people embraced.



## **Appendix 2**

### **Extract 1**

My fellow Americans, this is a great day for me personally. You're very smart to have voted for me because I'm going to do positive things for this country, starting with this mall I'm looking out over.

In the above extract, Trump's attempt to indulge in self glorification is succinctly expressed. Trump projects his image. The above extract is intimidating and clearly projects power. It is a gross exaggeration meant to project the positive image of the speaker. A sense of certainty and commitment is reinforced as Donald Trump declares his commitment, determination and resolve to lead the Americans and change America for the better. Trump portrays himself as the people's servant who is willing to serve them.

#### **4.4.1 Grice's Theory of Conversational Implicature Applied to Donald Trump's Inaugural Speech**

In the following extract, Donald Trump violates this maxim as he talks about New York city where he comes from.

## **Appendix 2**

### **Extract 2**

Where I come from, New York city- which happens to be the greatest city in the world, and the reason I say that is that I built most of it, and I only build quality, so I think I know what I'm talking about- a mall doesn't look like this. Where are the shops? I see grass, ponds-and what's that, an Obelisk? This is not Cairo.

In the above extract, Donald Trump gives too much information about New York City by describing it as the greatest city in the world. By comparing it with Cairo, Trump presents New

York City in a positive sense and Cairo in a derogatory sense. The direct result of being as informative as is required is not being more informative than is required. This aspect of Grice's maxim of quantity implies that there should not be over emphasis, exaggerations or excessive details by the speakers.

A violation of the quantity maxim can also be seen from the following extract:

**Appendix 2**

**Extract 3**

At the end of this so-called mall is the Lincoln Memorial... but if you want to make a statement about Lincoln, you could do much better than this. White Marbles? Columns? This is not Greece. And that statue, he looks like he's having a difficult bowel movement. This is no way to say thank you for saving the union.

Trump skillfully gave information about what the Americans think they did in honour of Abraham Lincoln in a manner that held his audience captivated, condemning it and apparently inspiring them to do more.

**Appendix 2**

**Extract 4**

So with respect to Lincoln, I would make a statement: pink marble, gold, mirrors, maybe some hanging gardens, fountains with water coming out of the breasts.

#### **4.4.3 The Maxim of Quality**

This maxim enjoins speakers not to say what they believe to be false and not to say that for which they lack evidence. Donald Trump violates this maxim in his inaugural speech as can be seen from the following extract.

## **Appendix 2**

### **Extract 5**

Everywhere I look I see wasted opportunities, and I've only been president for five minutes.

Trump presents himself as a visionary leader for having seen all he thinks he needed to see within his first five minutes as president. By quality, Trump violates this maxim because he lacks evidence having been president for only five minutes.

#### **4.4.4 Maxim of Relation**

This maxim requires speakers to say what is relevant. The maxim enjoins speakers to be relevant to the situation and the people they are addressing. The question is, did Trump's speech on the inaugural adhere to or violate this maxim? Let us consider the following statement:

## **Appendix 2**

### **Extract 6**

So what do you think about your new first lady? I picked Moronia- what's your name, honey? Melania, right. Great name. I just picked Melania here from a very wide selection of possibilities not just because the sex is incredible but because this nation wants and deserves a trophy first lady. When everyone sees our first lady standing next to some other first lady of another country, the wife of a premier or whatever, they'll want to go to bed with our first lady, not the other one. So the American people no longer have to worry on that score.

The above statement of Donald Trump violates the maxim of relation as it is not relevant to the situation and to the people he is addressing. This is so because the private life of a family, especially of a President, should not be for public consumption. Trump goes on by saying:

## Appendix 2

### Extract 7

And if they get tired of her, not a problem, because chances are I' ll be tired of her before they are-Trying to keep North Korea from getting a bomb, maybe that's a problem. Finding a new first lady? Trust me, not a problem.

The following implicatures arise from the above statement:

- (a) Melania is a bigamist since she is not only married to Donald Trump but to all the Americans. This is made vivid by the use of 'we',
- (b) Melania's position as the first lady is not guaranteed or secured since she may be dropped if Donald Trump and the Americans gets tired of her.
- (c) Trump and the Americans may get another first lady.

President Donald Trump builds up intense emotional power seeking to arouse the same in his listeners. The effect is unnecessary excessive emotive power beyond what is needed. Trump says too much than is needed about his wife and her private life. Instead of restricting himself to making the masses see his intention through his speech, he makes reference to his wife to the extent of calling her by her name.

#### **4.4.5 Maxim of Manner**

This maxim enjoins speakers to be perspicuous. This entails avoiding obscure expressions, avoiding ambiguity, being brief and being orderly. Donald Trump's speech on the inaugural adhered to this maxim. On policy, foreign policy, missiles and foreign front, he was very clear, unambiguous, brief and orderly. Let us consider the following statements:

**Appendix 2****Extract 8**

Policy wise? I'm going to be very hands on. If a situation comes up, like inflation, or a union beef, or Mike Tyson beats up another motorist, I'm going to be on it. It's going to be fixed.

Trump states categorically clear what he will do assuming a situation comes up. He gives an instance of what he did in central Park in New York City to buttress his point.

**Appendix 2****Extract 9**

Foreign-policy-Wise? Same. I'm a businessman. Other countries want to do business with us, I'm all for it. Trade, great. I have no problems with people trading with us. But it's going to be fair trade, by which I mean we come out on top.

Trump makes it clear that he is a business man and is out for profit for the American people. That is why he said that they will come out on top.

**Appendix 2****Extract 10**

Missiles? Very simple-you aim one at us, I fire a hundred at you. So don't go there.

Trump states in clear terms that he is out to protect the American citizens which is one of the areas where Obama's government failed the people.

**Appendix 2****Extract 11**

On Foreign Front, I have something to say to Fidel Castro. Adios, Pal. This time, we're going to nationalize your hotels and casinos.

Trump makes a firm promise to Fidel Castro that they are going to buy and also take control of their hotels and casinos. The above instances confirm that Donald Trump violated, and at the same time, adhere to the cooperative maxims in his inaugural speech.

#### **4.5 Donald Trump's First Speech to Congress**

This speech was delivered on February 28, 2017 to the congress as they mark the conclusion of Black History Month. Donald Trump reminded his audience (the Americans) of their Nations path towards civil rights and the work yet undone. He spoke to appeal to the Americans to inspire them to move with the change he is out to bring, stressing that while America is a Nation divided on policies, America still stands united in condemning hate and evil in all its forms. Trump encouraged the Americans not to allow the light handed down to their generation to be put out in their own hands. He entitled the message "a message of unity and strength from his heart":

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Extract 1**

As a new chapter of American greatness begins, a new national pride sweeps across the Nation and a new surge of optimism places impossible dreams firmly in their grips, he advocates for the renewal of the American spirit.

Donald Trump honestly acknowledged the circumstances they inherited as a nation from the past administration before outlining the steps they must take as a country to move America forward and make it a better place. He strongly believes that the Republicans and the Democrats can work together to achieve an outcome that has eluded their country for decades. He believes that everything that is broken can be fixed, every problem can be solved and every hurting

family can find healing and hope. Trump so much advocated that the Republicans and Democrats should work together and unite for the good of America and its people; stressing that:

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Extract 2**

true love for their people requires them to find a common ground, to advance the common good, and to cooperate on behalf of every American child who deserves a brighter future.

To further bring home his message of change, Trump emphasized what brought about the echo for a change.

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Extract 3**

It was all about the shrinking state of their middle class because America exported their job opportunities and wealth to foreign countries; America financed and built one global project after another ignoring the fates of its children in American inner cities. America defended the borders of other nations, leaving their own borders wide open for immigrants and for drugs to pour in at unprecedented rate. America have spent trillions of dollars overseas, while their infrastructure at home has so badly crumbled. Then, in 2016, the earth shifted beneath their feet as the rebellion started as a quiet protest, spoken by families of all colours and creeds. But then the quiet voices became a loud chorus as thousands of American citizens spoke out together, from their cities small and large; all across the country. Finally, the chorus became an earthquake and the people turned out by the tens of millions, and they were all united by one very simple, but crucial demand; that America put its citizens first.

Trump then made a litany of his plans and the way forward.

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Extract 4**

On jobs, Trump's government have saved tax payers hundreds of millions of dollars by bringing down the price of the fantastic new F-35 jet fighter. The government have begun to drain the swamp of government corruption by imposing a 5-year ban on lobbying by executive branch officials and a lifetime ban on becoming lobbyists for a foreign government. The government have also undertaken a historic effort of massively reducing job crushing regulations, creating a deregulation task force inside every government agency; imposing a new rule which mandates that for every 1 new regulation, 2 old regulations that threaten the future and livelihood of their great coal miners. Trump's government have cleared the way for the constructions of a new American pipelines, made with American steel, thereby creating tens of thousands of jobs.

To launch the National rebuilding, Trump promised to:

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Extract 5**

ask the congress to approve legislation that produces a \$ 1 trillion dollars investment in the infrastructure of the United States that will be financed through both private and public capital to create millions of new jobs. This effort will be guided by two core principles: Buy American, and hire American.



On security:

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Extract 6**

Trump's government will stop the drugs from pouring into Americas and poisoning their youths. There will be expanded treatment for youths who have become so badly addicted. On immigration, integrity and rule of law must be restored to the borders. Drug dealers and criminals that threaten their communities and prey on their citizens are being removed at the time Trump was delivering this speech.

Trump pledged again to serve, protect and defend the citizens of the United States and that very strong measures are also being taken to protect the Nation from Radical Islamic Terrorism.

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Extract 7**

He stated that it is not compassionate, but recklessness, to allow uncontrolled entry from places where proper vetting cannot occur. On defence, Trump, as promised, directed the department of defence to develop a plan to demolish and destroy ISIS and to extinguish them from our planet. ISIS is a network of lawless savages that have slaughtered Muslims, Christians, men, women and children of all faiths and beliefs.

As pertaining to Justice, Trump kept his promise of appointing Justice to the United States Supreme Court from the list of 20 judges. Judge Neil Gorsuch, who was described as a man of incredible skill and deep devotion to the law was appointed.

Concerning finance, Trump observed that:

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Extract 8**

America has the worst financial recovery in 65 years. In the last 8 years, the past administration has put more new debt than nearly all other Presidents combined. America has lost more than one-fourth of its manufacturing jobs since NAFTA was approved and have lost 60,000 factories since china joined the World Trade Organization in 2001. America's trade deficit in goods with the world last year was about \$800 billion dollars and overseas, America has inherited a series of tragic foreign policy disaster. Trump believes that solving these, and so many other pressing problems, will require Americans to work past the differences of party and so advocates that Americans should tap into the American spirit that has helped them to overcome every challenge throughout their long stories history.

On healthcare:

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Extract 9**

Trump called on the congress to repeal and replace Obamacare with reforms that expand choices, increase access, lower cost, and at the same time provide better healthcare.

Finally, Trump challenged Americans to work towards their 250th independence celebration so as to present the world with more wonders than they did in their centennial anniversary in 1876; when Alexander Graham Bell displayed his telephone for the first time, Remington unveiled the first typewriter and Thomas Edison showed an automated telegraph and an electric pen.

#### **4.5.1 Grice's Principle Applied to Donald Trump's first Speech to Congress**

Leech (1983) states that through communicative implicatures, pragmatic principles make it possible for hearers to get meanings from what the speakers say, as well as interpret beyond the speaker's utterances. In his first speech to congress, Donald Trump proved the veracity of Watzlawick (1967) assertion that it is impossible not to communicate as far as human beings are concerned and that every healthy human being engages in the activities of communication. The outstanding richness of Trump's speeches becomes glaring when Grician principle is applied to it.

Regarding the maxim of quantity, Trump's first speech to congress can be said to be as informative as is required because he captured how far his government has gone and his plans ahead. For instance, "that America must put its citizens first...", gives rise to the implicature that America (by quantity) has been putting foreign countries first. The maxim of quality requires the speaker to make contribution that is true, not to say what he believes to be false, not to say that for which he has no evidence. Trump's first speech to congress lives out this maxim. For instance, Trump's appointment of Judge Neil Gorsuch, a man of incredible skill and deep devotion to the law, is in keeping with his promise to appoint a Justice to the United States Supreme Court from his list of 20 judges. Also, Trump's honest acknowledgement of the circumstances his government inherited from the past government and his litary of his journey so far are evidences that Trump, in his first speech to congress adhered to the maxim of quality.

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Extract 10**

Nine-four million Americans are out of the labour force.  
Over 43 million people are now living in poverty, and  
over 43 million Americans are on food stamps. More than

I in 5 people in their prime working years are not working. We have the worst financial recovery in 65 years. In the last 8 years, the past administration has put on more new debts than nearly all other Presidents combined. We've lost more than one-fourth of our manufacturing jobs since NAFTA was approved, and we've lost 60,000 factories since china joined the world Trade Organization in 2001. Our trade deficit in goods with the world last-year was nearly \$800 billion dollars. And overseas, we have inherited a series of tragic foreign policy disaster.

The maxim of relation requires the speaker to be relevant. Let us examine the following statement;

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Extract 11**

If we are guided by the well-being of American citizens then I believe Republicans and Democrats can work together to achieve an outcome that has eluded our country for decades.

The above statement gives rise to the following implicatures:

1. They (the politicians) have not been guided by the well-being of American citizens.
2. The Republicans and the Democrats have not been working together.
3. A handsome outcome has eluded the country.

This is why the clarion call by Trump soliciting that both the Republicans and the Democrats should work past party differences for the good of America and its citizens.

The maxim of manner enjoins speakers to be perspicuous, avoiding obscure expressions and ambiguity and to be brief and orderly. Donald Trump's first speech to congress fulfilled this

maxim in that his speech was presented in very simple English that was clearly understood. He did not mince words when he said repeatedly that the Republicans and the Democrats needed to work together. Trump again assured American of his willingness, readiness and determination to serve, defend and protect the citizens of the United States.

