

University of Pardubice

Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Two-pronged Rhetorics in Contemporary America

Viktor Stuchel

Bachelor Thesis

2019

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Akademický rok: 2017/2018

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

(PROJEKTU, UMĚLECKÉHO DÍLA, UMĚLECKÉHO VÝKONU)

Jméno a příjmení: **Viktor Stuchel**
Osobní číslo: **H16225**
Studijní program: **B7310 Filologie**
Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk pro odbornou praxi**
Název tématu: **Dvojjí rétorika dnešní Ameriky**
Zadávající katedra: **Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Z á s a d y p r o v y p r a c o v á n í :

Práce se zaměří na dvojjí rozdílné rétorické a narativní strategie, jež utvářejí prostor soudobé politické diskuse ve Spojených státech amerických. Teoretická část práce bude zkoumat kořeny současné duální politické scény, analytická část se pak bude konkrétně věnovat primárním textům (projevy, eseje atp.), které si autor práce sám vybere. Podle uvážení se rozbor může zaměřit nejen na obsahovou stránku, ale z pragmalingvistického pohledu i na to, jakým způsobem a za jakým účelem jsou dané informace sdělovány.

Rozsah grafických prací:

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:

Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná**

Jazyk zpracování bakalářské práce: **Angličtina**

Seznam odborné literatury:

Lakoff, George; Johnson, Mark. "Metafory, kterými žijeme." Brno: Host, 2002.
Přeložil Mirek Čejka.

McLuhan, Marshall. "Understanding media: the existions of man". New York:
New American Library, 1964.

Bauman, Zygmunt. "Liquid Modernity: Living in an Age of Uncertainty".
Polity, 2006.

Chafe, William H. "The American Narrative: Is There One and What Is It?"
In: Daedalus, 2012, Vol.141(1), pp.11-17.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce:

Mgr. Michal Kleprlík, Ph.D.

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání bakalářské práce: **30. dubna 2018**

Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce: **31. března 2019**



prof. PhDr. Karel Rýdl, CSc.
děkan

Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D.
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2018

Prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracoval samostatně, že jsem řádně citoval všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu. Byl jsem obeznámen, že se na moji akademickou práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., autorský zákon a zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Beru dále na vědomí, že v souladu s § 47b Zákona č.111/1998 Sb., o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách) ve znění pozdějších předpisů, a směrnicí Univerzity Pardubice č. 9/2012, bude práce zveřejněna v Univerzitní knihovně a prostřednictvím Digitální knihovny Univerzity Pardubice

V Pardubicích, dne 20. srpna 2019

.....

Viktor Stuchel

ANNOTATION

This thesis deals with the contrastive rhetorics of Donald J. Trump and Hillary R. Clinton during their journey as presidential candidates for the Oval Office during the 2016 American elections. The first part delves into the history of current American political system by portraying Alexander Hamilton and his centralised fiscal and federal government policies against his rival, Thomas Jefferson, who preferred a collection of strong and independent agrarian states. The second part creates theoretical foundation on different conceptual metaphors explored by G.Lakoff, M.Johnson and other linguists. The corpus analysis, which is preceded by chapter dedicated to some background information on the presidential candidates, uses the already established theory in order to find conceptual metaphors which should help to further interpret the intended meaning in their respective speeches.

KEYWORDS

Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump, rhetorics, conceptual metaphor, presidential elections, figurative language

ANOTACE

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá kontrastivní rétorikou Donalda J. Trumpa a Hillary R. Clintonové během jejich politické kampaně na úřad prezidenta Spojených států v roce 2016. První část se ponoří do historie současného politického systému zobrazením Alexandra Hamiltona a jeho centralizované fiskální a federální politiky proti jeho soupeři, Thomasovi Jeffersonovi, který upřednostňoval sdružení samostatně nezávislých a silných států. Další část vysvětlí základy různých konceptuálních metafor, které objasnili G.Lakoff, M.Johnson a další lingvisti. Následuje krátká kapitola, která slouží jako podklad pro vysvětlení několika okolností výše zmíněných kandidátů. Analýza korpusu použije teorii druhé kapitoly pro vyhledání konceptuálních metafor, které pomohou lépe interpretovat cílený význam proslovů.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump, rétorika, konceptuální metafora, prezidentské volby, obrazný jazyk

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	7
1. The Foundation of American Rhetoric and Vision That Gave Birth to the Two-Party System	9
1.1. Alexander Hamilton’s Centralised Fiscal Vision.....	9
1.2. Thomas Jefferson’s Decentralised Agrarian Vision	11
1.3. Trump’s Jackson	14
2. Introduction to Rhetorics.....	22
2.1. Figurative Language.....	22
2.2. Conceptual Metaphor	23
2.3. Argument is War	25
2.4. Nation as Family	26
2.5. Other Metaphors.....	27
3. America Divided - The Politics of Donald J. Trump and Hillary D. R. Clinton	30
3.1. The Conservative Anti-Establishment Political Revolt of Donald. J. Trump.....	30
3.2. The Liberal Countermeasure of Hillary R. Clinton	34
4. Corpus Analysis of Speeches from Donald J. Trump and Hillary D. Clinton Throughout the 2016 US Presidential Election	38
4.1. War Metaphors.....	38
4.2. Animal Metaphors.....	40
4.3. Planter/Farmer and Building Metaphor.	43
4.4. Other Metaphors.....	44
Conclusion	47
Resumé.....	49
Bibliography	52
Appendices.....	56
Appendix A.....	56
Appendix B	70
Appendix C.....	82
Appendix D.....	92
Appendix E	103

Introduction

United States presidential elections have a tendency to be intensely discussed topic both domestically and worldwide, but the 2016 presidential elections exceeded many levels on the scale of controversy, strife, surprise and bewilderment by both the media, candidates themselves and the public. Whether based on facts or disinformation, the candidates had to endure and repel endless barrage of verbal attacks, sudden leaks of compromising information and other. Not that this is something irregular during the biggest American political event held every fourth year but it would be hard finding any contestants trying to match the fierceness, animation and madness of 2016 elections.

The first section of this paper will focus on some of the Founding Fathers policies and rhetorics that helped to pave the path for the contemporary United States of America, namely Alexander Hamilton and his rival, Thomas Jefferson. A.Hamilton was a strong supporter of a strong Federal government with a centralised power, central national bank and ultimately playing with an idea of “manageable debt” that was looming over America of that time. Even though War of Independence had been won against the British crown of George III, the war of making a stand in the world as a financially independent Union among the world’s superpowers just started. It is thanks to Hamilton that the cornerstones of American fiscal policy are still clearly visible, leaving it’s mark after its founder. Thomas Jefferson strongly opposed the idea of central government and desired decentralized agrarian republic—a system where most of the power would lie within the States and Central government would be limited in both political and financial power. Lastly, some light shall be shed towards one of the most infamous presidents of the United States—Andrew Jackson, the so-called American lion, men of integrity that loved duels as much as he hated the idea and existence of the national bank. Donald Trump will be mentioned alongside his policies in this chapter in order to draw any possible parallels between them.

The second part of the paper will explain some basic concepts of rhetoric, namely conceptual metaphors and their usage as conceived by linguists and writers by the likes of G.Lakoff, M.Johnson, Jonathan Carteris-Black, David Punter, Andreas Musolff and others. These conceptual metaphors used in political discourse such as metaphors ARGUMENT IS WAR, NATION IS FAMILY and others related to journey, animal or container metaphors. These should provide some basic understanding and give theoretical foundation for the analysis of corpus of

speeches from some of the contemporary American political rhetoric, namely from Hillary Rodham Clinton and Donald John Trump.

This leads to the third part where both of these former presidential candidates will be briefly introduced on their agenda, vision and unique rhetorical devices they may have used in their fight for the White House. Donald Trump as a businessman and entrepreneur who came crashing into the high politics versus his opponent Hillary Clinton, a seasoned veteran of high politics spanning over 30 years of experience. As the first woman from a major party ever to be nominated as a running candidate for the Democrats, she is facing an insidious threat in the form of Donald Trump, the man that came to shake the foundations and break every possible convention of successfully running a political campaign. Some of the first-hand experience of different viewpoints on these 2 candidates shall be included as well. Throughout the paper, some referential material—mostly in the form of speeches—will be included to complement the theory.

The last part will analyze some of the rhetorics of the above mentioned U.S. presidential candidates of 2016 used during their campaign for the presidency. Namely, identifying and recognizing conceptual metaphors shown in the second part of this paper together with some additional analysis of used rhetoric and the reasoning behind it. The analysis will be obtained from the following corpus of speeches: Hillary Clinton's Democratic convention speech, Donald Trump's Presidential Announcement Speech, Donald Trump's acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention, Hillary Clinton's Campaign and the first presidential debate between these two opponents. The objective of this paper is to discover these metaphors and decipher whether there is some hidden or ambiguous meaning behind their interpretation. Furthermore, to answer the question whether Donald Trump's political campaign and presidency is going to set the new standard for any future candidates and whether there is any historical basis of similar policies or behaviour with any of the previous presidents or public figures.

1. The Foundation of American Rhetoric and Vision That Gave Birth to the Two-Party System

1.1. Alexander Hamilton's Centralised Fiscal Vision

Born in the year 1755 in the Carribean jewel of St. Croix (island of the U.S. Virgin Islands, nowadays a territory of the United States) and being orphaned at the age of 13 due to his mother dying from contracting yellow fever, Hamilton's childhood wasn't an easy one, even for the standards of the 18th century. He gained invaluable experience while working as a clerk for a trading firm of Beekman and Cruger. For five years, he monitored shipments, warehouse supplies, kept books and assisted ship captains. There he learned the basics of discipline, organization and dealing with other people.¹ Hamilton referred to these years as "the most useful of his education"² since they served as a starting point of his future endeavours in the post of the first Secretary of the Treasury.

Both A.Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson served under the national hero and the first president of the United States, George Washington, both wanting only the best for their own country that had just won the War of Independence and freedom against the oppressive British crown of George III. Ferling reveals that G. Washington was interested in Hamilton for multitude of reasons and both had sympathies for each other. Washington was quick to recognize Hamilton (a colonel in the army at that time) as a trustful aide and often called for his advice, knowing that he was a man of many virtues, especially loyalty, which Washington admired above all else. He knew that Hamilton is going to be resourceful asset in pushing the Thirteen Colonies towards their next leap forward as the United States after the war was won.³ The author further comments that Washington described Hamilton as "a dreamer, an intriguer, a polemicist, a relentless avenger, and a veritable storehouse of ideas; he knew, too, that Hamilton was fluent, persuasive, and nearly unequaled in guile, political dexterity, and his capacity for work."⁴ This, combined with his knowledge and experience in trade, credit and commerce persuaded Washington to nominate Hamilton to be the first U.S. Secretary of Treasury. After months of Washington's inauguration and Congress creating 3 executive departments—War department, State department

¹ John Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton: The Rivalry That Forged a Nation* (New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2013), ch9, paragraph 9.24-9.25.

² Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton*, ch1, paragraph 9.25

³ Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton*, ch4, paragraph 13.12.

⁴ Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton*, ch9, paragraph 20.12

and Treasury—Hamilton, being the head of Treasury, immediately started on his lifetime work of setting America on its course of financial sustenance. One of the first steps was the creation of a central bank to deal with the total federal and state debt of “79\$ million”⁵ accumulated throughout the Revolutionary War, some of it as loans from France and Spain to pay for the war effort.

Many of Hamilton’s critics, including Thomas Jefferson, thought of him to be a British lapdog under influence of English bankers and the whole British finance system. Wright comments that “Jefferson called Hamilton ‘the servile copyist of Mr. Pitt,’ the famed British prime minister, and Jeffersonians ever since have deprecated Hamilton’s policies as too British, aristocratic, and oppressive.”⁶ It is quite true that he was influenced by the British banking system and commerce as “There can be little doubt that the English fiscal structure provided the model for Hamilton’s economic plans.”⁷

In the 1790s, a few years after the end of the war, America’s economy was booming in a financial revolution. The reason for that was established central bank, known as the Bank of the United States (BUS) with the addition of smaller private banks together with the completely new currency, the U.S. dollar.⁸ Hamilton, unlike Jefferson or A. Jackson, firmly believed that national debt which would be evenly spread out across multiple generations and its size kept at a reasonable level would be a “national blessing that would cement the young nation together and help it to prosper.”⁹ For Jackson and Jefferson which shared the same sympathies about the centralized system of government in the shape and form of both the federal government and the central bank, the public debt was an equivalent to “‘a national curse’ because he believed that it, like the BUS, gave ascendancy to a ‘monied aristocracy’ bent on destroying individual liberty with what one of his supporters called ‘harpy fangs’”.¹⁰

⁵ Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton*, ch9, paragraph 20.15

⁶ Robert E. Wright, *One Nation Under Debt: Hamilton, Jefferson, and the History of What We Owe* (McGraw-Hill Education, 2008), 155.

⁷ Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton*, ch9, paragraph 20.51.

⁸ Wright, *One Nation Under Debt*, 120.

⁹ Wright, *One Nation Under Debt*, 282.

¹⁰ Wright, *One Nation Under Debt*, 269.

1.2. Thomas Jefferson's Decentralised Agrarian Vision

Unlike Hamilton who knew adversity since his early years, Jefferson was born in 1743 as a son of wealthy and influential self-made man Virginian planter. That didn't make his childhood happy though, as he later on remarked on his youth as a time of "colonial subservience"¹¹ and "next to slavery, he said, one's earliest years had to be the worst state imaginable."¹² Even though he owed slaves, his stance on the matter when he was around 30 years old was that: "slavery degraded and corrupted both blacks and whites, retarded Virginia's economy, and concentrated wealth and power, resulting in an oligarchy of great planters."¹³

In comparison to Hamilton, Jefferson holds the opposite view: the Constitution created a federal government strictly limited in political and financial power. Most authority lies with States. This is a conflict of vision that has shaped the United States of America fiscal policies is still relevant, even today.

For Jefferson, the thought of a strong centralised government using a central bank, which might provide irresistible occasions for corruption, was simply appalling. He viewed a national central bank as something that would empower the federal government, something that would endanger agrarian way of life and his preferred idea of decentralised government.

Unlike Hamilton who was convinced that "social stability required the presence of a strong central government dominated by those at the top of a hierarchical society"¹⁴; Jefferson shared no such views and on numerous occasions openly criticized Hamilton's policies. Ferling describes one of his letters sent to president Washington in hopes to shake Washington's opinion on Hamilton. He warned that "Hamiltonianism was pushing the nation toward annihilation" and anticipated that American people would revolt against the high taxes which were required because of the "artificially created debt" proposed by Hamilton. Nor would people stand for Hamilton's subtle transformation of "the present republican form of government, to that of a monarchy, of which the English constitution is to be the model". According to Jefferson, the

¹¹ Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton*, ch1, paragraph 9.2

¹² John Ferling, *Setting the World Ablaze: Washington, Adams, Jefferson, and the American Revolution* (New York, 2000), 7.

¹³ Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton*, ch2, paragraph 11.12

¹⁴ Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton*, ch9, paragraph 20.51.

country was split into two sides of one coin, namely between “Republican party” and “Monarchical federalists” and commented on the division of North and South.¹⁵

Ferling describes how Jefferson always firmly believed that the creation of a central bank would never come into fruition. When the Bank Bill was approved by the congress, it still needed Washington’s sanction in order to make it into law. Washington did not act hastily for he asked both Hamilton and Jefferson to give him their own opinions on the matter. Jefferson’s answer was brief and to the point, stating that the charter of a national bank was unconstitutional. He argued that according to the Constitution, the Congress “was explicitly empowered to tax, borrow, and regulate commerce, but not to charter a bank.”¹⁶ In the letter he emphasizes the following points, starting with the Congress’ power to lay tax: “[...] A power to lay taxes for the purpose of paying the debts of the United States; but no debt is paid by this bill, nor any tax laid. [...]”¹⁷ Then he argues that the existence of a national bank doesn’t assure lending of money from its proprietors: “[...] But this bill neither borrows money nor ensures the borrowing it. The proprietors of the bank will be just as free as any other money holders, to lend or not to lend their money to the public. [...]”¹⁸ And lastly, he expresses his doubts whether the national bank would help to regulate commerce: “[...] To erect a bank, and to regulate commerce, are very different acts. He who erects a bank, creates a subject of commerce in its bills; so does he who makes a bushel of wheat, or digs a dollar out of the mines; yet neither of these persons regulates commerce thereby. [...]”¹⁹. He continues to elaborate more on these facts in his letter to Washington, hoping that “a fellow Virginian, would agree and see things in the same light.”²⁰

Hamilton takes the matter into his own hands and spends a week on before sending his reply. After a thorough examination, Washington decided that Hamilton’s eloquent letter had a superior case and thus, under Jefferson’s dismay, signed the Bank Bill into law on February 25, 1791.²¹ It wasn’t until the presidency of Andrew Jackson who was known for his adversity towards the national Bank and decided to eliminate it once and for all. Just as Jefferson, Jackson

¹⁵ Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton*, ch10, paragraph 21.19

¹⁶ Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton*, ch9, paragraph 20.59

¹⁷ Thomas Jefferson, “Opinion on the Constitutionality of a National Bank”, 15th February, 1791, accessed from <https://oll.libertyfund.org/pages/jefferson-hamilton-debate-session-3> in July 24th, 2019.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton*, ch9, paragraph 20.59

²¹ Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton*, ch9, paragraph 20.61

saw it as dangerous monopoly with inclinations to fraud and corruption only to cheat honest American farmers and workers.

In evaluating Hamilton's and Jefferson's view on the future fiscal policy of the United States, Wright states that both were right in their own sense. Jefferson who considered the national debt as an extortion of money from people who weren't even born yet and Hamilton who recognized it as a national blessing that would make it prosper and meld the nation together²². According to Ferling, it was Hamilton who shaped America into what it represents today.

Then again, Jefferson's fears of concentrated power in the hands of bankers and speculators were true. The transformation of America into the very same British superpower against which many American patriots lost their lives in their path to freedom, is what contemporary America with its enormous military and foreign states interventions represents. Quite different from Jefferson's agrarian vision which he eloquently described as: "a promised land of virtuous, republican, property-owning farmers who had little need of a powerful centralized government, who would never yearn for the rule of 'angels, in the form of kings,' and who would be independent of the long and awesome clout of the social and economic elite." and as Ferling says, America was like this for most descendants of a few generations after Jefferson's death²³

In short, it could be said that Jefferson's policies have always tried to protect the small Virginia farmer from the northern bankers.

²² Wright, *One Nation Under Debt*, 281-282

²³ Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton*, chapter Reckoning, paragraph 27.41-42

1.3. Trump's Jackson

If there was a parallel drawn to show any similarities between the current POTUS and his predecessors, one name would stand out. The 7th president of the United States. Andrew Jackson's policies, mannerism and tenacity might bear a resemblance in some of Donald Trump's decisions and political agenda. It is no secret that he to some degree acknowledges Jackson's feats and triumphs as this was shown on occasions such as mentioning A. Jackson's deeds during a speech held at Hermitage (Jackson's mansion—now a museum) at March 15 2017:

“From poverty and obscurity, Jackson rose to glory and greatness. First as the military leader and then as the seventh president of the United States. He did it with courage, with grit and with patriotic heart. And by the way, he was one of our great presidents.”²⁴

Defining Donald Trump's arrival to the political scene from poverty would surely raise more than just a few eyebrows considering his family background. Obscurity, on the other hand, might just do him justice. Not that he wasn't already known as a prolific businessman, but even his opponents today would agree that imagining him stepping into the political sphere, a presidential one on top of that, was quite simply unprecedented. He continues the speech with the following statement:

It was during the revolution the Jackson first confronted and defied an arrogant elite. Does that sound familiar to you? [*Puts a smug expression towards the audience*]²⁵. I wonder why they keep talking about Trump and Jackson, Jackson and Trump. Oh, I know the feeling, Andrew.²⁶

The rather simple antimetabole (Trump and Jackson, Jackson and Trump) follows with D. Trump casually addressing president Jackson by his first name and letting the audience know that just like Jackson, even he, is in conflict with “arrogant elite” and furthermore reinforcing the populist attitude he likes to imbue his speeches with.

²⁴ Donald Trump, “Trump expresses admiration for Andrew Jackson at Hermitage”, May 1, 2017, The Washington Post video, 01:55, https://www.washingtonpost.com/video/national/trump-expresses-admiration-for-andrew-jackson-at-hermitage/2017/05/01/3b0f1de2-2e8a-11e7-a335-fa0ae1940305_video.html?utm_term=.56d65652ea02

²⁵ Words in brackets are used as parenthetical information, this or any future examples will mark nonverbal communication such as hand gestures, facial expressions, posture or any other body movements.

²⁶ Donald Trump, “Trump expresses admiration for Andrew Jackson at Hermitage”, May 1, 2017, The Washington Post video, 01:55,

It is no secret that D. Trump has made a few changes concerning the decoration of the Oval office after being elected president. Namely it was the change of presidential portraits to the ones of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson as mentioned in his speech at Hermitage:

“Today the portrait of this orphan son who rose to the presidency, hangs proudly in the Oval Office opposite the portrait of another great american, Thomas Jefferson. I brought the Andrew Jackson portrait there. Right behind me, right [*points behind him*], boom, over my left shoulder.”²⁷

This symbolic move hasn't been met without any controversy as Andrew Jackson's past, although mostly known as ultimate patriot, is stained by two events that are looked down upon by today's standards of civic issues and human rights. His involvement with slavery and the removal and relocation of Native Americans under the Indian Removal Act of 1830, more commonly known as “Trail of Tears” due to it's brutal nature.

Andrew Jackson certainly didn't have the same luck in upbringing, social and economic stability as his other predecessors or successors did. Not to mention the fact that he was thrown into the turmoil of American Revolutionary War of 1775 when he was just thirteen years of age. Son of Scotch-Irish immigrants that came to settle in the area of Waxhaws located in the piedmont region between North Carolina and South Carolina and becoming an orphan at the age of fourteen after unfortunate events that ended life not only of his mother and father but his two brothers as well. “He had lost his father to overwork, and now his two brothers and his mother to war. At fourteen he faced the world alone.”²⁸

Having survived the struggle for American independence and showing his impudence against the British; this chapter of his life is famously reminded by an encounter with a British officer. The refusal to polish his boots earned him a gash on his hand and a permanent scar on the forehead made by the officer's sabre.²⁹ Certainly not the last chapter of Jackson's defiance and recklessness which he continued to execute against his political rivals and foes later in his life.

One of those rivals was the central Bank of the United States, Hamilton's legacy and institution that Jackson, just like Jefferson, despised with all his heart. And even though Jackson

²⁷ Ibid

²⁸ Henry William Brands, *Andrew Jackson : his life and times* (Anchor; 1st Thus. edition, October 10, 2006), chapter 3, paragraph 9.7, ePub.

²⁹ Brands, *Andrew Jackson*, ch. 2, par. 8.27, ePub

is known to be the only American president that eliminated the state debt by disassembling the national bank, his legacy lived only for a short time because of the establishment of a new central banking system in 1913—the Federal Reserve.

Concerning his involvement with slavery—even though most of the early US presidents were slave owners as well—according to Brands, Jackson was “more of a slaveholder rather than a slave trader”³⁰. He acquired his first slave in 1788, a woman called Nancy, as a payment for exchange of legal services. Three years later Jackson began buying slaves on a more regular basis to use them as workers on his properties, acquiring a modest amount of roughly one or two dozens between the years of 1791 and 1797.³¹ Many years later between 1820 and 1829 he owed roughly a hundred of slaves, mostly as plantation workers and house servants on his Hermitage farm. A substantial amount but still falling short when compared to the big planters of Carolinas and the Gulf coast who retained as much as hundreds of slaves to do their heavy and exhausting farmwork.³² Brands mentions that Jackson didn’t hesitate to severely punish any of his disobeying subjects if the punishment proved to have reasonable basis but on the other hand he wasn’t necessarily cruel as Brands depicts his morality regarding the subject as follows:

“Jackson treated slavery as a business matter but one not devoid of humanity. He bought and sold slaves as his business required. He bargained for the highest prices when he was selling and the lowest when he was buying. He tried to avoid selling young children away from their mothers, in part because it was bad for business—being hard on the mothers and children—but also because it offended his sympathies.”³³

Then again, not many Founding Fathers can escape the blame of owning slaves if we take into account the reality of late 17th century and the fact that most of them originated from the southern states where agriculture was the basis of the economy tied together with the slave labor. When George Washington on 14th April had received notification of his election to be the very first president of the United States he travelled to New York, the home of Congress, and was met with songs and compositions of “Welcome, mighty Chief and God Save the King.” Ferling

³⁰ Brands, *Andrew Jackson*, ch. 6, par. 12.27 ePub.

³¹ Brands, *Andrew Jackson*, ch.6, par. 12.25-26, ePub.

³² Brands, *Andrew Jackson*, ch.12, par. 19.9, ePub.

³³ Brands, *Andrew Jackson*, ch.12, par. 19.10, ePub.

further describes his rather lavish appearance befitted more of a monarch than someone who won the war against one:

“Predictably, his presidency rapidly took on a monarchical air. He was attended by servants in livery and wigs—mostly slaves brought north from Mount Vernon—traveled in a varnished, cream-colored carriage drawn by several horses and adorned with his family coat of arms. [...] The British minister, who knew royalty when he saw it, remarked that Washington was ‘very kingly.’”³⁴

In the matter of Indian Removal Act, it was this decision that empowered Jackson to forcibly remove all the Indian tribes that lived east of the Mississippi river. Of the affected tribes, one of them chose to fight the eviction in a surprising way; instead of going on warpath like their forefathers might have done, they decided to turn the weapon of a white man’s law against himself by taking the state of Georgia to court.

The Cherokees of Georgia have learned many things from the newcomers to the New World. Brands describes how the Cherokees grasped the knowledge of producing newspaper and books in newly devised written version of their own language, even grasping the knowledge and craft of agriculture and commerce—in essence, something that the Americans of that time would call civilization. This deeply vexed some of their neighbours who coveted the Indian lands and undermined their actions under various laws. Georgia state eventually passed some of those laws which forced the Cherokees—once again showing how much they have learned from the white man—to take the whole case to the Supreme Court.³⁵ Eventually, under John Marshall’s decision, they won the case and Supreme Court ruled that the Cherokee nation would gain sovereignty in the state of Georgia. This decision however, was swept away by Jackson reiterating a quote from the New York editor and aiming these words at Marshall: “John Marshall has made his decision; now let him enforce it.”³⁶ It was an unfortunate reality for the Native American tribe that given the racist realities of the time, “the defenders of the Cherokees were few and mostly far away from Georgia; their persecutors were many and near at hand”³⁷. Thus the Cherokee eviction, among with other Indian tribes, became what is now known as the Trails of Tears under

³⁴ Ferling, *Jefferson and Hamilton*, ch. 9, par. 20.6, ePub.

³⁵ Brands, *Andrew Jackson*, chapter 38, par. 47.17, ePub.

³⁶ Janet, Podell. Steven Anzovin, *Speeches of the American Presidents* (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 2001), 105.

³⁷ Brands, *Andrew Jackson*, ch. 38, par. 47.32, ePub.

Jackson's one of the most controversial act of completely ignoring Supreme Court decision. On Jackson's defense, Brands believes that Jackson's opinion that the Cherokees would face a certain extinction wasn't too far-fetched considering most people at that time held adverse attitude against the Indians. If Marshall's decision were to be imposed it would mean sending military and stationing them in Georgia to keep peace which could in practice mean to shoot the Georgians who posed a danger to the Indians. Jackson was sure that they simply would not do it and there was no way that this would be something sustainable and feasible for the American democracy in the long run.³⁸

It was this very act that made Jackson a thorn in the eye of many generations to come.

On the other hand, he firmly believed that the Cherokee nation would slowly but surely come to a point of extinction were it to stay and possibly assimilate in the state of Georgia. Throughout the speech to the Congress, Jackson's speech mainly focuses on portraying three primary points scattered within the entire message:

1. Native Americans as savages

Ex: “[...] It will place a dense and civilized population in large tracts of country now occupied by a few savage hunters. ³⁹[...] And is it supposed that the wandering savage has a stronger attachment to his home than the settled, civilized Christian?”⁴⁰

2. White men as civilized

Ex: “Philanthropy could not wish to see this continent restored to the condition in which it was found by our forefathers. What good man would prefer a country covered with forests and ranged by a few thousand savages to our extensive republic, studded with cities, towns, and prosperous farms, embellished with all the improvements which art can devise or industry execute, occupied by more than 12,000,000 happy people, and filled with all the blessings of liberty, civilization, and religion?”⁴¹

3. Civilization doing a favour to the savages

³⁸ Brands, *Andrew Jackson*, ch. 38, par. 47.29-32, ePub.

³⁹ Podell et al., *Speeches*, 105.

⁴⁰ Podell et al., *Speeches*, 107.

⁴¹ Podell et al., *Speeches*, 106.

Ex: “The consequences of a speedy removal will be important to the United States, to individual states, and to the Indians themselves. [...] It will separate the Indians from immediate contact with settlements of whites; free them from the power of the states; enable them to pursue happiness in their own way. [...] but as a government we have as little right to control them as we have to prescribe laws for other nations.”⁴²

Albeit masked as good intentions, it is clear that Jackson didn't have much sympathy for the original inhabitants of the New World. In the last comment (we have as little right...) he contradicts himself one year later when he declined to uphold the above mentioned sovereignty of the Cherokee Nation in the state of Georgia. Whether D.Trump views illegal immigrants the same way Jackson viewed the Native Americans and their definitive removal from the country is definitely up for a discussion. Trump's orator abilities seemed to be strikingly similar to the ones of Andrew as Brands describes Jackson's style of speech as follows:

He was not then or ever afterward what is commonly termed an orator. But he was a fluent, forceful and convincing speaker. [...] His voice, though strong and penetrating, was untrained. He had no idea of modulation, but let his inflections follow his feelings, naturally, as he went along. His gesticulation was even less trained and artful than his voice. About the only gestures he knew were the raising of both hands above his head to indicate reverence or veneration; the spreading of both arms wide out to indicate deprecation; and the fierce pointing of his long, gaunt forefinger straight forward, like a pistol, to indicate decision, dogmatism or defiance. And candor compels me to say that he used that forefinger more than any other limb or member in his gesticulation. His vocabulary was copious and he never stood at a loss for a word to express his sense. When perfectly calm or not roused by anything that appealed to his feelings rather than to his judgment, he spoke slowly, carefully and in well-selected phrase. But when excited or angry he would pour forth a torrent of rugged sentences more remarkable for their intent to beat down opposition than for their strict attention to the rules of rhetoric or even

⁴² Podell et al., *Speeches*, 105.

syntax. But in all situations and mental conditions his diction was clear and his purpose unmistakable.⁴³

The general public consensus seems to be that Donald Trump is not a very good orator either. His often jumps from topic to topic and his style of speech is often blunt, rough around the edges and incomprehensible at times. And just as Jackson—who would “pour forth a torrent of rugged sentences”—his language might feel forceful or aggressive, especially in situations where he is provoked by his opponent. When that happens, he tries to find any openings to refute the argument turning the debate and dragging his opponent with him into a boxing match of verbal jabs woven through his opponent’s words:

T: And Hillary, I'll just ask you this -- you've been doing this for thirty years. Why are you just thinking about these solutions right now? For thirty years, you've been doing it. And now you're just starting to think of solutions.

H: Well actually --

T: Excuse me. I will bring back jobs. You can't bring back jobs.

H: Well, actually, I have thought about this quite a bit.

T: Yeah for thirty years.

H: Well, not quite that long. I think my husband did a pretty good job in the 1990s. I think a lot about what worked and how we can make it work again.

T: Well, he approved NAFTA. He approved NAFTA, which is the single worst trade deal ever approved in this country.

H: ...a balanced budget, and incomes went up for everybody. Manufacturing jobs went up also in the 1990s, if we're actually going to look at the facts.⁴⁴

Just as Jackson extensively used his forefinger, it is clear to say without any doubt, that D. Trump taken this gesture into another level. His iconic thumb touching with the tip of the forefinger making an “okay” hand sign is undoubtedly one of his most widely used gesticulations.

⁴³ Brands, *Andrew Jackson*, ch. 6, par. 12.41-43, ePub.

⁴⁴ Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump, First Presidential Debate—September 26, 2016, Appendix E, page

Trump's style of speech is characterized by short sentences plus words combined with phrases that are reiterated many times: "But I know the negotiators in the world, and I put them one for each country. Believe me, folks. We will do very, very well, very, very well."⁴⁵ This may be a deliberate choice because Trump wants to be understood by everybody and he has often mentioned his stance on political correctness which has a tendency to make sentences longer and more complicated: "Here is the problem with political correctness, takes too long. We don't have time."⁴⁶ H.Clinton's sentences and vocabulary, on the other hand, are longer and richer in meaning. Williams comments on this matter, saying that being direct and communicating through straight talk is something that appeals to the working-class. That's why Trump's rhetorics which are promising to end the political correctness and return to the era where working-class men had dignity, stable job and weren't ostracized by numerous elements of modern era found their fertile ground.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Donald Trump, Donald Trump's acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention—July 21, 2016, Appendix C, page 75

⁴⁶ Donald Trump, "Donald Trump on political correctness", YouTube, last modified January 3, 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5DoPeuOU9mg>

⁴⁷ What So Many People Don't Get About the U.S. Working Class, Harvard Business Review, last modified November 10, 2016, <https://hbr.org/2016/11/what-so-many-people-dont-get-about-the-u-s-working-class?referral=00134>

2. Introduction to Rhetorics

A speech of passionate eloquence and masterful use of language is “one of the oldest and most powerful weapons in the armoury of professional politicians”⁴⁸. That much has been proven by many political figures throughout the ages of human history. Atkinson remarks that even though it is extremely difficult to master even a small portion of the whole rhetorical craft, the ability to see and recognize a good orator may be done by virtually anyone. Even when listening to speeches of unknown languages to us or conflicting ideas doesn’t bar us from seeing and recognizing the speaker's abilities to captivate the minds of many.⁴⁹ This chapter will focus on the usage of figurative language in politics, primarily through the use of conceptual metaphors as one of its many literary devices.

2.1. Figurative Language

Charteris-Black addresses one of the commonly known issues that has been plaguing political rhetoric since its creation. To what extent can the speakers be trusted when it is known that many employ professional speech-writers and other kinds of advisers to either practice their rhetorics or outright compose speeches for them? How can we know that their words are true to their beliefs or are they merely swayed by manipulation? And even though politicians have always relied on the external help, the rise of world connectedness through various media has only intensified its occurrence. Even if that is true, the speech-writer still has to construct and shape the speech to comply with the speaker’s image and expected appearance. Otherwise he’s risking failure by not being consistent with the speaker's image.⁵⁰

Charteris-Black puts a big emphasis on personification of America to evoke more personal feelings which would otherwise be hard with abstract political terms. He elaborates on this that even better strategy while personifying America as a person is to gradually add personal pronouns like “I”, “we”. For example, G.W.Bush addressing the American public post September 11th attacks: “And all nations should know: America will do what is necessary to ensure our nation’s security. We’ll be deliberate, yet time is not on our side. I will not wait on events, while dangers gather.”⁵¹ This makes a potent strategy for any speaking willing to speak a

⁴⁸ Max Atkinson, *Our Master’s Voices* (New York: Methuen & Co., 1984), 1.

⁴⁹ Atkinson, *Our Master’s Voices*, 6.

⁵⁰ Jonathan Charteris-Black, *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 5-6.

⁵¹ Charteris-Black, *Politicians and Rhetoric*, 257.

good word-of-mouth about his country to further intensify the desired effect of empathy and patriotism for your own country.

Another common rhetorical strategy explained by Charteris-Black explains a highly effective method of compressing extensive ideas into a small package. These are so called “sound bites” with the potential to become viral when recycled through media for their attribute of being highly quotable and memorable. Something that can be expressed through one sentence instead of a full paragraph is a highly valuable and effective communication device. Here are some of the examples:

“Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few”
(Winston Churchill, House of Commons 1940)

“Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.” (Ronald Reagan, Berlin, 1987)

“We need to build a wall” (Donald Trump, U.S. presidential primaries, 2016)

Even though those last two examples are literally polar opposites (building or tearing down the wall) the semantics might differ a bit. Where R. Reagan’s tearing down the wall calls for an end of the Cold War and the reunification of Germany, D.Trump’s building of a wall might not necessarily mean the opposite, which would be the start of a war and division of the whole country in half. His meaning is most likely in the same sense of ancient Chinese building The Great Wall of China against unwanted Mongolian marauders. Just replace Chinese for American and Mongolian for Mexican. At the same time, some may disagree that his wall rhetoric is already dividing America, albeit not on a physical but rather an intellectual level between the citizens themselves.

2.2. Conceptual Metaphor

Many authors think of Aristotle as the first philosopher who studied and elaborated on the understanding of metaphors. Punter shows how Aristotle thought of metaphor—to master its usage is a sign of genius as it cannot be learned from others. It is an ability where you need to have a keen sense of sensing “similarity in dissimilars”⁵². Aristotle did not consider metaphors to be a part of rhetoric and logic, for he didn’t regard them as a critical part for a language to properly function. For him, their main function was to beautify and decorate the language,

⁵² David Punter, *Metaphor: The New Critical Idiom* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 11

primarily in poems.⁵³ Lastly, according to Punter, Aristotle defined metaphor as “giving the thing a name that belongs to something else”⁵⁴. English author of fantasy novels—Terry Pratchett—wasn’t very far off in his somewhat satirical explanation of metaphor in his book “Guards! Guards! “Sgt. Colon said we have gone Up in the World and has told Nobby not to try to sell the furnishings. Going Up in the World is a metaphor, which I am learning about, it is like Lying but more decorative.”⁵⁵

Charteris-Black gives his take on metaphor by highlighting the literal meaning of a word, known as the “source domain”, the common-sense of a word. When this common-sense shifts into a different use of a word, it is afterwards known as “target domain” of the metaphor. Basically, giving word a new sense by shifting its meaning. This shift in meaning is one of the reasons for using metaphors—to provoke a bigger emotional response which we could not have done with the original “source domain”. Charteris further explains that the only way to recognize metaphor is from discourse knowledge—Ability to recognize them is based on our knowledge of language itself. If we know the common meaning of a word—the “source domain”—and see it is not being used that way, we know it’s a metaphor. Vice versa, a speaker may see a metaphor without even realizing it because he doesn’t recognize it was originally a metaphor in the first place.⁵⁶ For example, the “web” in “world wide web”, because of its rampant usage, one may associate it with the internet rather than with a spider. Another could be deadline, where the original meaning was a line around a prison boundary that wasn’t meant to be crossed unless the prisoner wanted to be shot. Nowadays everyone understands it as when a work is due.⁵⁷ Punter describes these so called “dead metaphors” as follows: “A metaphor which has been used so often that it barely stands out as a metaphor at all and has descended to the level of cliché. Typical of much political language.”⁵⁸ Charteris also mentions that the primary reason for metaphors in politics is to skew the viewpoint of the audience by phasing out other points of view. It is especially useful when trying to present their opponent in a bad light and themselves in a good light.⁵⁹

⁵³ Punter, *Metaphor*, 11-12

⁵⁴ Punter, *Metaphor*, 12

⁵⁵ Terry Pratchett, *Guards! Guards!* (London: HarperCollins, 2007), 153

⁵⁶ Charteris-Black, *Politicians and Rhetoric*, 31-32

⁵⁷ Examples of Dead Metaphors, YourDictionary, last modified August 5, 2019, <https://examples.yourdictionary.com/reference/examples/examples-of-dead-metaphors.html>

⁵⁸ Punter, *Metaphor*, 146.

⁵⁹ Charteris-Black, *Politicians and Rhetoric*, 32.

2.3. Argument is War

A heated argument between two speakers where either side tries to get the upper hand stands at the tip of political rhetoric and just as Lakoff and Johnson suggests, there is a conceptual metaphor that “ARGUMENT IS WAR.”⁶⁰ To be precise, they are two different things from the standpoint of verbal and armed conflict but the argument is “partially structured, understood, performed, and talked about in terms of WAR.”⁶¹ Charteris-Black on a related note comments that politics is a conflict based on the fact how the result is announced by the language of war, be it victory, draw or defeat. Both sides of conflict possess a finite amount of resources they have to allocate. When in a war a supply of fresh troops is lifeblood to any general, the use of language is the lifeblood of any speaker in politics.⁶² Musolff also mentions the concept political conflict as war by the following example spoken by the former British Prime Minister, James Cameron: “This is going to be a long, tough fight. And frankly sometimes you have to be ready to lose a battle in order to win a war (The DailyTelegraph, 27 June 2014).” Metaphors of fight and war used in this context helps readers to delve deeper and think more about the topic presented to them via visualizing the war as some kind of struggle and which they consequently carry over to the topic of politics.⁶³

Some examples:

- I riposted sharply against her argument.
- She counter-attacked with a sound rebuttal.
- I lost the debate.

Lakoff and Johnson remarked that not only we can talk about argument using the fight and war metaphors, we can literally lose or become victorious in them. We can either attack or defend against our opponent and gain an advantage or lose it just like on a battlefield. If our rhetorical tactic proves to be unsuccessful, we may alter it or switch the strategy entirely to try to gain an upper ground. It is a battle not on a physical, but a verbal level.⁶⁴ The authors further emphasize the fact that the thing which makes us different from animals that fight for either territory, food or

⁶⁰ George Lakoff, Mark Johnson, *Metaphors we live by*, (London: The University of Chicago press), 5.

⁶¹ Lakoff et al., *Metaphors we live by*, 6.

⁶² Charteris-Black, *Politicians and Rhetoric*, 3-4.

⁶³ Andreas Musolff, *Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and scenarios* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016), 7.

⁶⁴ Lakoff et al., *Metaphors we live by*, 5.

sex is how we refined techniques which would minimize the amount of physical danger and chances of getting hurt or maimed in consequence. By being “rational animals” instead, we have developed our craft of fighting an argument through brains, not brawns. The interesting part is that these battles fought by words can have the same implications as physical fight. Even in arguments we can lose ground, gain an advantage, attack or defend, counter-attack, etc.

Lakoff and Johnson divide the above-mentioned tactics into two categories, the first being “irrational arguments” such as intimidation, insult, challenging authority, threat, evading the issue, bargaining and flatter. The second being “rational arguments” that should draw logical conclusion, bring sound arguments supported by evidence and not being swayed by emotions like in the first case. Their examples would therefore be more present in the higher works of academic world and diplomacy.⁶⁵

2.4. Nation as Family

Being a part of a family is generally recognised as a positive outcome. There is no doubt that family metaphors are widely and successfully used by leaders when they intend to bond and bring the group or nation together as one. In the same scenario where parents are there to provide nurture, care and protection to their offspring, it is the country leaders who provide the same for their citizens.

Musolff mentions Lakoff and his view on American model of NATION AS FAMILY metaphor that runs on two primary versions, the “Strict Father” and “Nurturant Parent” models of a family which are based upon man and woman models. The first case of “Strict Father” is based on old Western traditions that go as far back as ancient Rome—where fathers were strict leaders in mostly patriarchal societies—and therefore had an advantage in having more time to develop over the “Nurturant Parent” model which has more liberal attitude. The “Strict Father” model is based on a “nuclear family” where father has the most responsibility and the last word in deciding what’s best for the family. The rules are strict and absolute in order to obtain appropriate child behaviour. On the contrary, the “Nurturant Parent” model of a family shares responsibility distributed evenly among all of its members. The rules are not as strict and children are taught of being self-reliant and disciplined through being loved and cared for.⁶⁶ Although Lakoff doesn’t

⁶⁵ Lakoff et al., *Metaphors we live by*, 62-64.

⁶⁶ Musolff, *Political Metaphor Analysis*, 26-29.

say it directly, according to Ahrens, the “Nurturant Parent” model is used mainly by The Democrats and the main metaphor for this model is “MORALITY IS NURTURANCE” and “MORALITY IS EMPATHY”. On the other side, the Republicans use the “Strict Father” model with the main metaphor of MORALITY IS STRENGTH and MORALITY IS AUTHORITY. Ahrens mentions how these two models hold different values and respect towards women in politics. In the “Strict Father” model, men hold moral authority over women but in the “Nurturant Parent” model, both men and women are on equal footing. Doesn’t necessarily mean that there aren’t any women leaders on the Republicans side, just the fact that the Democrats have more of them.⁶⁷

This image of authoritarian father versus protective mother may be quite apparent when you compare the rhetoric of both D. Trump and Hillary Clinton. Where H. Clinton's common rhetoric focuses on the ability that she with everyone else together can make changes, D. Trump often emphasizes how he alone is the one who can fix things as that’s exactly what he said after his nomination to be Republican Party nominee for president: “Nobody knows the system better than *me* [puts affiliative smile towards the audience, then shrugs]. Which is why, *I alone* can fix it. [spreads hands with palms open towards the audience].”⁶⁸

On a matter of STATE IS FAMILY metaphor, Lakoff mentions its usage through time as in calling the American leaders of Thirteen Colonies Founding Fathers and George Washington “the father of his country” for being the head of a state that had been just recently created. He mentions how American soldiers were called “sons” whenever they went into a war, how the U.S. government holds a nickname “Uncle Sam” or George Orwell’s authoritarian government of “Big Brother”.⁶⁹

2.5. Other Metaphors

One of the most widely used metaphors everyone uses on a daily basis are orientational/spatial metaphors since they are based on our “physical and cultural experience”. Lakoff and Johnson describes how most of these have a relation with our spatial awareness that is linked to our bodies. These would include up, down, forward or behind where up and forward are mostly

⁶⁷ Kathleen Ahrens, *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors* (London:Palgrave Macmillian, 2009), 63-64.

⁶⁸ Donald Trump, Donald Trump’s acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention—July 21, 2016, Appendix C, page 85

⁶⁹ George Lakoff, *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think* (University of Chicago Press, 2016), 153.

considered as a good things and down or behind bad things. UP IS GOOD and DOWN IS BAD kinds of metaphors are usually the prevalent themes in western culture. For example: “He has a lofty position. She'll rise to the top. He's at the peak of his career. He's climbing the ladder. Things are looking up. We hit a peak last year, but it's been downhill ever since.”⁷⁰

These fundamental concepts that we use on a daily-basis that usually contain one or more spatial metaphors. It is these kinds of metaphors that are widely used without anyone giving it a second thought since they are so ingrained in our daily speech.

Another highly concentrated one is a journey metaphor, Charteris-Black mentions their origin in the biblical tales of “good and evil paths”⁷¹ where God serves as a guide. Lakoff and Johnson’s metaphor of “LOVE IS A JOURNEY” and later on a new conception of “LIFE IS A JOURNEY” is put into perspective as well. Charteris-Black sees journey as a large supply of source domain for metaphors because of the simple pattern which includes the start and end of a path with people or entities walking on them. Additional elements like gate, guide or bridge can therefore be added to intensify the end result. You can also express both negative and positive experiences via using the journey metaphors such as meeting a “dead end” or “making friends” along the road. Ahrens also mentions that the journey metaphor is widely used and very much productive to highlight positive policies, since the end goals are usually seen as something attractive and not the other way around.⁷² Some examples what could function as a source domain for journey metaphor: road, path, obstacle, step, move or street.

Then there are container metaphors which express the ability of storing or filling something inside of that container or simply walking/putting something out/in of it. As Lakoff and Johnson puts it, almost anything is a container, including our own bodies or other intangible objects like a mind or linguistic expression. More common though are tangible objects like buildings, rooms or anything with mapped borders since no human instinct is as prevalent as the territorial one. Even a field of view of our eyes can be a container due to the fact that the borders are defined by roughly one hundred and twenty degrees arc of vision. Anything coming into that

⁷⁰ Lakoff et al., *Metaphors we live by*, 17

⁷¹ Charteris-Black, *Politicians and Rhetoric*, 66.

⁷² Ahrens, *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors*, 20

line of sight is therefore entering a certain “physical space” fulfilling the visual fields are containers concept.⁷³

They provide a few examples:

“The ship is *coming into* view.”

“I *have* him *in* sight.”

“That's *in the center* of my field of vision. There's *nothing in* sight.”⁷⁴

⁷³ Lakoff et al., *Metaphors we live by*, 30-31

⁷⁴ Lakoff et al., *Metaphors we live by*, 31

3. America Divided - The Politics of Donald J. Trump and Hillary D. R. Clinton

3.1. The Conservative Anti-Establishment Political Revolt of Donald. J. Trump

Since the Republican Party presidential primaries, D.Trump has made one thing clear. He's not a politician, he doesn't talk like one, he doesn't behave like one and his brash personality mixed with narcissistic confidence it's one of the things that gave him the upper hand in gaining a lot of media attention. Him breaking all the rules what an aspiring presidential candidate should do to to gain sympathies was the right concoction of cockiness, tenacity, and strength. His unconventional style gave him an edge over his other Republican candidates who didn't take him all that much seriously. For them, he was the Hollywood-like businessman, con artist and political pretender. Many times, he entered a flurry of shots with either hosts and hostesses or his opponents that included name-calling or ad hominem, coming from both sides. Or when he said a highly controversial comment which was met with strong critique because of the implications that Mexican people are inferior to American people on the very same day he announced he would be officially running for president of the United States:

“When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you [points towards the audience with an open hand]. They're not sending you [points towards the audience again, now with the index finder]. They're sending people that have lots of problems. And they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume are good people.”⁷⁵

After many similar and heated moments, his advisors urged and recommended him to apologize for his words but trump was adamant and instead of falling to the public pressure, he doubled down and stayed true to his character. Proving to be relentless and not showing weakness, combined with his rhetorics about secure borders, international trade, job opportunities and breaking the ingrained political establishment, secured him the place of Republican presidential nominee.

After absolutely crushing Republican primaries and getting more than triple of Bound delegates than the second place Ted Cruz, he kick-started his political campaign for presidency

⁷⁵ Donald Trump, Presidential Announcement Speech—June 16, 2015, Appendix B, page 70

even further. His notoriety received major upswing, especially after his distaste for political correctness and focusing on big issues like immigration, job outsourcing or America's international trade deals which he deemed to be inadequate and unfair to his own country. D.Trump's verbal presentation leaves much to be desired; he often repeats words or phrases after each other and compared to his opponent, Hillary Clinton, he had almost zero experience in running in politics. At first, he wasn't really taken seriously by political analysts, some still thinking of him running as a joke. To some, that continued to hold up until the very last moment of elections and proved fatal considering he actually managed to win. Many media outlets projected reports of Trump winning the elections with a very low probability of success and often criticized his agenda together with popular late-night shows hosted by the likes of John Oliver, Stephen Colbert or Jimmy Kimmel. His dispute with media popularized the term "Fake News", mainly because some of the media outlets seemed to prioritize pushing their own agenda rather than following journalistic ethics. This is not a new trend since the American distrust in media has been steadily rising for a few decades already as shown by the Gallup research conducted in 2012 showing that 60% of Americans expressed that "they have little or no trust in the mass media to report the news fully, accurately, and fairly."⁷⁶

Even though Barack Obama was the first president which started to utilize the ever-growing power of the word spoken through social media, it was his successor, Donald J. Trump who managed to tap its power to form a completely new kind of rhetoric. In the days of early America, it was the word of mouth, the mail, then the telegraph, telephone, radio and television and lastly computer networks and the internet. McLuhan's concept of two types of media, namely media "hot and cold", could very well be applied to social media the likes of Twitter. His definition of hot media is the one where participation from audience is low but its quality is in "high definition" where "high definition is the state of being well filled with data"⁷⁷. For instance, someone's photograph would be considered a hot medium whereas a crude painting of the same person would be a cold one. On the contrary, cold media such as dialogue, a seminar or a phone call are rich in participation but they lack the "high definition" of a hot media because more information has to be filled in by the audience. By the same principle, a lecture or a movie

⁷⁶ "U.S. Distrust in Media Hits New High",Gallup, last modified September 21, 2012, <https://news.gallup.com/poll/157589/distrust-media-hits-new-high.aspx>.

⁷⁷ Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of a Man* (New York: The New American Library, 1964), 36.

would be considered hot media for their rich content but low if not non-existent participation from its listener/watcher.⁷⁸ Unlike traditional media where the watcher/listener is only supposed to absorb whatever is being thrown at him, Twitter allows communication between the author and other users. This combined with the fact, that the messages themselves have character limitation of 140 words, makes Twitter useful for a snappy comments that focus more on brevity than the “high definition” hot media of more elaborated messages you would find elsewhere. Considering that one of D.Trump’s appeals is the ability to speak his own mind without being obstructed by the lengthy and ambiguous meanings and the barricades of political correctness, it is no wonder that Twitter is the perfect platform for his rhetorics.

Cheered for or found repulsive by many, no presidential campaign slogan in recent American history has made more ruckus than Donald Trump’s “Make America Great Again”, shortly abbreviated as MAGA. As a matter of fact it wasn’t the first this it was used in a political campaign. It was Ronald Reagan and some others like Bill Clinton who used comparable version of “Let’s Make America Great Again” in his campaign⁷⁹. It fulfills the rule-of-three or rather the three-part list which, according to Atkinson, is a great way to add “an air of unity or completeness”⁸⁰ and makes the message formulated as three-part list “much more likely to be noticed and remembered than messages formulated in other ways.”⁸¹ Furthermore, as explained by Atkinson, it’s a message that allows people to draw their own conclusions using their own reasoning, rather than saying something directly. If an audience feels like somebody is oversimplifying any kind of message directed to them, they might lose interest or become offended.⁸² For example, JFK’s famous “Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country”⁸³ has much more profound meaning and better impact with the audience than if he had said something along the way of “Stop being dependent on your government and start working on making yourself a better citizen for the public good”.

⁷⁸ McLuhan, *Understanding Media*, 36-37.

⁷⁹ “Who Was the First Politician to Use “Make America Great Again” Anyway?”, Town&Country, last modified November 14, 2018, <https://www.townandcountrymag.com/society/politics/a25053571/donald-trump-make-america-great-again-slogan-origin/>

⁸⁰ Atkinson, *Our Master’s Voices*, 57.

⁸¹ Atkinson, *Our Master’s Voices*, 162.

⁸² Atkinson, *Our Master’s Voices*, 161.

⁸³ John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Inaugural Address, Washington, D.C, 1961

“Make America Great Again” might be paraphrased by someone as “America used to be great, but it’s not anymore, let’s change that.”

According to McMillian, Trump is claiming that “America is no longer great and that there was a ‘time before the fall’ when it held this status.”⁸⁴ He mentions how this became the cornerstone of Trump’s campaign by highlighting the fall of American exceptionalism. In consequence, Trump’s campaign became more of a “collective movement”⁸⁵ where he in rare moments recognized that it’s not only about him.⁸⁶ One of those moments might be his interview with Oprah Winfrey on Oprah Show way back in 1988 where he criticizes America’s poor tariff and free-trade policy and allowing countries like Japan or Kuwait to “live like kings” without giving anything back in return because America makes it possible. When asked if he would run for presidency, he gives the following reply:

"I just probably would not do it, Oprah. I probably would not, but I do get tired of seeing what is happening with this country, and if it got so bad, I would never want to rule it out totally, because I really am tired of seeing what's happening with this country, how we're really making other people live like kings, and we are not."⁸⁷

Then again, many people might outright disagree with this statement. For some, it might remind them of the days of racial segregation, unequal rights or outright poverty. Former US president Bill Clinton even commented on this matter by saying that “I’m actually old enough to remember the good old days, and they weren’t all that good in many ways”⁸⁸ at the rally in Orlando in 2016. This kind of message truly resonates with people who really feel nostalgic about the “good old days” or even, in the case of younger demographics, the days that had ended before they were even born. Hillary Clinton acknowledged this fact herself during the CBS’s Sunday Morning

⁸⁴ Chris McMillian, “*MakeAmericaGreatAgain: ideological fantasy American exceptionalism and Donald Trump*”, *Subjectivity* 10, no.2 (July 2017): 15

⁸⁵ McMillian, “*MakeAmericaGreatAgain*,” 15

⁸⁶ McMillian, “*MakeAmericaGreatAgain*,” 15-16

⁸⁷ Donald Trump, “Donald Trump Teases a President Bid During a 1988 Oprah Show”, posted June 26, 2015, YouTube video, 3:09, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SEPs17_AkTI

⁸⁸ Bill Clinton, HuffPost, “Speech at Orlando rally” (2016), https://www.huffpost.com/entry/bill-clinton-says-make-america-great-again-is-just-a-racist-dog-whistle_n_5b2a678ae4b0697eecbf66f3

interview: “He was quite successful in referencing a nostalgia that would give hope, comfort, settle grievances for millions of people who were upset about gains that were made by others.”⁸⁹

3.2. The Liberal Countermeasure of Hillary R. Clinton

Hillary Rodham Clinton has been profusely active in politics for many years. Starting out as the first lady to president Bill Clinton, then becoming a senator for New York, running for president in 2008 and eventually becoming secretary of state under President Obama. She was a textbook democrat to become presidential nominee for the 2016 elections. Compared to Donald Trump, her eloquent rhetorics combined with her professional and calm composure made her a threat to be reckoned with on the political arena for presidency. H. Clinton’s rhetorics often criticized and blamed Trump for creating division amidst American people for calling immigrants in America “illegal aliens”, securing the borders against them via building wall and for being a magnet to hateful groups people who idealize sexism, racism, xenophobia and other forms of discrimination. H. Clinton’s rhetoric on the other hand were apparently focused on bringing communities together and making everybody work hard for the well-being of everyone.

The story of American values between those representing public communal good on one side and the undeniable freedom of opportunities for an individual on the other side seem to have coexisting together since the first European settlers set foot on the beaches of the New World. In his essay, Chafe explains how these two “overriding paradigms” have always been in conflict throughout the various political and social upheavals in America. He describes that “the first imagines America as a community that places the good of the whole first”⁹⁰ while “the second envisions the country as a gathering of individuals who prize individual freedom and value more than anything else each person’s ability to determine his own fate.”⁹¹ Through American history, these two visions have often clashed and raced with each other in order to gain an upper hand. There are numerous events and ideas that helped to shape both of these ideas into something that represents America today. Chafe mentions some of those: The idea of “Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness” for every man, woman and child through the Declaration of Independence; the Civil War where slavery was contradictory to that very idea of liberty; the Great Depression

⁸⁹ Hillary Clinton, CBS news, “Hillary Clinton on why she lost and ‘the most important’ mistake she made”, last modified September 10, 2017

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/hillary-clinton-what-happened-sunday-morning-jane-pauley/>

⁹⁰ William H. Chafe, “The American Narrative: Is There One & What Is It?”, *Daedalus*, Vol. 141(1), 2012, 11.