#### **4.6 Trump's 2017 U.N. Speech**

This speech was presented by President Donald Trump to the United Nations General Assembly on September 19, 2017 at New York City, Donald Trump's home city. The centre of his address was the very serious threats before the Nations today and also the enormous potentials waiting to be unleashed. Trump acknowledged that we live in a time of extra-ordinary opportunity- breakthrough in science, technology, and medicines are curing illnesses and solving problems that generations before ours thought impossible to solve. But then, each day also brings news of growing dangers that threaten everything we cherish and value. Trump puts it simply thus:

#### **Appendix 4**

##### **Extract 1**

“we meet at a time of both immense promise and great peril. It is entirely up to us either to lift the world to new heights, or to let it fall into a valley of despair. We also have it in our own power, should we so choose, to lift millions from poverty, to help our citizens realize their dreams, and to ensure that new generations of children are raised free from violence, hatred and fear”.

Trump reminded the leaders that the U.N was founded after the two World Wars to help shape this better future, based on the vision that diverse nations could cooperate to protect their sovereignty, preserve their security, and promote their prosperity. He stressed that the success of

the U.N depends on the independent strength of its members; adding that, we the U.N. must begin with the wisdom of the past to overcome the perils of the present and achieve the promise of the future; as nations uphold the two core sovereign duties of respecting the interest of their own people and the rights of every other sovereign nation. This being the beautiful union's vision. Trump emphasized that leaders of member nations to the U.N. should renew this founding principle of sovereignty because it is one of the yard sticks upon which their responsibility to their own citizens is measured.

Trump spoke out against threats to sovereignty, the likes of Ukrain and North Korea, who starve millions of its citizens to death, imprison, torture, kill and oppress countless more, stressing that the U.N. must reject such threats. He condemned the Iranian government that masks a corrupt dictatorship behind the false guise of democracy. This is because this government has turned Iran which used to be a wealthy country with rich history and culture into an economically depleted rogue state with violence, bloodshed and chaos as its chief export. Trump states that the U.N. must not allow this to continue. Trump enjoins the world to join the U.N. in demanding that Iran's government end its pursuit of death and destruction, free all people unjustly detained (both Americans and citizens of other nations), and finally, stop supporting terrorists. Iran government must begin to serve its own people and respect the sovereign rights of its neighbours.

Trump notes that major portions of the world are in conflict and some, in fact, are going to hell; but he is encouraged by the fact that the leaders under the U.N. can solve many of these vicious and complex problems. He suggests that Nations should take greater role in promoting secure and prosperous societies in their own regions, giving the following instances of what the United States did in the Western hemisphere. There is a new strategy to fight evil in Afghanistan.

In Syria and Iraq, there are big gains towards final defeat of ISIS. United States stood against corrupt and destabilizing regime in Cuba, imposed tough, calibrated sanctions on the socialist dictatorship of Nicolas Maduro in Venezuela with the singular goal of helping them regain their freedom, recover their country, and restore their democracy. Trump states that the problem in Venezuela is not that socialism has been poorly implemented, but that socialism has been faithfully implemented. From the Soviet Union to Cuba to Venezuela, wherever true socialism or communism has been adopted, it has delivered anguish, devastation and failure.

Trump ends his speech to the U.N. General Assembly with the following resounding rhetorical questions. Are we still patriots? Do we love our nations enough to protect their sovereignty and to take ownership of their future? Do we revere them enough to defend their interests, preserve their cultures, and ensure a peaceful world for their citizens? Challenging them further, Trump cited one of the greatest American patriots, John Adams, who wrote that American Revolution was “effected before the war commenced. The Revolution was in the minds and hearts of the people”. That was the moment America awoke, when they looked around and understood that they were a nation. They realized who they were, what they value, and what they would give their lives to defend. Trump called for a great reawakening of Nations, for the revival of their spirits, their pride, their people, and their patriotism. He called on leaders of Nations to live out this true vision of U.N., the ancient wish of every people, and the deepest yearning that lives inside every sacred soul.

#### 4.6.1 Grice's Principle Applied Trump's Speech to the U.N. General Assembly

In the course of his speech, Donald Trump stated that:

##### **Appendix 4**

##### **Extract 2**

We live in a time of extraordinary opportunity. Breakthroughs in science, technology, and medicine are curing illnesses and solving problems that prior generations thought impossible to solve. But each day also brings news of growing danger that threaten everything we cherish or value. Terrorists and extremists have gathered strength and spread to every region of the planet.

The above statement satisfies the maxim of quantity in that it was as informative as was required at that moment; and it avoided exaggerations.

The speech equally made contributions that the speaker believed to be true with adequate evidences. Let us consider the following statement:

##### **Appendix 4**

##### **Extract 3**

No one has shown contempt for other nations and for the wellbeing of their own people than the depraved regime of North Korea. It is responsible for the starvation deaths of millions of North Koreans, and for the imprisonment, torture, killing, and oppression of countless more. We were all witnesses to the regime's deadly abuse when an innocent American college student, Otto Warmbier, was returned to America only to die a few days later. We saw it in the assassination of the dictator's brother using banned nerve agents in an international airport. We know it kidnapped a sweet 13-year- old Japanese girl from a



beach in her own country to enslave her as a language tutor for North Korea's spies.

In line with the above statement, Trump's speech to the U.N. General Assembly obeyed the maxim of quality.

The maxim of Relation requires speakers to be relevant. This means that the speech should be of importance both to the addressees and to their situations. Let us consider the following statement:

#### **Appendix 4**

##### **Extract 4**

International criminal networks traffic drugs, weapons, people; force dislocation and mass migration, threaten our borders; and new forms of aggressive exploit technology to menace our citizens. To put it simply, we meet at a time of both immense promise and greet peril.

The above statement is relevant both to the addresses and the situations they are facing. This speech, therefore, satisfies the maxim of relation.

Trump's speech to the U.N. General Assembly was also devoid of obscure expressions and ambiguities. It was equally brief and orderly thereby obeying the maxim of manner. Trump was clear when he made the following statements:

#### **Appendix 4**

##### **Extract 5**

The success of the U.N depends on the independent strength of members. We do expect all nations to uphold these to core sovereign duties: to respect the interest of their own people, and the rights of every sovereign nation. Now, we are calling for a great reawakening of nations, for the revival of their spirit, their pride, their people, and their patriotism.

Based on the above instances, it can be stated that Trump's speech to the U.N. General Assembly fulfilled the requirements of Grice's principle, popularly known as the cooperative principles, and its maxims. The contributions made by Donald Trump in the speech was appropriately, informative, true, relevant and perspicuous.

#### **4.7 Donald Trump's US Election Victory Speech.**

This speech started with an apology for being late and keeping the people waiting Trump was very careful to return the victory to the people when he said, "I've just received a call from Secretary Clinton. She congratulated us. It's about us, on our victory..." Trump called on all and sundry to come together and work as a united people so as to achieve the task of rebuilding America and renewing the American dream.

### **Appendix 5**

#### **Extract 1**

Now it's time for America to bind the wounds of division. To all Republicans, and Democrats and Independents across this nation. I say it is time for us to come together as one united people. It's time... for those who have chosen not to support me in the past,... I'm reaching out to you for your guidance and your help so we can work together and unify our great country.

Trump reaffirms his determination to serve the Americans in the following words of his, I pledge to every citizen of our land that I will be President for all Americans and this is so important to me.

Trump carried his audience along as he explains future plans on rebuilding the nation and his dreams for America. As a business, who have spent his entire life on business, looking at the

untapped potentials in projects and in people all over the world, he reaffirms that every single American will have the opportunity to realize his or her fullest potential. The forgotten men and women will be remembered. The inner cities will be fixed and the highways, bridges, tunnels, air ports, schools and hospitals will be rebuilt. The infrastructures will be rebuilt to be second to none and millions of people will be put to work. The great Veterans will be taken care of and a national project of growth and renewal will be embarked on and the creative talents of the people will be harnessed for the benefit of all. There is a great economic plan that will double the growth of the nation and give the strongest economy in the world.

There will be great relationships as American interest will be put first. America will deal fairly with everyone. America will seek common ground not hostility, partnership not conflict. He ended the speech as he acknowledge his parents, wife and children, siblings and a host of other associates and friends, with a firm promise of not letting them down.

#### **4.7.1 Grice's Principle and Donald Trump's U.S. Election Victory Speech**

According to Grundy (2008) "Knowing the speaker well enough would enable us to know what they each mean "(95). The Americans have known Donald Trump well enough and can distinguish between what he says on the one hand and what he meant on the other. The context of his speech is very important as it helps to determine what the speaker means by what he says. For Grice (1989), any meaning that is conveyed indirectly or through hints, and understood as implicit in what is said without actually being explicitly stated is an implicature. Therefore, Grice argues that speakers tend to be cooperative when they talk. The question now is, how cooperative was Donald Trump's US election victory speech in the light of the cooperative principles and its maxims of quantity, quality, manner and relation?

In relation to the maxim of quantity, was Donald Trump's speech as informative as required or more informative than is required? Let us consider the following statement:

### **Appendix 5**

#### **Extract 2**

Now it's time for America to bind the wounds of division. We have to get together. To all Republicans and Democrats and independents across this nation, I say it's time for us to come together as one united people, it's time. For those who have chosen not to support me in the past... I'm reaching out to you for your guidance and your help so we can work together and unify our great country.

Trump having emerged victorious, can be said to be aware of the fact that all ears are open to hearing what he has to say and his political opponents are anxiously waiting for this time. His wisdom in calling other political parties, especially those who choose not to support him in the past and his vow to be President for all Americans, by quantity adheres to this maxim.

On the maxim of quality, Trump stated the truth as he knew and believe it:

### **Appendix 5**

#### **Extract 3**

I've just received a call from Secretary Clinton. She congratulated us. It's about us, on our victory... WE will do a great job.

The above extract gives rise to the implicature that Trump believes, and also has evidence that, in truth, Power belongs to the people and that united, we stand, divided, we fall. The above extract also shows that Trump of a truth is out to serve. This is why he related Clinton's congratulatory message to his audience. His statement that "WE will do a great "job", succinctly brings this out.

Regarding the maxim of relation, Trump's speech could be said to be relevant. His going all out to itemize his plans, his declaration and firm promise to be president for all Americans and his acknowledgement of his supporters are in accordance with the maxim of relevance; as it will make Americans to stand with him.

Finally, Donald Trump was careful to avoid obscurity of expression and ambiguity. He made efforts to be straight, brief and orderly. This indicates that he complied to the maxim of manner which enjoins speakers to be perspicuous. Trump did not leave his audience in doubt regarding his future plans on rebuilding the nation and renewing the American dream. The road map towards this was articulated in unambiguous terms.

#### **4.8 The extent to which Donald Trump's Speeches Obeyed or Flouted the Maxims of Quantity, Quality, Manner and Relation**

According to Grundy, every utterance has both natural meaning (entailment) and non-natural meaning (implicature), whether it abides by or flouts the maxim(s). He further stated that flouting a maxim is a particularly salient way of bringing the addressees to draw an inference and thereby recover an implicature. In other words, flouting a maxim obviously alerts the addressees that there is an implicit meaning. From the discussions carried out in this chapter, it can be stated that Trump's political speeches obeyed Grice's cooperative principle to a great extent and flouted the same to a lesser extent. This has been observed from the analysis of his speeches in the light of the maxims of quantity, quality, manner and relation.

#### **4.9 Summary of the Chapter**

This chapter analyzes the selected political speeches of Donald Trump using Grice's cooperative principles with its maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner. The analysis revealed that the selected speeches adhered to the maxims to a great extent, and also flouted same to a lesser degree.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES**

#### **5.1 Summary of Findings**

This study has examined the role of language in political discourse with particular interest on the pragmatic features of the political speeches of Donald Trump. The study x-rayed the strategies employed by the speaker to communicate his ideology and achieve persuasion using Grice's cooperative principles and its maxims of quantity, quality, manner and relation. Among all the speeches, political speeches are recognized as having the greatest impact and influence on people. The researcher believes that pragmatics would help in determining the implicature arising from these speeches as well as provide a better understanding of them. A review of relevant literature revealed that previous scholarship in our area of investigation focused largely on analysis using the speech acts theory. Scant attention is paid to the use of Grice's cooperative principles and its maxims of quantity, quality, manner and relation. It is this gap in scholarship, in the opinion of the researcher, that constitutes the research slot that the present investigation has filled. The theoretical underpinning for this work is studied and the speech act theory and conversational implicature are analyzed to determine the suitability of the theories for this investigation.

The study revealed that Donald Trump's political speeches obeyed the maxims of quantity, quality, manner and relation to a great extent and flouted same to a lesser degree; thereby, giving rise to the implicature, which affirms the need for this study.

## 5.2 Conclusion

Man has been said to be a political animal. Language on the other hand, has been captured as a unique means of communication characteristic of man. It follows, therefore, that man's political instincts manifests in his choice and use of words.

Language as an intrinsic inheritance of man as homo-sapiens, remains an instrument for propaganda and persuasion in the hands of politicians. Politicians use political speeches to sell their views and reshape the minds of the electorate. Donald Trump manipulated language code and centred his speeches on burning issues to bring about the needed change. Observations from the analyzed data showed that certain conclusions are obvious.

First, pragmatic principles should be used in analyzing political speeches to bring to lime light the extent of cooperation or otherwise between the interactants.

Second, the political speeches of Donald Trump analyzed in this work are as informative as is required, well founded, extensively relevant in their contexts, and have perspicuity as its posture. This is the reason for the implicature that arose.