⁹¹ Chafe, “The American Narrative”, 11.

and World War 2 that brought socialist policies in the form of the New Deal where idea of collectivism stayed dominant rather than individualism; the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 60s and the consequent conservative resurgence of Ronald Reagan.⁹²

Chafe continues to suggest that in recent years, “the tension between the two narratives has escalated to an alarming degree⁹³” and to the public eye, it may seem the tension during the 2016 presidential elections was even greater. Both candidates and their voters showed unhealthy hostility against each other that was unprecedented in prior elections. If things are taken to the extreme, both sides had their loud vocal minority to exacerbate conflict even further. The clash of far-right groups that advocate homogenous heterosexual nationalistic monoculturalistic society versus those of far-left that are for the destruction of traditional nuclear family, LGBT rights and multiculturalism. It is visibly apparent that H. Clinton stands with the mentioned paradigm of a community that places the good of the whole first judging from her selection of policies and rhetoric used during her run for presidency.

Consequently, Hillary Clinton’s campaign slogan “I am with Her” might be paraphrased as “I am voting for the first female US president” as using the pronoun “him”, had there been a choice between two male candidates, would certainly cause confusion and the overall message would be dubious at best. Her second campaign slogan “Stronger Together”, which seems to refer to the above mentioned public communal good in Chafe’s essay, was referenced in her 2016 Democratic National Convention:

“We all know the story. But we usually focus on how it turned out - and not enough on how close that story came to never being written at all. When representatives from 13 unruly colonies met just down the road from here, some wanted to stick with the King. Some wanted to stick it to the king, and go their own way. The revolution hung in the balance. Then somehow they began listening to each other ... compromising ... finding common purpose. And by the time they left Philadelphia, they had begun to see themselves as one nation. That's what made it possible to stand up to a King. That took courage. They had courage. Our Founders embraced the enduring truth that we are stronger together.”⁹⁴

⁹² Chafe, “The American Narrative”, 12-15

⁹³ Chafe, “The American Narrative”, 17

⁹⁴ Hillary Clinton, Hillary Clinton's Democratic convention speech—July 28, 2016, Appendix A, page 57

Not precisely a callback on nostalgia, although it may bear a certain connection to the fact that there seems to be a fissure between democrats and republicans that has only been growing larger and larger and the two parties, instead of finding a common ground, find it harder and harder to find a solution or compromise to common issues.⁹⁵ When a common foe or adversity isn't shared, whether it be the redcoats under George III or the Reds under Brezhnev, it's going to leave its mark on degrading the internal discourse. Other than that, she may have been referencing to the American public and its racial and economic issues that culminated in the form of "Black Lives Matter" or "Occupy Wall Street" protests that have been causing rifts all over the country.

Simmons describes the very moment of shock when the unthinkable happened in her essay, commenting on the division of American public and society which is the greatest since the Civil War. The author herself, who has roots in the rural west of Oregon, explains the effects of a shockwave from 2016 presidential election results that blazed across new home of New Jersey. "Some expressed fear, contempt, anger or even hatefulness towards what happened"⁹⁶. When she tried to explain the situation saying how "she gets it" considering "life back there isn't worth much"⁹⁷ she was only met with perplexed faces and confusion.

The author suggests that the working class doesn't have to necessarily bear grudges against the rich entrepreneurs the likes of Donald Trump. Quite the contrary. Sometimes, they respect the fact that someone is able to work hard and become rich or even look up to them as role models to stand as a reminder that if you have got guts and perseverance you can be someone. "If there is someone the working class hates, it is the managers, doctors, lawyers, teachers and other 'intellectuals' that often do not think much of them"⁹⁸ and that's exactly the impression of H.Clinton's some people took to their hearts⁹⁹. Simmons mentions what Joan Williams wrote about H.Clinton in Harvard Business Review:

"She symbolises arrogance and egoism of elite circles. Just the fact that she criticizes Trump for being unfit for the post of presidency or how she labels his

⁹⁵ "This is why Republicans and Democrats aren't talking to each other in Washington", CNN, last modified January 8, 2019, <https://edition.cnn.com/2019/01/08/politics/republicans-democrats-divide-party-demographics-districts/index.html>

⁹⁶ Diane Simmons, "Světoběžnice z oregonské pouště", *Host*, Vol. 6, 2018, my translation, 74.

⁹⁷ Simmons, *Světoběžnice*, my translation, 74.

⁹⁸ Simmons, *Světoběžnice*, my translation, 74.

⁹⁹ Simmons, *Světoběžnice*, my translation, 72-74.

voters as racist, sexist, homophobic or xenophobic. It is hard to believe that someone like her might find empathy for the average worker.”¹⁰⁰

This was a reference to H. Clinton and her “basket of deplorables” speech delivered on September 9, 2016 during her campaign. Huge political overstep, where she alienated half of supposed Trump voters, giving her opponent ammunition to use against her. She regretted making those comments in her post-election memoirs book “What Happened”:

“Generalizing about a broad group of people is almost always unwise. And I regret handing Trump a political gift with my ‘deplorables’ comment. I know that a lot of well-intentioned people were insulted because they misunderstood me to be criticizing all Trump voters. I’m sorry about that.”¹⁰¹

On her defense, she elaborates that she was only talking about a reality based on research supervised by General Social Society by the University of Chicago; showing that white Republicans held much more different attitude towards black people in terms of poverty, intelligence or willpower than white Democrats did. Or the matter that plenty of people overlooked the fact that D. Trump “bragged about sexual assault, attacked a federal judge for being Mexican and grieving Gold Star parents who were Muslim, and has a long and well-documented history of racial discrimination in his businesses”¹⁰² (this most likely refers to Trump’s racial discrimination policies in the rental of apartments back in the 70s)¹⁰³. She never meant to generalize anyone, but it seems that plentiful of Trump supporters simply hold views and alignments that she simply finds nothing else than—deplorable.¹⁰⁴ Trump used this so-called political gift on Tuesday, September 26, 2016 at the second presidential debate. When asked whether he could be a devoted president to all the people in the United States, he replied “Absolutely. I mean, she calls our people deplorable, a large group, and irredeemable. I will be a president for all of our people.”¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁰ Simmons, *Světoběžnice*, my translation, 74.

¹⁰¹ Hillary Rodham Clinton, *What Happened* (New York: Simon & Schuster 2017), ch. Why, paragraph 58.85.

¹⁰² Clinton, *What Happened*, ch. Why, paragraph 58.86.

¹⁰³ “FBI releases files on Trump apartments’ race discrimination probe in ‘70s”, Politico, last modified February 15, 2017, <https://www.politico.com/blogs/under-the-radar/2017/02/trump-fbi-files-discrimination-case-235067>

¹⁰⁴ Clinton, *What Happened*, ch. Why, paragraph 58.84-86.

¹⁰⁵ Donald Trump, Second Presidential Debate—September 26, 2016, <http://www.astrid-online.it/static/upload/tran/transcript-of-the-second-presidential-debate.pdf>

4. Corpus Analysis of Speeches from Donald J. Trump and Hillary D. Clinton Throughout the 2016 US Presidential Election

Analysis of some of the candidate's rhetoric will be extracted from the following corpus of speeches:

1. Hillary Clinton's Democratic convention speech—July 28, 2016
2. Donald Trump's Presidential Announcement Speech—June 16, 2015
3. Donald Trump's acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention—July 21, 2016
4. Hillary Clinton's Campaign Launch Speech—June 13, 2015
5. First Presidential Debate—September 26, 2016

These, apart from the first presidential debate, were picked for the reason of their thorough preparation which was undoubtedly met with some external help. Still, as it was mentioned before, even the speech-writer still has to produce the kind of rhetoric that suits the speaker's image and expected appearance.

The “T” and “H” letters will be used to mark Trump's or Hillary's speeches respectively (Hillary Clinton's first name will take precedence since that's how she is usually called in the political world to avoid any ambiguity with her husband Bill Clinton). Next to those letters, there will be A/B/C/D/E letter in parentheses accompanied with a specific number in order to identify from which appendix and document page the citation has been taken. For example, T(B72) refers to the quotation of Donald Trump, appendix B, page 72,

The identified Conceptual metaphors will be visibly differentiated by capitalization of all letters and BOOKMAN OLD STYLE font.

4.1. War Metaphors

T(B70): “Our country is in serious trouble. We don't have *victories* anymore. We used to have *victories*, but we don't have them. When was the last time anybody saw us *beating*, let's say, China in a trade deal? They *kill* us. I *beat* China all the time. All the time.

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

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

Donald Trump is applying the "Strict Father" model running on "MORALITY IS STRENGTH" metaphor, asserting himself to be the strong single leader who clearly knows what is best for the family (America). This single statement is packed with multiple war rhetorics combined with the personification of America, China and Japan with the repeated "we" pronoun in order to reach higher emotional impact with the audience combined with the "AMERICA IS FAMILY" metaphor. INTERNATIONAL TRADE IS A WAR metaphor is used here to draw the attention on the fact that America is getting beaten and even killed by the foreign powers in international trade deals.

H(A68): "I know because I've seen it in the lives of people across America who *get knocked down* and *get right back up*.

And I know it from my own life. More than a few times, I've had to *pick myself up* and *get back in the game*.

Like so much else, I got this from my mother. She never let me back down from *any challenge*."

Hillary is trying to win the audience's sympathies by letting them know that just like them, even she had to collect her senses and figuratively get back on her feet in these various "LIFE A STRUGGLE/FIGHT" metaphor and

T(Inaugural Address): "This American carnage stops right here and right now,"

Trump using "carnage", a rather strong word as a physical "AMERICA IS SLAUGHTERED" metaphor for the context of illegal immigrants hurting American people. And in the context of economy, carnage as the loss of job opportunities as a consequence of shipping them overseas and outsourcing or simply shutting down pieces of American industry altogether.

H(A66): “We will *strike* their sanctuaries from the air, and *support* local forces taking them out on the ground. We will surge our intelligence so that we detect and *prevent* attacks before they happen.”

Hillary suggesting that AMERICANS ARE GUARDIANS (support, prevent) ready to reflect any blow from their opponent with the overwhelming technological advantage (from the air/surge our intelligence).

COUNTRIES ARE ENEMIES/OPPONENTS metaphor.

T(B71): “Our enemies are getting *stronger* and *stronger* by the way, and we as a country are getting *weaker*.”

OPEN BORDERS IS CULT metaphor.

T(C83): “One more child to *sacrifice* on the order and on the altar of open borders.”

HILLARY CLINTON IS ENEMY/CHALLENGER metaphor.

T(C86): “Let's *defeat* her in November, OK?”

T(C84): “The most important difference between our plan and that of our *opponent* is that our plan will put America first “

Trump asserts himself as a fighter via the TRUMP IS WARRIOR metaphor (arena) to protect (defend) the ones without an ability to fight for themselves.

T(C85): “I have joined the political *arena* so that the powerful can no longer *beat up* on people who cannot *defend* themselves.”

4.2. Animal Metaphors

T(E118): “We have gangs *roaming* the street. And in many cases, they're illegally here, illegal immigrants.”

T(C83): “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.”

Trump shows various depictions of immigrants through the IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS metaphor suggesting that there is a released herd of animals trampling over the United States territory with no restriction whatsoever.

Putting the key words (roaming, crossed, released) in a sequential order by inverting their appearance evokes a picture of something being *released* as if from a container—possibly hinting at the MEXICO IS CONTAINER metaphor, full of immigrants—that has *crossed* the American border and now it’s *roaming* free with no particular direction but only to *threaten*—using the war metaphor immigrants are danger—the territory of the United States. Here is an example when AMERICA IS CONTAINER metaphor instead of Mexico:

T(C87): “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!”

Carver mentions the usage of immigrant metaphors in political labelling is quite often accompanied in terms of “flood”, “epidemic” or in Trump’s case the previously mentioned animal metaphors to produce a certain type of stigma that could be further used as a scare tactic which would prompt a response from the public.¹⁰⁶ But immigrants are not the only case of Trump using animal metaphor. For example, here he’s using COMPANIES ARE BEAST metaphor:

T(C89): “Reducing taxes will cause new companies and new jobs to come *roaring* back into our country”

H(A66): “Ask yourself: Does Donald Trump have the temperament to be Commander-in-Chief? Donald Trump can't even handle the *rough-and-tumble* of a presidential campaign. He loses his cool at the slightest provocation. When he's gotten a tough question from a reporter. When he's *challenged* in a debate. When he sees a protestor at a rally. Imagine him in the Oval Office *facing* a real crisis. A man you can *bait with a tweet* is not a man we can trust with nuclear weapons.”

¹⁰⁶ Terren Carver, *Politics, Language and Metaphor* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 190.

Hillary questions Trump's capability in leading America's fighting forces and continues using the POLITICAL LIFE IS A BRAWL metaphor (rough-and-tumble, challenged) in further denouncing him by invoking authority. "Facing a real crisis" is an oriental metaphor as explained by Lakoff and Johnson that "FORESEEABLE FUTURE EVENTS ARE UP (and AHEAD)"¹⁰⁷, which in this case of an event refers to the ominous "red button" for launching the nuclear weapons or rather the authority to do so since as far as we are concerned, there is no such button in the Oval Office. Lastly, H.Clinton uses TRUMP IS ANIMAL metaphor (bait) in suggesting that he is one who can be easily controlled just like an animal falling for the possible food trap (in his case, a tweet on Twitter).

¹⁰⁷ Lakoff, Johnson, *Metaphors*, 16

4.3. Planter/Farmer and Building Metaphor.

T(Inaugural Adress): “We will not fail. Our country will *thrive* and prosper again.”

AMERICA IS A FIELD metaphor.

H(E105): “And so what I believe is the more we can do for the middle class, the more we can invest in you, your education, your skills, your future, the better we will be off and the better we'll *grow*.”

Hillary suggesting that PEOPLE ARE ASSETS that, if invested into, will increase country's value.

This rather dubious part has Hillary talking about the middle class using the pronoun “you” but then changing it to “we” which could refer to the nation as a whole, but she could also mean other group that would “profit” from it.

H(E110): “But it's because I see this -- we need to have strong *growth*, fair *growth*, sustained *growth*.”

Not only can be a nation be presented as NATION IS FAMILY metaphor, but as nation is a PLANT OR NATION IS A BUILDING that can either grow, wither, rise up or collapse. More examples follow:

H(A68): “*Building* a better tomorrow for our beloved children and our beloved country.”

H(E103): “The central question in this election is really what kind of country we want to be and what kind of future we'll *build* together.”

H(D92): “When President Clinton honored the bargain, we had the longest peacetime expansion in history, a balanced budget, and the first time in decades we all *grew* together”

Hillary is using personification of America with the pronoun “we” to simultaneously refer to the FAMILY IS A NATION metaphor to further emphasize their collective growth as one unit.

4.4. Other Metaphors

H(A57): “We have to decide whether we *all will work together* so we *all can rise together*.”

Our country's motto is e pluribus unum: out of many, *we are one*.

Will we stay true to that motto?

Well, we heard Donald Trump's answer last week at his convention.”

Here, Hillary C. uses D.Trump’s rhetoric against himself in a full swing by answering her own question with his answer that was chosen to show Hillary as the polar opposite of Trump. The rhetoric changes from an idea of togetherness “we are one”, “rise together”, “work together”—essentially a NATION IS FAMILY metaphor into the idea of “blinding”—which implies that without an ability to see, the person left is to wander alone in darkness. Therefore, “Helping each other” subsequently changes to “fear each other”. Staying true to the The “Nurturant Parent” models applies here to assert that all of the family members (citizens) share the same amount of responsibility between each other. Unlike D.Trump, she’s not trying to elevate herself into the position of a sole leader that can alone fix things, quite the opposite. H.Clinton continues to develop this rhetoric:

H(A57): “He wants to divide us - from the rest of the world, and from each other.

He's betting that the perils of today's world will *blind* us to its unlimited promise.

He's taken the Republican Party a long way...

from "Morning in America" to "Midnight in America.

He wants us to fear the future and fear each other.”

Hillary C. is using the phrase “Morning in America”, where morning bring a positive connotation of something or someone that is ready to arise to start a new day (or start of a new era in this context) and referencing one of the popular Ronald Reagan's political campaign advertisement bearing the same name. Just as morning brings light, the midnight bears a negative connotation of darkness and consequently “fear” which is H.Clinton subsequently mentions by adding “fear the future” and “fear each other”. These basic light and and darkness metaphors are mentioned by Lakoff: “LIFE IS LIGHT and DEATH IS DARKNESS, LIFE IS HEAT and DEATH IS COLD,

and A Lifetime Is a Cycle of Waxing and Waning”¹⁰⁸ adding that it is the source of “light and heat during waxing and darkness and cold during waning”.¹⁰⁹

H(A58): “We will *rise* to the *challenge*, just as we always have.

We will not build a wall.

Instead, we will *build* an economy where everyone who wants a good paying job can get one.

And we'll *build a path* to citizenship for millions of immigrants who are already contributing to our economy!”

H. Clinton mixes the war metaphor (challenge) with a spatial metaphor UP IS GOOD (rise). Continues with the ECONOMY IS A BUILDING metaphor and once again using the rhetoric of togetherness and overall well-being based on community in her MORALITY IS NURTURANCE model.

And staying true to the MORALITY IS EMPATHY model, H. Clinton uses the Citizenship Is A Journey metaphor to address millions of migrants already working in America.

T(B79): We're *very close*, that's the point of no return. \$24 trillion. We *will be there* soon. That's when we become Greece. That's when we become a country that's unsalvageable. And we're gonna *be there very soon*. We're gonna *be there very soon*.

Trump using the journey metaphor in BANKRUPTCY IS NEAR metaphor by warning about the ever-increasing state debt.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS ARE A CONTAINER.

H(A65): “I'm proud that we *put a lid* on Iran's nuclear program without firing a single shot.”

OBTAINING NUCLEAR WEAPONS IS A JOURNEY.

T(C84): “Iran is on the *path* to nuclear weapons.”

¹⁰⁸ Lakoff, Johnson, *Metaphors we live by*, 252.

¹⁰⁹ Lakoff, Johnson, *Metaphors we live by*, 252.

T(B71): “Well, you need somebody, because politicians are all talk, no action. Nothing’s gonna get done. They will not bring us— believe me— to the promised land. They will not. [...]

So I’ve watched the politicians. I’ve dealt with them all my life. If you can’t make a good deal with a politician, then there’s something wrong with you. You’re certainly not very good. And that’s what we have representing us. They will never make America great again. They don’t even have a chance. They’re controlled fully— they’re controlled fully by the lobbyists, by the donors, and by the special interests, fully.”

Donald trump saying that the POLITICIANS ARE PUPPETS (controlled) who don’t serve public interest and once again using the “Strict Father” model using the MORALITY IS STRENGTH where he’s suggesting that someone who’s going to lead the country and guide it back to its former glory is not going to be some weak politician who can’t make a proper deals, but a strong leader who knows how to deal with those powerless politicians—no other than he himself.

Conclusion

Both presidential candidates used their own approach to rhetorics in order to fully present their idea of running the country. Their difference in style was crafted in order to catch the attention of particular voter demographic. Those differences were shown in the rhetoric and metaphors both candidates used during the U.S. presidential elections of 2016. In D.Trump's case, it was mostly to grab the attention of America's working-class together with people who were dissatisfied with the development and decisions taken by the federal government concerning border security, job opportunities and international trade deals. D.Trump served as an avatar of public discord and outcry towards the establishment and political correctness that has been rapidly spreading throughout the whole Western world in recent years. H.Clinton crafted her rhetoric to highlight her long political career to assert the notion of stability, experience and knowledge that D.Trump was severely lacking. Contrary to her opponent, she highlighted an idea of opening the country for everyone deserving the chance to join the already diverse America.

The analysis of the corpus revealed some major differences between the two candidates. Namely the wide usage of H.Clinton's metaphors and rhetoric that denied hostility and division in any form, favouring the rhetoric of collectivism (out of many, we are one) while condemning Trump's attempts to further divide the country (we will not build a wall) and outright refusing her idea of allowing everyone who wants to, to become a part of that collectivist society. Furthermore, her metaphors seemed to be focused more on building and growing the already cosmopolitan American society D.Trump's rhetoric, on the contrary, are defined by the ever present fight and war metaphors that are in hi case very much focused on the aspect of winning or losing. He often describes himself as the man who knows things from "inside out" and therefore the only one who possesses the ability to fight the ingrained system. This one-man-army attire has certainly given him a certain edge and charisma over his opponent by constructing his own image as that one of a warrior, ready to fight and never give up under any circumstances.

Trump's politics and orator skills can possibly be backtracked to a few individuals. Ronald Reagan comes to mind due to his revival of conservatism, not the mention both were a television personality, but certainly not in the field of rhetoric. Where Reagan's speech was calm and collected, the one of Trump's resembles a wild hurricane.

Although D.Trump shares certain perks or a brash personality with Andrew Jackson that causes friction on both public and federal level. For example, their hostility towards unwanted minorities in the form of Jackson’s “savages” or Trump’s “illegal aliens”. They both share an unrefined style of speech that came from hard learned experience rather than properly learning any orator skills. Trump doesn’t seem to want to challenge the status quo concerning the federal government, like Jackson did with his elimination of the national bank. It is hard to decide whether Trump’s turbulent term is going to form a completely new paradigm for future presidential candidates or whether Trump’s arrival to one of the most prominent political seats was already a consequence of change that had been set in motion way before he even thought of running for the office. There were many who prophesied that him winning the presidential race would spell a complete disaster for any Civil liberties and universal freedom but anything of the sort didn’t seem to have happened yet.

Resumé

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá zobrazením řečnických prostředků a to zejména metafory ve vybraných projevech presidentských kandidátů na post prezidenta Spojených států amerických, které se uskutečnily v roce 2016. Práce dále nastíní politiku, ideály a způsoby vyjadřování výše zmíněných kandidátů společně s kořeny amerického politického systému.

První část práce zkoumá kořeny dvou současných politických stran se zaměřením na fiskální politiku Alexandra Hamiltona a jeho politického oponenta Thomase Jeffersona. Oba dva se zařazují mezi významné Otce zakladatele Spojených států amerických, kteří velkou část života věnovali úvahám, politice a rozvoji nově vytvořené Unie třinácti původních britských kolonií.

Hamilton, kterého ministrem financí nově jmenoval samotný George Washington, navrhl zavedení a ustanovení centrální banky USA a zavedení “zdravého” státního dluhu, který by byl pomalu splácen dalšími generacemi. Hamiltonova představa finanční nezávislosti Spojených států byla mnohými odsuzována jako pro-anglická a zřízení centrální banky USA jako protiústavní. Jeho hlavním oponentem byl Thomas Jefferson, původem farmář a plantážník z Virginie, který jakoukoliv formu sjednocení moci na úkor Unie hluboce odsuzoval. Jeffersonova vize, narozdíl od Hamiltona, tkvěla v silných, nezávislých, ale přesto jednotných státech Unie. Dle jeho vize mělo největší množství autority zůstat ve státech samotných a ne být centralizováno vládou nebo centrální bankou. Konec první části byl zaměřen na vybranou politiku a rétoriku dalšího amerického velikána, Andrewa Jacksona s malým náznakem přidruženosti k momentálnímu prezidentovi Spojených Států, Donaldu Trumpovi. Konkrétně se jedná o jeho postoj k minoritám jako jsou afroameričané nebo Američtí indiáni. Jeho násilná politika odstěhování Amerických indiánů západně od řeky Mississippi dodnes zvedá mnohá obočí v obličejích liberálně smýšlejících Američanů a tudíž slouží jako následná paralela Donalda Trumpa a jeho postoje k nelegální migraci do Spojených Států.

Druhá část práce dále představila některé základní poznatky o rétorice, metaforické mluvě a některé strategie k jejímu úspěšnému použití ve světě politiky. Primárně se pak zaměřuje zejména na konceptuální metafory zpočátku objevených a popsanych Americkým lingvistou a filosofem Georgem Lakoffem a profesorem Markem L. Johnsonem v knize *Metafory, kterými žijeme*. Jejich práce pojednává o konceptuálních metaforách používaných v běžném životě na mnoha úrovních mluvy. Například koncept metafor jako “argument je válka”, který vysvětluje

využití válečného lexikonu v politice, nebo metafory “národ je rodina”, která je hojně využívána pokud řečník chce apelovat na semknutí národa dohromady a následné využití těchto metafor pro účel většího emocionálního zabarvení. Pozornost je dána faktu, že stejně jako konflikt mezi dvěma stranami, argument mezi dvěma řečníky je obohacen lexikonem porážky, vítězství a dalších strategických manévřů založených na konceptu boje. Přítomno je více pohledů na věc od dalších autorů a lingvistů zabývajících se danou problematikou jako jsou například Max Atkinson, Jonathan Charteris-Black, David Punter, Kathleen Ahrens a další. Lakoff dále zmiňuje koncept dvojího modelu metafory “národ je rodina”. Konkrétně se jedná o model “Striktního otce” a “Pečujícího rodiče”, které jsou založeny na předloze výchovy otcem a matkou. V prvním případě se jedná o pozici, kde jedinec přebírá veškerou zodpovědnost za výchovu dítěte, v tomto případě národa. Model “Pečujícího rodiče” naopak sdílí odpovědnost mezi všechny členy rodiny stejným dílem a dítě je učeno soběstačnosti. Oba modely také upřednostňují rozdílné morální zásady; zatímco model “Striktního otce” vyzdvihuje sílu a autoritu jedince, druhý model naopak vyzdvihuje schopnost pečovat a vcítit se do situace druhých jako určitý morální kodex. Lakoffova teorie se tudíž dá v extrémním případě aplikovat na politické schéma, kdy u moci může být autokrat s největší odpovědností a posledním slovem a stejně tak na druhé straně mince oligarchie, která zodpovědnost a rozhodování rozděluje mezi své členy. V tomto případě je možné zmíněný model aplikovat na Donalda Trumpa, který jakožto “Striktní otec” ve své předvolební kampani dával najevo, že on sám je silným jedincem, který zlomí dlouhodobé status quo. Naproti tomu to byla Hillary Clinton, která se jevila jako “Pečující rodič”, protože v její rétorice spíše vyzdvihovala sílu a schopnost národa před sebou samou. Dále jsou v této sekci zmíněny další možné metafory, které se mohou objevit v pozdější části práce a rozboru proslulých kandidátů na prezidenta USA Donalda Trumpa a Hillary Clintonové.

Třetí část práce se pak snaží objasnit to, čím byl Donald Trump tak výjimečný jako kandidát pro americké prezidentské volby v roce 2016. Jeho naprosto odlišná strategie, vyjadřování, a v jistém slova smyslu kuráž, která popírala všechny základy úspěšné politické kampaně definitivně našla své stoupence v rozbouřeném žvilvu Obamovské Ameriky. Tato iregulární strategie a odlišné chování z něho vytvořily jednoho z největších terčů posměchu zejména levicově orientovaných médií a večerních televizních pořadů jako například talk-show Stephena Colberta nebo Johna Olivera. Dále je v této části práce nastíněno proč je sociální síť Twitter, coby chladné médium po vzoru teorie McLuhana a jeho konceptu horkých a chladných

médií, oblíbenou mediální formou a pomocníkem Trumpovy strategie. Druhá polovina této sekce objasňuje komunální rétoriku Hillary Clintonové, která svými kořeny zasahuje až do samotných počátků Ameriky, kdy první osadníci přistáli na pobřežích Nového světa. Tyto kořeny se rozvětvily do dvou sekcí, a to vize, která káže vzájemné dobro pro celou komunitu a druhá, která vidí komunitu jako skupinu individualistických osobností, kde každý je sám řidičem [MB1] svého života a osudu. Dále je objasněn důvod a význam používaných hesel kampaně jako Trumpovo „Make America Great Again“ (zkráceně MAGA) a následně Clintonovou „I am with Her“ a „Stronger Together“. Závěr kapitoly se věnuje výroku Clintonové „basket of deplorables“, aneb „košíku plných mizerů“, který poněkud neobratně ku prospěchu svého oponenta použila při zmínce o Trumpově voličské základně. Tento čin se po volbách snažila obhájit ve své knize „What Happened“, která zobrazovala čím vším si Hillary prošla, když bojovala za první funkci ženské prezidentky v historii Spojených států amerických.

Poslední praktická část zahrnuje aplikaci teoretické části konceptuálních metafor na vybraný korpus proslovů Hillary Clintonové a Donalda Trumpa. Rozbor se zaměřil na jejich použité konceptuální metafory, které pomohly rozvinout skutečný význam zprávy, kterou se snažili sdělit svému publiku. Mezi tyto konceptuální metafory patří například metafory války, cesty, zvířat a další jim podobné, které byly vysvětleny v předchozích kapitolách po vzoru konceptuálních metafor George Lakoffa, Marka Johnsona, Charteris-Blacka a jiných. Mimo jiné bylo u několika příkladů těchto metafor objasněno, za jakým účelem jsou tyto informace sdělovány a případně proč byly vybrány různé lingvistické strategie.