Finally, political speeches of Donald Trump are better grasped and appreciated when Grice's cooperative principles and its maxims are applied to it.

## 5.3 Recommendations

The findings and conclusion reached in this study necessitates the following recommendations.

- (a) Pragmatics, as a course of study, should be studied as a core subject in the departments of English and Literary Studies, and linguistics, and not as an elective. This is because it will help students to derive both natural and non-natural meanings from various speeches.



- (b) Nigerian politicians should be asked to present logical template on how they intend to actualize their political promises if we actually want to change this nation for the better. Failure to do this, should amount to gross incompetence on the candidate and subsequent dismissal from the political race.

#### **5.4 Suggestions for Further Studies**

Since pragmatic principles are informative in the analysis of language in use, this work does not lay claims to having highlighted all that should be touched in our area of investigation. It is hoped that the analysis of more works will provide better information on messages of political speeches. Further research should be conducted on the analysis of other political speeches made by outstanding Nigerian politicians. Since politics has remained a veritable source of human activities involving a whole of linguistic fabrications and manipulation, it is our hope that this investigation will open up new vistas for language experts to carry out further investigations in this area.

## REFERENCES

- Agbedo, C.U. (2008). "A speech Act analysis of political discuss in Nigerian print media". *International Journal of African studies* 10 (pp. 146-165).
- Akinwote, S. A, (2013). "A speech Act Analysis of the Acceptance of Nomination speeches of Chief Obafemi Awolowo and Chief M.K.O. Abiola". *English Linguistic Research* (online). Vol. 2.1, pp 45-51.
- Aristotle, (2015). "Politics". Book 1:11 Trans, Jowett Benjamin Adelaide: The Adelaide University Library, South Australia Thursday April, 2018.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon press,
- Ayeomoni, O. M & AKinkuolere, S. O. (2012) . "A Pragmatic analysis of Victory and Inaugural speeches of President Umaru Musa Yar' Adua". *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. Vol. 2.3, pp 467-468.
- Beard, A. (2000). *The language of Politics*. London Routledge.
- Bilmes, Jack. (1986). "*Discuss and Behaviour*". New York: Plenum press.
- Brown P, & Levinson S. (1987). "*Politeness*", Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Buckley, C. (2000). "Trump: The Inaugural." Wall street journal October 21. Retrieved on Tuesday March, 2018.
- Chilton, P. A. (1998). "Politics and Language": *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. London: Etsevier, pp. 688-694.
- Cutting, J. (2002). "*Pragmatics and discourse. A Resource for Students*". London: Routledge.
- Dada, S.A. (2004). "*Introduction to Pragmatics.*" *An integrated study in language and society*. Ed. Bamiseye, T. Lagos: Majab Publishers, 142-165.
- Fareed, H. A. & D. Saffah, M.D. (2017). "*Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis*". Journal of Education and practice vol. 5, No. 19.
- Focault, M. (2003). "*An Introduction to language*". 7<sup>th</sup> edition United States: Thomson Corporation House.
- \_\_\_\_ (1994). "The Ethics of the concern of self as a practice of Freedom. "*Ethics, subjectivity and Truth: The Essential works of Michael Foucault*. Ed. Paul Robinow. London: Pengilin, . Pp. 281-301.
- Fromkin, V. et al. (2007). "*An Introduction to language English Edition*". U.S.A. Wordsworth language learning. (2007).

- Grice, H. P. (1975). "Logic and conversation". *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts 3*. Eds P. Cole and J. Morgan. New York: Academic Press.
- Grundy, P. (2008). *Doing Pragmatics*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. London: Hodder Education.
- Hornby, A.S. (2006). *Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary*. 7<sup>th</sup>ed. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- Igwedibia, E. A. (2015). "Pragmatic Analysis of seven poems of Audre Lorde "A Ph.D Thesis of the Department of English and literary studies, faculty of Arts, University of Nigeria, Nsukka,
- — — (2012). "A pragmatic analysis of selected political speeches of President Barack Obama". A master's project in the department of English and literary studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Jones, J. & Peccei, J.S. (2004). "Language and Politics". *Language society and power*. Ed. L1 Thomas. New York: Routledge Pp. 95-110.
- Katz, J.J. (1977). "*Presuppositional structure and illocutionary force*". New York: Crowell.
- Kempson, R. M. (1975) *Presupposition and the Delimitation of Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- — — (1977). *Semantic theory* Cambridge University press.
- Krisagbedo, C. E. (2010). "Pragmatics of former President Obasango's speeches on Corruption in Nigeria". M.A. Thesis. University of Nigeria. A maser's project of the Department of English and literary studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Lycan, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics* London: Longman.
- Lycan, W. G. (1984). "*Logical Forum in National Language*". Cambridge, M.A. Bradford Boods/MIT Press.
- Mair, C. (2012). *English Linguistics: An Introduction* 2<sup>nd</sup> edition Tubinger: Verlga Gmbtt.
- Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics: AN introduction*. Oxford Blackwell, (1993).
- — — (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Mohammed, A. (2015). "A multimodal discourse Analysis of some Newspaper political campaign Advertisements for Nigeria's 2015 elections". A paper Presented at the conference organized by the electoral institute, independent National Electoral commission. Abiya on 28<sup>th</sup> July, Tuesday March, 2018.

- Monsuld, S. (2007). "Literature as Discourse Illustrated in an Analysis of Discursive strategies in Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses*". *Towards the understanding of Discourse strategies*. Eds. M. Olateji, R. Taiwo, and F. Adeleke. Ago-Iwoye, Nigeria: Onabanjo University Press. Pp. 51-81
- Nworgu, B.G. (2006). "Educational Research: Basic Issues and methodology. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Ibadan: Wisdom publishers
- Oguegbu, P.O. (2011). "Pragmatic analysis of the language of stickers printed in English" A master's project in the Department of English and Literary studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Ogunba, O. (1975). *The movement of Transition*. Ibadan: University of Ibadan press.
- Ohaja, E.U (2003). *Mass Communication research and project Report Writing*. Lagos: John Letter man limited.
- Okoro, N. C. (2016). "Pragmatic Analysis of selected political speeches of President Muhammadu Buhari. A master's project in the Department of English and literary studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Olamide, I, & Segun, A. (2014). "A speech Act Analysis of Editorial comments of TELL magazine". *Research on Humanities and social sciences* Vol. 4.9, Pp 1-8
- Olaniyi, O. & Bamigbola E. (2012). "Contextual Acts in President Goodluck Jonathan's Declaration of Presidential Candidacy under the Peoples' Democratic Party", ISEL, 10: Pp. 21-32. Thursday April, 2018.
- Oniugbo, S. (2003). "Exploration of the theories of pragmatics in Ebele Eko's Bridge of Gold. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis. Nsukka: University of Nigeria, A Ph.D Thesis of the Department of English and Literary Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Osisanwu, W. (2003). "*An introduction to discourse analysis and pragmatics*". Lagos: Femolous-Fetop Publishers.
- Petrey, S. (1990). *Speech Act and Literacy theory* New York: Routledge,
- Retrieved from <https://abc13.com/politics/donald-trumps-2016-rnc-speech/1437927/>
- Retrieved from <https://ar.usembassy.gov/remarks-president-trump-72nd-session-united-nations-general-assembly>
- Riemer, N. (2010). *Introducing Semantics* New York: Cambridge Up,

Sadock, J. (2004). "Speech Acts", *Handbook of pragmatics* Eds Horn Laurence R. and Ward Gregory. Oxford: Blackwell, Pp. 53-73.

Saeed, J. I. (2003). *Semantics* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Blackwell publishing.

Sperber, D. & Deidre, W.(1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Syal, P. & Jindal. D.V. (2010). *An Introduction to Linguistics: Language, Grammar and semantics*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New Delhi: PHI Learning Private.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*: Essex, England: Longman.

**APPENDIX 1****PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP'S NOMINATION ACCEPTANCE SPEECH**

Thank you. Thank you very much. Friends, delegates and fellow Americans, I humbly and gratefully accept your nomination for the presidency of the United States.

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Friends, delegates and fellow Americans, I humbly and gratefully accept your nomination for the presidency of the United States.

Who would have believed that when we started this journey on June 16th last year, we, and I say we because we are a team, would have received almost 14 million votes, the most in the history of the Republican Party and that the Republican Party would get 60 percent more votes than it received eight years ago. Who would have believed this? Who would have believed this?

The Democrats on the other hand received 20 percent fewer votes than they got four years ago. Not so good, not so good.

Together, we will lead our party back to the White House and we will lead our country back to safety, prosperity and peace.

We will be a country of generosity and warmth, but we will also be a country of law and order.

Our convention occurs at a moment of crisis for our nation. The attacks on our police, and the terrorism in our cities, threaten our very way of life. Any politician who does not grasp this danger is not fit to lead our country.

Americans watching this address tonight have seen the recent images of violence in our streets and the chaos in our communities. Many have witnessed this violence personally, some have even been its victims. I have a message for all of you: The crime and violence that today afflicts our nation will soon, and I mean very soon come to an end.

Beginning on January 20th of 2017, safety will be restored.

The most basic duty of government is to defend the lives of its own citizens. Any government that fails to do so is a government unworthy to lead. It is finally time for a straightforward assessment of the state of our nation.

I will present the facts plainly and honestly. We cannot afford to be so politically correct anymore.

So if you want to hear the corporate spin, the carefully-crafted lies, and the media myths, the Democrats are holding their convention next week. Go there. But here, at our convention, there will be no lies.

We will honor the American people with the truth, and nothing else.

These are the facts. Decades of progress made in bringing down crime are now being reversed by this administration's rollback of criminal enforcement. Homicides last year increased by 17 percent in America's 50 largest cities. That's the largest increase in 25 years.

In our nation's capital, killings have risen by 50 percent.

They're up nearly 60 percent in nearby Baltimore. In the president's hometown of Chicago, more than 2,000 people have been the victim of shootings this year alone. And almost 4,000 have been killed in the Chicago area since he took office.

The number of police officers killed in the line of duty has risen by almost 50 percent compared to this point last year. Nearly 180,000 illegal immigrants with criminal records, ordered deported from our country, are tonight roaming free to threaten peaceful citizens.

The number of new illegal immigrant families who have crossed the border so far this year already exceeds the entire total from 2015. They are being released by the tens of thousands in our communities with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources.

One such border crosser was released and made his way to Nebraska. There he ended the life of an innocent young girl named Sarah Root. She was 21 years old and was killed the day after graduating from college with a 4.0 grade point average, number one in her class. Her killer was then released a second time and he is now a fugitive from the law. I've met Sarah's beautiful family. But to this administration, their amazing daughter was just one more American life that wasn't worth protecting. No more.

One more child to sacrifice on the order and on the altar of open borders.

What about our economy? Again, I will tell you the plain facts that have been edited out of your nightly news and your morning newspaper.

Nearly four in 10 African-American children are living in poverty while 58 percent of African-American youth are now not employed. Two million more Latinos are in poverty today than when President Obama took his oath of office less than eight years ago.

Another 14 million people have left the workforce entirely. Household incomes are down more than \$4,000 since the year 2000, that's 16 years ago.

Our trade deficit in goods reached nearly, now think of this, think of this, our trade deficit is \$800 billion. Think of that, \$800 billion last year alone.

We're going to fix that!

The budget is no better. President Obama has almost doubled our national debt to more than \$19 trillion and growing. And yet, what do we have to show for it? Our roads and bridges are falling apart, our airports are third-world condition, and 43 million Americans are on food stamps.

Now, let us consider the state of affairs abroad. Not only have our citizens endured domestic disaster, but they've lived through one international humiliation after another, one after another.

We all remember the images of our sailors being forced to their knees by their Iranian captors at gunpoint.

This was just prior to the signing of the Iran deal, which gave back to Iran \$150 billion and gave us absolutely nothing.

It will go down in history as one of the worst deals ever negotiated.

Another humiliation came when President Obama drew a red line in Syria and the whole world knew it meant absolutely nothing.

In Libya, our consulate, the symbol of American prestige around the globe, was brought down in flames. America is far less safe and the world is far less stable than when Obama made the decision to put Hillary Clinton in charge of America's foreign policy.

Let's defeat her in November, OK?

I am certain that it was a decision that President Obama truly regrets. Her bad instincts and her bad judgment, something pointed out by Bernie Sanders, are what caused so many of the disasters unfolding today.

Let's review the record.

In 2009, pre-Hillary, ISIS was not even on the map, Libya was stable, Egypt was peaceful, Iraq was seeing really a big, big reduction in violence, Iran was being choked by sanctions, Syria was somewhat under control. After four years of Hillary Clinton, what do we have?

ISIS has spread across the region and the entire world. Libya is in ruins and our ambassador and his staff were left helpless to die at the hands of savage killers. Egypt was turned over to the radical Muslim Brotherhood, forcing the military to retake control. Iraq is in chaos. Iran is on the path to nuclear weapons. Syria is engulfed in a civil war. And a refugee crisis now threatens the West.



After 15 years of wars in the Middle East, after trillions of dollars spent and thousands of lives lost, the situation is worse than it has ever been before. This is the legacy of Hillary Clinton: death, destruction, terrorism and weakness.

But Hillary Clinton's legacy does not have to be America's legacy. The problems we face now, poverty and violence at home, war and destruction abroad, will last only as long as we continue relying on the same politicians who created them in the first place.

A change in leadership is required to produce a change in outcomes.

Tonight I will share with you my plan for action for America. The most important difference between our plan and that of our opponent is that our plan will put America first.

Americanism, not globalism, will be our credo. As long as we are led by politicians who will not put America first, then we can be assured that other nations will not treat America with respect, the respect that we deserve.

The American people will come first once again.

My plan will begin with safety at home, which means safe neighborhoods, secure borders and protection from terrorism. There can be no prosperity without law and order.

On the economy, I will outline reforms to add millions of new jobs and trillions in new wealth that can be used to rebuild America.

A number of these reforms that I will outline tonight will be opposed by some of our nation's most powerful special interests. That's because these interests have rigged our political and economic system for their exclusive benefit. Believe me, it's for their benefit.

Big business, elite media and major donors are lining up behind the campaign of my opponent because they know she will keep our rigged system in place.

They are throwing money at her because they have total control over every single thing she does. She is their puppet and they pull the strings.

That is why Hillary Clinton's message is that things will never change, never, ever.

My message is that things have to change and they have to change right now.

Every day I wake up determined to deliver a better life for the people all across this nation that have been ignored, neglected and abandoned. I have visited the laid-off factory workers and the communities crushed by our horrible and unfair trade deals. These are the forgotten men and women of our country, and they are forgotten, but they're not going to be forgotten long.

These are people who work hard, but no longer have a voice. I am your voice!

I have embraced crying mothers who have lost their children because our politicians put their personal agendas before the national good. I have no patience for injustice.

How great are our police? And how great is Cleveland?

Thank you.

I have no patience for injustice, no tolerance for government incompetence, of which there is so much, no sympathy for leaders who fail their citizens. When innocent people suffer because our political system lacks the will or the courage or the basic decency to enforce our laws or, still worse, has sold out to some corporate lobbyists for cash, I am not able to look the other way. And I won't look the other way.

And when a secretary of state illegally stores her emails on a private server, deletes 33,000 of them so the authorities can't see her crime, puts our country at risk, lies about it in every different form and faces no consequence, I know that corruption has reached a level like never, ever before in our country!

When the FBI director says that the secretary of state was extremely careless and negligent in handling our classified secrets, I also know that these terms are minor compared to what she actually did. They were just used to save her from facing justice for her terrible, terrible crimes.

In fact, her single-greatest accomplishment may be committing such egregious crime and getting away with it, especially when others who have done far less have paid so dearly.

When that same secretary of state rakes in millions and millions of dollars trading access and favors to special interests and foreign powers, I know the time for action has come.

I have joined the political arena so that the powerful can no longer beat up on people who cannot defend themselves.

Nobody knows the system better than me.

Which is why I alone can fix it.

I have seen firsthand how the system is rigged against our citizens, just like it was rigged against Bernie Sanders. He never had a chance, never had a chance. But his supporters will join our movement because we will fix his biggest single issue: trade deals that strip our country of its jobs and strip us of our wealth as a country.

Millions of Democrats will join our movement because we are going to fix the system so it works fairly and justly for each and every American.

In this cause, I am proud to have at my side the next vice president of the United States, Governor Mike Pence of Indiana!

And a great guy.

We will bring the same economic success to America that Mike brought to Indiana, which is amazing.

He's a man of character and accomplishment. He is the man for the job. The first task for our new administration will be to liberate our citizens from the crime and terrorism and lawlessness that threatens our communities.

America was shocked to its core when our police officers in Dallas were so brutally executed. Immediately after Dallas, we've seen continued threats and violence against our law enforcement officials. Law officers have been shot or killed in recent days in Georgia, Missouri, Wisconsin, Kansas, Michigan and Tennessee.

On Sunday, more police were gunned down in Baton Rouge, Louisiana; three were killed and three were very, very badly injured.

An attack on law enforcement is an attack on all Americans.

I have a message to every last person threatening the peace on our streets and the safety of our police. When I take the oath of office next year, I will restore law and order to our country.

Believe me. Believe me.

I will work with and appoint the best and brightest prosecutors and law enforcement officials to get the job properly done.

In this race for the White House, I am the law and order candidate!

The irresponsible rhetoric of our president, who has used the pulpit of the presidency to divide us by race and color, has made America a more dangerous environment than frankly I have ever seen and anybody in this room has ever watched or seen. This administration has failed America's inner cities. Remember, it has failed America's inner cities.

It's failed them on education. It's failed them on jobs. It's failed them on crime. It's failed them in every way and on every single level. When I am president, I will work to ensure that all of our kids are treated equally and protected equally.

Every action I take I will ask myself, does this make better for young Americans in Baltimore, in Chicago, in Detroit, in Ferguson, who have really, in every way, folks, the same right to live out their dreams as any other child in America, any other child.

To make life safe for all of our citizens, we must also address the growing threats we face from outside the country. We are going to defeat the barbarians of ISIS and we're going to defeat them fast!

Once again, France is the victim of brutal Islamic terrorism. Men, women and children viciously mowed down, lives ruined, families ripped apart, a nation in mourning. The damage and devastation that can be inflicted by Islamic radicals has been proven over and over at the World Trade Center, at an office party in San Bernardino, at the Boston Marathon, at a military recruiting center in Chattanooga, Tennessee, and many, many other locations.

Only weeks ago in Orlando, Florida, 49 wonderful Americans were savagely murdered by an Islamic terrorist. This time, the terrorist targeted LGBTQ community. No good, and we're going to stop it.

As your president, I will do everything in my power to protect our LGBTQ citizens from the violence and oppression of a hateful foreign ideology. Believe me.

And I have to say, as a Republican, it is so nice to hear you cheering for what I just said. Thank you.

To protect us from terrorism, we need to focus on three things. We must have the best, absolutely the best gathering of intelligence anywhere in the world. The best.

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

We're going to win, we're going to win fast!

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

Recently, I have said that NATO was obsolete because it did not properly cover terror, and also that many of the member countries were not paying their fair share. As usual, the United States has been picking up the costs.

Shortly thereafter, it was announced that NATO will be setting up a new program in order to combat terrorism, a true step in the right direction.

Lastly, and very importantly, we must immediately suspend immigration from any nation that has been compromised by terrorism. Until such time as proven vetting mechanisms have been put in place, we don't want them in our country.

My opponent has called for a radical 550 percent increase in Syrian — think of this, think of this, this is not believable, but this is what's happening — a 550 percent increase in Syrian refugees on top of the existing massive refugee flows coming into our country already under the leadership of President Obama.

She proposes this despite the fact that there's no way to screen these refugees in order to find out who they are or where they come from.

I only want to admit individuals into our country who will support our values and love our people.

Anyone who endorses violence, hatred or oppression is not welcome in our country and never, ever will be!

Decades of record immigration have produced lower wages and higher unemployment for our citizens, especially for African American and Latino workers. We are going to have an immigration system that works, but one that works for the American people.

On Monday, we heard from three parents whose children were killed by illegal immigrants: Mary Ann Mendoza, Sabine Durden and my friend, Jamiel Shaw. They're just three brave representatives of many thousands who have suffered so gravely.

Of all my travels in this country, nothing has affected me more, nothing even close I have to tell you, than the time I have spent with the mothers and fathers who have lost their children to violence spilling across our borders, which we can solve, we have to solve it!

These families have no special interests to represent them. There are no demonstrators to protect them, and certainly none to protest on their behalf. My opponent will never meet with them or share in their pain, believe me. Instead, my opponent wants sanctuary cities.

But where was the sanctuary for Kate Steinle?

Where was the sanctuary for the children of Mary Ann and Sabine and Jamiel? Where was the sanctuary for all of the other — oh, it's so sad to even be talking about it because we can solve this problem so quickly. Where was the sanctuary for all of the other Americans who have been so brutally murdered and who have suffered so, so horribly?

These wounded American families have been alone, but they are not alone any longer.

Tonight, this candidate and a whole nation stand in their corner to support them, to send them our love and to pledge in their honor that we will save countless more families from suffering and the same awful fate.

We are going to build a great border wall to stop illegal immigration, to stop the gangs and the violence and to stop the drugs from pouring into our communities!

I have been honored to receive the endorsement of America's Border Patrol agents.

And will work directly with them to protect the integrity of our lawful, lawful, lawful immigration system — lawful.

By ending catch-and-release on the border, we will end the cycle of human smuggling and violence. Illegal border crossings will go down. We will stop it. It won't be happening very much anymore. Believe me.

Peace will be restored by enforcing the rules for millions for overstay their visas. Our laws will finally receive the respect that they deserve.

Tonight, I want every American whose demands for immigration security have been denied and every politician who has denied them to listen very, very closely to the words I am about to say.

On January 20th of 2017, the day I take the oath of office...

...Americans will finally wake up in a country where the laws of the United States are enforced!

We are going to be considerate and compassionate to everyone, but my greatest compassion will be for our own struggling citizens.

My plan is the exact opposite of the radical and dangerous immigration policy of Hillary Clinton. Americans want relief from uncontrolled immigration, which is what we have now.

Communities want relief, yet Hillary Clinton is proposing mass amnesty, mass immigration and mass lawlessness.

Her plan will overwhelm your schools and hospitals, further reduce your jobs and wages and make it harder for recent immigrants to escape the tremendous cycle of poverty that they're going through right now and make it almost impossible for them to join the middle class.

I have a different vision for our workers. It begins with a new fair trade policy that protects our jobs and stands up to countries that cheat, of which there are many.

It's been a signature message of my campaign from day one, and it will be a signature feature of my presidency from the moment I take the oath of office.

I have made billions of dollars in business making deals. Now I'm going to make our country rich again.

Using the greatest business people in the world, which our country has, I am going to turn our bad trade agreements into great trade agreements.

America has lost nearly one-third of its manufacturing jobs since 1997 following the enactment of disastrous trade deals supported by Bill and Hillary Clinton.

Remember, it was Bill Clinton who signed NAFTA, one of the worst economic deals ever made by our country or, frankly, any other country. Never, ever again.

I am going to bring back our jobs to Ohio and Pennsylvania and New York and Michigan and all of America. And I am not going to let companies move to other countries, firing their employees along the way without consequence. Not going to happen anymore.

My opponent, on the other hand, has supported virtually every trade agreement that has been destroying our middle class. She supported NAFTA and she supported China's entrance into the World Trade Organization, another one of her husband's colossal mistakes and disasters. She supported the job-killing trade deal with South Korea. She supported the Trans-Pacific Partnership which will not only destroy our manufacturing, but it will make America subject to the rulings of foreign governments. And it's not going to happen.

I pledge to never sign any trade agreement that hurts our workers or that diminishes our freedom and our independence. We will never, ever sign bad trade deals. America first again. America first!

Instead, I will make individual deals with individual countries. No longer will we enter into these massive transactions with many countries that are thousands of pages long and which no one from our country even reads or understands.

We are going to enforce all trade violations against any country that cheats.

This includes stopping China's outrageous theft of intellectual property along with their illegal product dumping and their devastating currency manipulation. They are the greatest that ever came about, they are the greatest currency manipulators ever.

Our horrible trade agreements with China and many others will be totally renegotiated. That includes renegotiating NAFTA to get a much better deal for America. And we'll walk away if we don't get that kind of a deal.

Our country is going to start building and making things again.

Next comes the reform of our tax laws, regulations and energy rules. While Hillary Clinton plans a massive, and I mean massive, tax increase, I have proposed the largest tax reduction of any candidate who has run for president this year, Democrat or Republican.

Middle-income Americans and businesses will experience profound relief and taxes will be greatly simplified for everyone. I mean everyone.

America is one of the highest tax nations in the world. Reducing taxes will cause new companies and new jobs to come roaring back into our country. Believe me, it'll happen and it'll happen fast.

Then we're going to deal with the issue of regulation, one of the greatest job killers of them all. Excessive regulation is costing our country as much as \$2 trillion a year. And we will end it very, very quickly.

We are going to lift the restrictions on the production of American energy.

This will produce more than \$20 trillion in job-creating economic activity over the next four decades. My opponent, on the other hand, wants to put the great miners and the great steelworkers of our country out of work and out of business. That will never happen with Donald J. Trump as president. Our steelworkers and our miners are going back to work again!

With these new economic policies, trillions and trillions of dollars will start flowing into our country. This new wealth will improve the quality of life for all Americans. We will build the roads, highways, bridges, tunnels, airports and the railways of tomorrow. This, in turn, will create millions of more jobs.

We will rescue kids from failing schools by helping their parents send them to a safe school of their choice.

My opponent would rather protect bureaucrats than serve American children, and that's what she's doing and that's what she's done.

We will repeal and replace disastrous "Obamacare!"

You will be able to choose your own doctor again.

And we will fix TSA at the airports, which is a total disaster.

Thank you. Thank you.

We're going to work with all of our students who are drowning in debt to take the pressure off these young people just starting out in their adult lives. A tremendous problem.

We will completely rebuild our depleted military!

And the countries that we are protecting at a massive cost to us will be asked to pay their fair share.

We will take care of our great veterans like they have never been taken care of before!



My just-released 10-point plan has received tremendous veteran support. We will guarantee those who serve this country will be able to visit the doctor or hospital of their choice without waiting five days on a line and dying.

My opponent dismissed the VA scandal, one more sign of how out of touch she really is.

We are going to ask every department head in government to provide a list of wasteful spending on projects that we can eliminate in my first 100 days.

The politicians have talked about this for years, but I'm going to do it.

Yes, you will! Yes, you will! Yes, you will!

We are going to appoint justices of the United States Supreme Court who will uphold our laws and our Constitution!

The replacement of our beloved Justice Scalia will be a person of similar views, principles and judicial philosophies. Very important.

This will be one of the most important issues decided by this election. My opponent wants to essentially abolish the Second Amendment.

I, on the other hand, received the early and strong endorsement of the National Rifle Association...

...and will protect the right of all Americans to keep their families safe.

At this moment, I would like to thank the evangelical and religious community, because I'll tell you what, the support that they've given me, and I'm not sure I totally deserve it...

...has been so amazing and has had such a big reason for me being here tonight.

They have much to contribute to our politics, yet our laws prevent you from speaking your minds from your own pulpits.