Bibliography

Book/E-Book sources:

Ferling, John. *Jefferson and Hamilton: The Rivalry That Forged a Nation*. New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2013.

Wright, Robert E. *One Nation Under Debt: Hamilton, Jefferson, and the History of What We Owe*, McGraw-Hill Education, 2008.

Brands Henry William. *Andrew Jackson : his life and times*. Anchor; 1st Thus. edition, October 10, 2006.

Podell, Janet, Steven Anzovin. *Speeches of the American Presidents*. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 2001.

Lakoff, George, Mark Johnson. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Lakoff, George. *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016.

Atkinson, Max. *Our Master's Voices*. New York: Methuen & Co., 1984.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan. *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Punter, David. *Metaphor: The New Critical Idiom*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Musolff, Andreas. *Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and scenarios*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016.

Ahrens, Kathleen. *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of a Man*. New York: The New American Library, 1964.

Clinton, Hillary Rodham. *What Happened*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2017.

Ferling, John. *Setting the World Ablaze: Washington, Adams, Jefferson, and the American Revolution*. New York, Oxford University Press, 2000.

Pratchett, Terry. *Guards! Guards!*. London: HarperCollins, 2007.

Other sources:

McMillian, Chris “MakeAmericaGreatAgain: ideological fantasy American exceptionalism and Donald Trump”, *Subjectivity* 10, no.2 (July 2017): 1-21.

https://www.academia.edu/39717099/MakeAmericaGreatAgain_Ideological_fantasy_American_exceptionalism_and_Donald_Trump.

William H. Chafe, “The American Narrative: Is There One & What Is It?”, *Daedalus*, Vol. 141(1), (2012): 11-17.

https://kisslibrary.net/book/E0110ED8D6299B108B15?utm_source=ps19&utm_medium=azanubokuc.tk&utm_campaign=fnom&x=1583089.

Simmons, Diane, “Světoběžnice z oregonské pouště”, *Host*, Vol. 6, (2018): 73-76.

Jefferson, Thomas. Online Library of Liberty. “Opinion on the Constitutionality of a National Bank”. Accessed July 24th, 2019. <https://oll.libertyfund.org/pages/jefferson-hamilton-debate-session-3>.

Trump, Donald. The Washington Post. “Trump expresses admiration for Andrew Jackson at Hermitage”, May 1, 2017, The Washington Post video, 01:55.

https://www.washingtonpost.com/video/national/trump-expresses-admiration-for-andrew-jackson-at-hermitage/2017/05/01/3b0f1de2-2e8a-11e7-a335-fa0ae1940305_video.html?utm_term=.56d65652ea02.

Trump, Donald. “Donald Trump on political correctness”, YouTube video, 2:26, last modified January 3, 2016.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5DoPeuOU9mg>.

Harvard Business Review. “What So Many People Don’t Get About the U.S. Working Class”. Last modified November 10, 2016. <https://hbr.org/2016/11/what-so-many-people-dont-get-about-the-u-s-working-class?referral=00134>.

YourDictionary. “Examples of Dead Metaphors”. Last modified August 5, 2019. <https://examples.yourdictionary.com/reference/examples/examples-of-dead-metaphors.html>.

Gallup. “U.S. Distrust in Media Hits New High”. Last modified September 21, 2012. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/157589/distrust-media-hits-new-high.aspx>.

Town&Country. “Who Was the First Politician to Use "Make America Great Again" Anyway?”. Last modified November 14, 2018.

<https://www.townandcountrymag.com/society/politics/a25053571/donald-trump-make-america-great-again-slogan-origin/>.

Trump, Donald. “Donald Trump Teases a President Bid During a 1988 Oprah Show”. Posted June 26, 2015. YouTube video, 3:09. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SEPs17_AkTI.

Clinton, Bill. HuffPost. “Speech at Orlando rally” (2016). Accessed June 20, 2019. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/bill-clinton-says-make-america-great-again-is-just-a-racist-dog-whistle_n_5b2a678ae4b0697eecbf66f3

Clinton, Hillary. CBS news. “Hillary Clinton on why she lost and ‘the most important’ mistake she made”. Last modified September 10, 2017.

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/hillary-clinton-what-happened-sunday-morning-jane-pauley/>.

Politico. “FBI releases files on Trump apartments' race discrimination probe in '70s”. Last modified February 15, 2017.

<https://www.politico.com/blogs/under-the-radar/2017/02/trump-fbi-files-discrimination-case-235067>.

Trump, Donald. Second Presidential Debate—September 26, 2016.

<http://www.astrid-online.it/static/upload/tran/transcript-of-the-second-presidential-debate.pdf>.

Corpus sources

Hillary Clinton's Democratic convention speech—July 28, 2016

<https://oklahoman.com/article/feed/1047134/text-of-hillary-clintons-democratic-convention-speech>

Donald Trump's Presidential Announcement Speech—June 16, 2015

<https://time.com/3923128/donald-trump-announcement-speech/>

Donald Trump's acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention—July 21, 2016

<https://www.vox.com/2016/7/21/12253426/donald-trump-acceptance-speech-transcript-republican-nomination-transcript>

Hillary Clinton's Campaign Launch Speech—June 13, 2015

<https://time.com/3920332/transcript-full-text-hillary-clinton-campaign-launch/>

First Presidential Debate—September 26, 2016

<http://www.astrid-online.it/static/upload/tran/transcript-of-the-second-presidential-debate.pdf>

Appendices

Appendix A – Hillary Clinton's Democratic convention speech—July 28, 2016

Thank you! Thank you for that amazing welcome.

And Chelsea, thank you.

I'm so proud to be your mother and so proud of the woman you've become.

Thanks for bringing Marc into our family, and Charlotte and Aidan into the world.

And Bill, that conversation we started in the law library 45 years ago is still going strong.

It's lasted through good times that filled us with joy, and hard times that tested us.

And I've even gotten a few words in along the way.

On Tuesday night, I was so happy to see that my Explainer-in-Chief is still on the job.

I'm also grateful to the rest of my family and the friends of a lifetime.

To all of you whose hard work brought us here tonight ... and to those of you who joined our campaign this week.

And what a remarkable week it's been.

We heard the man from Hope, Bill Clinton.

And the man of Hope, Barack Obama.

America is stronger because of President Obama's leadership, and I'm better because of his friendship.

We heard from our terrific vice president, the one-and-only Joe Biden, who spoke from his big heart about our party's commitment to working people.

(Story continued below...)

First Lady Michelle Obama reminded us that our children are watching, and the president we elect is going to be their president, too.

And for those of you out there who are just getting to know Tim Kaine - you're soon going to understand why the people of Virginia keep promoting him: from city council and mayor, to Governor, and now Senator.

He'll make the whole country proud as our Vice President.

And. I want to thank Bernie Sanders.

Bernie, your campaign inspired millions of Americans, particularly the young people who threw their hearts and souls into our primary.

You've put economic and social justice issues front and center, where they belong.

And to all of your supporters here and around the country:

I want you to know, I've heard you.

Your cause is our cause.

Our country needs your ideas, energy, and passion.

That's the only way we can turn our progressive platform into real change for America.

We wrote it together - now let's go out there and make it happen together.

My friends, we've come to Philadelphia - the birthplace of our nation - because what happened in this city 240 years ago still has something to teach us today.

We all know the story.

But we usually focus on how it turned out - and not enough on how close that story came to never being written at all.

When representatives from 13 unruly colonies met just down the road from here, some wanted to stick with the King.

Some wanted to stick it to the king, and go their own way.

The revolution hung in the balance.

Then somehow they began listening to each other . compromising . finding common purpose.

And by the time they left Philadelphia, they had begun to see themselves as one nation.

That's what made it possible to stand up to a King.

That took courage.

They had courage.

Our Founders embraced the enduring truth that we are stronger together.

America is once again at a moment of reckoning.

Powerful forces are threatening to pull us apart.

Bonds of trust and respect are fraying.

And just as with our founders, there are no guarantees.

It truly is up to us.

We have to decide whether we all will work together so we all can rise together.

Our country's motto is e pluribus unum: out of many, we are one.

Will we stay true to that motto?

Well, we heard Donald Trump's answer last week at his convention.

He wants to divide us - from the rest of the world, and from each other.

He's betting that the perils of today's world will blind us to its unlimited promise.

He's taken the Republican Party a long way ... from "Morning in America" to "Midnight in America."

He wants us to fear the future and fear each other.

Well, a great Democratic President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, came up with the perfect rebuke to Trump more than eighty years ago, during a much more perilous time: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

Now we are clear-eyed about what our country is up against.

But we are not afraid.

We will rise to the challenge, just as we always have.

We will not build a wall.

Instead, we will build an economy where everyone who wants a good paying job can get one.

And we'll build a path to citizenship for millions of immigrants who are already contributing to our economy!

We will not ban a religion.

We will work with all Americans and our allies to fight terrorism.

There's a lot of work to do.

Too many people haven't had a pay raise since the crash.

There's too much inequality.

Too little social mobility.

Too much paralysis in Washington.

Too many threats at home and abroad.

But just look at the strengths we bring to meet these challenges.

We have the most dynamic and diverse people in the world.

We have the most tolerant and generous young people we've ever had.

We have the most powerful military.

The most innovative entrepreneurs.

The most enduring values. Freedom and equality, justice and opportunity.

We should be so proud that these words are associated with us. That when people hear them - they hear. America.

So don't let anyone tell you that our country is weak.

We're not.

Don't let anyone tell you we don't have what it takes.

We do.

And most of all, don't believe anyone who says: "I alone can fix it."

Those were actually Donald Trump's words in Cleveland.

And they should set off alarm bells for all of us.

Really?

I alone can fix it?
Isn't he forgetting?
Troops on the front lines.
Police officers and firefighters who run toward danger.
Doctors and nurses who care for us.
Teachers who change lives.
Entrepreneurs who see possibilities in every problem.
Mothers who lost children to violence and are building a movement to keep other kids safe.
He's forgetting every last one of us.
Americans don't say, "I alone can fix it."
We say, "We'll fix it together."
Remember: Our Founders fought a revolution and wrote a Constitution so America would never be a nation where one person had all the power.
Two hundred and forty years later, we still put our faith in each other.
Look at what happened in Dallas after the assassinations of five brave police officers.
Chief David Brown asked the community to support his force, maybe even join them.
And you know how the community responded?
Nearly 500 people applied in just 12 days.
That's how Americans answer when the call for help goes out.
20 years ago I wrote a book called "It Takes a Village." A lot of people looked at the title and asked, what the heck do you mean by that?
This is what I mean.
None of us can raise a family, build a business, heal a community or lift a country totally alone.
America needs every one of us to lend our energy, our talents, our ambition to making our nation better and stronger.
I believe that with all my heart.
That's why "Stronger Together" is not just a lesson from our history.
It's not just a slogan for our campaign.
It's a guiding principle for the country we've always been and the future we're going to build.
A country where the economy works for everyone, not just those at the top.
Where you can get a good job and send your kids to a good school, no matter what zip code you live in.
A country where all our children can dream, and those dreams are within reach.
Where families are strong. communities are safe.

And yes, love trumps hate.

That's the country we're fighting for.

That's the future we're working toward.

And so it is with humility ... determination ... and boundless confidence in America's promise .
that I accept your nomination for President of the United States!

Now, sometimes the people at this podium are new to the national stage.

As you know, I'm not one of those people.

I've been your First Lady. Served 8 years as a Senator from the great State of New York.

I ran for President and lost.

Then I represented all of you as Secretary of State.

But my job titles only tell you what I've done.

They don't tell you why.

The truth is, through all these years of public service, the "service" part has always come easier to me than the "public" part.

I get it that some people just don't know what to make of me.

So let me tell you.

The family I'm from ... well, no one had their name on big buildings.

My family were builders of a different kind.

Builders in the way most American families are.

They used whatever tools they had - whatever God gave them - and whatever life in America provided - and built better lives and better futures for their kids.

My grandfather worked in the same Scranton lace mill for 50 years.

Because he believed that if he gave everything he had, his children would have a better life than he did.

And he was right.

My dad, Hugh, made it to college. He played football at Penn State and enlisted in the Navy after Pearl Harbor.

When the war was over he started his own small business, printing fabric for draperies.

I remember watching him stand for hours over silk screens.

He wanted to give my brothers and me opportunities he never had.

And he did. My mother, Dorothy, was abandoned by her parents as a young girl. She ended up on her own at 14, working as a house maid.

She was saved by the kindness of others.

Her first-grade teacher saw she had nothing to eat at lunch, and brought extra food to share.

The lesson she passed on to me years later stuck with me: No one gets through life alone.

We have to look out for each other and lift each other up.

She made sure I learned the words of our Methodist faith: "Do all the good you can, for all the people you can, in all the ways you can, as long as ever you can."

I went to work for the Children's Defense Fund, going door-to-door in New Bedford, Massachusetts on behalf of children with disabilities who were denied the chance to go to school.

I remember meeting a young girl in a wheelchair on the small back porch of her house.

She told me how badly she wanted to go to school - it just didn't seem possible.

And I couldn't stop thinking of my mother and what she went through as a child.

It became clear to me that simply caring is not enough.

To drive real progress, you have to change both hearts and laws.

You need both understanding and action.

So we gathered facts. We built a coalition. And our work helped convince Congress to ensure access to education for all students with disabilities.

It's a big idea, isn't it?

Every kid with a disability has the right to go to school.

But how do you make an idea like that real? You do it step-by-step, year-by-year . sometimes even door-by-door.

And my heart just swelled when I saw Anastasia Somoza on this stage, representing millions of young people who - because of those changes to our laws - are able to get an education.

It's true ... I sweat the details of policy - whether we're talking about the exact level of lead in the drinking water in Flint, Michigan, the number of mental health facilities in Iowa, or the cost of your prescription drugs.

Because it's not just a detail if it's your kid — if it's your family.

It's a big deal. And it should be a big deal to your president.

Over the last three days, you've seen some of the people who've inspired me.

People who let me into their lives, and became a part of mine.

People like Ryan Moore and Lauren Manning.

They told their stories Tuesday night.

I first met Ryan as a seven-year-old.

He was wearing a full body brace that must have weighed forty pounds.

Children like Ryan kept me going when our plan for universal health care failed . and kept me working with leaders of both parties to help create the Children's Health Insurance Program that covers 8 million kids every year.

Lauren was gravely injured on 9/11.

It was the thought of her, and Debbie St. John, and John Dolan and Joe Sweeney, and all the victims and survivors, that kept me working as hard as I could in the Senate on behalf of 9/11 families, and our first responders who got sick from their time at Ground Zero.

I was still thinking of Lauren, Debbie and all the others ten years later in the White House Situation Room when President Obama made the courageous decision that finally brought Osama bin Laden to justice.

In this campaign, I've met so many people who motivate me to keep fighting for change.

And, with your help, I will carry all of your voices and stories with me to the White House.

I will be a President for Democrats, Republicans, and Independents.

For the struggling, the striving and the successful.

For those who vote for me and those who don't.

For all Americans.

Tonight, we've reached a milestone in our nation's march toward a more perfect union: the first time that a major party has nominated a woman for President.

Standing here as my mother's daughter, and my daughter's mother, I'm so happy this day has come.

Happy for grandmothers and little girls and everyone in between.

Happy for boys and men, too - because when any barrier falls in America, for anyone, it clears the way for everyone. When there are no ceilings, the sky's the limit.

So let's keep going, until every one of the 161 million women and girls across America has the opportunity she deserves.

Because even more important than the history we make tonight, is the history we will write together in the years ahead.

Let's begin with what we're going to do to help working people in our country get ahead and stay ahead.

Now, I don't think President Obama and Vice President Biden get the credit they deserve for saving us from the worst economic crisis of our lifetimes.

Our economy is so much stronger than when they took office. Nearly 15 million new private-sector jobs. Twenty million more Americans with health insurance. And an auto industry that just had its best year ever. That's real progress.

But none of us can be satisfied with the status quo. Not by a long shot.

We're still facing deep-seated problems that developed long before the recession and have stayed with us through the recovery.

I've gone around our country talking to working families. And I've heard from so many of you who feel like the economy just isn't working.

Some of you are frustrated - even furious.

And you know what??? You're right.

It's not yet working the way it should.

Americans are willing to work - and work hard.

But right now, an awful lot of people feel there is less and less respect for the work they do.

And less respect for them, period.

Democrats are the party of working people.

But we haven't done a good enough job showing that we get what you're going through, and that we're going to do something about it.

So I want to tell you tonight how we will empower Americans to live better lives.

My primary mission as President will be to create more opportunity and more good jobs with rising wages right here in the United States ... from my first day in office to my last!

Especially in places that for too long have been left out and left behind.

From our inner cities to our small towns, from Indian Country to Coal Country.

From communities ravaged by addiction to regions hollowed out by plant closures.

And here's what I believe.

I believe America thrives when the middle class thrives.

I believe that our economy isn't working the way it should because our democracy isn't working the way it should.

That's why we need to appoint Supreme Court justices who will get money out of politics and expand voting rights, not restrict them. And we'll pass a constitutional amendment to overturn Citizens United!

I believe American corporations that have gotten so much from our country should be just as patriotic in return.

Many of them are. But too many aren't.

It's wrong to take tax breaks with one hand and give out pink slips with the other.

And I believe Wall Street can never, ever be allowed to wreck Main Street again.

I believe in science. I believe that climate change is real and that we can save our planet while creating millions of good-paying clean energy jobs.

I believe that when we have millions of hardworking immigrants contributing to our economy, it would be self-defeating and inhumane to kick them out.

Comprehensive immigration reform will grow our economy and keep families together - and it's the right thing to do.

Whatever party you belong to, or if you belong to no party at all, if you share these beliefs, this is your campaign.

If you believe that companies should share profits with their workers, not pad executive bonuses, join us.

If you believe the minimum wage should be a living wage . and no one working full time should have to raise their children in poverty . join us.

If you believe that every man, woman, and child in America has the right to affordable health care . join us.

If you believe that we should say "no" to unfair trade deals ... that we should stand up to China ... that we should support our steelworkers and autoworkers and homegrown manufacturers.join us.

If you believe we should expand Social Security and protect a woman's right to make her own health care decisions . join us.

And yes, if you believe that your working mother, wife, sister, or daughter deserves equal pay . join us.

Let's make sure this economy works for everyone, not just those at the top.

Now, you didn't hear any of this from Donald Trump at his convention.

He spoke for 70-odd minutes - and I do mean odd.

And he offered zero solutions. But we already know he doesn't believe these things.

No wonder he doesn't like talking about his plans.

You might have noticed, I love talking about mine.

In my first 100 days, we will work with both parties to pass the biggest investment in new, good-paying jobs since World War II.

Jobs in manufacturing, clean energy, technology and innovation, small business, and infrastructure.

If we invest in infrastructure now, we'll not only create jobs today, but lay the foundation for the jobs of the future.

And we will transform the way we prepare our young people for those jobs.

Bernie Sanders and I will work together to make college tuition-free for the middle class and debt-free for all!

We will also liberate millions of people who already have student debt.

It's just not right that Donald Trump can ignore his debts, but students and families can't refinance theirs.

And here's something we don't say often enough: College is crucial, but a four-year degree should not be the only path to a good job.

We're going to help more people learn a skill or practice a trade and make a good living doing it.

We're going to give small businesses a boost. Make it easier to get credit. Way too many dreams die in the parking lots of banks.

In America, if you can dream it, you should be able to build it.

We're going to help you balance family and work. And you know what, if fighting for affordable child care and paid family leave is playing the "woman card," then Deal Me In!

(Oh, you've heard that one?)

Now, here's the thing, we're not only going to make all these investments, we're going to pay for every single one of them.

And here's how: Wall Street, corporations, and the super-rich are going to start paying their fair share of taxes.

Not because we resent success. Because when more than 90% of the gains have gone to the top 1%, that's where the money is.

And if companies take tax breaks and then ship jobs overseas, we'll make them pay us back. And we'll put that money to work where it belongs . creating jobs here at home!

Now I know some of you are sitting at home thinking, well that all sounds pretty good.

But how are you going to get it done? How are you going to break through the gridlock in Washington? Look at my record. I've worked across the aisle to pass laws and treaties and to launch new programs that help millions of people. And if you give me the chance, that's what I'll do as President.

But Trump, he's a businessman. He must know something about the economy.

Well, let's take a closer look.

In Atlantic City, 60 miles from here, you'll find contractors and small businesses who lost everything because Donald Trump refused to pay his bills.

People who did the work and needed the money, and didn't get it - not because he couldn't pay them, but because he wouldn't pay them.

That sales pitch he's making to be your president? Put your faith in him - and you'll win big? That's the same sales pitch he made to all those small businesses. Then Trump walked away, and left working people holding the bag.

He also talks a big game about putting America First. Please explain to me what part of America First leads him to make Trump ties in China, not Colorado.

Trump suits in Mexico, not Michigan. Trump furniture in Turkey, not Ohio. Trump picture frames in India, not Wisconsin.

Donald Trump says he wants to make America great again - well, he could start by actually making things in America again.

The choice we face is just as stark when it comes to our national security.

Anyone reading the news can see the threats and turbulence we face.

From Baghdad and Kabul, to Nice and Paris and Brussels, to San Bernardino and Orlando, we're dealing with determined enemies that must be defeated.

No wonder people are anxious and looking for reassurance. Looking for steady leadership.

You want a leader who understands we are stronger when we work with our allies around the world and care for our veterans here at home. Keeping our nation safe and honoring the people who do it will be my highest priority.

I'm proud that we put a lid on Iran's nuclear program without firing a single shot - now we have to enforce it, and keep supporting Israel's security.

I'm proud that we shaped a global climate agreement - now we have to hold every country accountable to their commitments, including ourselves.

I'm proud to stand by our allies in NATO against any threat they face, including from Russia.

I've laid out my strategy for defeating ISIS.

We will strike their sanctuaries from the air, and support local forces taking them out on the ground. We will surge our intelligence so that we detect and prevent attacks before they happen.

We will disrupt their efforts online to reach and radicalize young people in our country.

It won't be easy or quick, but make no mistake - we will prevail.

Now Donald Trump says, and this is a quote, "I know more about ISIS than the generals do.."

No, Donald, you don't.

He thinks that he knows more than our military because he claimed our armed forces are "a disaster."

Well, I've had the privilege to work closely with our troops and our veterans for many years, including as a Senator on the Armed Services Committee.

I know how wrong he is. Our military is a national treasure.

We entrust our commander-in-chief to make the hardest decisions our nation faces.

Decisions about war and peace. Life and death.

A president should respect the men and women who risk their lives to serve our country - including the sons of Tim Kaine and Mike Pence, both Marines.

Ask yourself: Does Donald Trump have the temperament to be Commander-in-Chief?

Donald Trump can't even handle the rough-and-tumble of a presidential campaign.

He loses his cool at the slightest provocation. When he's gotten a tough question from a reporter. When he's challenged in a debate. When he sees a protestor at a rally.

Imagine him in the Oval Office facing a real crisis. A man you can bait with a tweet is not a man we can trust with nuclear weapons.

I can't put it any better than Jackie Kennedy did after the Cuban Missile Crisis. She said that what worried President Kennedy during that very dangerous time was that a war might be started - not by big men with self-control and restraint, but by little men - the ones moved by fear and pride.

America's strength doesn't come from lashing out.

Strength relies on smarts, judgment, cool resolve, and the precise and strategic application of power.

That's the kind of Commander-in-Chief I pledge to be.

And if we're serious about keeping our country safe, we also can't afford to have a President who's in the pocket of the gun lobby.

I'm not here to repeal the 2nd Amendment.

I'm not here to take away your guns.

I just don't want you to be shot by someone who shouldn't have a gun in the first place.

We should be working with responsible gun owners to pass common-sense reforms and keep guns out of the hands of criminals, terrorists and all others who would do us harm.

For decades, people have said this issue was too hard to solve and the politics were too hot to touch.

But I ask you: how can we just stand by and do nothing?

You heard, you saw, family members of people killed by gun violence.

You heard, you saw, family members of police officers killed in the line of duty because they were outgunned by criminals.

I refuse to believe we can't find common ground here.

We have to heal the divides in our country.

Not just on guns. But on race. Immigration. And more.

That starts with listening to each other. Hearing each other. Trying, as best we can, to walk in each other's shoes.

So let's put ourselves in the shoes of young black and Latino men and women who face the effects of systemic racism, and are made to feel like their lives are disposable.

Let's put ourselves in the shoes of police officers, kissing their kids and spouses goodbye every day and heading off to do a dangerous and necessary job.

We will reform our criminal justice system from end-to-end, and rebuild trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve.

We will defend all our rights - civil rights, human rights and voting rights . women's rights and workers' rights . LGBT rights and the rights of people with disabilities!

And we will stand up against mean and divisive rhetoric wherever it comes from.

For the past year, many people made the mistake of laughing off Donald Trump's comments - excusing him as an entertainer just putting on a show.

They think he couldn't possibly mean all the horrible things he says - like when he called women "pigs." Or said that an American judge couldn't be fair because of his Mexican heritage. Or when he mocks and mimics a reporter with a disability.

Or insults prisoners of war like John McCain -a true hero and patriot who deserves our respect.

At first, I admit, I couldn't believe he meant it either.

It was just too hard to fathom - that someone who wants to lead our nation could say those things. Could be like that.

But here's the sad truth: There is no other Donald Trump...This is it.

And in the end, it comes down to what Donald Trump doesn't get: that America is great - because America is good.

So enough with the bigotry and bombast. Donald Trump's not offering real change.

He's offering empty promises. What are we offering? A bold agenda to improve the lives of people across our country — to keep you safe, to get you good jobs, and to give your kids the opportunities they deserve.

The choice is clear.

Every generation of Americans has come together to make our country freer, fairer, and stronger.

None of us can do it alone.

I know that at a time when so much seems to be pulling us apart, it can be hard to imagine how we'll ever pull together again.

But I'm here to tell you tonight - progress is possible.

I know because I've seen it in the lives of people across America who get knocked down and get right back up.

And I know it from my own life. More than a few times, I've had to pick myself up and get back in the game.

Like so much else, I got this from my mother. She never let me back down from any challenge. When I tried to hide from a neighborhood bully, she literally blocked the door. "Go back out there," she said.

And she was right. You have to stand up to bullies.

You have to keep working to make things better, even when the odds are long and the opposition is fierce.

We lost my mother a few years ago. I miss her every day. And I still hear her voice urging me to keep working, keep fighting for right, no matter what.

That's what we need to do together as a nation.

Though "we may not live to see the glory," as the song from the musical Hamilton goes, "let us gladly join the fight."

Let our legacy be about "planting seeds in a garden you never get to see."

That's why we're here...not just in this hall, but on this Earth.

The Founders showed us that.

And so have many others since.

They were drawn together by love of country, and the selfless passion to build something better for all who follow.

That is the story of America. And we begin a new chapter tonight.

Yes, the world is watching what we do.

Yes, America's destiny is ours to choose.

So let's be stronger together.

Looking to the future with courage and confidence.

Building a better tomorrow for our beloved children and our beloved country.

When we do, America will be greater than ever.

Thank you and may God bless the United States of America!

Appendix B – Donald Trump's Presidential Announcement Speech—June 16, 2015

Wow. Whoa. That is some group of people. Thousands.

So nice, thank you very much. That's really nice. Thank you. It's great to be at Trump Tower. It's great to be in a wonderful city, New York. And it's an honor to have everybody here. This is beyond anybody's expectations. There's been no crowd like this.

And, I can tell, some of the candidates, they went in. They didn't know the air-conditioner didn't work. They sweated like dogs.

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

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

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

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

The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems.

Thank you. It's true, and these are the best and the finest. When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people.

But I speak to border guards and they tell us what we're getting. And it only makes common sense. It only makes common sense. They're sending us not the right people.

It's coming from more than Mexico. It's coming from all over South and Latin America, and it's coming probably— probably— from the Middle East. But we don't know. Because we have no protection and we have no competence, we don't know what's happening. And it's got to stop and it's got to stop fast.

Islamic terrorism is eating up large portions of the Middle East. They've become rich. I'm in competition with them.

They just built a hotel in Syria. Can you believe this? They built a hotel. When I have to build a hotel, I pay interest. They don't have to pay interest, because they took the oil that, when we left Iraq, I said we should've taken.

So now ISIS has the oil, and what they don't have, Iran has. And in 19— and I will tell you this, and I said it very strongly, years ago, I said— and I love the military, and I want to have the strongest military that we've ever had, and we need it more now than ever. But I said, "Don't hit Iraq," because you're going to totally destabilize the Middle East. Iran is going to take over the Middle East, Iran and somebody else will get the oil, and it turned out that Iran is now taking over Iraq. Think of it. Iran is taking over Iraq, and they're taking it over big league.

We spent \$2 trillion in Iraq, \$2 trillion. We lost thousands of lives, thousands in Iraq. We have wounded soldiers, who I love, I love — they're great — all over the place, thousands and thousands of wounded soldiers.

And we have nothing. We can't even go there. We have nothing. And every time we give Iraq equipment, the first time a bullet goes off in the air, they leave it.