An amendment pushed by Lyndon Johnson many years ago threatens religious institutions with a loss of their tax-exempt status if they openly advocate their political views. Their voice has been taken away.

I am going to work very hard to repeal that language and to protect free speech for all Americans!

We can accomplish these great things and so much more. All we need to do is start believing in ourselves and in our country again. Start believing.

It is time to show the whole world that America is back, bigger and better and stronger than ever before!

In this journey, I'm so lucky to have at my side my wife, Melania, and my wonderful children. Don, Ivanka, Eric, Tiffany and Barron, you will always be my greatest source of pride and joy. And by the way, Melania and Ivanka, did they do a job?

My dad, Fred Trump, was the smartest and hardest-working man I ever knew. I wonder sometimes what he'd say if he were here to see this and to see me tonight. It's because of him that I learned from my youngest age to respect the dignity of work and the dignity of working people.

He was a guy most comfortable in the company of bricklayers and carpenters and electricians. And I have a lot of that in me also. I love those people.

Then there's my mother, Mary. She was strong, but also warm and fair-minded. She was a truly great mother. She was also one of the most honest and charitable people that I have ever known and a great, great judge of character. She could pick them out from anywhere.

To my sisters, Mary Anne and Elizabeth, my brother, Robert, and my late brother, Fred, I will always give you my love. You are most special to me.

I have had a truly great life in business. But now, my sole and exclusive mission is to go to work for our country, to go to work for you. It's time to deliver a victory for the American people! We don't win anymore, but we are going to start winning again!

But to do that, we must break free from the petty politics of the past. America is a nation of believers, dreamers and strivers that is being led by a group of censors, critics, and cynics.

Remember, all of the people telling you you can't have the country you want are the same people that wouldn't stand, I mean, they said Trump does not have a chance of being here tonight, not a chance, the same people. Oh, we love defeating those people, don't we? Don't we love defeating those people? Love it. Love it. Love it.

No longer can we rely on those same people in the media and politics who will say anything to keep a rigged system in place. Instead, we must choose to believe in America.

History is watching us now. We don't have much time, but history is watching. It's waiting to see if we will rise to the occasion, and if we will show the whole world that America is still free and independent and strong.

I am asking for your support tonight so that I can be your champion in the White House. And I will your champion.

My opponent asks her supporters to recite a three-word loyalty pledge. It reads: "I'm with her."

I choose to recite a different pledge. My pledge reads: "I'm with you, the American people."

I am your voice. So to every parent who dreams for their child, and every child who dreams for their future, I say these words to you tonight: I am with you, and I will fight for you, and I will win for you!

To all Americans tonight, in all our cities and towns, I make this promise: We will make America strong again! We will make America proud again! We will make America safe again! And we will make America great again!

God bless you and goodnight! I love you!

**Retrieved from <https://abc13.com/politics/donald-trumps-2016-rnc-speech/1437927/>**

## APPENDIX 2

### The Inaugural

#### Donald trump says he is seriously thinking about presidential bid

##### The Christian science monitor

My fellow Americans, this is a great day for me personally. You are very smart to have voted for me because I' m going to do positive things for this country, starting with this mall I'm looking out over.

For starters, I don't know why this is called a "mall." Where I come from, New York city-which happens to be the greatest city in the world, and the reason I say that is that I built most of it, and I only build quality, so I think I know what I'm talking about-a mall doesn't look like this. Where are the shops? I see grass, ponds-and what's that, an obelisk? This is not Cairo. I don't know how much the government paid for the Washington Monumnet- and I have no problem with George Washington, but he wasn't a businessman- they overpaid. You've got a 560-foot-tall structure sitting on some of the most prime real estate in the country, incredible views, including of my new home. People would pay a lot for a duplex co-op in a building like that. I would charge \$ 1,5000 to \$ 2,000 a square foot, and I' d get it. No wonder this government is trillions in debt.

Everywhere I look I see wasted opportunities, and I've only been president for five minutes. At the end of this so-called mall is the Lincoln Memorial. Lincoln was an okay president, but I would have freed the slaves, too. And I would have given them something more useful than forty acres and a mule, incidentally. But if you want to make a statement about Lincoln, you could do much better than this. White marble? Columns? This is not Greece. And that statue, he looks like he's having a difficult bowel movement. This is no way to say thank you for saving the Union. And I know about unions, believe me. As around. Don't try offering them forty acres and a mule. So with respect to Lincoln, I would make a statement: pink marble, gold, mirrors, maybe some hanging gardens, fountains with water coming out the breasts. People love that stuff. A restaurant on the roof that would serve first-rate food, because that's the only kind of food I'm interested in. mediocre food does not interest me.

So what do you think of your new first lady? I picked Moronia-what's your name, honey? Melania, right. Great name. I just picked Melania here from a very wide selection of possibilities- not just because the sex is incredible but because this nation wants and deserves a

trophy first lady. When everyone sees our first lady standing next to some other first Lady of another country, the wife of a premier or whatever, they'll want to go to bed with our first lady, not the other one. So the American people no longer have to worry on that score. And if they get tired of her nit a problem, because chances are I' ll be tried of her before they are. And we'll get a new first lady. Trying to keep North Korea from getting the bomb, maybe that's a problem. Finding a new first lady? Trust me, not a problem.

Policy-wise? I'm going to be very hands-on. If a situation comes up, like inflation, or a union beef, or Mike Tyson beats up another motorist, I'm going to be on it. It's going to be fixed. There was a skating rink in New York City in Central Park. There were problems with it. Then I got involved. Now people can skate on it. Again, it's not rocket science.

Foreign-policy-wise? Same. I'm businessman. Other countries want to do business with us, I'm all for it. trade, great. I have no problems with people trading with us. But it's going to be fair trade, by which I mean we come out on top. They have a problem with that, they can sell their TVs and cheese and whatever to someone else. Maybe North Korea. It's just not complicated. Missiles? Very simple- you aim one at us, I fire a hundred at you. So don't go there. Turning a country into a radioactive parking lot foes not bother me. I sleep fine. Ask Melanoma. And finally on the foreign front, I have something to say to Fidel Castro. Adios, pal. This time, we're going to nationalize your hotels and casinos.

That about covers it. I have to go, because important senators and congressmen are giving me a lavish luncheon in the Rotunda behind me here. I understand they're serving a lot of jumbo shrimp. Basically they're trying to impress me so I won't cancel their highway projects and ethanol subsidies. I know how they do things. Now they're going to find out how I do things. By the way, I've directed the Treasury to issue a couple billion extra in hundred-dollar chips. Enjoy yourselves. This is dawn of a great, great era. (Buckley 2000).

Buckley, Christopher. (2000). "Trump: the Inaugural." Wall street journal October 21.

### APPENDIX 3

#### PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP'S FIRST SPEECH TO CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, members of Congress, the First Lady of the United States — (applause) — and citizens of America:

Tonight, as we mark the conclusion of our celebration of Black History Month, we are reminded of our nation's path towards civil rights and the work that still remains to be done. (Applause.)

Recent threats targeting Jewish community centers and vandalism of Jewish cemeteries, as well as last week's shooting in Kansas City, remind us that while we may be a nation divided on policies, we are a country that stands united in condemning hate and evil in all of its very ugly forms. (Applause.)

Each American generation passes the torch of truth, liberty and justice in an unbroken chain all the way down to the present. That torch is now in our hands. And we will use it to light up the world. I am here tonight to deliver a message of unity and strength, and it is a message deeply delivered from my heart. A new chapter — (applause) — of American Greatness is now beginning. A new national pride is sweeping across our nation. And a new surge of optimism is placing impossible dreams firmly within our grasp.

What we are witnessing today is the renewal of the American spirit. Our allies will find that America is once again ready to lead. (Applause.) All the nations of the world — friend or foe — will find that America is strong, America is proud, and America is free.

In nine years, the United States will celebrate the 250th anniversary of our founding — 250 years since the day we declared our independence. It will be one of the great milestones in the history of the world. But what will America look like as we reach our 250th year? What kind of country will we leave for our children?

I will not allow the mistakes of recent decades past to define the course of our future. For too long, we've watched our middle class shrink as we've exported our jobs and wealth to foreign countries. We've financed and built one global project after another, but ignored the fates of our children in the inner cities of Chicago, Baltimore, Detroit, and so many other places throughout our land.

We've defended the borders of other nations while leaving our own borders wide open for anyone to cross and for drugs to pour in at a now unprecedented rate. And we've spent trillions and trillions of dollars overseas, while our infrastructure at home has so badly crumbled.

Then, in 2016, the Earth shifted beneath our feet. The rebellion started as a quiet protest, spoken by families of all colors and creeds — families who just wanted a fair shot for their children and a fair hearing for their concerns.

But then the quiet voices became a loud chorus as thousands of citizens now spoke out together, from cities small and large, all across our country. Finally, the chorus became an earthquake, and the people turned out by the tens of millions, and they were all united by one very simple, but crucial demand: that America must put its own citizens first. Because only then can we truly make America great again. (Applause.)

Dying industries will come roaring back to life. Heroic veterans will get the care they so desperately need. Our military will be given the resources its brave warriors so richly deserve.

Crumbling infrastructure will be replaced with new roads, bridges, tunnels, airports and railways gleaming across our very, very beautiful land. Our terrible drug epidemic will slow down and, ultimately, stop. And our neglected inner cities will see a rebirth of hope, safety and opportunity.

Above all else, we will keep our promises to the American people. (Applause.)

It's been a little over a month since my inauguration, and I want to take this moment to update the nation on the progress I've made in keeping those promises.

Since my election, Ford, Fiat-Chrysler, General Motors, Sprint, Softbank, Lockheed, Intel, Walmart and many others have announced that they will invest billions and billions of dollars in the United States, and will create tens of thousands of new American jobs. (Applause.)

The stock market has gained almost \$3 trillion in value since the election on November 8th, a record. We've saved taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars by bringing down the price of a fantastic — and it is a fantastic — new F-35 jet fighter, and we'll be saving billions more on contracts all across our government. We have placed a hiring freeze on non-military and non-essential federal workers.

We have begun to drain the swamp of government corruption by imposing a five-year ban on lobbying by executive branch officials and a lifetime ban — (applause) — thank you — and a lifetime ban on becoming lobbyists for a foreign government.

We have undertaken a historic effort to massively reduce job-crushing regulations, creating a deregulation task force inside of every government agency. (Applause.) And we're imposing a new rule which mandates that for every one new regulation, two old regulations must be

eliminated. (Applause.) We're going to stop the regulations that threaten the future and livelihood of our great coal miners. (Applause.)

We have cleared the way for the construction of the Keystone and Dakota Access Pipelines — (applause) — thereby creating tens of thousands of jobs. And I've issued a new directive that new American pipelines be made with American steel. (Applause.)

We have withdrawn the United States from the job-killing Trans-Pacific Partnership. (Applause.) And with the help of Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, we have formed a council with our neighbors in Canada to help ensure that women entrepreneurs have access to the networks, markets and capital they need to start a business and live out their financial dreams. (Applause.)

To protect our citizens, I have directed the Department of Justice to form a Task Force on Reducing Violent Crime. I have further ordered the Departments of Homeland Security and Justice, along with the Department of State and the Director of National Intelligence, to coordinate an aggressive strategy to dismantle the criminal cartels that have spread all across our nation. (Applause.) We will stop the drugs from pouring into our country and poisoning our youth, and we will expand treatment for those who have become so badly addicted. (Applause.)

At the same time, my administration has answered the pleas of the American people for immigration enforcement and border security. (Applause.) By finally enforcing our immigration laws, we will raise wages, help the unemployed, save billions and billions of dollars, and make our communities safer for everyone. (Applause.) We want all Americans to succeed, but that can't happen in an environment of lawless chaos. We must restore integrity and the rule of law at our borders. (Applause.)

For that reason, we will soon begin the construction of a great, great wall along our southern border. (Applause.) As we speak tonight, we are removing gang members, drug dealers, and criminals that threaten our communities and prey on our very innocent citizens. Bad ones are going out as I speak, and as I promised throughout the campaign.

To any in Congress who do not believe we should enforce our laws, I would ask you this one question: What would you say to the American family that loses their jobs, their income, or their loved one because America refused to uphold its laws and defend its borders? (Applause.)

Our obligation is to serve, protect, and defend the citizens of the United States. We are also taking strong measures to protect our nation from radical Islamic terrorism. (Applause.)



According to data provided by the Department of Justice, the vast majority of individuals convicted of terrorism and terrorism-related offenses since 9/11 came here from outside of our country. We have seen the attacks at home — from Boston to San Bernardino to the Pentagon, and, yes, even the World Trade Center.

We have seen the attacks in France, in Belgium, in Germany, and all over the world. It is not compassionate, but reckless to allow uncontrolled entry from places where proper vetting cannot occur. (Applause.) Those given the high honor of admission to the United States should support this country and love its people and its values. We cannot allow a beachhead of terrorism to form inside America. We cannot allow our nation to become a sanctuary for extremists. (Applause.)

That is why my administration has been working on improved vetting procedures, and we will shortly take new steps to keep our nation safe and to keep out those out who will do us harm. (Applause.)

As promised, I directed the Department of Defense to develop a plan to demolish and destroy ISIS — a network of lawless savages that have slaughtered Muslims and Christians, and men, and women, and children of all faiths and all beliefs. We will work with our allies, including our friends and allies in the Muslim world, to extinguish this vile enemy from our planet. (Applause.)

I have also imposed new sanctions on entities and individuals who support Iran's ballistic missile program, and reaffirmed our unbreakable alliance with the State of Israel. (Applause.)

Finally, I have kept my promise to appoint a justice to the United States Supreme Court, from my list of 20 judges, who will defend our Constitution. (Applause.)

I am greatly honored to have Maureen Scalia with us in the gallery tonight. (Applause.) Thank you, Maureen. Her late, great husband, Antonin Scalia, will forever be a symbol of American justice. To fill his seat, we have chosen Judge Neil Gorsuch, a man of incredible skill and deep devotion to the law. He was confirmed unanimously by the Court of Appeals, and I am asking the Senate to swiftly approve his nomination. (Applause.)

Tonight, as I outline the next steps we must take as a country, we must honestly acknowledge the circumstances we inherited. Ninety-four million Americans are out of the labor force. Over 43 million people are now living in poverty, and over 43 million Americans are on food stamps. More than one in five people in their prime working years are not working. We have the worst

financial recovery in 65 years. In the last eight years, the past administration has put on more new debt than nearly all of the other Presidents combined.

We've lost more than one-fourth of our manufacturing jobs since NAFTA was approved, and we've lost 60,000 factories since China joined the World Trade Organization in 2001. Our trade deficit in goods with the world last year was nearly \$800 billion dollars. And overseas we have inherited a series of tragic foreign policy disasters.

Solving these and so many other pressing problems will require us to work past the differences of party. It will require us to tap into the American spirit that has overcome every challenge throughout our long and storied history. But to accomplish our goals at home and abroad, we must restart the engine of the American economy — making it easier for companies to do business in the United States, and much, much harder for companies to leave our country. (Applause.)

Right now, American companies are taxed at one of the highest rates anywhere in the world. My economic team is developing historic tax reform that will reduce the tax rate on our companies so they can compete and thrive anywhere and with anyone. (Applause.) It will be a big, big cut. At the same time, we will provide massive tax relief for the middle class. We must create a level playing field for American companies and our workers. We have to do it. (Applause.)

Currently, when we ship products out of America, many other countries make us pay very high tariffs and taxes. But when foreign companies ship their products into America, we charge them nothing, or almost nothing.

I just met with officials and workers from a great American company, Harley-Davidson. In fact, they proudly displayed five of their magnificent motorcycles, made in the USA, on the front lawn of the White House. ((Laughter and applause.) And they wanted me to ride one and I said, "No, thank you." (Laughter.)

At our meeting, I asked them, how are you doing, how is business? They said that it's good. I asked them further, how are you doing with other countries, mainly international sales? They told me — without even complaining, because they have been so mistreated for so long that they've become used to it — that it's very hard to do business with other countries because they tax our goods at such a high rate. They said that in the case of another country, they taxed their motorcycles at 100 percent. They weren't even asking for a change. But I am. (Applause.)

I believe strongly in free trade but it also has to be fair trade. It's been a long time since we had fair trade. The first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, warned that the "abandonment of the protective policy by the American government... will produce want and ruin among our people." Lincoln was right — and it's time we heeded his advice and his words. (Applause.) I am not going to let America and its great companies and workers be taken advantage of us any longer. They have taken advantage of our country. No longer. (Applause.)

I am going to bring back millions of jobs. Protecting our workers also means reforming our system of legal immigration. (Applause.) The current, outdated system depresses wages for our poorest workers, and puts great pressure on taxpayers. Nations around the world, like Canada, Australia and many others, have a merit-based immigration system. (Applause.) It's a basic principle that those seeking to enter a country ought to be able to support themselves financially.

Yet, in America, we do not enforce this rule, straining the very public resources that our poorest citizens rely upon. According to the National Academy of Sciences, our current immigration system costs American taxpayers many billions of dollars a year.

Switching away from this current system of lower-skilled immigration, and instead adopting a merit-based system, we will have so many more benefits. It will save countless dollars, raise workers' wages, and help struggling families — including immigrant families — enter the middle class. And they will do it quickly, and they will be very, very happy, indeed. (Applause.)

I believe that real and positive immigration reform is possible, as long as we focus on the following goals: To improve jobs and wages for Americans; to strengthen our nation's security; and to restore respect for our laws. If we are guided by the wellbeing of American citizens, then I believe Republicans and Democrats can work together to achieve an outcome that has eluded our country for decades. (Applause.)

Another Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, initiated the last truly great national infrastructure program — the building of the Interstate Highway System. The time has come for a new program of national rebuilding. (Applause.) America has spent approximately \$6 trillion in the Middle East — all the while our infrastructure at home is crumbling. With this \$6 trillion, we could have rebuilt our country twice, and maybe even three times if we had people who had the ability to negotiate. (Applause.)

To launch our national rebuilding, I will be asking Congress to approve legislation that produces a \$1 trillion investment in infrastructure of the United States — financed through both public and private capital — creating millions of new jobs. (Applause.) This effort will be guided by two core principles: buy American and hire American. (Applause.)

Tonight, I am also calling on this Congress to repeal and replace Obamacare — (applause) — with reforms that expand choice, increase access, lower costs, and, at the same time, provide better healthcare. (Applause.)

Mandating every American to buy government-approved health insurance was never the right solution for our country. (Applause.) The way to make health insurance available to everyone is to lower the cost of health insurance, and that is what we are going to do. (Applause.)

Obamacare premiums nationwide have increased by double and triple digits. As an example, Arizona went up 116 percent last year alone. Governor Matt Bevin of Kentucky just said Obamacare is failing in his state — the state of Kentucky — and it's unsustainable and collapsing.

One-third of counties have only one insurer, and they are losing them fast. They are losing them so fast. They are leaving, and many Americans have no choice at all. There's no choice left.

Remember when you were told that you could keep your doctor and keep your plan? We now know that all of those promises have been totally broken. Obamacare is collapsing, and we must act decisively to protect all Americans. (Applause.)

Action is not a choice, it is a necessity. So I am calling on all Democrats and Republicans in Congress to work with us to save Americans from this imploding Obamacare disaster. (Applause.)

Here are the principles that should guide the Congress as we move to create a better healthcare system for all Americans:

First, we should ensure that Americans with preexisting conditions have access to coverage, and that we have a stable transition for Americans currently enrolled in the healthcare exchanges. (Applause.)

Secondly, we should help Americans purchase their own coverage through the use of tax credits and expanded Health Savings Accounts — but it must be the plan they want, not the plan forced on them by our government. (Applause.)

Thirdly, we should give our great state governors the resources and flexibility they need with Medicaid to make sure no one is left out. (Applause.)

Fourth, we should implement legal reforms that protect patients and doctors from unnecessary costs that drive up the price of insurance, and work to bring down the artificially high price of drugs, and bring them down immediately. (Applause.)

And finally, the time has come to give Americans the freedom to purchase health insurance across state lines — (applause) — which will create a truly competitive national marketplace that will bring costs way down and provide far better care. So important.

Everything that is broken in our country can be fixed. Every problem can be solved. And every hurting family can find healing and hope.

Our citizens deserve this, and so much more — so why not join forces and finally get the job done, and get it done right? (Applause.) On this and so many other things, Democrats and Republicans should get together and unite for the good of our country and for the good of the American people. (Applause.)

My administration wants to work with members of both parties to make childcare accessible and affordable, to help ensure new parents that they have paid family leave — (applause) — to invest in women's health, and to promote clean air and clean water, and to rebuild our military and our infrastructure. (Applause.)

True love for our people requires us to find common ground, to advance the common good, and to cooperate on behalf of every American child who deserves a much brighter future.

An incredible young woman is with us this evening, who should serve as an inspiration to us all. Today is Rare Disease Day, and joining us in the gallery is a rare disease survivor, Megan Crowley. (Applause.)

Megan was diagnosed with Pompe disease, a rare and serious illness, when she was 15 months old. She was not expected to live past five. On receiving this news, Megan's dad, John, fought with everything he had to save the life of his precious child. He founded a company to look for a cure, and helped develop the drug that saved Megan's life. Today she is 20 years old and a sophomore at Notre Dame. (Applause.)

Megan's story is about the unbounded power of a father's love for a daughter. But our slow and burdensome approval process at the Food and Drug Administration keeps too many advances, like the one that saved Megan's life, from reaching those in need. If we slash the restraints, not

just at the FDA but across our government, then we will be blessed with far more miracles just like Megan. (Applause.) In fact, our children will grow up in a nation of miracles.

But to achieve this future, we must enrich the mind and the souls of every American child.

Education is the civil rights issue of our time. (Applause.) I am calling upon members of both parties to pass an education bill that funds school choice for disadvantaged youth, including millions of African American and Latino children. (Applause.) These families should be free to choose the public, private, charter, magnet, religious, or home school that is right for them.

(Applause.)

Joining us tonight in the gallery is a remarkable woman, Denisha Merriweather. As a young girl, Denisha struggled in school and failed third grade twice. But then she was able to enroll in a private center for learning — a great learning center — with the help of a tax credit and a scholarship program.

Today, she is the first in her family to graduate, not just from high school, but from college.

Later this year she will get her master's degree in social work. We want all children to be able to break the cycle of poverty just like Denisha. (Applause.)

But to break the cycle of poverty, we must also break the cycle of violence. The murder rate in 2015 experienced its largest single-year increase in nearly half a century. In Chicago, more than 4,000 people were shot last year alone, and the murder rate so far this year has been even higher.

This is not acceptable in our society. (Applause.)

Every American child should be able to grow up in a safe community, to attend a great school, and to have access to a high-paying job. (Applause.) But to create this future, we must work with, not against — not against — the men and women of law enforcement. (Applause.) We must build bridges of cooperation and trust — not drive the wedge of disunity and, really, it's what it is, division. It's pure, unadulterated division. We have to unify.

Police and sheriffs are members of our community. They're friends and neighbors, they're mothers and fathers, sons and daughters — and they leave behind loved ones every day who worry about whether or not they'll come home safe and sound. We must support the incredible men and women of law enforcement. (Applause.)

And we must support the victims of crime. I have ordered the Department of Homeland Security to create an office to serve American victims. The office is called VOICE — Victims of Immigration Crime Engagement. We are providing a voice to those who have been ignored by

our media and silenced by special interests. (Applause.) Joining us in the audience tonight are four very brave Americans whose government failed them. Their names are Jamiel Shaw, Susan Oliver, Jenna Oliver, and Jessica Davis.

Jamiel's 17-year-old son was viciously murdered by an illegal immigrant gang member who had just been released from prison. Jamiel Shaw, Jr. was an incredible young man, with unlimited potential who was getting ready to go to college where he would have excelled as a great college quarterback. But he never got the chance. His father, who is in the audience tonight, has become a very good friend of mine. Jamiel, thank you. Thank you. (Applause.)

Also with us are Susan Oliver and Jessica Davis. Their husbands, Deputy Sheriff Danny Oliver and Detective Michael Davis, were slain in the line of duty in California. They were pillars of their community. These brave men were viciously gunned down by an illegal immigrant with a criminal record and two prior deportations. Should have never been in our country.

Sitting with Susan is her daughter, Jenna. Jenna, I want you to know that your father was a hero, and that tonight you have the love of an entire country supporting you and praying for you. (Applause.)

To Jamiel, Jenna, Susan and Jessica, I want you to know that we will never stop fighting for justice. Your loved ones will never, ever be forgotten. We will always honor their memory. (Applause.)

Finally, to keep America safe, we must provide the men and women of the United States military with the tools they need to prevent war — if they must — they have to fight and they only have to win. (Applause.)

I am sending Congress a budget that rebuilds the military, eliminates the defense sequester — (applause) — and calls for one of the largest increases in national defense spending in American history. My budget will also increase funding for our veterans. Our veterans have delivered for this nation, and now we must deliver for them. (Applause.)

The challenges we face as a nation are great, but our people are even greater. And none are greater or braver than those who fight for America in uniform. (Applause.)

We are blessed to be joined tonight by Carryn Owens, the widow of a U.S. Navy Special Operator, Senior Chief William "Ryan" Owens. Ryan died as he lived: a warrior and a hero, battling against terrorism and securing our nation. (Applause.) I just spoke to our great General Mattis, just now, who reconfirmed that — and I quote — "Ryan was a part of a highly successful

raid that generated large amounts of vital intelligence that will lead to many more victories in the future against our enemies.” Ryan’s legacy is etched into eternity. Thank you. (Applause.)

And Ryan is looking down, right now — you know that — and he is very happy because I think he just broke a record. (Laughter and applause.)

For as the Bible teaches us, “There is no greater act of love than to lay down one’s life for one’s friends.” Ryan laid down his life for his friends, for his country, and for our freedom. And we will never forget Ryan. (Applause.)

To those allies who wonder what kind of a friend America will be, look no further than the heroes who wear our uniform. Our foreign policy calls for a direct, robust and meaningful engagement with the world. It is American leadership based on vital security interests that we share with our allies all across the globe.

We strongly support NATO, an alliance forged through the bonds of two world wars that dethroned fascism, and a Cold War, and defeated communism. (Applause.)

But our partners must meet their financial obligations. And now, based on our very strong and frank discussions, they are beginning to do just that. In fact, I can tell you, the money is pouring in. Very nice. (Applause.) We expect our partners — whether in NATO, the Middle East, or in the Pacific — to take a direct and meaningful role in both strategic and military operations, and pay their fair share of the cost. Have to do that.

We will respect historic institutions, but we will respect the foreign rights of all nations, and they have to respect our rights as a nation also. (Applause.) Free nations are the best vehicle for expressing the will of the people, and America respects the right of all nations to chart their own path. My job is not to represent the world. My job is to represent the United States of America. (Applause.)

But we know that America is better off when there is less conflict, not more. We must learn from the mistakes of the past. We have seen the war and the destruction that have ravaged and raged throughout the world — all across the world. The only long-term solution for these humanitarian disasters, in many cases, is to create the conditions where displaced persons can safely return home and begin the long, long process of rebuilding. (Applause.)

America is willing to find new friends, and to forge new partnerships, where shared interests align. We want harmony and stability, not war and conflict. We want peace, wherever peace can be found.