Last week, I read 2,300 Humvees— these are big vehicles— were left behind for the enemy. 2,000? You would say maybe two, maybe four? 2,300 sophisticated vehicles, they ran, and the enemy took them.

Last quarter, it was just announced our gross domestic product— a sign of strength, right? But not for us. It was below zero. Whoever heard of this? It's never below zero.

Our labor participation rate was the worst since 1978. But think of it, GDP below zero, horrible labor participation rate.

And our real unemployment is anywhere from 18 to 20 percent. Don't believe the 5.6. Don't believe it.

That's right. A lot of people up there can't get jobs. They can't get jobs, because there are no jobs, because China has our jobs and Mexico has our jobs. They all have jobs.

But the real number, the real number is anywhere from 18 to 19 and maybe even 21 percent, and nobody talks about it, because it's a statistic that's full of nonsense.

Our enemies are getting stronger and stronger by the way, and we as a country are getting weaker. Even our nuclear arsenal doesn't work.

It came out recently they have equipment that is 30 years old. They don't know if it worked. And I thought it was horrible when it was broadcast on television, because boy, does that send signals to Putin and all of the other people that look at us and they say, "That is a group of people, and that is a nation that truly has no clue. They don't know what they're doing. They don't know what they're doing."

We have a disaster called the big lie: Obamacare. Obamacare.

Yesterday, it came out that costs are going for people up 29, 39, 49, and even 55 percent, and deductibles are through the roof. You have to be hit by a tractor, literally, a tractor, to use it, because the deductibles are so high, it's virtually useless. It's virtually useless. It is a disaster.

And remember the \$5 billion website? \$5 billion we spent on a website, and to this day it doesn't work. A \$5 billion website.

I have so many websites, I have them all over the place. I hire people, they do a website. It costs me \$3. \$5 billion website.

Well, you need somebody, because politicians are all talk, no action. Nothing's gonna get done. They will not bring us— believe me— to the promised land. They will not.

As an example, I've been on the circuit making speeches, and I hear my fellow Republicans. And they're wonderful people. I like them. They all want me to support them. They don't know how to bring it about. They come up to my office. I'm meeting with three of them in the next week. And they don't know— "Are you running? Are you not running? Could we have your support? What do we do? How do we do it?"

I like them. And I hear their speeches. And they don't talk jobs and they don't talk China. When was the last time you heard China is killing us? They're devaluing their currency to a level that you wouldn't believe. It makes it impossible for our companies to compete, impossible. They're killing us.

But you don't hear that from anybody else. You don't hear it from anybody else. And I watch the speeches.

I watch the speeches of these people, and they say the sun will rise, the moon will set, all sorts of wonderful things will happen. And people are saying, "What's going on? I just want a job. Just get me a job. I don't need the rhetoric. I want a job."

And that's what's happening. And it's going to get worse, because remember, Obamacare really kicks in in '16, 2016. Obama is going to be out playing golf. He might be on one of my courses. I would invite him, I actually would say. I have the best courses in the world, so I'd say, you what, if he wants to— I have one right next to the White House, right on the Potomac. If he'd like to play, that's fine.

In fact, I'd love him to leave early and play, that would be a very good thing.

But Obamacare kicks in in 2016. Really big league. It is going to be amazingly destructive. Doctors are quitting. I have a friend who's a doctor, and he said to me the other day, "Donald, I never saw anything like it. I have more accountants than I have nurses. It's a disaster. My patients are beside themselves. They had a plan that was good. They have no plan now."

We have to repeal Obamacare, and it can be— and— and it can be replaced with something much better for everybody. Let it be for everybody. But much better and much less expensive for people and for the government. And we can do it.

So I've watched the politicians. I've dealt with them all my life. If you can't make a good deal with a politician, then there's something wrong with you. You're certainly not very good. And that's what we have representing us. They will never make America great again. They don't even have a chance. They're controlled fully— they're controlled fully by the lobbyists, by the donors, and by the special interests, fully.

Yes, they control them. Hey, I have lobbyists. I have to tell you. I have lobbyists that can produce anything for me. They're great. But you know what? it won't happen. It won't happen. Because we have to stop doing things for some people, but for this country, it's destroying our country. We have to stop, and it has to stop now.

Now, our country needs— our country needs a truly great leader, and we need a truly great leader now. We need a leader that wrote "The Art of the Deal."

We need a leader that can bring back our jobs, can bring back our manufacturing, can bring back our military, can take care of our vets. Our vets have been abandoned.

And we also need a cheerleader.

You know, when President Obama was elected, I said, "Well, the one thing, I think he'll do well. I think he'll be a great cheerleader for the country. I think he'd be a great spirit."

He was vibrant. He was young. I really thought that he would be a great cheerleader.

He's not a leader. That's true. You're right about that.

But he wasn't a cheerleader. He's actually a negative force. He's been a negative force. He wasn't a cheerleader; he was the opposite.

We need somebody that can take the brand of the United States and make it great again. It's not great again.

We need— we need somebody— we need somebody that literally will take this country and make it great again. We can do that.

And, I will tell you, I love my life. I have a wonderful family. They're saying, "Dad, you're going to do something that's going to be so tough."

You know, all of my life, I've heard that a truly successful person, a really, really successful person and even modestly successful cannot run for public office. Just can't happen. And yet that's the kind of mindset that you need to make this country great again.

So ladies and gentlemen... I am officially running... for president of the United States, and we are going to make our country great again.

It can happen. Our country has tremendous potential. We have tremendous people.

We have people that aren't working. We have people that have no incentive to work. But they're going to have incentive to work, because the greatest social program is a job. And they'll be proud, and they'll love it, and they'll make much more than they would've ever made, and they'll be— they'll be doing so well, and we're going to be thriving as a country, thriving. It can happen.

I will be the greatest jobs president that God ever created. I tell you that.

I'll bring back our jobs from China, from Mexico, from Japan, from so many places. I'll bring back our jobs, and I'll bring back our money.

Right now, think of this: We owe China \$1.3 trillion. We owe Japan more than that. So they come in, they take our jobs, they take our money, and then they loan us back the money, and we pay them in interest, and then the dollar goes up so their deal's even better.

How stupid are our leaders? How stupid are these politicians to allow this to happen? How stupid are they?

I'm going to tell you— thank you. I'm going to tell you a couple of stories about trade, because I'm totally against the trade bill for a number of reasons.

Number one, the people negotiating don't have a clue. Our president doesn't have a clue. He's a bad negotiator.

He's the one that did Bergdahl. We get Bergdahl, they get five killer terrorists that everybody wanted over there.

We get Bergdahl. We get a traitor. We get a no-good traitor, and they get the five people that they wanted for years, and those people are now back on the battlefield trying to kill us. That's the negotiator we have.

Take a look at the deal he's making with Iran. He makes that deal, Israel maybe won't exist very long. It's a disaster, and we have to protect Israel. But...

So we need people— I'm a free trader. But the problem with free trade is you need really talented people to negotiate for you. If you don't have talented people, if you don't have great leadership,

if you don't have people that know business, not just a political hack that got the job because he made a contribution to a campaign, which is the way all jobs, just about, are gotten, free trade terrible.

Free trade can be wonderful if you have smart people, but we have people that are stupid. We have people that aren't smart. And we have people that are controlled by special interests. And it's just not going to work.

So, here's a couple of stories happened recently. A friend of mine is a great manufacturer. And, you know, China comes over and they dump all their stuff, and I buy it. I buy it, because, frankly, I have an obligation to buy it, because they devalue their currency so brilliantly, they just did it recently, and nobody thought they could do it again.

But with all our problems with Russia, with all our problems with everything— everything, they got away with it again. And it's impossible for our people here to compete.

So I want to tell you this story. A friend of mine who's a great manufacturer, calls me up a few weeks ago. He's very upset. I said, "What's your problem?"

He said, "You know, I make great product."

And I said, "I know. I know that because I buy the product."

He said, "I can't get it into China. They won't accept it. I sent a boat over and they actually sent it back. They talked about environmental, they talked about all sorts of crap that had nothing to do with it."

I said, "Oh, wait a minute, that's terrible. Does anyone know this?"

He said, "Yeah, they do it all the time with other people."

I said, "They send it back?"

"Yeah. So I finally got it over there and they charged me a big tariff. They're not supposed to be doing that. I told them."

Now, they do charge you tariff on trucks, when we send trucks and other things over there.

Ask Boeing. They wanted Boeing's secrets. They wanted their patents and all their secrets before they agreed to buy planes from Boeing.

Hey, I'm not saying they're stupid. I like China. I sell apartments for— I just sold an apartment for \$15 million to somebody from China. Am I supposed to dislike them? I own a big chunk of the Bank of America Building at 1290 Avenue of the Americas, that I got from China in a war. Very valuable.

I love China. The biggest bank in the world is from China. You know where their United States headquarters is located? In this building, in Trump Tower. I love China. People say, "Oh, you don't like China?"

No, I love them. But their leaders are much smarter than our leaders, and we can't sustain ourself with that. There's too much— it's like— it's like take the New England Patriots and Tom Brady and have them play your high school football team. That's the difference between China's leaders and our leaders.

They are ripping us. We are rebuilding China. We're rebuilding many countries. China, you go there now, roads, bridges, schools, you never saw anything like it. They have bridges that make the George Washington Bridge look like small potatoes. And they're all over the place.

We have all the cards, but we don't know how to use them. We don't even know that we have the cards, because our leaders don't understand the game. We could turn off that spigot by charging them tax until they behave properly.

Now they're going militarily. They're building a military island in the middle of the South China sea. A military island. Now, our country could never do that because we'd have to get environmental clearance, and the environmentalist wouldn't let our country— we would never build in an ocean. They built it in about one year, this massive military port.

They're building up their military to a point that is very scary. You have a problem with ISIS. You have a bigger problem with China.

And, in my opinion, the new China, believe it or not, in terms of trade, is Mexico.

So this man tells me about the manufacturing. I say, "That's a terrible story. I hate to hear it."

But I have another one, Ford.

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

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

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

So I announced that I'm running for president. I would...

... one of the early things I would do, probably before I even got in— and I wouldn't even use— you know, I have— I know the smartest negotiators in the world. I know the good ones. I know the bad ones. I know the overrated ones.

You get a lot of them that are overrated. They're not good. They think they are. They get good stories, because the newspapers get buffaloed. But they're not good.

But I know the negotiators in the world, and I put them one for each country. Believe me, folks. We will do very, very well, very, very well.

But I wouldn't even waste my time with this one. I would call up the head of Ford, who I know. If I was president, I'd say, "Congratulations. I understand that you're building a nice \$2.5 billion car factory in Mexico and that you're going to take your cars and sell them to the United States zero tax, just flow them across the border."

And you say to yourself, "How does that help us," right? "How does that help us? Where is that good"? It's not.

So I would say, "Congratulations. That's the good news. Let me give you the bad news. Every car and every truck and every part manufactured in this plant that comes across the border, we're

going to charge you a 35-percent tax, and that tax is going to be paid simultaneously with the transaction, and that's it.

Now, here's what is going to happen. If it's not me in the position, it's one of these politicians that we're running against, you know, the 400 people that we're (inaudible). And here's what's going to happen. They're not so stupid. They know it's not a good thing, and they may even be upset by it. But then they're going to get a call from the donors or probably from the lobbyist for Ford and say, "You can't do that to Ford, because Ford takes care of me and I take care of you, and you can't do that to Ford."

And guess what? No problem. They're going to build in Mexico. They're going to take away thousands of jobs. It's very bad for us.

So under President Trump, here's what would happen:

The head of Ford will call me back, I would say within an hour after I told them the bad news. But it could be he'd want to be cool, and he'll wait until the next day. You know, they want to be a little cool.

And he'll say, "Please, please, please." He'll beg for a little while, and I'll say, "No interest." Then he'll call all sorts of political people, and I'll say, "Sorry, fellas. No interest," because I don't need anybody's money. It's nice. I don't need anybody's money.

I'm using my own money. I'm not using the lobbyists. I'm not using donors. I don't care. I'm really rich. I (inaudible).

And by the way, I'm not even saying that's the kind of mindset, that's the kind of thinking you need for this country.

So— because we got to make the country rich.

It sounds crass. Somebody said, "Oh, that's crass." It's not crass.

We got \$18 trillion in debt. We got nothing but problems.

We got a military that needs equipment all over the place. We got nuclear weapons that are obsolete.

We've got nothing. We've got Social Security that's going to be destroyed if somebody like me doesn't bring money into the country. All these other people want to cut the hell out of it. I'm not going to cut it at all; I'm going to bring money in, and we're going to save it.

But here's what's going to happen:

After I'm called by 30 friends of mine who contributed to different campaigns, after I'm called by all of the special interests and by the— the donors and by the lobbyists— and they have zero chance at convincing me, zero— I'll get a call the next day from the head of Ford. He'll say, "Please reconsider," I'll say no.

He'll say, "Mr. President, we've decided to move the plant back to the United States, and we're not going to build it in Mexico." That's it. They have no choice. They have no choice.

There are hundreds of things like that. I'll give you another example.

Saudi Arabia, they make \$1 billion a day. \$1 billion a day. I love the Saudis. Many are in this building. They make a billion dollars a day. Whenever they have problems, we send over the ships. We say “we’re gonna protect.” What are we doing? They’ve got nothing but money.

If the right person asked them, they’d pay a fortune. They wouldn’t be there except for us.

And believe me, you look at the border with Yemen. You remember Obama a year ago, Yemen was a great victory. Two weeks later, the place was blown up. Everybody got out— and they kept our equipment.

They always keep our equipment. We ought to send used equipment, right? They always keep our equipment. We ought to send some real junk, because, frankly, it would be— we ought to send our surplus. We’re always losing this gorgeous brand-new stuff.

But look at that border with Saudi Arabia. Do you really think that these people are interested in Yemen? Saudi Arabia without us is gone. They’re gone.

And I’m the one that made all of the right predictions about Iraq. You know, all of these politicians that I’m running against now— it’s so nice to say I’m running as opposed to if I run, if I run. I’m running.

But all of these politicians that I’m running against now, they’re trying to disassociate. I mean, you looked at Bush, it took him five days to answer the question on Iraq. He couldn’t answer the question. He didn’t know. I said, “Is he intelligent?”

Then I looked at Rubio. He was unable to answer the question, is Iraq a good thing or bad thing? He didn’t know. He couldn’t answer the question.

How are these people gonna lead us? How are we gonna— how are we gonna go back and make it great again? We can’t. They don’t have a clue. They can’t lead us. They can’t. They can’t even answer simple questions. It was terrible.

But Saudi Arabia is in big, big trouble. Now, thanks to fracking and other things, the oil is all over the place. And I used to say it, there are ships at sea, and this was during the worst crisis, that were loaded up with oil, and the cartel kept the price up, because, again, they were smarter than our leaders. They were smarter than our leaders.

There is so much wealth out there that can make our country so rich again, and therefore make it great again. Because we need money. We’re dying. We’re dying. We need money. We have to do it. And we need the right people.

So Ford will come back. They’ll all come back. And I will say this, this is going to be an election, in my opinion, that’s based on competence.

Somebody said — thank you, darlin’.

Somebody said to me the other day, a reporter, a very nice reporter, “But, Mr. Trump, you’re not a nice person.”

That’s true. But actually I am. I think I am a nice person. People that know me, like me. Does my family like me? I think so, right. Look at my family. I’m proud of my family.

By the way, speaking of my family, Melania, Barron, Kai, Donnie, Don, Vanessa, Tiffany, Ivanka did a great job. Did she do a great job?

Great. Jared, Laura and Eric, I’m very proud of my family. They’re a great family.

So the reporter said to me the other day, “But, Mr. Trump, you’re not a nice person. How can you get people to vote for you?”

I said, “I don’t know.” I said, “I think that number one, I am a nice person. I give a lot of money away to charities and other things. I think I’m actually a very nice person.”

But, I said, “This is going to be an election that’s based on competence, because people are tired of these nice people. And they’re tired of being ripped off by everybody in the world. And they’re tired of spending more money on education than any nation in the world per capita, than any nation in the world, and we are 26th in the world, 25 countries are better than us in education. And some of them are like third world countries. But we’re becoming a third world country, because of our infrastructure, our airports, our roads, everything. So one of the things I did, and I said, you know what I’ll do. I’ll do it. Because a lot of people said, “He’ll never run. Number one, he won’t want to give up his lifestyle.”

They’re right about that, but I’m doing it.

Number two, I’m a private company, so nobody knows what I’m worth. And the one thing is that when you run, you have to announce and certify to all sorts of governmental authorities your net worth.

So I said, “That’s OK.” I’m proud of my net worth. I’ve done an amazing job.

I started off— thank you— I started off in a small office with my father in Brooklyn and Queens, and my father said — and I love my father. I learned so much. He was a great negotiator. I learned so much just sitting at his feet playing with blocks listening to him negotiate with subcontractors. But I learned a lot.

But he used to say, “Donald, don’t go into Manhattan. That’s the big leagues. We don’t know anything about that. Don’t do it.”

I said, “I gotta go into Manhattan. I gotta build those big buildings. I gotta do it, Dad. I’ve gotta do it.”

And after four or five years in Brooklyn, I ventured into Manhattan and did a lot of great deals—the Grand Hyatt Hotel. I was responsible for the convention center on the west side. I did a lot of great deals, and I did them early and young. And now I’m building all over the world, and I love what I’m doing.

But they all said, a lot of the pundits on television, “Well, Donald will never run, and one of the main reasons is he’s private and he’s probably not as successful as everybody thinks.”

So I said to myself, you know, nobody’s ever going to know unless I run, because I’m really proud of my success. I really am.

I’ve employed— I’ve employed tens of thousands of people over my lifetime. That means medical. That means education. That means everything.

So a large accounting firm and my accountants have been working for months, because it’s big and complex, and they’ve put together a statement, a financial statement, just a summary. But everything will be filed eventually with the government, and we don’t [use] extensions or anything. We’ll be filing it right on time. We don’t need anything.

And it was even reported incorrectly yesterday, because they said, “He had assets of \$9 billion.” So I said, “No, that’s the wrong number. That’s the wrong number. Not assets.”

So they put together this. And before I say it, I have to say this. I made it the old-fashioned way. It's real estate. You know, it's real estate.

It's labor, and it's unions good and some bad and lots of people that aren't in unions, and it's all over the place and building all over the world.

And I have assets— big accounting firm, one of the most highly respected— 9 billion 240 million dollars.

And I have liabilities of about \$500 million. That's long-term debt, very low interest rates.

In fact, one of the big banks came to me and said, "Donald, you don't have enough borrowings. Could we loan you \$4 billion"? I said, "I don't need it. I don't want it. And I've been there. I don't want it."

But in two seconds, they give me whatever I wanted. So I have a total net worth, and now with the increase, it'll be well-over \$10 billion. But here, a total net worth of—net worth, not assets, not— a net worth, after all debt, after all expenses, the greatest assets— Trump Tower, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, Bank of America building in San Francisco, 40 Wall Street, sometimes referred to as the Trump building right opposite the New York— many other places all over the world.

So the total is \$8,737,540,00.

Now I'm not doing that...

I'm not doing that to brag, because you know what? I don't have to brag. I don't have to, believe it or not.

I'm doing that to say that that's the kind of thinking our country needs. We need that thinking. We have the opposite thinking.

We have losers. We have losers. We have people that don't have it. We have people that are morally corrupt. We have people that are selling this country down the drain.

So I put together this statement, and the only reason I'm telling you about it today is because we really do have to get going, because if we have another three or four years— you know, we're at \$8 trillion now. We're soon going to be at \$20 trillion.

According to the economists— who I'm not big believers in, but, nevertheless, this is what they're saying— that \$24 trillion— we're very close— that's the point of no return. \$24 trillion. We will be there soon. That's when we become Greece. That's when we become a country that's unsalvageable. And we're gonna be there very soon. We're gonna be there very soon.

So, just to sum up, I would do various things very quickly. I would repeal and replace the big lie, Obamacare.

I would build a great wall, and nobody builds walls better than me, believe me, and I'll build them very inexpensively, I will build a great, great wall on our southern border. And I will have Mexico pay for that wall.

Mark my words.

Nobody would be tougher on ISIS than Donald Trump. Nobody.

I will find — within our military, I will find the General Patton or I will find General MacArthur, I will find the right guy. I will find the guy that's going to take that military and make it really work. Nobody, nobody will be pushing us around.

I will stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons. And we won't be using a man like Secretary Kerry that has absolutely no concept of negotiation, who's making a horrible and laughable deal, who's just being tapped along as they make weapons right now, and then goes into a bicycle race at 72 years old, and falls and breaks his leg. I won't be doing that. And I promise I will never be in a bicycle race. That I can tell you.

I will immediately terminate President Obama's illegal executive order on immigration, immediately.

Fully support and back up the Second Amendment.

Now, it's very interesting. Today I heard it. Through stupidity, in a very, very hard core prison, interestingly named Clinton, two vicious murderers, two vicious people escaped, and nobody knows where they are. And a woman was on television this morning, and she said, "You know, Mr. Trump," and she was telling other people, and I actually called her, and she said, "You know, Mr. Trump, I always was against guns. I didn't want guns. And now since this happened"— it's up in the prison area— "my husband and I are finally in agreement, because he wanted the guns. We now have a gun on every table. We're ready to start shooting."

I said, "Very interesting."

So protect the Second Amendment.

End— end Common Core. Common Core should— it is a disaster. Bush is totally in favor of Common Core. I don't see how he can possibly get the nomination. He's weak on immigration. He's in favor of Common Core. How the hell can you vote for this guy? You just can't do it. We have to end education has to be local.

Rebuild the country's infrastructure.

Nobody can do that like me. Believe me. It will be done on time, on budget, way below cost, way below what anyone ever thought.

I look at the roads being built all over the country, and I say I can build those things for one-third. What they do is unbelievable, how bad.

You know, we're building on Pennsylvania Avenue, the Old Post Office, we're converting it into one of the world's great hotels. It's gonna be the best hotel in Washington, D.C. We got it from the General Services Administration in Washington. The Obama administration. We got it. It was the most highly sought after— or one of them, but I think the most highly sought after project in the history of General Services. We got it. People were shocked, Trump got it.

Well, I got it for two reasons. Number one, we're really good. Number two, we had a really good plan. And I'll add in the third, we had a great financial statement. Because the General Services, who are terrific people, by the way, and talented people, they wanted to do a great job. And they wanted to make sure it got built.

So we have to rebuild our infrastructure, our bridges, our roadways, our airports. You come into La Guardia Airport, it's like we're in a third world country. You look at the patches and the 40-year-old floor. They throw down asphalt, and they throw.

You look at these airports, we are like a third world country. And I come in from China and I come in from Qatar and I come in from different places, and they have the most incredible airports in the world. You come to back to this country and you have LAX, disaster. You have all of these disastrous airports. We have to rebuild our infrastructure.

Save Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security without cuts. Have to do it.

Get rid of the fraud. Get rid of the waste and abuse, but save it. People have been paying it for years. And now many of these candidates want to cut it. You save it by making the United States, by making us rich again, by taking back all of the money that's being lost.

Renegotiate our foreign trade deals.

Reduce our \$18 trillion in debt, because, believe me, we're in a bubble. We have artificially low interest rates. We have a stock market that, frankly, has been good to me, but I still hate to see what's happening. We have a stock market that is so bloated.

Be careful of a bubble because what you've seen in the past might be small potatoes compared to what happens. So be very, very careful.

And strengthen our military and take care of our vets. So, so important.

Sadly, the American dream is dead.

But if I get elected president I will bring it back bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and we will make America great again.

Thank you. Thank you very much.

Appendix C – Donald Trump’s acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention—July 21, 2016

Who would have believed that when we started this journey on June 16, last year, we — 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 it? The Democrats on the other hand, received 20 percent fewer votes than they got four years ago, 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 2017, safety will be restored.

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.

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% in America's fifty largest cities. That's the largest increase in 25 years.

In our nation's capital, killings have risen by 50 percent. They are up nearly 60 percent in nearby Baltimore.

In the president's hometown of Chicago, more than 2,000 have been the victims 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 of 2015.

They are being released by the tens of thousands into 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. 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. One more child to sacrifice 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% of African-American youth are now not employed.

2 million more Latinos are in poverty today than when the president took his oath of office 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 is 16 years ago.

Our trade deficit in goods reached — think of this — our trade deficit is \$800 hundred billion dollars. Think of that. \$800 billion last year alone. We will fix that.

The budget is no better. President Obama has almost doubled our national debt to more than \$19 trillion, 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 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 have 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. I am certain it is a decision he truly regrets.

Her bad instincts and her bad judgment, something pointed out by Bernie Sanders are what caused 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 had seen a big reduction in violence. Iran was being choked by sanctions. Syria was somewhat under control.

After four years of Hillary Clinton, what do we have? ISIS has spread across the region and the entire world. Libya is in ruins, and our ambassador and his staff were left helpless to die at the hands of savage killers. Egypt was turned over to the radical Muslim Brotherhood, forcing the military to retake control. Iraq is in chaos. Iran is on the path to nuclear weapons. Syria is engulfed in a civil war and a refugee crisis that now threatens the West. After 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 and 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. A change in leadership is required to produce a change in outcomes.

Tonight, I will share with you for action for America. The most important difference between our plan and that of our opponents, 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.

First, 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 is because these interests have rigged our political and economic system for their exclusive benefit. Believe me. It is for their benefit. 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 had 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 will not 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. No tolerance for government incompetence. When innocent people suffer, because our political system lacks the will, or the courage, or the basic decency to enforce our laws, or worse still, has sold out to some corporate lobbyist for cash I am not able to look the other way. And I won't look the other way.

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 an egregious crime and getting away with it, especially when others who have been far less have paid so dearly.

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

I have joined the political arena so that the powerful can no longer beat up on people that 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.

But his supporters will join our movement, because we will fix his biggest issue: Trade deals that strip our country of jobs and the distribution of wealth in the 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 Indiana, which is amazing. He is a man of character and accomplishment. He is the right 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 their — our communities.

America was shocked to its core when our police officers in Dallas were so brutally executed. Immediately after Dallas, we have 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 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.

I will work with, and appoint, the best prosecutors and law enforcement officials in the country 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 seeing.

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 life better for young Americans in Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit, and Ferguson who have really come in every way, have the same right to live out their dreams as any other child in America?

To make life safe in America, we must also address the growing threats from outside the country. We are going to defeat the barbarians of ISIS. And we are going to defeat them bad.

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, and a military recruiting center in Chattanooga, Tennessee. And 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, Libya, in Egypt, and 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 cost. 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 — think of this, this is not believable, but this is what is happening — a 550 percent increase in Syrian refugees on top of 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 are just three brave representatives of many thousands who have suffered so greatly.

Of all my travels in this country, nothing has affected me more, nothing even close 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 none too 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 sanctuary for Kate Steinle? Where was sanctuary for the children of Mary Ann, Sabine and Jamiel? Is so sad to even be talking about this. We can solve it so quickly. Where was sanctuary for all the other Americans who have been so brutally murdered, and who have suffered so horribly? These wounded American families have been alone. But they are not alone any longer.

Tonight, this candidate and this 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 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, immigration system.

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

Peace will be restored by enforcing the rules for the millions who overstay their visas, our laws will finally receive the respect 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 closely to the words I am about to say: On on

January 20 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 from the tremendous cycle of poverty they are going through right now and make it almost impossible for them to join the middle class.

I have a different vision for our workers. 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 businesspeople of the world, I'm 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 our jobs 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 consequences. 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 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 is not going to happen.

I pledge to never sign any trade agreement that hurts our workers, or that diminishes our freedom and Independence. We will never ever sign bad trade deals. America first again. American 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 currently 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 will 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 will experience profound relief, and taxes will be greatly simplified for everyone. I mean everyone.

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

Then we are 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 and it 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 steelworkers of our country out of work and out of business. That will never happen with Donald J trump as president. Our steelworkers and are miners are going back to work again.

With these new economic policies, 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 our 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 education bureaucrats than serve American children. That is what she is doing and that is what she has 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.

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

We will completely rebuild our depleted military. And the countries that we 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 better 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 in 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 and government to provide a list of wasteful spending 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.

We are also going to appoint justices to 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 2nd 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 community because, I will tell you what, the support they have given me — and I'm not sure I totally deserve it — has been so amazing. And has been such a big reason I'm here tonight. They have much to contribute to our policies.

Yet our laws prevent you from speaking your mind 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 will work 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 a 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 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, 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 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 loved my 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 is 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 would not stand, I mean they said Trump does not have a chance of being here tonight, not a chance, the same people. We love defeating those people, don't we? 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. It's we don't have much time. We don't have much time. 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 year champion in the White House. And I will be a champion. 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'm 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!

Appendix D – Hillary Clinton's Campaign Launch Speech—June 13, 2015

Thank you! Oh, thank you all! Thank you so very, very much.

It is wonderful to be here with all of you.

To be in New York with my family, with so many friends, including many New Yorkers who gave me the honor of serving them in the Senate for eight years.

To be right across the water from the headquarters of the United Nations, where I represented our country many times.

To be here in this beautiful park dedicated to Franklin Roosevelt's enduring vision of America, the nation we want to be.

And in a place... with absolutely no ceilings.