America is friends today with former enemies. Some of our closest allies, decades ago, fought on the opposite side of these terrible, terrible wars. This history should give us all faith in the possibilities for a better world. Hopefully, the 250th year for America will see a world that is more peaceful, more just, and more free.

On our 100th anniversary, in 1876, citizens from across our nation came to Philadelphia to celebrate America's centennial. At that celebration, the country's builders and artists and inventors showed off their wonderful creations. Alexander Graham Bell displayed his telephone for the first time. Remington unveiled the first typewriter. An early attempt was made at electric light. Thomas Edison showed an automatic telegraph and an electric pen. Imagine the wonders our country could know in America's 250th year. (Applause.)

Think of the marvels we can achieve if we simply set free the dreams of our people. Cures to the illnesses that have always plagued us are not too much to hope. American footprints on distant worlds are not too big a dream. Millions lifted from welfare to work is not too much to expect. And streets where mothers are safe from fear, schools where children learn in peace, and jobs where Americans prosper and grow are not too much to ask. (Applause.)

When we have all of this, we will have made America greater than ever before — for all Americans. This is our vision. This is our mission. But we can only get there together. We are one people, with one destiny. We all bleed the same blood. We all salute the same great American flag. And we all are made by the same God. (Applause.)

When we fulfill this vision, when we celebrate our 250 years of glorious freedom, we will look back on tonight as when this new chapter of American Greatness began. The time for small thinking is over. The time for trivial fights is behind us. We just need the courage to share the dreams that fill our hearts, the bravery to express the hopes that stir our souls, and the confidence to turn those hopes and those dreams into action.

From now on, America will be empowered by our aspirations, not burdened by our fears; inspired by the future, not bound by the failures of the past; and guided by our vision, not blinded by our doubts.

I am asking all citizens to embrace this renewal of the American spirit. I am asking all members of Congress to join me in dreaming big, and bold, and daring things for our country. I am asking everyone watching tonight to seize this moment. Believe in yourselves, believe in your future, and believe, once more, in America.

Thank you, God bless you, and God bless the United States. (Applause.)

Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-joint-address-congress/>

## APPENDIX 4

### PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP'S ELECTION VICTORY SPEECH

Thank you. Thank you very much, everybody. Sorry to keep you waiting. Complicated business! Complicated. Thank you very much.

I've just received a call from Secretary Clinton. She congratulated us. It's about us. On our victory, and I congratulated her and her family on a very, very hard-fought campaign.

I mean, she fought very hard. Hillary has worked very long and very hard over a long period of time, and we owe her a major debt of gratitude for her service to our country.

I mean that very sincerely. Now it is time for America to bind the wounds of division, have to get together. To all Republicans and Democrats and independents across this nation, I say it is time for us to come together as one united people.

It is time. I pledge to every citizen of our land that I will be President for all of Americans, and this is so important to me. For those who have chosen not to support me in the past, of which there were a few people, I'm reaching out to you for your guidance and your help so that we can work together and unify our great country.

As I've said from the beginning, ours was not a campaign but rather an incredible and great movement, made up of millions of hard-working men and women who love their country and want a better, brighter future for themselves and for their family.

It is a movement comprised of Americans from all races, religions, backgrounds, and beliefs, who want and expect our government to serve the people -- and serve the people it will.

Working together, we will begin the urgent task of rebuilding our nation and renewing the American dream. I've spent my entire life in business, looking at the untapped potential in projects and in people all over the world.

That is now what I want to do for our country. Tremendous potential. I've gotten to know our country so well. Tremendous potential. It is going to be a beautiful thing. Every single American will have the opportunity to realize his or her fullest potential.

The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer.

We are going to fix our inner cities and rebuild our highways, bridges, tunnels, airports, schools, hospitals. We're going to rebuild our infrastructure, which will become, by the way, second to none. And we will put millions of our people to work as we rebuild it.

We will also finally take care of our great veterans who have been so loyal, and I've gotten to know so many over this 18-month journey. The time I've spent with them during this campaign has been among my greatest honors. Our veterans are incredible people.

We will embark upon a project of national growth and renewal. I will harness the creative talents of our people, and we will call upon the best and brightest to leverage their tremendous talent for the benefit of all. It is going to happen.

We have a great economic plan. We will double our growth and have the strongest economy anywhere in the world. At the same time, we will get along with all other nations willing to get along with us. We will be. We will have great relationships. We expect to have great, great relationships.

No dream is too big, no challenge is too great. Nothing we want for our future is beyond our reach.

America will no longer settle for anything less than the best. We must reclaim our country's destiny and dream big and bold and daring. We have to do that. We're going to dream of things for our country, and beautiful things and successful things once again.

I want to tell the world community that while we will always put America's interests first, we will deal fairly with everyone, with everyone. All people and all other nations.

We will seek common ground, not hostility; partnership, not conflict.

And now I would like to take this moment to thank some of the people who really helped me with this, what they are calling tonight a very, very historic victory.

First, I want to thank my parents, who I know are looking down on me right now. Great people. I've learned so much from them. They were wonderful in every regard. Truly great parents.

I also want to thank my sisters, Marianne and Elizabeth, who are here with us tonight. Where are they? They're here someplace. They're very shy, actually.

And my brother Robert, my great friend. Where is Robert? Where is Robert?

My brother Robert, and they should be on this stage, but that's okay. They're great.

And also my late brother Fred, great guy. Fantastic guy. Fantastic family. I was very lucky.

Great brothers, sisters, great, unbelievable parents.

To Melania and Don and Ivanka and Eric and Tiffany and Barron, I love you and I thank you, and especially for putting up with all of those hours. This was tough.

This was tough. This political stuff is nasty, and it is tough.

So I want to thank my family very much. Really fantastic. Thank you all. Thank you all. Lara, unbelievable job. Unbelievable. Vanessa, thank you. Thank you very much. What a great group. You've all given me such incredible support, and I will tell you that we have a large group of people. You know, they kept saying we have a small staff. Not so small. Look at all of the people that we have. Look at all of these people.

And Kellyanne and Chris and Rudy and Steve and David. We have got tremendously talented people up here, and I want to tell you it's been very, very special.

I want to give a very special thanks to our former mayor, Rudy Giuliani. He's unbelievable. Unbelievable. He traveled with us and he went through meetings, and Rudy never changes. Where is Rudy. Where is he?

Gov. Chris Christie, folks, was unbelievable. Thank you, Chris. The first man, first senator, first major, major politician. Let me tell you, he is highly respected in Washington because he is as smart as you get.

Sen. Jeff Sessions. Where is Jeff? A great man. Another great man, very tough competitor. He was not easy. He was not easy. Who is that? Is that the mayor that showed up? Is that Rudy?

Up here. Really a friend to me, but I'll tell you, I got to know him as a competitor because he was one of the folks that was negotiating to go against those Democrats, Dr. Ben Carson. Where's Ben? Where is Ben? By the way, Mike Huckabee is here someplace, and he is fantastic. Mike and his family Sarah, thank you very much. Gen. Mike Flynn. Where is Mike? And Gen. Kellogg. We have over 200 generals and admirals that have endorsed our campaign and they are special people.

We have 22 Congressional Medal of Honor people. A very special person who, believe me, I read reports that I wasn't getting along with him. I never had a bad second with him. He's an unbelievable star. He is ... that's right, how did you possibly guess? Let me tell you about Reince. I've said Reince. I know it. I know it. Look at all of those people over there. I know it, Reince is a superstar. I said, they can't call you a superstar, Reince, unless we win it. Like Secretariat. He would not have that bust at the track at Belmont.

Reince is really a star and he is the hardest-working guy, and in a certain way I did this. Reince, come up here. Get over here, Reince.

Boy, oh, boy, oh, boy. It's about time you did this right. My god. Nah, come here. Say something.

Amazing guy. Our partnership with the RNC was so important to the success and what we've done, so I also have to say, I've gotten to know some incredible people.

The Secret Service people. They're tough and they're smart and they're sharp and I don't want to mess around with them, I can tell you. And when I want to go and wave to a big group of people and they rip me down and put me back down in the seat, but they are fantastic people so I want to thank the Secret Service.

And law enforcement in New York City, they're here tonight. These are spectacular people, sometimes underappreciated unfortunately. We appreciate them.

So it's been what they call a historic event, but to be really historic, we have to do a great job, and I promise you that I will not let you down. We will do a great job. We will do a great job. I look very much forward to being your president, and hopefully at the end of two years or three years or four years or maybe even eight years you will say so many of you worked so hard for us, with you. You will say that -- you will say that that was something that you were -- really were very proud to do and I can — thank you very much.

And I can only say that while the campaign is over, our work on this movement is now really just beginning. We're going to get to work immediately for the American people, and we're going to be doing a job that hopefully you will be so proud of your President. You will be so proud. Again, it's my honor.

It's an amazing evening. It's been an amazing two-year period, and I love this country. Thank you.

Thank you very much. Thank you to Mike Pence.

Retrieved from <https://edition.cnn.com/2016/11/09/politics/donald-trump-victory-speech/index.html>

## APPENDIX 5

### PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP'S 2017 U.N. SPEECH

Mr. Secretary General, Mr. President, world leaders, and distinguished delegates, welcome to New York. It is a profound honor to stand here in my home city as a representative of the American people to address the people of the world. As millions of our citizens continue to suffer the effects of the devastating hurricanes that have struck our country, I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to every leader in this room who has offered assistance and aid. The American people are strong and resilient, and they will emerge from these hardships more determined than ever before.

Fortunately, the United States has done very well since Election Day last November 8. The stock market is at an all-time high, a record. Unemployment is at its lowest level in 16 years, and because of our regulatory and other reforms, we have more people working in the United States today than ever before. Companies are moving back, creating job growth, the likes of which our country has not seen in a very long time, and it has just been announced that we will be spending almost \$700 billion on our military and defence. Our military will soon be the strongest it has ever been. For more than 70 years, in times of war and peace, the leaders of nations, movements, and religions have stood before this assembly.

Like them, I intend to address some of the very serious threats before us today, but also the enormous potential waiting to be unleashed. We live in a time of extraordinary opportunity. Breakthroughs in science, technology, and medicine are curing illnesses and solving problems that prior generations thought impossible to solve. But each day also brings news of growing dangers that threaten everything we cherish and value. Terrorists and extremists have gathered strength and spread to every region of the planet. Rogue regimes represented in this body not only support terror but threaten other nations and their own people with the most destructive weapons known to humanity.

Authority and authoritarian powers seek to collapse the values, the systems, and alliances, that prevented conflict and tilted the world toward freedom since World War II. International criminal networks traffic drugs, weapons, people, force dislocation and mass migration, threaten our borders and new forms of aggression exploit technology to menace our citizens. To put it simply, we meet at a time of both immense promise and great peril. It is entirely up to us whether we lift the world to new heights or let it fall into a valley of disrepair. We have it in our power, should

we so choose, to lift millions from poverty, to help our citizens realize their dreams, and to ensure that new generations of children are raised free from violence, hatred, and fear.

This institution was founded in the aftermath of two world wars, to help shape this better future. It was based on the vision that diverse nations could cooperate to protect their sovereignty, preserve their security, and promote their prosperity. It was in the same period exactly 70 years ago that the United States developed the Marshall Plan to help restore Europe. Those these beautiful pillars, they are pillars of peace, sovereignty, security, and prosperity. The Marshall Plan was built on the noble idea that the whole world is safer when nations are strong, independent, and free. As president, Truman said in his message to congress at that time, our support of European recovery is in full accord with our support of the United Nations.

The success of the United Nations depends upon the independent strength of its members. To overcome the perils of the present, and to achieve the promise of the future, we must begin with the wisdom of the past. Our success depends on a coalition of strong and independent nations that embrace their sovereignty, to promote security, prosperity, and peace, for themselves and for the world. We do not expect diverse countries to share the same cultures, traditions, or even systems of government, but we do expect all nations to uphold these two core sovereign duties, to respect the interests of their own people and the rights of every other sovereign nation.

This is the beautiful vision of this institution, and this is the foundation for cooperation and success. Strong sovereign nations let diverse countries with different values, different cultures, and different dreams not just coexist, but work side by side on the basis of mutual respect. Strong sovereign nations let their people take ownership of the future and control their own destiny. And strong sovereign nations allow individuals to flourish in the fullness of the life intended by God. In America, we do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone, but rather to let it shine as an example for everyone to watch.

This week gives our country a special reason to take pride in that example. We are celebrating the 230th anniversary of our beloved Constitution, the oldest constitution still in use in the world today. This timeless document has been the foundation of peace, prosperity, and freedom for the Americans and for countless millions around the globe whose own countries have found inspiration in its respect for human nature, human dignity, and the rule of law. The greatest in the united States Constitution is its first three beautiful words. They are "We the people."

Generations of Americans have sacrificed to maintain the promise of those words, the promise of our country and of our great history.

In America, the people govern, the people rule, and the people are sovereign. I was elected not to take power, but to give power to the American people where it belongs. In foreign affairs, we are renewing this founding principle of sovereignty. Our government's first duty is to its people, to our citizens, to serve their needs, to ensure their safety, to preserve their rights, and to defend their values. As president of the United States, I will always put America first. Just like you, as the leaders of your countries, will always and should always put your countries first.

All responsible leaders have an obligation to serve their own citizens, and the nation state remains the best vehicle for elevating the human condition. But making a better life for our people also requires us to work together in close harmony and unity, to create a more safe and peaceful future for all people.

The United States will forever be a great friend to the world and especially to its allies. But we can no longer be taken advantage of or enter into a one-sided deal where the United States gets nothing in return. As long as I hold this office, I will defend America's interests above all else, but in fulfilling our obligations to our nations, we also realize that it's in everyone's interests to seek the future where all nations can be sovereign, prosperous, and secure.

America does more than speak for the values expressed in the United Nations charter. Our citizens have paid the ultimate price to defend our freedom and the freedom of many nations represented in this great hall. America's devotion is measured on the battlefields where our young men and women have fought and sacrificed alongside of our allies. From the beaches of Europe to the deserts of the Middle East to the jungles of Asia, it is an eternal credit to the American character that even after we and our allies emerge victorious from the bloodiest war in history, we did not seek territorial expansion or attempt to oppose and impose our way of life on others. Instead, we helped build institutions such as this one to defend the sovereignty, security, and prosperity for all. For the diverse nations of the world, this is our hope.

We want harmony and friendship, not conflict and strife. We are guided by outcomes, not ideologies. We have a policy of principled realism, rooted in shared goal, interests, and values. That realism forces us to confront the question facing every leader and nation in this room, it is a question we cannot escape or avoid. We will slide down the path of complacency, numb to the



challenges, threats, and even wars that we face, or do we have enough strength and pride to confront those dangers today so that our citizens can enjoy peace and prosperity tomorrow.

If we desire to lift up our citizens, if we aspire to the approval of history, then we must fulfill our sovereign duties to the people we faithfully represent. We must protect our nations, their interests and their futures. We must reject threats to sovereignty from the Ukraine to the South China Sea. We must uphold respect for law, respect for borders, and respect for culture, and the peaceful engagement these allow.

And just as the founders of this body intended, we must work together and confront together those who threaten us with chaos, turmoil, and terror. The score of our planet today is small regimes that violate every principle that the United Nations is based. They respect neither their own citizens nor the sovereign rights of their countries. If the righteous many do not confront the wicked few, then evil will triumph. When decent people and nations become bystanders to history, the forces of destruction only gather power and strength.

No one has shown more contempt for other nations and for the well-being of their own people than the depraved regime in North Korea. It is responsible for the starvation deaths of millions of North Koreans. And for the imprisonment, torture, killing, and oppression of countless more. We were all witness to the regime's deadly abuse when an innocent American college student, Otto Warmbier, was returned to America, only to die a few days later.

We saw it in the assassination of the dictator's brother, using banned nerve agents in an international airport. We know it kidnapped a sweet 13-year-old Japanese girl from a beach in her own country, to enslave her as a language tutor for North Korea's spies. If this is not twisted enough, now North Korea's reckless pursuit of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles threatens the entire world with unthinkable loss of human life. It is an outrage that some nations would not only trade with such a regime, but would arm, supply, and financially support a country that imperils the world with nuclear conflict.

No nation on Earth has an interest in seeing this band of criminals arm itself with nuclear weapons and missiles. The United States has great strength and patience, but if it is forced to defend itself or its allies, we will have no choice but to totally destroy North Korea. Rocket man is on a suicide mission for himself and for his regime. The United States is ready, willing, and able, but hopefully this will not be necessary. That's what the United Nations is all about. That's what the United Nations is for. Let's see how they do.

It is time for North Korea to realize that the denuclearization is its only acceptable future. The United Nations Security Council recently held two unanimous 15-0 votes adopting hard-hitting resolutions against North Korea, and I want to thank China and Russia for joining the vote to impose sanctions, along with all of the other members of the Security Council. Thank you to all involved. But we must do much more.

It is time for all nations to work together to isolate the Kim regime until it ceases its hostile behavior. We face this decision not only in North Korea; it is far past time for the nations of the world to confront another reckless regime, one that speaks openly of mass murder, vowing death to America, destruction to Israel, and ruin for many leaders and nations in this room.

The Iranian government masks a corrupt dictatorship behind the false guise of a democracy. It has turned a wealthy country, with a rich history and culture, into an economically depleted rogue state whose chief exports are violence, bloodshed, and chaos. The longest-suffering victims of Iran's leaders are, in fact, its own people. Rather than use its resources to improve Iranian lives, its oil profits go to fund Hezbollah and other terrorists that kill innocent Muslims and attack their peaceful Arab and Israeli neighbors.

This wealth, which rightly belongs to Iran's people, also goes to shore up Bashar al-Assad's dictatorship, fuel Yemen's civil war, and undermine peace throughout the entire Middle East. We cannot let a murderous regime continue these destabilizing activities while building dangerous missiles, and we cannot abide by an agreement if it provides cover for the eventual construction of a nuclear program. The Iran deal was one of the worst and most one-sided transactions the United States has ever entered into. Frankly, that deal is an embarrassment to the United States, and I don't think you've heard the last of it. Believe me.

It is time for the entire world to join us in demanding that Iran's government end its pursuit of death and destruction. It is time for the regime to free all Americans and citizens of other nations that they have unjustly detained. Above all, Iran's government must stop supporting terrorists, begin serving its own people, and respect the sovereign rights of its neighbors. The entire world understands that the good people of Iran want change, and, other than the vast military power of the United States, that Iran's people are what their leaders fear the most. This is what causes the regime to restrict internet access, tear down satellite dishes, shoot unarmed student protesters, and imprison political reformers.

Oppressive regimes cannot endure forever, and the day will come when the people will face a choice. Will they continue down the path of poverty, bloodshed, and terror, or will the Iranian people return to the nation's proud roots as a center of civilization, culture, and wealth, where their people can be happy and prosperous once again? The Iranian regime's support for terror is in stark contrast to the recent commitments of many of its neighbors to fight terrorism and halt its finance, and in Saudi Arabia early last year, I was greatly honored to address the leaders of more than 50 Arab and Muslim nations. We agreed that all responsible nations must work together to confront terrorists and the Islamic extremism that inspires them.

We will stop radical Islamic terrorism because we cannot allow it to tear up our nation and, indeed, to tear up the entire world. We must deny the terrorists' safe haven, transit, funding, and any form of support for their vile and sinister ideology. We must drive them out of our nation. It is time to expose and hold responsible those countries whose support and fi — who support and finance terror groups like al-Qaeda, Hezbollah, the Taliban, and others that slaughter innocent people.

The United States and our allies are working together throughout the Middle East to crush the loser terrorists and stop the reemergence of safe havens they use to launch attacks on all of our people. Last month I announced a new strategy for victory in the fight against this evil in Afghanistan. From now on, our security interests will dictate the length and scope of military operation, not arbitrary benchmarks and timetables set up by politicians. I have also totally changed the rules of engagement in our fight against the Taliban and other terrorist groups.

In Syria and Iraq, we have made big gains toward lasting defeat of ISIS. In fact, our country has achieved more against ISIS in the last eight months than it has in many, many years combined. We seek the deescalation of the Syrian conflict, and a political solution that honors the will of the Syrian people. The actions of the criminal regime of Bashar al-Assad, including the use of chemical weapons against his own citizens, even innocent children, shock the conscience of every decent person. No society could be safe if banned chemical weapons are allowed to spread. That is why the United States carried out a missile strike on the airbase that launched the attack.

We appreciate the efforts of the United Nations' agencies that are providing vital humanitarian assistance in areas liberated from ISIS, and we especially thank Jordan, Turkey, and Lebanon for their role in hosting refugees from the Syrian conflict. The United States is a compassionate nation and has spent billions and billions of dollars in helping to support this effort. We seek an

approach to refugee resettlement that is designed to help these horribly treated people and which enables their eventual return to their home countries to be part of the rebuilding process. For the cost of resettling one refugee in the United States, we can assist more than 10 in their home region.

Out of the goodness of our hearts, we offer financial assistance to hosting countries in the region and we support recent agreements of the G20 nations that will seek to host refugees as close to their home countries as possible. This is the safe, responsible, and humanitarian approach. For decades the United States has dealt with migration challenges here in the Western Hemisphere.

We have learned that over the long term, uncontrolled migration is deeply unfair to both the sending and the receiving countries. For the sending countries, it reduces domestic pressure to pursue needed political and economic reform and drains them of the human capital necessary to motivate and implement those reforms. For the receiving countries, the substantial costs of uncontrolled migration are born overwhelmingly by low-income citizens whose concerns are often ignored by both media and government.

I want to salute the work of the United Nations in seeking to address the problems that cause people to flee from their home. The United Nations and African Union led peacekeeping missions to have invaluable contributions in stabilising conflict in Africa. The United States continues to lead the world in humanitarian assistance, including famine prevention and relief, in South Sudan, Somalia, and northern Nigeria and Yemen.

We have invested in better health and opportunity all over the world through programmes like PEPFAR, which funds AIDS relief, the President's Malaria Initiative, the Global Health Security Agenda, the Global Fund to End Modern Slavery, and the Women Entrepreneur's Finance Initiative, part of our commitment to empowering women all across the globe.

We also thank — we also thank the secretary general for recognising that the United Nations must reform if it is to be an effective partner in confronting threats to sovereignty, security, and prosperity. Too often the focus of this organisation has not been on results, but on bureaucracy and process. In some cases, states that seek to subvert this institution's noble end have hijacked the very systems that are supposed to advance them. For example, it is a massive source of embarrassment to the United Nations that some governments with egregious human rights records sit on the UN Human Rights Council.

The United States is one out of 193 countries in the United Nations, and yet we pay 22 percent of the entire budget and more. In fact, we pay far more than anybody realises. The United States bears an unfair cost burden, but to be fair, if it could actually accomplish all of its stated goals, especially the goal of peace, this investment would easily be well worth it. Major portions of the world are in conflict, and some, in fact, are going to hell, but the powerful people in this room, under the guidance and auspices of the United Nations, can solve many of these vicious and complex problems. The American people hope that one day soon the United Nations can be a much more accountable and effective advocate for human dignity and freedom around the world. In the meantime, we believe that no nation should have to bear a disproportionate share of the burden, militarily or financially. Nations of the world must take a greater role in promoting secure and prosperous societies in their own region. That is why in the Western Hemisphere the United States has stood against the corrupt, destabilizing regime in Cuba and embraced the enduring dream of the Cuban people to live in freedom.

My administration recently announced that we will not lift sanctions on the Cuban government until it makes fundamental reforms. We have also imposed tough calibrated sanctions on the socialist Maduro regime in Venezuela, which has brought a once thriving nation to the brink of total collapse. The socialist dictatorship of Nicolás Maduro has inflicted terrible pain and suffering on the good people of that country.

This corrupt regime destroyed a prosperous nation — prosperous nation, by imposing a failed ideology that has produced poverty and misery everywhere it has been tried. To make matters worse, Maduro has defied his own people, stealing power from their elected representatives, to preserve his disastrous rule. The Venezuelan people are starving, and their country is collapsing. Their democratic institutions are being destroyed. The situation is completely unacceptable, and we cannot stand by and watch.

As a responsible neighbor and friend, we and all others have a goal — that goal is to help them regain their freedom, recover their country, and restore their democracy. I would like to thank leaders in this room for condemning the regime and providing vital support to the Venezuelan people. The United States has taken important steps to hold the regime accountable. We are prepared to take further action if the government of Venezuela persists on its path to impose authoritarian rule on the Venezuelan people.

We are fortunate to have incredibly strong and healthy trade relationships with many of the Latin American countries gathered here today. Our economic bond forms a critical foundation for advancing peace and prosperity for all of our people and all of our neighbors. I ask every country represented here today to be prepared to do more to address this very real crisis. We call for the full restoration of democracy and political freedoms in Venezuela. The problem in Venezuela is not that socialism has been poorly implemented, but that socialism has been faithfully implemented.

From the Soviet Union to Cuba to Venezuela, wherever true socialism or communism has been adopted, it has delivered anguish and devastation and failure. Those who preach the tenets of these discredited ideologies only contribute to the continued suffering of the people who live under these cruel systems. America stands with every person living under a brutal regime. Our respect for sovereignty is also a call for action. All people deserve a government that cares for their safety, their interests, and their well-being, including their prosperity. In America, we seek stronger ties of business and trade with all nations of goodwill, but this trade must be fair and it must be reciprocal.

For too long the American people were told that mammoth, multinational trade deals, unaccountable international tribunals, and powerful global bureaucracies were the best way to promote their success. But as those promises flowed, millions of jobs vanished and thousands of factories disappeared. Others gamed the system and broke the rules, and our great middle class, once the bedrock of American prosperity, was forgotten and left behind, but they are forgotten no more and they will never be forgotten again.

While America will pursue cooperation and commerce with other nations, we are renewing our commitment to the first duty of every government, the duty of our citizens. This bond is the source of America's strength and that of every responsible nation represented here today. If this organization is to have any hope of successfully confronting the challenges before us, it will depend, as President Truman said some 70 years ago, on the independent strength of its members. If we are to embrace the opportunities of the future and overcome the present dangers together, there can be no substitute for strong, sovereign, and independent nations, nations that are rooted in the histories and invested in their destiny, nations that seek allies to befriend, not enemies to conquer, and most important of all, nations that are home to men and women who are

willing to sacrifice for their countries, their fellow citizens, and for all that is best in the human spirit.

In remembering the great victory that led to this body's founding, we must never forget that those heroes who fought against evil, also fought for the nations that they love. Patriotism led the Poles to die to save Poland, the French to fight for a free France, and the Brits to stand strong for Britain. Today, if we do not invest ourselves, our hearts, our minds, and our nations, if we will not build strong families, safe communities, and healthy societies for ourselves, no one can do it for us.

This is the ancient wish of every people and the deepest yearning that lives inside every sacred soul. So let this be our mission, and let this be our message to the world. We will fight together, sacrifice together, and stand together for peace, for freedom, for justice, for family, for humanity, and for the almighty God who made us all. Thank you, God bless you, God bless the nations of the world, and God bless the United States of America. Thank you very much.

Retrieved from <https://ar.usembassy.gov/remarks-president-trump-72nd-session-united-nations-general-assembly>