You know, President Roosevelt's Four Freedoms are a testament to our nation's unmatched aspirations and a reminder of our unfinished work at home and abroad. His legacy lifted up a nation and inspired presidents who followed. One is the man I served as Secretary of State, Barack Obama, and another is my husband, Bill Clinton.

Two Democrats guided by the — Oh, that will make him so happy. They were and are two Democrats guided by the fundamental American belief that real and lasting prosperity must be built by all and shared by all.

President Roosevelt called on every American to do his or her part, and every American answered. He said there's no mystery about what it takes to build a strong and prosperous America: "Equality of opportunity... Jobs for those who can work... Security for those who need it... The ending of special privilege for the few... The preservation of civil liberties for all... a wider and constantly rising standard of living."

That still sounds good to me.

It's America's basic bargain. If you do your part you ought to be able to get ahead. And when everybody does their part, America gets ahead too.

That bargain inspired generations of families, including my own.

It's what kept my grandfather going to work in the same Scranton lace mill every day for 50 years.

It's what led my father to believe that if he scrimped and saved, his small business printing drapery fabric in Chicago could provide us with a middle-class life. And it did.

When President Clinton honored the bargain, we had the longest peacetime expansion in history, a balanced budget, and the first time in decades we all grew together, with the bottom 20 percent of workers increasing their incomes by the same percentage as the top 5 percent.

When President Obama honored the bargain, we pulled back from the brink of Depression, saved the auto industry, provided health care to 16 million working people, and replaced the jobs we lost faster than after a financial crash.

But, it's not 1941, or 1993, or even 2009. We face new challenges in our economy and our democracy.

We're still working our way back from a crisis that happened because time-tested values were replaced by false promises.

Instead of an economy built by every American, for every American, we were told that if we let those at the top pay lower taxes and bend the rules, their success would trickle down to everyone else.

What happened?

Well, instead of a balanced budget with surpluses that could have eventually paid off our national debt, the Republicans twice cut taxes for the wealthiest, borrowed money from other countries to pay for two wars, and family incomes dropped. You know where we ended up.

Except it wasn't the end.

As we have since our founding, Americans made a new beginning.

You worked extra shifts, took second jobs, postponed home repairs... you figured out how to make it work. And now people are beginning to think about their future again – going to college, starting a business, buying a house, finally being able to put away something for retirement.

So we're standing again. But, we all know we're not yet running the way America should.

You see corporations making record profits, with CEOs making record pay, but your paychecks have barely budged.

While many of you are working multiple jobs to make ends meet, you see the top 25 hedge fund managers making more than all of America's kindergarten teachers combined. And, often paying a lower tax rate.

So, you have to wonder: "When does my hard work pay off? When does my family get ahead?"

"When?"

I say now.

Prosperity can't be just for CEOs and hedge fund managers.

Democracy can't be just for billionaires and corporations.

Prosperity and democracy are part of your basic bargain too.

You brought our country back.

Now it's time — your time to secure the gains and move ahead.

And, you know what?

America can't succeed unless you succeed.

That is why I am running for President of the United States.

Here, on Roosevelt Island, I believe we have a continuing rendezvous with destiny. Each American and the country we cherish.

I'm running to make our economy work for you and for every American.

For the successful and the struggling.

For the innovators and inventors.

For those breaking barriers in technology and discovering cures for diseases.

For the factory workers and food servers who stand on their feet all day.

For the nurses who work the night shift.

For the truckers who drive for hours and the farmers who feed us.

For the veterans who served our country.

For the small business owners who took a risk.

For everyone who's ever been knocked down, but refused to be knocked out.

I'm not running for some Americans, but for all Americans.

Our country's challenges didn't begin with the Great Recession and they won't end with the recovery.

For decades, Americans have been buffeted by powerful currents.

Advances in technology and the rise of global trade have created whole new areas of economic activity and opened new markets for our exports, but they have also displaced jobs and undercut wages for millions of Americans.

The financial industry and many multi-national corporations have created huge wealth for a few by focusing too much on short-term profit and too little on long-term value... too much on complex trading schemes and stock buybacks, too little on investments in new businesses, jobs, and fair compensation.

Our political system is so paralyzed by gridlock and dysfunction that most Americans have lost confidence that anything can actually get done. And they've lost trust in the ability of both government and Big Business to change course.

Now, we can blame historic forces beyond our control for some of this, but the choices we've made as a nation, leaders and citizens alike, have also played a big role.

Our next President must work with Congress and every other willing partner across our entire country. And I will do just that — to turn the tide so these currents start working for us more than against us.

At our best, that's what Americans do. We're problem solvers, not deniers. We don't hide from change, we harness it.

But we can't do that if we go back to the top-down economic policies that failed us before.

Americans have come too far to see our progress ripped away.

Now, there may be some new voices in the presidential Republican choir, but they're all singing the same old song...

A song called "Yesterday."

You know the one — all our troubles look as though they're here to stay... and we need a place to hide away... They believe in yesterday.

And you're lucky I didn't try singing that, too, I'll tell you!

These Republicans trip over themselves promising lower taxes for the wealthy and fewer rules for the biggest corporations without regard for how that will make income inequality even worse.

We've heard this tune before. And we know how it turns out.

Ask many of these candidates about climate change, one of the defining threats of our time, and they'll say: "I'm not a scientist." Well, then, why don't they start listening to those who are?

They pledge to wipe out tough rules on Wall Street, rather than rein in the banks that are still too risky, courting future failures. In a case that can only be considered mass amnesia.

They want to take away health insurance from more than 16 million Americans without offering any credible alternative.

They shame and blame women, rather than respect our right to make our own reproductive health decisions.

They want to put immigrants, who work hard and pay taxes, at risk of deportation.

And they turn their backs on gay people who love each other.

Fundamentally, they reject what it takes to build an inclusive economy. It takes an inclusive society. What I once called "a village" that has a place for everyone.

Now, my values and a lifetime of experiences have given me a different vision for America.

I believe that success isn't measured by how much the wealthiest Americans have, but by how many children climb out of poverty...

How many start-ups and small businesses open and thrive...

How many young people go to college without drowning in debt...

How many people find a good job...

How many families get ahead and stay ahead.

I didn't learn this from politics. I learned it from my own family.

My mother taught me that everybody needs a chance and a champion. She knew what it was like not to have either one.

Her own parents abandoned her, and by 14 she was out on her own, working as a housemaid. Years later, when I was old enough to understand, I asked what kept her going.

You know what her answer was? Something very simple: Kindness from someone who believed she mattered.

The 1st grade teacher who saw she had nothing to eat at lunch and, without embarrassing her, brought extra food to share.

The woman whose house she cleaned letting her go to high school so long as her work got done. That was a bargain she leapt to accept.

And, because some people believed in her, she believed in me.

That's why I believe with all my heart in America and in the potential of every American.

To meet every challenge.

To be resilient... no matter what the world throws at you.

To solve the toughest problems.

I believe we can do all these things because I've seen it happen.

As a young girl, I signed up at my Methodist Church to babysit the children of Mexican farmworkers, while their parents worked in the fields on the weekends. And later, as a law student, I advocated for Congress to require better working and living conditions for farm workers whose children deserved better opportunities.

My first job out of law school was for the Children's Defense Fund. I walked door-to-door to find out how many children with disabilities couldn't go to school, and to help build the case for a law guaranteeing them access to education.

As a leader of the Legal Services Corporation, I defended the right of poor people to have a lawyer. And saw lives changed because an abusive marriage ended or an illegal eviction stopped.

In Arkansas, I supervised law students who represented clients in courts and prisons, organized scholarships for single parents going to college, led efforts for better schools and health care, and personally knew the people whose lives were improved.

As Senator, I had the honor of representing brave firefighters, police officers, EMTs, construction workers, and volunteers who ran toward danger on 9/11 and stayed there, becoming sick themselves.

It took years of effort, but Congress finally approved the health care they needed.

There are so many faces and stories that I carry with me of people who gave their best and then needed help themselves.

Just weeks ago, I met another person like that, a single mom juggling a job and classes at community college, while raising three kids.

She doesn't expect anything to come easy. But she did ask me: What more can be done so it isn't quite so hard for families like hers?

I want to be her champion and your champion.

If you'll give me the chance, I'll wage and win Four Fights for you.

The first is to make the economy work for everyday Americans, not just those at the top.

To make the middle class mean something again, with rising incomes and broader horizons. And to give the poor a chance to work their way into it.

The middle class needs more growth and more fairness. Growth and fairness go together. For lasting prosperity, you can't have one without the other.

Is this possible in today's world?

I believe it is or I wouldn't be standing here.

Do I think it will be easy? Of course not.

But, here's the good news: There are allies for change everywhere who know we can't stand by while inequality increases, wages stagnate, and the promise of America dims. We should welcome the support of all Americans who want to go forward together with us.

There are public officials who know Americans need a better deal.

Business leaders who want higher pay for employees, equal pay for women and no discrimination against the LGBT community either.

There are leaders of finance who want less short-term trading and more long-term investing.

There are union leaders who are investing their own pension funds in putting people to work to build tomorrow's economy. We need everyone to come to the table and work with us.

In the coming weeks, I'll propose specific policies to:

Reward businesses who invest in long term value rather than the quick buck – because that leads to higher growth for the economy, higher wages for workers, and yes, bigger profits, everybody will have a better time.

I will rewrite the tax code so it rewards hard work and investments here at home, not quick trades or stashing profits overseas.

I will give new incentives to companies that give their employees a fair share of the profits their hard work earns.

We will unleash a new generation of entrepreneurs and small business owners by providing tax relief, cutting red tape, and making it easier to get a small business loan.

We will restore America to the cutting edge of innovation, science, and research by increasing both public and private investments.

And we will make America the clean energy superpower of the 21st century.

Developing renewable power – wind, solar, advanced biofuels...

Building cleaner power plants, smarter electric grids, greener buildings...

Using additional fees and royalties from fossil fuel extraction to protect the environment...

And ease the transition for distressed communities to a more diverse and sustainable economic future from coal country to Indian country, from small towns in the Mississippi Delta to the Rio Grande Valley to our inner cities, we have to help our fellow Americans.

Now, this will create millions of jobs and countless new businesses, and enable America to lead the global fight against climate change.

We will also connect workers to their jobs and businesses. Customers will have a better chance to actually get where they need and get what they desire with roads, railways, bridges, airports, ports, and broadband brought up to global standards for the 21st century.

We will establish an infrastructure bank and sell bonds to pay for some of these improvements.

Now, building an economy for tomorrow also requires investing in our most important asset, our people, beginning with our youngest.

That's why I will propose that we make preschool and quality childcare available to every child in America.

And I want you to remember this, because to me, this is absolutely the most-compelling argument why we should do this. Research tells us how much early learning in the first five years of life can impact lifelong success. In fact, 80 percent of the brain is developed by age three.

One thing I've learned is that talent is universal – you can find it anywhere – but opportunity is not. Too many of our kids never have the chance to learn and thrive as they should and as we need them to.

Our country won't be competitive or fair if we don't help more families give their kids the best possible start in life.

So let's staff our primary and secondary schools with teachers who are second to none in the world, and receive the respect they deserve for sparking the love of learning in every child.

Let's make college affordable and available to all ...and lift the crushing burden of student debt.

Let's provide lifelong learning for workers to gain or improve skills the economy requires, setting up many more Americans for success.

Now, the second fight is to strengthen America's families, because when our families are strong, America is strong.

And today's families face new and unique pressures. Parents need more support and flexibility to do their job at work and at home.

I believe you should have the right to earn paid sick days.

I believe you should receive your work schedule with enough notice to arrange childcare or take college courses to get ahead.

I believe you should look forward to retirement with confidence, not anxiety.

That you should have the peace of mind that your health care will be there when you need it, without breaking the bank.

I believe we should offer paid family leave so no one has to choose between keeping a paycheck and caring for a new baby or a sick relative.

And it is way past time to end the outrage of so many women still earning less than men on the job — and women of color often making even less.

This isn't a women's issue. It's a family issue. Just like raising the minimum wage is a family issue. Expanding childcare is a family issue. Declining marriage rates is a family issue. The unequal rates of incarceration is a family issue. Helping more people with an addiction or a mental health problem get help is a family issue.

In America, every family should feel like they belong.

So we should offer hard-working, law-abiding immigrant families a path to citizenship. Not second-class status.

And, we should ban discrimination against LGBT Americans and their families so they can live, learn, marry, and work just like everybody else.

You know, America's diversity, our openness, our devotion to human rights and freedom is what's drawn so many to our shores. What's inspired people all over the world. I know. I've seen it with my own eyes.

And these are also qualities that prepare us well for the demands of a world that is more interconnected than ever before.

So we have a third fight: to harness all of America's power, smarts, and values to maintain our leadership for peace, security, and prosperity.

No other country on Earth is better positioned to thrive in the 21st century. No other country is better equipped to meet traditional threats from countries like Russia, North Korea, and Iran – and to deal with the rise of new powers like China.

No other country is better prepared to meet emerging threats from cyber attacks, transnational terror networks like ISIS, and diseases that spread across oceans and continents.

As your President, I'll do whatever it takes to keep Americans safe.

And if you look over my left shoulder you can see the new World Trade Center soaring skyward.

As a Senator from New York, I dedicated myself to getting our city and state the help we needed to recover. And as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I worked to maintain the best-trained, best-equipped, strongest military, ready for today's threats and tomorrow's.

And when our brave men and women come home from war or finish their service, I'll see to it that they get not just the thanks of a grateful nation, but the care and benefits they've earned.

I've stood up to adversaries like Putin and reinforced allies like Israel. I was in the Situation Room on the day we got bin Laden.

But, I know — I know we have to be smart as well as strong.

Meeting today's global challenges requires every element of America's power, including skillful diplomacy, economic influence, and building partnerships to improve lives around the world with people, not just their governments.

There are a lot of trouble spots in the world, but there's a lot of good news out there too.

I believe the future holds far more opportunities than threats if we exercise creative and confident leadership that enables us to shape global events rather than be shaped by them.

And we all know that in order to be strong in the world, though, we first have to be strong at home. That's why we have to win the fourth fight – reforming our government and revitalizing our democracy so that it works for everyday Americans.

We have to stop the endless flow of secret, unaccountable money that is distorting our elections, corrupting our political process, and drowning out the voices of our people.

We need Justices on the Supreme Court who will protect every citizen's right to vote, rather than every corporation's right to buy elections.

If necessary, I will support a constitutional amendment to undo the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United.

I want to make it easier for every citizen to vote. That's why I've proposed universal, automatic registration and expanded early voting.

I'll fight back against Republican efforts to disempower and disenfranchise young people, poor people, people with disabilities, and people of color.

What part of democracy are they afraid of?

No matter how easy we make it to vote, we still have to give Americans something worth voting for.

Government is never going to have all the answers – but it has to be smarter, simpler, more efficient, and a better partner.

That means access to advanced technology so government agencies can more effectively serve their customers, the American people.

We need expertise and innovation from the private sector to help cut waste and streamline services.

There's so much that works in America. For every problem we face, someone somewhere in America is solving it. Silicon Valley cracked the code on sharing and scaling a while ago. Many states are pioneering new ways to deliver services. I want to help Washington catch up.

To do that, we need a political system that produces results by solving problems that hold us back, not one overwhelmed by extreme partisanship and inflexibility.

Now, I'll always seek common ground with friend and opponent alike. But I'll also stand my ground when I must.

That's something I did as Senator and Secretary of State — whether it was working with Republicans to expand health care for children and for our National Guard, or improve our foster care and adoption system, or pass a treaty to reduce the number of Russian nuclear warheads that could threaten our cities — and it's something I will always do as your President.

We Americans may differ, bicker, stumble, and fall; but we are at our best when we pick each other up, when we have each other's back.

Like any family, our American family is strongest when we cherish what we have in common, and fight back against those who would drive us apart.

People all over the world have asked me: “How could you and President Obama work together after you fought so hard against each other in that long campaign?”

Now, that is an understandable question considering that in many places, if you lose an election you could get imprisoned or exiled – even killed – not hired as Secretary of State.

But President Obama asked me to serve, and I accepted because we both love our country. That's how we do it in America.

With that same spirit, together, we can win these four fights.

We can build an economy where hard work is rewarded.

We can strengthen our families.

We can defend our country and increase our opportunities all over the world.

And we can renew the promise of our democracy.

If we all do our part. In our families, in our businesses, unions, houses of worship, schools, and, yes, in the voting booth.

I want you to join me in this effort. Help me build this campaign and make it your own.

Talk to your friends, your family, your neighbors.

Text “JOIN” J-O-I-N to 4-7-2-4-6.

Go to hillaryclinton.com and sign up to make calls and knock on doors.

It’s no secret that we’re going up against some pretty powerful forces that will do and spend whatever it takes to advance a very different vision for America. But I’ve spent my life fighting for children, families, and our country. And I’m not stopping now.

You know, I know how hard this job is. I’ve seen it up close and personal.

All our Presidents come into office looking so vigorous. And then we watch their hair grow grayer and grayer.

Well, I may not be the youngest candidate in this race. But I will be the youngest woman President in the history of the United States!

And the first grandmother as well.

And one additional advantage: You’re won’t see my hair turn white in the White House. I’ve been coloring it for years!

So I’m looking forward to a great debate among Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. I’m not running to be a President only for those Americans who already agree with me. I want to be a President for all Americans.

And along the way, I’ll just let you in on this little secret. I won’t get everything right. Lord knows I’ve made my share of mistakes. Well, there’s no shortage of people pointing them out!

And I certainly haven’t won every battle I’ve fought. But leadership means perseverance and hard choices. You have to push through the setbacks and disappointments and keep at it.

I think you know by now that I’ve been called many things by many people — “quitter” is not one of them.

Like so much else in my life, I got this from my mother.

When I was a girl, she never let me back down from any bully or barrier. In her later years, Mom lived with us, and she was still teaching me the same lessons. I’d come home from a hard day at the Senate or the State Department, sit down with her at the small table in our breakfast nook, and just let everything pour out. And she would remind me why we keep fighting, even when the odds are long and the opposition is fierce.

I can still hear her saying: “Life’s not about what happens to you, it’s about what you do with what happens to you – so get back out there.”

She lived to be 92 years old, and I often think about all the battles she witnessed over the course of the last century — all the progress that was won because Americans refused to give up or back down.

She was born on June 4, 1919 — before women in America had the right to vote. But on that very day, after years of struggle, Congress passed the Constitutional Amendment that would change that forever.

The story of America is a story of hard-fought, hard-won progress. And it continues today. New chapters are being written by men and women who believe that all of us – not just some, but all – should have the chance to live up to our God-given potential.

Not only because we're a tolerant country, or a generous country, or a compassionate country, but because we're a better, stronger, more prosperous country when we harness the talent, hard work, and ingenuity of every single American.

I wish my mother could have been with us longer. I wish she could have seen Chelsea become a mother herself. I wish she could have met Charlotte.

I wish she could have seen the America we're going to build together.

An America, where if you do your part, you reap the rewards.

Where we don't leave anyone out, or anyone behind.

An America where a father can tell his daughter: yes, you can be anything you want to be. Even President of the United States.

Thank you all. God bless you. And may God bless America.

Appendix E – First Presidential Debate—September 26, 2016

HOLT: Good evening from Hofstra University in Hempstead, New York. I'm Lester Holt, anchor of "NBC Nightly News." I want to welcome you to the first presidential debate.

The participants tonight are Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. This debate is sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates, a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization. The commission drafted tonight's format, and the rules have been agreed to by the campaigns.

The 90-minute debate is divided into six segments, each 15 minutes long. We'll explore three topic areas tonight: Achieving prosperity; America's direction; and securing America. At the start of each segment, I will ask the same lead-off question to both candidates, and they will each have up to two minutes to respond. From that point until the end of the segment, we'll have an open discussion.

The questions are mine and have not been shared with the commission or the campaigns. The audience here in the room has agreed to remain silent so that we can focus on what the candidates are saying.

I will invite you to applaud, however, at this moment, as we welcome the candidates: Democratic nominee for president of the United States, Hillary Clinton, and Republican nominee for president of the United States, Donald J. Trump.

(APPLAUSE)

CLINTON: How are you, Donald?

(APPLAUSE)

HOLT: Good luck to you.

(APPLAUSE)

Well, I don't expect us to cover all the issues of this campaign tonight, but I remind everyone, there are two more presidential debates scheduled. We are going to focus on many of the issues that voters tell us are most important, and we're going to press for specifics. I am honored to have this role, but this evening belongs to the candidates and, just as important, to the American people.

Candidates, we look forward to hearing you articulate your policies and your positions, as well as your visions and your values. So, let's begin.

We're calling this opening segment "Achieving Prosperity." And central to that is jobs. There are two economic realities in America today. There's been a record six straight years of job growth, and new census numbers show incomes have increased at a record rate after years of stagnation. However, income inequality remains significant, and nearly half of Americans are living paycheck to paycheck.

Beginning with you, Secretary Clinton, why are you a better choice than your opponent to create the kinds of jobs that will put more money into the pockets of American workers?

CLINTON: Well, thank you, Lester, and thanks to Hofstra for hosting us.

The central question in this election is really what kind of country we want to be and what kind of future we'll build together. Today is my granddaughter's second birthday, so I think about this

a lot. First, we have to build an economy that works for everyone, not just those at the top. That means we need new jobs, good jobs, with rising incomes.

I want us to invest in you. I want us to invest in your future. That means jobs in infrastructure, in advanced manufacturing, innovation and technology, clean, renewable energy, and small business, because most of the new jobs will come from small business. We also have to make the economy fairer. That starts with raising the national minimum wage and also guarantee, finally, equal pay for women's work.

CLINTON: I also want to see more companies do profit-sharing. If you help create the profits, you should be able to share in them, not just the executives at the top.

And I want us to do more to support people who are struggling to balance family and work. I've heard from so many of you about the difficult choices you face and the stresses that you're under. So let's have paid family leave, earned sick days. Let's be sure we have affordable child care and debt-free college.

How are we going to do it? We're going to do it by having the wealthy pay their fair share and close the corporate loopholes.

Finally, we tonight are on the stage together, Donald Trump and I. Donald, it's good to be with you. We're going to have a debate where we are talking about the important issues facing our country. You have to judge us, who can shoulder the immense, awesome responsibilities of the presidency, who can put into action the plans that will make your life better. I hope that I will be able to earn your vote on November 8th.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton, thank you.

Mr. Trump, the same question to you. It's about putting money -- more money into the pockets of American workers. You have up to two minutes.

TRUMP: Thank you, Lester. Our jobs are fleeing the country. They're going to Mexico. They're going to many other countries. You look at what China is doing to our country in terms of making our product. They're devaluing their currency, and there's nobody in our government to fight them. And we have a very good fight. And we have a winning fight. Because they're using our country as a piggy bank to rebuild China, and many other countries are doing the same thing.

So we're losing our good jobs, so many of them. When you look at what's happening in Mexico, a friend of mine who builds plants said it's the eighth wonder of the world. They're building some of the biggest plants anywhere in the world, some of the most sophisticated, some of the best plants. With the United States, as he said, not so much.

So Ford is leaving. You see that, their small car division leaving. Thousands of jobs leaving Michigan, leaving Ohio. They're all leaving. And we can't allow it to happen anymore. As far as child care is concerned and so many other things, I think Hillary and I agree on that. We probably disagree a little bit as to numbers and amounts and what we're going to do, but perhaps we'll be talking about that later.

But we have to stop our jobs from being stolen from us. We have to stop our companies from leaving the United States and, with it, firing all of their people. All you have to do is take a look at Carrier air conditioning in Indianapolis. They left -- fired 1,400 people. They're going to Mexico. So many hundreds and hundreds of companies are doing this.

TRUMP: We cannot let it happen. Under my plan, I'll be reducing taxes tremendously, from 35 percent to 15 percent for companies, small and big businesses. That's going to be a job creator like we haven't seen since Ronald Reagan. It's going to be a beautiful thing to watch.

Companies will come. They will build. They will expand. New companies will start. And I look very, very much forward to doing it. We have to renegotiate our trade deals, and we have to stop these countries from stealing our companies and our jobs.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton, would you like to respond?

CLINTON: Well, I think that trade is an important issue. Of course, we are 5 percent of the world's population; we have to trade with the other 95 percent. And we need to have smart, fair trade deals.

We also, though, need to have a tax system that rewards work and not just financial transactions. And the kind of plan that Donald has put forth would be trickle-down economics all over again. In fact, it would be the most extreme version, the biggest tax cuts for the top percent of the people in this country than we've ever had.

I call it trumped-up trickle-down, because that's exactly what it would be. That is not how we grow the economy.

We just have a different view about what's best for growing the economy, how we make investments that will actually produce jobs and rising incomes.

I think we come at it from somewhat different perspectives. I understand that. You know, Donald was very fortunate in his life, and that's all to his benefit. He started his business with \$14 million, borrowed from his father, and he really believes that the more you help wealthy people, the better off we'll be and that everything will work out from there.

I don't buy that. I have a different experience. My father was a small-businessman. He worked really hard. He printed drapery fabrics on long tables, where he pulled out those fabrics and he went down with a silkscreen and dumped the paint in and took the squeegee and kept going.

And so what I believe is the more we can do for the middle class, the more we can invest in you, your education, your skills, your future, the better we will be off and the better we'll grow. That's the kind of economy I want us to see again.

HOLT: Let me follow up with Mr. Trump, if you can. You've talked about creating 25 million jobs, and you've promised to bring back millions of jobs for Americans. How are you going to bring back the industries that have left this country for cheaper labor overseas? How, specifically, are you going to tell American manufacturers that you have to come back?

TRUMP: Well, for one thing -- and before we start on that -- my father gave me a very small loan in 1975, and I built it into a company that's worth many, many billions of dollars, with some of the greatest assets in the world, and I say that only because that's the kind of thinking that our country needs.

Our country's in deep trouble. We don't know what we're doing when it comes to devaluations and all of these countries all over the world, especially China. They're the best, the best ever at it. What they're doing to us is a very, very sad thing.

So we have to do that. We have to renegotiate our trade deals. And, Lester, they're taking our jobs, they're giving incentives, they're doing things that, frankly, we don't do.

Let me give you the example of Mexico. They have a VAT tax. We're on a different system. When we sell into Mexico, there's a tax. When they sell in -- automatic, 16 percent, approximately. When they sell into us, there's no tax. It's a defective agreement. It's been defective for a long time, many years, but the politicians haven't done anything about it.

Now, in all fairness to Secretary Clinton -- yes, is that OK? Good. I want you to be very happy. It's very important to me.

But in all fairness to Secretary Clinton, when she started talking about this, it was really very recently. She's been doing this for 30 years. And why hasn't she made the agreements better? The NAFTA agreement is defective. Just because of the tax and many other reasons, but just because of the fact...

HOLT: Let me interrupt just a moment, but...

TRUMP: Secretary Clinton and others, politicians, should have been doing this for years, not right now, because of the fact that we've created a movement. They should have been doing this for years. What's happened to our jobs and our country and our economy generally is -- look, we owe \$20 trillion. We cannot do it any longer, Lester.

HOLT: Back to the question, though. How do you bring back -- specifically bring back jobs, American manufacturers? How do you make them bring the jobs back?

TRUMP: Well, the first thing you do is don't let the jobs leave. The companies are leaving. I could name, I mean, there are thousands of them. They're leaving, and they're leaving in bigger numbers than ever.

And what you do is you say, fine, you want to go to Mexico or some other country, good luck. We wish you a lot of luck. But if you think you're going to make your air conditioners or your cars or your cookies or whatever you make and bring them into our country without a tax, you're wrong.

And once you say you're going to have to tax them coming in, and our politicians never do this, because they have special interests and the special interests want those companies to leave, because in many cases, they own the companies. So what I'm saying is, we can stop them from leaving. We have to stop them from leaving. And that's a big, big factor.

HOLT: Let me let Secretary Clinton get in here.

CLINTON: Well, let's stop for a second and remember where we were eight years ago. We had the worst financial crisis, the Great Recession, the worst since the 1930s. That was in large part because of tax policies that slashed taxes on the wealthy, failed to invest in the middle class, took their eyes off of Wall Street, and created a perfect storm.

In fact, Donald was one of the people who rooted for the housing crisis. He said, back in 2006, "Gee, I hope it does collapse, because then I can go in and buy some and make some money." Well, it did collapse.

TRUMP: That's called business, by the way. [Interruption]

CLINTON: Nine million people -- nine million people lost their jobs. Five million people lost their homes. And \$13 trillion in family wealth was wiped out.

Now, we have come back from that abyss. And it has not been easy. So we're now on the precipice of having a potentially much better economy, but the last thing we need to do is to go back to the policies that failed us in the first place.

Independent experts have looked at what I've proposed and looked at what Donald's proposed, and basically they've said this, that if his tax plan, which would blow up the debt by over \$5 trillion and would in some instances disadvantage middle-class families compared to the wealthy, were to go into effect, we would lose 3.5 million jobs and maybe have another recession.

They've looked at my plans and they've said, OK, if we can do this, and I intend to get it done, we will have 10 million more new jobs, because we will be making investments where we can grow the economy. Take clean energy. Some country is going to be the clean- energy superpower of the 21st century. Donald thinks that climate change is a hoax perpetrated by the Chinese. I think it's real.

TRUMP: I did not. I did not. I do not say that. [Interruption]

CLINTON: I think science is real.

TRUMP: I do not say that. [Interruption]

CLINTON: And I think it's important that we grip this and deal with it, both at home and abroad. And here's what we can do. We can deploy a half a billion more solar panels. We can have enough clean energy to power every home. We can build a new modern electric grid. That's a lot of jobs; that's a lot of new economic activity.

So I've tried to be very specific about what we can and should do, and I am determined that we're going to get the economy really moving again, building on the progress we've made over the last eight years, but never going back to what got us in trouble in the first place.

HOLT: Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: She talks about solar panels. We invested in a solar company, our country. That was a disaster. They lost plenty of money on that one.

Now, look, I'm a great believer in all forms of energy, but we're putting a lot of people out of work. Our energy policies are a disaster. Our country is losing so much in terms of energy, in terms of paying off our debt. You can't do what you're looking to do with \$20 trillion in debt.

The Obama administration, from the time they've come in, is over 230 years' worth of debt, and he's topped it. He's doubled it in a course of almost eight years, seven-and-a-half years, to be semi- exact.

So I will tell you this. We have to do a much better job at keeping our jobs. And we have to do a much better job at giving companies incentives to build new companies or to expand, because they're not doing it.

And all you have to do is look at Michigan and look at Ohio and look at all of these places where so many of their jobs and their companies are just leaving, they're gone.

And, Hillary, I'd just ask you this. You've been doing this for 30 years. Why are you just thinking about these solutions right now? For 30 years, you've been doing it, and now you're just starting to think of solutions.

CLINTON: Well, actually... [Interruption]

TRUMP: I will bring -- excuse me. I will bring back jobs. You can't bring back jobs.

CLINTON: Well, actually, I have thought about this quite a bit.

TRUMP: Yeah, for 30 years. [Interruption]

CLINTON: And I have -- well, not quite that long. I think my husband did a pretty good job in the 1990s. I think a lot about what worked and how we can make it work again...

TRUMP: Well, he approved NAFTA... [Interruption]

(CROSSTALK)

CLINTON: ... million new jobs, a balanced budget...

TRUMP: He approved NAFTA, which is the single worst trade deal ever approved in this country. [Interruption]

CLINTON: Incomes went up for everybody. Manufacturing jobs went up also in the 1990s, if we're actually going to look at the facts.

When I was in the Senate, I had a number of trade deals that came before me, and I held them all to the same test. Will they create jobs in America? Will they raise incomes in America? And are they good for our national security? Some of them I voted for. The biggest one, a multinational one known as CAFTA, I voted against. And because I hold the same standards as I look at all of these trade deals.

But let's not assume that trade is the only challenge we have in the economy. I think it is a part of it, and I've said what I'm going to do. I'm going to have a special prosecutor. We're going to enforce the trade deals we have, and we're going to hold people accountable.

When I was secretary of state, we actually increased American exports globally 30 percent. We increased them to China 50 percent. So I know how to really work to get new jobs and to get exports that helped to create more new jobs.

HOLT: Very quickly...

TRUMP: But you haven't done it in 30 years or 26 years or any number you want to...

CLINTON: Well, I've been a senator, Donald...

TRUMP: You haven't done it. You haven't done it. [Interruption]

CLINTON: And I have been a secretary of state...

TRUMP: Excuse me. [Interruption]

CLINTON: And I have done a lot...

TRUMP: Your husband signed NAFTA, which was one of the worst things that ever happened to the manufacturing industry.

CLINTON: Well, that's your opinion. That is your opinion. [Interruption]

TRUMP: You go to New England, you go to Ohio, Pennsylvania, you go anywhere you want, Secretary Clinton, and you will see devastation where manufacture is down 30, 40, sometimes 50 percent. NAFTA is the worst trade deal maybe ever signed anywhere, but certainly ever signed in this country.

And now you want to approve Trans-Pacific Partnership. You were totally in favor of it. Then you heard what I was saying, how bad it is, and you said, I can't win that debate. But you know that if you did win, you would approve that, and that will be almost as bad as NAFTA. Nothing will ever top NAFTA.

CLINTON: Well, that is just not accurate. I was against it once it was finally negotiated and the terms were laid out. I wrote about that in...

TRUMP: You called it the gold standard. [Interruption]

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: You called it the gold standard of trade deals. You said it's the finest deal you've ever seen. [Interruption]

CLINTON: No.

TRUMP: And then you heard what I said about it, and all of a sudden you were against it. [Interruption]

CLINTON: Well, Donald, I know you live in your own reality, but that is not the facts. The facts are -- I did say I hoped it would be a good deal, but when it was negotiated...

TRUMP: Not. [Interruption]

CLINTON: ... which I was not responsible for, I concluded it wasn't. I wrote about that in my book...

TRUMP: So is it President Obama's fault? [Interruption]

CLINTON: ... before you even announced.

TRUMP: Is it President Obama's fault? [Interruption]

CLINTON: Look, there are differences...

TRUMP: Secretary, is it President Obama's fault? [Interruption]

CLINTON: There are...

TRUMP: Because he's pushing it. [Interruption]

CLINTON: There are different views about what's good for our country, our economy, and our leadership in the world. And I think it's important to look at what we need to do to get the economy going again. That's why I said new jobs with rising incomes, investments, not in more tax cuts that would add \$5 trillion to the debt.

TRUMP: But you have no plan. [Interruption]

CLINTON: But in -- oh, but I do.

TRUMP: Secretary, you have no plan. [Interruption]

CLINTON: In fact, I have written a book about it. It's called "Stronger Together." You can pick it up tomorrow at a bookstore...

TRUMP: That's about all you've... [Interruption]

(CROSSTALK)

HOLT: Folks, we're going to...

CLINTON: ... or at an airport near you.

HOLT: We're going to move to...

CLINTON: But it's because I see this -- we need to have strong growth, fair growth, sustained growth. We also have to look at how we help families balance the responsibilities at home and the responsibilities at business.

So we have a very robust set of plans. And people have looked at both of our plans, have concluded that mine would create 10 million jobs and yours would lose us 3.5 million jobs, and explode the debt which would have a recession.

TRUMP: You are going to approve one of the biggest tax cuts in history. You are going to approve one of the biggest tax increases in history. You are going to drive business out. Your regulations are a disaster, and you're going to increase regulations all over the place. [Interruption]

And by the way, my tax cut is the biggest since Ronald Reagan. I'm very proud of it. It will create tremendous numbers of new jobs. But regulations, you are going to regulate these businesses out of existence.

When I go around -- Lester, I tell you this, I've been all over. And when I go around, despite the tax cut, the thing -- the things that business as in people like the most is the fact that I'm cutting regulation. You have regulations on top of regulations, and new companies cannot form and old companies are going out of business. And you want to increase the regulations and make them even worse.

I'm going to cut regulations. I'm going to cut taxes big league, and you're going to raise taxes big league, end of story.

HOLT: Let me get you to pause right there, because we're going to move into -- we're going to move into the next segment. We're going to talk taxes...

CLINTON: That can't -- that can't be left to stand. [Interruption]

HOLT: Please just take 30 seconds and then we're going to go on.

CLINTON: I kind of assumed that there would be a lot of these charges and claims, and so...

TRUMP: Facts. [Interruption]

CLINTON: So we have taken the home page of my website, HillaryClinton.com, and we've turned it into a fact-checker. So if you want to see in real-time what the facts are, please go and take a look. Because what I have proposed...

TRUMP: And take a look at mine, also, and you'll see. [Interruption]

CLINTON: ... would not add a penny to the debt, and your plans would add \$5 trillion to the debt. What I have proposed would cut regulations and streamline them for small businesses. What I have proposed would be paid for by raising taxes on the wealthy, because they have made all the gains in the economy. And I think it's time that the wealthy and corporations paid their fair share to support this country.

HOLT: Well, you just opened the next segment.

TRUMP: Well, could I just finish -- I think I... [Interruption]

(CROSSTALK)

HOLT: I'm going to give you a chance right here...

TRUMP: I think I should -- you go to her website, and you take a look at her website.

HOLT: ... with a new 15-minute segment...

TRUMP: She's going to raise taxes \$1.3 trillion.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, I'm going to...

TRUMP: And look at her website. You know what? It's no difference than this. She's telling us how to fight ISIS. Just go to her website. She tells you how to fight ISIS on her website. I don't think General Douglas MacArthur would like that too much.

HOLT: The next segment, we're continuing...

CLINTON: Well, at least I have a plan to fight ISIS. [Interruption]

HOLT: ... achieving prosperity...

TRUMP: No, no, you're telling the enemy everything you want to do. [Interruption]

CLINTON: No, we're not. No, we're not.

TRUMP: See, you're telling the enemy everything you want to do. No wonder you've been fighting -- no wonder you've been fighting ISIS your entire adult life. [Interruption]

CLINTON: That's a -- that's -- go to the -- please, fact checkers, get to work.

HOLT: OK, you are unpacking a lot here. And we're still on the issue of achieving prosperity. And I want to talk about taxes. The fundamental difference between the two of you concerns the wealthy.

Secretary Clinton, you're calling for a tax increase on the wealthiest Americans. I'd like you to further defend that. And, Mr. Trump, you're calling for tax cuts for the wealthy. I'd like you to defend that. And this next two-minute answer goes to you, Mr. Trump.

TRUMP: Well, I'm really calling for major jobs, because the wealthy are going create tremendous jobs. They're going to expand their companies. They're going to do a tremendous job.

I'm getting rid of the carried interest provision. And if you really look, it's not a tax -- it's really not a great thing for the wealthy. It's a great thing for the middle class. It's a great thing for companies to expand.

And when these people are going to put billions and billions of dollars into companies, and when they're going to bring \$2.5 trillion back from overseas, where they can't bring the money back, because politicians like Secretary Clinton won't allow them to bring the money back, because the taxes are so onerous, and the bureaucratic red tape, so what -- is so bad.

So what they're doing is they're leaving our country, and they're, believe it or not, leaving because taxes are too high and because some of them have lots of money outside of our country. And instead of bringing it back and putting the money to work, because they can't work out a deal to -- and everybody agrees it should be brought back.

Instead of that, they're leaving our country to get their money, because they can't bring their money back into our country, because of bureaucratic red tape, because they can't get together. Because we have -- we have a president that can't sit them around a table and get them to approve something.

And here's the thing. Republicans and Democrats agree that this should be done, \$2.5 trillion. I happen to think it's double that. It's probably \$5 trillion that we can't bring into our country, Lester. And with a little leadership, you'd get it in here very quickly, and it could be put to use on the inner cities and lots of other things, and it would be beautiful.

But we have no leadership. And honestly, that starts with Secretary Clinton.

HOLT: All right. You have two minutes of the same question to defend tax increases on the wealthiest Americans, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: I have a feeling that by, the end of this evening, I'm going to be blamed for everything that's ever happened.

TRUMP: Why not? [Interruption]

CLINTON: Why not? Yeah, why not?

(LAUGHTER)

You know, just join the debate by saying more crazy things. Now, let me say this, it is absolutely the case...

TRUMP: There's nothing crazy about not letting our companies bring their money back into their country.

[Interruption]

HOLT: This is -- this is Secretary Clinton's two minutes, please.

TRUMP: Yes. [Interruption]

CLINTON: Yeah, well, let's start the clock again, Lester. We've looked at your tax proposals. I don't see changes in the corporate tax rates or the kinds of proposals you're referring to that would cause the repatriation, bringing back of money that's stranded overseas. I happen to support that.

TRUMP: Then you didn't read it. [Interruption]

CLINTON: I happen to -- I happen to support that in a way that will actually work to our benefit. But when I look at what you have proposed, you have what is called now the Trump loophole, because it would so advantage you and the business you do. You've proposed an approach that has a...

TRUMP: Who gave it that name? The first I've -- who gave it that name? [Interruption]

(CROSSTALK)

HOLT: Mr. Trump, this is Secretary Clinton's two minutes.

CLINTON: ... \$4 billion tax benefit for your family. And when you look at what you are proposing...

TRUMP: How much? How much for my family? [Interruption] CLINTON: ... it is...

TRUMP: Lester, how much? [Interruption]

CLINTON: ... as I said, trumped-up trickle-down. Trickle-down did not work. It got us into the mess we were in, in 2008 and 2009. Slashing taxes on the wealthy hasn't worked.

And a lot of really smart, wealthy people know that. And they are saying, hey, we need to do more to make the contributions we should be making to rebuild the middle class.

CLINTON: I don't think top-down works in America. I think building the middle class, investing in the middle class, making college debt-free so more young people can get their education, helping people refinance their -- their debt from college at a lower rate. Those are the kinds of things that will really boost the economy. Broad-based, inclusive growth is what we need in America, not more advantages for people at the very top.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, we're...

TRUMP: Typical politician. All talk, no action. Sounds good, doesn't work. Never going to happen. Our country is suffering because people like Secretary Clinton have made such bad decisions in terms of our jobs and in terms of what's going on. [Interruption]

Now, look, we have the worst revival of an economy since the Great Depression. And believe me: We're in a bubble right now. And the only thing that looks good is the stock market, but if you raise interest rates even a little bit, that's going to come crashing down.

We are in a big, fat, ugly bubble. And we better be awfully careful. And we have a Fed that's doing political things. This Janet Yellen of the Fed. The Fed is doing political -- by keeping the interest rates at this level. And believe me: The day Obama goes off, and he leaves, and goes out to the golf course for the rest of his life to play golf, when they raise interest rates, you're going to see some very bad things happen, because the Fed is not doing their job. The Fed is being more political than Secretary Clinton.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, we're talking about the burden that Americans have to pay, yet you have not released your tax returns. And the reason nominees have released their returns for decades is so that voters will know if their potential president owes money to -- who he owes it to and any business conflicts. Don't Americans have a right to know if there are any conflicts of interest?

TRUMP: I don't mind releasing -- I'm under a routine audit. And it'll be released. And -- as soon as the audit's finished, it will be released.

But you will learn more about Donald Trump by going down to the federal elections, where I filed a 104-page essentially financial statement of sorts, the forms that they have. It shows income -- in fact, the income -- I just looked today -- the income is filed at \$694 million for this past year, \$694 million. If you would have told me I was going to make that 15 or 20 years ago, I would have been very surprised.

But that's the kind of thinking that our country needs. When we have a country that's doing so badly, that's being ripped off by every single country in the world, it's the kind of thinking that our country needs, because everybody -- Lester, we have a trade deficit with all of the countries that we do business with, of almost \$800 billion a year. You know what that is? That means, who's negotiating these trade deals?

We have people that are political hacks negotiating our trade deals.

HOLT: The IRS says an audit... [Interruption]

TRUMP: Excuse me.

HOLT: ... of your taxes -- you're perfectly free to release your taxes during an audit. And so the question, does the public's right to know outweigh your personal...

TRUMP: Well, I told you, I will release them as soon as the audit. Look, I've been under audit almost for 15 years. I know a lot of wealthy people that have never been audited. I said, do you get audited? I get audited almost every year.

And in a way, I should be complaining. I'm not even complaining. I don't mind it. It's almost become a way of life. I get audited by the IRS. But other people don't.

I will say this. We have a situation in this country that has to be taken care of. I will release my tax returns -- against my lawyer's wishes -- when she releases her 33,000 e-mails that have been deleted. As soon as she releases them, I will release.

(APPLAUSE)

I will release my tax returns. And that's against -- my lawyers, they say, "Don't do it." I will tell you this. No -- in fact, watching shows, they're reading the papers. Almost every lawyer says, you don't release your returns until the audit's complete. When the audit's complete, I'll do it. But I would go against them if she releases her e-mails.

HOLT: So it's negotiable?

TRUMP: It's not negotiable, no. Let her release the e-mails. Why did she delete 33,000...

HOLT: Well, I'll let her answer that. But let me just admonish the audience one more time. There was an agreement. We did ask you to be silent, so it would be helpful for us. Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I think you've seen another example of bait-and-switch here. For 40 years, everyone running for president has released their tax returns. You can go and see nearly, I think, 39, 40 years of our tax returns, but everyone has done it. We know the IRS has made clear there is no prohibition on releasing it when you're under audit.

So you've got to ask yourself, why won't he release his tax returns? And I think there may be a couple of reasons. First, maybe he's not as rich as he says he is. Second, maybe he's not as charitable as he claims to be.

CLINTON: Third, we don't know all of his business dealings, but we have been told through investigative reporting that he owes about \$650 million to Wall Street and foreign banks. Or maybe he doesn't want the American people, all of you watching tonight, to know that he's paid nothing in federal taxes, because the only years that anybody's ever seen were a couple of years when he had to turn them over to state authorities when he was trying to get a casino license, and they showed he didn't pay any federal income tax.

TRUMP: That makes me smart. [Interruption]

CLINTON: So if he's paid zero, that means zero for troops, zero for vets, zero for schools or health. And I think probably he's not all that enthusiastic about having the rest of our country see what the real reasons are, because it must be something really important, even terrible, that he's trying to hide.

And the financial disclosure statements, they don't give you the tax rate. They don't give you all the details that tax returns would. And it just seems to me that this is something that the

American people deserve to see. And I have no reason to believe that he's ever going to release his tax returns, because there's something he's hiding.

And we'll guess. We'll keep guessing at what it might be that he's hiding. But I think the question is, were he ever to get near the White House, what would be those conflicts? Who does he owe money to? Well, he owes you the answers to that, and he should provide them.

HOLT: He also -- he also raised the issue of your e-mails. Do you want to respond to that?

CLINTON: I do. You know, I made a mistake using a private e-mail. TRUMP: That's for sure.

CLINTON: And if I had to do it over again, I would, obviously, do it differently. But I'm not going to make any excuses. It was a mistake, and I take responsibility for that.

HOLT: Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: That was more than a mistake. That was done purposely. OK? That was not a mistake. That was done purposely. When you have your staff taking the Fifth Amendment, taking the Fifth so they're not prosecuted, when you have the man that set up the illegal server taking the Fifth, I think it's disgraceful. And believe me, this country thinks it's -- really thinks it's disgraceful, also.

As far as my tax returns, you don't learn that much from tax returns. That I can tell you. You learn a lot from financial disclosure. And you should go down and take a look at that.

The other thing, I'm extremely underleveraged. The report that said \$650 -- which, by the way, a lot of friends of mine that know my business say, boy, that's really not a lot of money. It's not a lot of money relative to what I had.

The buildings that were in question, they said in the same report, which was -- actually, it wasn't even a bad story, to be honest with you, but the buildings are worth \$3.9 billion. And the \$650 isn't even on that. But it's not \$650. It's much less than that.

But I could give you a list of banks, I would -- if that would help you, I would give you a list of banks. These are very fine institutions, very fine banks. I could do that very quickly.

I am very underleveraged. I have a great company. I have a tremendous income. And the reason I say that is not in a braggadocious way. It's because it's about time that this country had somebody running it that has an idea about money.

When we have \$20 trillion in debt, and our country's a mess, you know, it's one thing to have \$20 trillion in debt and our roads are good and our bridges are good and everything's in great shape, our airports. Our airports are like from a third world country.

You land at LaGuardia, you land at Kennedy, you land at LAX, you land at Newark, and you come in from Dubai and Qatar and you see these incredible -- you come in from China, you see these incredible airports, and you land -- we've become a third world country.

So the worst of all things has happened. We owe \$20 trillion, and we're a mess. We haven't even started. And we've spent \$6 trillion in the Middle East, according to a report that I just saw. Whether it's 6 or 5, but it looks like it's 6, \$6 trillion in the Middle East, we could have rebuilt our country twice.

And it's really a shame. And it's politicians like Secretary Clinton that have caused this problem. Our country has tremendous problems. We're a debtor nation. We're a serious debtor nation. And

we have a country that needs new roads, new tunnels, new bridges, new airports, new schools, new hospitals. And we don't have the money, because it's been squandered on so many of your ideas.

HOLT: We'll let you respond and we'll move on to the next segment.

CLINTON: And maybe because you haven't paid any federal income tax for a lot of years. (APPLAUSE)

And the other thing I think is important...

TRUMP: It would be squandered, too, believe me.

CLINTON: ... is if your -- if your main claim to be president of the United States is your business, then I think we should talk about that. You know, your campaign manager said that you built a lot of businesses on the backs of little guys.

And, indeed, I have met a lot of the people who were stiffed by you and your businesses, Donald. I've met dishwashers, painters, architects, glass installers, marble installers, drapery installers, like my dad was, who you refused to pay when they finished the work that you asked them to do.

We have an architect in the audience who designed one of your clubhouses at one of your golf courses. It's a beautiful facility. It immediately was put to use. And you wouldn't pay what the man needed to be paid, what he was charging you to do...

TRUMP: Maybe he didn't do a good job and I was unsatisfied with his work...

CLINTON: Well, to...

TRUMP: Which our country should do, too.

CLINTON: Do the thousands of people that you have stiffed over the course of your business not deserve some kind of apology from someone who has taken their labor, taken the goods that they produced, and then refused to pay them?

I can only say that I'm certainly relieved that my late father never did business with you. He provided a good middle-class life for us, but the people he worked for, he expected the bargain to be kept on both sides.

And when we talk about your business, you've taken business bankruptcy six times. There are a lot of great businesspeople that have never taken bankruptcy once. You call yourself the King of Debt. You talk about leverage. You even at one time suggested that you would try to negotiate down the national debt of the United States.

TRUMP: Wrong. Wrong.

CLINTON: Well, sometimes there's not a direct transfer of skills from business to government, but sometimes what happened in business would be really bad for government.

HOLT: Let's let Mr. Trump...

CLINTON: And we need to be very clear about that.

TRUMP: So, yeah, I think -- I do think it's time. Look, it's all words, it's all sound bites. I built an unbelievable company. Some of the greatest assets anywhere in the world, real estate assets anywhere in the world, beyond the United States, in Europe, lots of different places. It's an unbelievable company.

But on occasion, four times, we used certain laws that are there. And when Secretary Clinton talks about people that didn't get paid, first of all, they did get paid a lot, but taken advantage of the laws of the nation.

Now, if you want to change the laws, you've been there a long time, change the laws. But I take advantage of the laws of the nation because I'm running a company. My obligation right now is to do well for myself, my family, my employees, for my companies. And that's what I do.

But what she doesn't say is that tens of thousands of people that are unbelievably happy and that love me. I'll give you an example. We're just opening up on Pennsylvania Avenue right next to the White House, so if I don't get there one way, I'm going to get to Pennsylvania Avenue another.

But we're opening the Old Post Office. Under budget, ahead of schedule, saved tremendous money. I'm a year ahead of schedule. And that's what this country should be doing.

We build roads and they cost two and three and four times what they're supposed to cost. We buy products for our military and they come in at costs that are so far above what they were supposed to be, because we don't have people that know what they're doing.

When we look at the budget, the budget is bad to a large extent because we have people that have no idea as to what to do and how to buy. The Trump International is way under budget and way ahead of schedule. And we should be able to do that for our country.

HOLT: Well, we're well behind schedule, so I want to move to our next segment. We move into our next segment talking about America's direction. And let's start by talking about race.

The share of Americans who say race relations are bad in this country is the highest it's been in decades, much of it amplified by shootings of African-Americans by police, as we've seen recently in Charlotte and Tulsa. Race has been a big issue in this campaign, and one of you is going to have to bridge a very wide and bitter gap.

So how do you heal the divide? Secretary Clinton, you get two minutes on this.

CLINTON: Well, you're right. Race remains a significant challenge in our country. Unfortunately, race still determines too much, often determines where people live, determines what kind of education in their public schools they can get, and, yes, it determines how they're treated in the criminal justice system. We've just seen those two tragic examples in both Tulsa and Charlotte.

And we've got to do several things at the same time. We have to restore trust between communities and the police. We have to work to make sure that our police are using the best training, the best techniques, that they're well prepared to use force only when necessary. Everyone should be respected by the law, and everyone should respect the law.

CLINTON: Right now, that's not the case in a lot of our neighborhoods. So I have, ever since the first day of my campaign, called for criminal justice reform. I've laid out a platform that I think would begin to remedy some of the problems we have in the criminal justice system. But we also have to recognize, in addition to the challenges that we face with policing, there are so many good, brave police officers who equally want reform. So we have to bring communities together in order to begin working on that, as a mutual goal.

And we've got to get guns out of the hands of people who should not have them. The gun epidemic is the leading cause of death of young African-American men, more than the next nine causes put together.

So we have to do two things, as I said. We have to restore trust. We have to work with the police. We have to make sure they respect the communities and the communities respect them. And we have to tackle the plague of gun violence, which is a big contributor to a lot of the problems that we're seeing today.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, you have two minutes. How do you heal the divide?

TRUMP: First of all, Secretary Clinton doesn't want to use a couple of words. And that's law and order. And we need law and order. If we don't have it, we're not going to have a country. And when I look at what's going on in Charlotte, a city I love, city where I have investments, when I look at what's going on throughout various parts of our country -- I can just keep naming them all day long -- we need law and order in our country.

And I just got today, as you know, the endorsement of the Fraternal Order of Police, it just came in. We have endorsements from, I think, almost every police group, very -- I mean, a large percentage of them in the United States. We have a situation where we have our inner cities, African-Americans, Hispanics, are living in hell, because it's so dangerous.

TRUMP: You walk down the street, you get shot. In Chicago, they've had thousands of shootings, thousands, since January 1st. Thousands of shootings. And I say, where is this? Is this a war-torn country? What are we doing? And we have to stop the violence, we have to bring back law and order, in a place like Chicago, where thousands of people have been killed. Thousands, over the last number of years.

In fact, almost 4,000 have been killed since Barack Obama became president. Over 4 -- almost 4,000 people in Chicago have been killed. We have to bring back law and order. Now, whether or not in a place like Chicago, you do stop and frisk, which worked very well, Mayor Giuliani is here, it worked very well in New York. It brought the crime rate way down, but you take the gun away from criminals that shouldn't be having it.

We have gangs roaming the street. And in many cases, they're illegally here, illegal immigrants. And they have guns. And they shoot people. And we have to be very strong. And we have to be very vigilant. We have to be -- we have to know what we're doing. Right now, our police, in many cases, are afraid to do anything. We have to protect our inner cities, because African-American communities are being decimated by crime.

HOLT: Your two minutes has expired. But I do want to follow up, stop and frisk was ruled unconstitutional in New York, because it largely singled out black and Hispanic young men --

TRUMP: No, you're wrong. It went before a judge who was a very against police judge. It was taken away from her and our mayor, our new mayor, refused to go forward with the case. They would have won an appeal. If you look at it, throughout the country, there are many places --

HOLT: The argument is that it's a form of racial profiling.

TRUMP: No, the argument is that we have to take the guns away from these people that have them and that are bad people that shouldn't have them. These are felons, these are people that are bad people that shouldn't be -- when you have 3,000 shootings in Chicago, from January 1st,

when you have 4,000 people killed in Chicago by guns, from the beginning of the presidency of Barack Obama, his hometown, you have to have stop and frisk.

You need more police, you need a better community, you know, relation. You don't have good community relations in Chicago. It's terrible. I have property there. It's terrible what's going on in Chicago. But when when you look -- and Chicago's not the only -- you go to Ferguson, you go to so many different places. You need better relationships -- I agree with Secretary Clinton on this -- you need better relationships between the communities and the police. Because in some cases it's not good. But you look at Dallas, where the relationships were really studied, the relationships were really a beautiful thing, and then five police officers were killed one night very violently. So there's some bad things going on. Some really bad things.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton, I want --

TRUMP: Lester, we need law and order. We need law and order in the inner cities. Because the people that are most affected by what's happening are African-American and Hispanic people. And it's very unfair to them what our politicians are allowing to happen.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I've heard Donald say this at his rallies, and it's really unfortunate that he paints such a dire negative picture of black communities in our country.

TRUMP: [Groan]

CLINTON: The vibrancy of the black church, the black businesses that employ so many people, the opportunities that so many families are working to provide for their kids. There's a lot that we should be proud of and we should be supporting and lifting up. But we do always have to make sure we keep people safe.

There are the right ways of doing it, and then there are ways that are ineffective. Stop and frisk was found to be unconstitutional, and in part because it was ineffective. It did not do what it needed to do. Now, I believe in community policing, and in fact violent crime is one half of what it was in 1991. Property crime is down 40 percent. We just don't want to see it creep back up. We've had 25 years of very good cooperation.

CLINTON: But there were some problems, some unintended consequences. Too many young African-American and Latino men ended up in jail for nonviolent offenses, and it's just a fact that if you're a young African-American man and you do the same thing as a young white man, you are more likely to be arrested, charged, convicted and incarcerated. So we've got to address the systemic racism in our criminal justice system.

We cannot just say law and order. We have to say -- we have to come forward with a plan that is going to divert people from the criminal justice system, deal with mandatory minimum sentences, which have put too many people away for too long, for doing too little. We need to have more second-chance programs. I'm glad that we're ending private prisons in the federal system. I want to see them ended in the state system. You shouldn't have a profit motivation to fill prison cells with young Americans.

CLINTON: So there are some positive ways we can work on this. And I believe strongly that common sense gun safety measures would assist us right now, and this is something Donald has supported along with the gun lobby. Right now we've got too many military style weapons on the streets, in a lot of places our police are outgunned. We need comprehensive background checks,

and we need to keep guns out of the hands of those who will do harm. And we finally need to pass a prohibition on anyone who's on the terrorist watchlist from being able to buy a gun in our country. If you're too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun. There are things we can do and we ought to do it in a bipartisan way.

HOLT: Last week you said we have to do everything possible to improve policing to go right at implicit bias. Do you believe that police are implicitly biased against black people?

CLINTON: Lester, I think implicit bias is a problem for everyone, not just police. I think unfortunately, too many of us in our great country, um, jump to conclusions about each other. And therefore, I think we need all of us to be asking hard questions about, you know, Why am I feeling this way?

But when it comes to policing, since it can have, literally, fatal consequences, I have said in my first budget, we would put money into that budget to help us deal with implicit bias by retraining a lot of our police officers. I've met with a group of very distinguished, experienced police chiefs a few weeks ago. They admit it's an issue. They've got a lot of concerns. Mental health is one of the biggest concerns, because now police are having to handle a lot of really difficult mental health problems on the street. They want support, they want more training, they want more assistance. And I think the federal government could be in a position where we would offer and provide that.

HOLT: Mr.--

TRUMP: I'd like to respond.

HOLT: Please.

TRUMP: First of all, I agree, and a lot of people even within my own party want to give certain rights to people on watch lists and no fly lists. I agree with you, when a person is on a watch list or a no fly list -- and I have the endorsement of the NRA, which I'm very proud of, these are very very good people, and they are protecting the Second Amendment -- but I think we have to look very strongly at no fly lists and watch lists, and when people are on there, even if they shouldn't be on there, we'll help them, we'll help them legally, we'll help them get off. But I tend to agree with that, quite strongly.

I do want to bring up the fact that you were the one that brought up the word super predator about young black youth. That's a term that I think was a -- it's been horribly met as you know. I think you apologized for it. But I think it was a terrible thing to say, and when it comes to stop and frisk, you know, you're talking about taking guns away. Well I'm talking about taking guns away from gangs and people that use them. I don't think -- I really don't think you disagree with me on this, if you want to know the truth. I think there's a political reason why you can't say, I really don't believe. In New York City, stop and frisk, we had 2,200 murders and stop and frisk brought it down to 500 murders, 500 is a lot of murders. Hard to believe, 500 is supposed to be good.

We went from 2,200 to 500, and it was continued on by Mayor Bloomberg. And it was terminated by our current mayor. Stop and frisk had a tremendous impact on the safety of New York City. Tremendous beyond belief. When you say it has no impact, it really did, it had a very big impact.

CLINTON: It's also fair to say, if we're going to talk about mayors, that under the current mayor, crime has continued to drop, including murders.

TRUMP: You're wrong.

CLINTON: No, I'm not.

TRUMP: Murders are up.

CLINTON: New York has done an excellent job. I give credit across the board going back two mayors, two police chiefs, it has worked. And other communities need to come together to do what will work as well.

Look, one murder is too many. But it is important that we learn about what has been effective, and not go to things that sound good that really did not have the kind of impact that we would want. Who disagrees with keeping neighborhoods safe? But let's also add, no one should disagree about respecting the rights of young men who live in those neighborhoods. We need to do a better job of working again with the communities, faith communities, business communities, as well as the police to try to deal with this problem.

HOLT: This conversation is about race. Mr. Trump, I have to ask you --

TRUMP: I'd like to responded if I might.

HOLT: Please respond.

TRUMP: Look, the African-American community has been let down by our politicians. They talk good around election time, like right now, and after the election, they said, see ya later, I'll see you in four years. The African-American community -- look, the community within the inner cities has been so badly treated, they've been abused and used in order to get votes by Democrat politicians, that's what it is. They've controlled these communities for up to 100 years.

HOLT: Mr. Trump --

TRUMP: You look at the inner cities, I just left Detroit, I just left Philadelphia. You've seen me, I've been all over the place. You decided to stay home and that's OK.

I will tell you, I've been all over, and I've met some of the greatest people I'll ever meet within these communities. And they are very very upset with what their politicians have told them And what their politicians have done.

CLINTON: I think Donald just criticized me for preparing for this debate. And yes, I did. And you know what else I prepared for? I prepared to be president. And I think that's a good thing.

(APPLAUSE)

HOLT: Mr. Trump, for five years you perpetuated a false claim of the nation's first black president was not a natural born citizen. You questioned his legitimacy. In the last couple weeks, you acknowledged what most Americans have accepted for years, the president was born in the United States. Can you tell us what took you so long?

TRUMP: I'll tell you, it's simple to say. Sidney Blumenthal works for the campaign and close -- very close friend of Secretary Clinton. And her campaign manager Patti Doyle went to -- during the campaign, her campaign against President Obama, fought very hard, and you can go look it up and you can check it out, if you look at CNN this past week, Patti Doyle was on Wolf Blitzer saying that this happened, Blumenthal sent McClatchy to Kenya to find out about it, they were pressing very hard. They failed to get the birth certificate.

When I got involved I didn't fail, I got him to give the birth certificate. I'm satisfied with it.

HOLT: That was in 2011.

TRUMP: I want to get on to defeating ISIS, to creating jobs. I want to get on to having a strong border. I want to get on to things that are very important to me, and that are very important to the country.

HOLT: I will let you responded, that's important. But I want to get the answer here. The birth certificate was produced in 2011, you continued to tell the story and question the president's legitimacy in 2012, '13, '14, as recently as January. What changed your mind?

TRUMP: Nobody was pressing it, nobody was caring much about it. I figured you'd ask the question tonight, of course.

I was the one that got him to produce the birth certificate, and I think I did a good job. Secretary Clinton also fought it, I mean, you know -- now, everybody in mainstream is going to say, that's not true. Look, it's true. Sidney Blumenthal sent a reporter -- you just have to take a look at CNN, the last week, the interview with your former campaign manager. And she was involved. But just like she can't bring back jobs, she can't produce.

HOLT: I'm going to follow up -- I will let you respond to that. There's a lot here. We're talking about racial healing in this segment. What do you say to Americans --

TRUMP: Well, I say nothing, because I was able to get him to produce it. He should have produced it a long time before. I say nothing. When you talk about healing, I think that I've developed very, very good relationships, over the last little while with the African-American community. I think you can see that. And I feel like they really wanted me to come to that conclusion, and I think I did a great job and a great service, not only for the country but even for the president in getting him to produce his birth certificate.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, just listen to what you heard. And clearly, as Donald just admitted, he knew he was going to stand on this debate stage, and Lester Holt was going to be asking us questions, he tried to put the whole racist birther lie to bed.

But it can't be dismissed that easily. He has really started his political activity based on this racist lie that our first black president was not an American citizen. There was absolutely no evidence for it, he persisted, he persisted year after year, because some of his supporters, people that he was trying to bring into his fold, apparently believed it or wanted to believe it.

CLINTON: But remember. Donald started his career back in 1973 being sued by the Justice Department for racial discrimination. Because he would not rent apartments in one of his developments to African-Americans, and he made sure that the people who worked for him understood that was the policy. He actually was sued twice by the Justice Department. So he has a long record of engaging in racist behavior. And the birther lie was a very hurtful one.

Barack Obama is a man of great dignity. And I could tell how much it bothered him and annoyed him is that this was being touted and used against him. But I would like to remember what Michelle Obama said in her amazing speech at our Democratic National Convention. When they go low, we go high. And Barack Obama went high, despite Donald Trump's best efforts to bring him down.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, you can respond, and we're going to move on.

TRUMP: I would love to respond. First of all, I got to watch in preparing for this, some of your debates against Barack Obama. You treated him with terrible disrespect, and I watched the way you talk now about how lovely everything is, and how wonderful you are -- it doesn't work that way. You were after him, you were trying to -- you even sent out or your campaign sent out pictures of him in a certain garb, very famous pictures, I don't think you can deny that. Just last week, your campaign manager said it was true. So when you tried to act holier than thou, it really doesn't work.

As far as the lawsuit, yes, when I was very young, I went into my father's company. We along with many, many other companies throughout the country, it was a federal lawsuit, were sued. We settled the suit with zero -- no admission of guilt. It was very easy to do. But they sued many people. I notice you bring that up a lot. And I also notice the nasty commercials you do on me in so many different ways, which I don't do on you. Maybe I'm trying to save the money. Frankly, I look at that, and I say, isn't that amazing? I settled that lawsuit with no admission of guilt, but that was a lawsuit brought against many, many real estate firms, it's one of those things.

TRUMP: I'll go one step further. In Palm Beach, Florida, tough community, a brilliant community, a wealthy community, probably the wealthiest community there is in the world, I opened a club, and really got great credit for it, no discrimination against African-Americans, against Muslims, against anybody. And it's a tremendously successful club. And I'm so glad I did it, and I have been given great credit for what I did. And I'm very very proud of it. And that's the way I feel. That is the true way I feel.

HOLT: Our next segment is called securing America. We want to start with a 21st century war happening every day in this country, our institutions are under cyber attack, and our secrets are being stolen. So my question is, who's behind it, and how do we fight it? Secretary Clinton, this answer goes to you.

CLINTON: Well I, think cybersecurity, cyberwarfare, will be one of the biggest challenges facing the next president, because clearly we're facing at this point, two different kinds of adversaries. There are the independent hacking groups that do it mostly for commercial reasons to try to steal information that they then can use to make money.

But increasingly, we are seeing cyberattacks coming from states. Organs of states. The most recent and troubling of these has been Russia. There's no doubt now that Russia has used cyberattacks against all kinds of organizations in our country, and I am deeply concerned about this. I know Donald is very praise -- praiseworthy of Vladimir Putin. But Putin is playing a very tough, long game here. And one of the things he's done is to let loose cyber attackers to hack into government files, to hack into personal files, hack into the Democratic National Committee. And we recently have learned that this is one of their preferred methods of trying to wreak havoc and collect information.

CLINTON: We need to make it very clear, whether it's Russia, China, Iran, or anybody else, the United States has much greater capacity. And we are not going to sit idly by and permit state actors to go after our information, our private sector information or our public sector information, and we're going to have to make it clear that we don't want to use the kinds of tools that we have. We don't want to engage in a different kind of warfare. But we will defend the citizens of this country, and the Russians need to understand that. I think they've been treating it as almost a probing, how far would we go? How much would we do? And that's why I was so, I was so

shocked when Donald publicly invited Putin to hack into Americans. That is, that is just unacceptable.

It's one of the reasons why 50 national security officials who served in Republican administration --

HOLT: Two minutes has expired.

CLINTON: -- have said that Donald is unfit to be the commander-in-chief. It's comments like that that really worry people who understand the threats that we face.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, you have two minutes in the same question.

TRUMP: I do want to say that I was just endorsed, and more are coming next week, it will be over 200 admirals. Many of them are here, admirals and generals endorsed me to lead this country. That just happened. And many more are coming. And I'm very proud of it. In addition, I was just endorse the by ICE. They've never endorsed anybody before, on immigration. I was just endorsed by ICE. I was just recently endorsed, 16,500 border patrol agents.

So when Secretary Clinton talks about this, I mean, I'll take the admirals and I'll take the generals any day over the political hacks that I see that have led our country so brilliantly over the last 10 years with their knowledge.

TRUMP: Because look at the mess that we're in. Look at the mess that we're in. As far as the cyber, I agree to parts of what Secretary Clinton said, we should be better than anybody else, and perhaps we're not. I don't think anybody knows it was Russia that broke into the DNC. She's saying Russia, Russia, Russia. Maybe it was. I mean, it could be Russia, but it could also be China, but it could also be lots of other people, it also could be someone sitting on their bed that weighs 400 pounds, OK?

You don't know who broke into DNC, but what did we learn with DNC? We learn that Bernie Sanders was taken advantage of by your people. By Debbie Wasserman Schultz. Look what happened to her. But Bernie Sanders was taken advantage of. That's what it is.

TRUMP: Now, whether that was Russia, whether that was China, whether it was another country, we don't know, because the truth is, under President Obama we've lost control of things that we used to have control over. We came in with an Internet, we came up with the Internet. And I think Secretary Clinton and myself would agree very much, when you look at what ISIS is doing with the Internet, they're beating us at our own game. ISIS. So we have to get very, very tough on cyber and cyber warfare. It is a, it is a huge problem.

I have a son. He's 10 years old. He has computers. He is so good with these computers, it's unbelievable. The security aspect of cyber is very, very tough. And maybe it's hardly do-able. But I will say, we are not doing the job we should be doing, but that's true throughout our whole governmental society. We have so many things that we have to do better, Lester, and certainly cyber is one of them.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Well, I think there are a number of issues that we should be addressing. I have put forth a plan to defeat ISIS. It does involve going after them online. I think we need do much more with our tech companies to prevent ISIS and their operatives from being able to use the internet, to radicalize, even direct people in our country and Europe and elsewhere, but we also have to

intensify our airstrikes against ISIS and eventually support our Arab and Kurdish partners to be able to actually take out ISIS in Raqqa and their claim of being a caliphate.

We're making progress. Our military is assisting in Iraq. And we're hoping that within the year we'll be able to push ISIS out of Iraq and really squeeze them in Syria. But we have to be cognizant of the fact that they've had foreign fighters coming to volunteer for them, foreign money, foreign weapons, so we have to make this the top priority. And I would also do everything possible to take out their leadership. I was involved in a number of efforts to take out Al-Qaeda leadership when I was Secretary of State, including of course taking out Bin Laden, and I think we need to go after Baghdadi as well, make that one of our organizing principles. Because we've got to defeat ISIS and we've got to do everything we can to disrupt their propaganda efforts online.

HOLT: You mentioned ISIS, and we think of ISIS certainly as "over there," but there are American citizens who have been inspired to commit acts of terror on American soil. The latest incident, of course, the bombings we just saw in New York and New Jersey, the knife attack at a mall in Minnesota, and last year deadly attacks in San Bernardino and Orlando. I'll ask this to both of you: Tell us specifically how you would prevent home-grown attacks by American citizens. Mr. Trump?

TRUMP: First I have to say one thing, very important. Secretary Clinton is talking about taking out ISIS -- we will take out ISIS. Well, President Obama and Secretary Clinton created a vacuum the way they got out of Iraq, because they got out, well they shouldn't have been in, but once they got in, the way they got out was a disaster. And ISIS was formed.

So she talks about taking them out -- she's been doing it a long time, she's been trying to take them out for a long time. She's been trying to take them out for a long time. But they wouldn't even have been formed if they left some troops behind. Like 10,000 or maybe something more than that. And then you wouldn't have had them.

TRUMP: Or, as I've been saying for a long time, and I think you'll agree, because I said it to you once -- had we taken the oil, and we should have taken the oil, ISIS would not have been able to form either, because the oil was their primary source of income. And now they have the oil all over the place, including the oil, a lot of the oil in Libya. Which was another one of her disasters.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I hope the fact checkers are turning up the volume and really working hard. Donald supported the invasion of Iraq.

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: That is absolutely --

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: Proved over and over again.

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: He actually advocated for the actions we took in Libya and urged that Gaddafi be taken out, after actually doing some business with him one time. But the larger point, he says this constantly, is George W. Bush made the agreement about when American troops would leave Iraq. Not Barack Obama. And the only way that American troops could have stayed in Iraq is to

get an agreement from the then Iraqi government that would have protected our troops. And the Iraqi government would not give that.

But let's talk about the question you asked, Lester. The question you asked is what do we do here in the United States. That's the most important part of this. How do we prevent attacks? How do we protect our people?

And I think we've got to have an intelligence surge, where we are looking for every scrap of information. I was so proud of law enforcement in New York, in Minnesota, in New Jersey, you know, they responded so quickly, so professionally to the attacks that occurred by Rahami and they brought him down.

CLINTON: And we may find out more information because he is still alive, which may prove to be an intelligence benefit. So we've got to do everything we can to vacuum up intelligence from Europe, from the Middle East, and that means we have to work more closely with our allies, and that's something that Donald has been very dismissive of.

We're working with NATO, the longest military alliance in the history of the world, to really turn our attention to terrorism. We're working with our friends in the Middle East, many of which, as you know, are Muslim majority nations.

Donald has consistently insulted Muslims abroad, Muslims at home, when we need to be cooperating with Muslim nations and with the American Muslim community. They're on the front lines. They can provide information to us that we might not get anywhere else. They need to have close working cooperation with law enforcement in these communities, not be alienated and pushed away, as some of Donald's rhetoric has unfortunately led to.

TRUMP: I have to respond.

HOLT: Please respond.

TRUMP: The secretary said very strongly about working with, we've been working with them for many years, and we have the greatest mess anyone's ever seen. You look at the Middle East, it's a total mess.

Under your direction, to a large extent. But you look at the Middle East. You started the Iran deal. That's another beauty where you have a country that was ready to fall, I mean they were doing so badly, they were choking on the sanctions, and now they're going to be actually probably a major power at some point pretty soon the way they're going.

But when you look at NATO, I was asked on a major show, what do you think of NATO? You have to understand I'm a business person, I did really well, but I have common sense. I said well, I'll tell you, I haven't given lots of thought to NATO, but two things: Number 1, the 28 countries of NATO, many of them aren't paying their fair share. Number 2, and that bothers me, because we should be, yes, we're defending them, they should be at least paying us what they are supposed to be paying by treaty and contract.

TRUMP: And number two, I said and very strongly, NATO could be obsolete, because, and I was very strong on this, and it was actually covered very accurately in the New York Times, which is unusual for the New York Times to be honest, but I said they do not focus on terror. And I was very strong. And I said it numerous times. And about four months ago, I read on the front page of the Wall Street Journal that NATO is opening up a major terror division, and I think that's great.

And I think we should get, because we pay approximately 73 percent of the cost of NATO. It's a lot of money to protect other people. But I'm all for NATO. But I said they have to focus on terror also. And they're going to do that. And that was, believe me, I'm sure I'm not going to get credit for it, but that was largely because of what I was saying and my criticism of NATO. I think we have to get NATO to go into the Middle East with us. In addition to surrounding nations, and we have to knock the hell out of ISIS. And we have to do it fast.

When ISIS formed in this vacuum created by Barack Obama and Secretary Clinton, and believe me, you were the ones that took out the troops. Not only that, you named the day. They couldn't believe it. They sat back and ...

CLINTON: Lester, we've covered this ground.

TRUMP: No, wait a minute. When they formed, when they formed, this is something that never should have happened. It should never happened. Now you're talking about taking out ISIS. But you were there, and you were Secretary of State when it was a little infant. Now it's in over 30 countries, and you're going to stop them? I don't think so.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, a lot of these judgment questions. You supported the war in Iraq before the invasion. What makes your --

TRUMP: I did not support the War in Iraq.

HOLT: In 2002 --

TRUMP: That is a mainstream media nonsense put out by her, because she frankly, I think the best person in her campaign is mainstream media. Would you like to hear? I was against the war, wait a minute. I was against the war in Iraq. Just so you put it out.

HOLT: The record shows otherwise, but.

TRUMP: It does not show that. The record shows that I'm right. When I did an interview with Howard Stern, very lightly, the first time anybody's asked me that, I said, very lightly, I don't know, maybe, who knows. Essentially. I then did an interview with Neil Cavuto, we talked about the economy, it's more important. I then spoke to Sean Hannity, which everybody refuses to call Sean Hannity. I had numerous conversations with Sean Hannity at Fox. And Sean Hannity said -- and he called me the other day and I spoke to him about it and he said you were totally against the war, because he was for the war and that was before the war started. Sean Hannity said very strongly, to me and other people, he's willing to say, but nobody wants to call him, I was against the war. He said you used to have fights with me, because Sean was in favor of the war.

And I understand that side also. Not very much, because we should have never been there, but nobody called Sean Hannity. And then they did an article in a major magazine, shortly after the war started. I think in '04. But they did an article, which had me totally against the War in Iraq. And one of your compatriots said, you know, whether it was before or right after, Trump was definite because if you read this article, there's no doubt. But if somebody, and I'll ask the press, if somebody would call up Sean Hannity, this was before the war started. He and I used to have arguments about the war. I said it's a terrible and a stupid thing. It's going to destabilize the Middle East. And that's exactly what this's done.

HOLT: My reference is to what you had said in 2002.

TRUMP: You didn't hear what I said.

HOLT: And my question was why is your judgment any different than Mrs. Clinton's?

TRUMP: I have better judgment than she does, there's no question about that. I also have a much better temperament than she has, you know? I have a much better. She spent, let me tell you. She spent hundreds of millions of dollars on an advertising -- you know, they got Madison Avenue into a room, oh, temperament, let's go after. I think my strongest asset, maybe by far is my temperament, I have a winning temperament, I know how to win. She does not --

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Woo, okay.

(LAUGHTER)

CLINTON: Let's talk about two important issues that were briefly mentioned by Donald. First, NATO. NATO, as a military alliance has something called Article V. And basically it says this, an attack on one is an attack on all. And do you know the only time it's ever been invoked after 9/11? When the 28 nations NATO said that they would go to Afghanistan with us to fight terrorism. Something that they still are doing by our side.

With respect to Iran, when I became Secretary of State Iran was weeks away from having enough nuclear material to form a bomb. They had mastered the nuclear fuel cycle under the Bush administration. They had built covert facilities, stocked them with centrifuges that were whirling away. And we had sanctioned them. I voted for every sanction against Iran when I was in the Senate, but it wasn't enough. So I spent a year and a half putting together a coalition that included Russia and China, to impose the toughest sanctions on Iran, and we did drive them to the negotiating table. And my successor, John Kerry and President Obama got a deal that put a lid on Iran's nuclear program. Without firing a single shot. That's diplomacy. That's coalition building. That's working with other nations. The other day, I saw Donald saying that there were some Iranian sailors on a ship in the waters off of Iran, and they were taunting American sailors who were on a nearby ship. He said, you know, if they taunted our sailors, I'd blow them out of the water and start another war. That's --

TRUMP: That would not start a war.

CLINTON: That's bad judgment. That is not the right temperament to be commander in chief, to be taunted and the worst part --

TRUMP: They were taunting us --

CLINTON: The worst part of what I heard Donald say has been about nuclear weapons. He has said repeatedly that he didn't care if other countries got nuclear weapon, Japan, South Korea even Saudi Arabia. It has been the policy of the United States, Democrats and Republicans, to do everything we could to reduce the proliferation of nuclear weapons. He even said if there were nuclear war in East Asia, that's fine, you know.

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: Have a good time, folks.

TRUMP: That's lies.

CLINTON: And in fact, his cavalier attitude about nuclear weapons is so deeply troubling. That is the number one threat we face in the world, and it becomes particularly threatening if terrorists ever get their hands on any nuclear material. So a man who can be provoked by a tweet should

not have his fingers anywhere near the nuclear codes. As far as I think anyone with any sense about this should be concerned.

TRUMP: That line is getting a little bit old, I have to say.

CLINTON: It's a good one, though, well describes the problem.

TRUMP: It's not an accurate one at all. It's not an accurate one. So, I just want to give a lot of things and just to respond.

I agree with her on one thing. The single greatest problem the world has is nuclear armament, nuclear weapons. Not global warming, like you think and your president thinks. Nuclear is the single greatest threat.

Just to go down the list, we defend Japan. We defend Germany. We defend South Korea, we defend Saudi Arabia. We defend countries. They do not pay us what they should be paying us, because we are providing tremendous service and we're losing a fortune, that's why we're losing. We're losing-we lose on everything. I say who makes these? We lose on everything. All I said, that it's very possible that if they don't pay a fair share, because this is isn't 40 years ago where we could do what we're doing. We can't defend Japan, a behemoth selling us cars by the millions.

HOLT: We need to move on.

TRUMP: Alright, but it's very important. All I said is they may have to defend themselves or they have to help us out. We're a country that owes \$20 trillion. They have to help us out. As far as the nuclear is concerned, I agree. It is the single greatest threat that this country has.

HOLT: Which leads my next question, as we head to our last segment here, we're still on the subject of securing America. On nuclear weapons, President Obama reportedly considered changing the nation's longstanding policy on first use. Do you support the current policy? Mr. Trump, you have two minutes on that.

TRUMP: Well, I have to say that, you know, for, what Secretary Clinton was saying about nuclear with Russia. She's very cavalier in the way she talks about various countries. But Russia has been expanding their, they have a much newer capability than we do. We have not been updating from the new standpoint. I looked the other night, I was seeing B-52s, they're old enough that your father, your grandfather could be flying them. We are not keeping up with other countries. I'd like everybody to end it, just get rid of it, but I would certainly not do first strike.

I think that once the nuclear alternative happens, it's over. At the same time, we have to be prepared. I can't take anything off the table. Because you look at some of these countries, you look at North Korea, we're doing nothing there. China should solve that problem for us. China should go into North Korea, China is totally powerful as it relates to North Korea.

TRUMP: And by the way, another one powerful is, the worst deal I think I've ever seen negotiated that you started, is the Iran deal. Iran is one of their biggest trading partners. Iran has power over North Korea. And when they made that horrible deal with Iran, they should have included the fact that they do something with respect to North Korea and they should have done something with respect to Yemen and all these other places, and when asked to Secretary Kerry, why didn't you do that? Why didn't you add other things into the deal?

One of the great giveaways of all time, of all time, including \$400 million in cash. Nobody's ever seen that before. That turned out to be wrong, it was actually \$1.7 billion in cash. Obviously, I

guess for the hostages, it certainly looks that way. So you say to yourself, why didn't they make the right deal? This is one of the worst deals ever made by any country in history. The deal with Iran will lead to nuclear problems, all they have to do is sit back 10 years, and they don't have to do much. And they're gonna end up getting nuclear. I met with Bibi Netanyahu the other day, believe me, he's not a happy camper.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton, you have two minutes.

CLINTON: Let me start by saying words matter. Words matter when you run for president, and they really matter when you are president. And I want to reassure our allies in Japan and South Korea and elsewhere that we have mutual defense treaties, and we will honor them. It is essential that America's word be good. And so I know that this campaign has caused some questioning and some worries on the part of many leaders across the globe. I've talked with a number of them. But I want to, on behalf of myself, and I think on behalf of a majority of the American people say that, you know, our word is good.

It's also important that we look at the entire global situation. There's no doubt that we have other problems with Iran, but personally, I'd rather deal with the other problems having put that lid on their nuclear program than still to be facing that. And Donald never tells you what he would do. Would he have started a war? Would he have bombed Iran? If he's going to criticize a deal that has been very successful in giving us access to Iranian facilities that we never had before, then he should tell us what his alternative would be.

CLINTON: But it's like his plan to defeat ISIS. He says it's a secret plan, but the only secret is that he has no plan. So we need to be more precise in how we talk about these issues. People around the world follow our presidential campaigns so closely, trying to get hints about what we will do. Can they rely on us? Are we going to lead the world with strength and in accordance with our values?

That's what I intend to do. I intend to be a leader of our country that people can count on both here at home and around the world to make decisions that will further peace and prosperity but also stand up to bullies, whether they're abroad or at home. We cannot let those who would try to destabilize the world, to interfere with American interests and security --

HOLT: Two minutes is expired.

CLINTON: -- if given any opportunities at all.

TRUMP: Lester, ne thing I'd like to say.

HOLT: Very quickly.

TRUMP: I will be very quickly. But I will tell you, Hillary will tell you to go to her website and read all about how to defeat ISIS, which she could have defeated by never having it, you know, get going in the first place. Right now it's getting tougher and tougher to defeat them, because they're in more and more places, more and more states, more and more nations and it's a big problem, and as far as Japan is concerned, I want to help all of our allies. But we are losing billions and billions of dollars. We cannot be the policeman of the world. We cannot protect countries all over the world.

HOLT: We have just a --

TRUMP: Where they're not paying us what we need.

HOLT: We have just a few final questions.

TRUMP: She doesn't say that, because she has no business ability. We need heart, we need a lot of things, but you have to have some basic ability. And sadly, she doesn't have that. All of the things that she's talking about could have been taken care of during the last ten years, let's say, while she had great power, but they weren't taken care. And if she ever wins this race, they won't be taken care of.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, this year, secretary Clinton became the first woman nominated for president by a major party. Earlier this month, you said she doesn't have a presidential look. She's standing here right now. What did you mean by that?

TRUMP: She doesn't have the look. She doesn't have the stamina. I said she doesn't have the stamina, and I don't believe she does have the stamina. To be president of this country, you need tremendous stamina.

HOLT: The quote was, "I just don't think she has a presidential look."

TRUMP: Wait a minute, Lester. You asked me a question. Did you ask me a question? You have to be able to negotiate our trade deals. You have to be able to negotiate. That's right. With Japan, with Saudi Arabia. I mean, can you imagine, we're defending Saudi Arabia and with all of the money they have, we're defending them, and they're not paying, all you have to do is speak to them. Wait, you have so many different things, you have to be able to do, and I don't believe that Hillary has the stamina.

HOLT: Let's let her respond.

CLINTON: Well, as soon as he travels to 112 countries and negotiates a peace deal, a cease-fire, a release of dissidents, an opening of new opportunities in nations around the world or even spends 11 hours testifying in front of a congressional committee, he can talk to me about stamina.

TRUMP: The world.

(CHEERS AND APPLAUSE)

TRUMP: Let me tell you. Let me tell you. Hillary has experience, but it's bad experience. We have made so many bad deals during the last -- So she has experience, I agree. But it's bad, bad experience, whether it's the Iran deal that you're so in love with, where we gave them \$150 billion back. Whether it's the Iran deal, whether it's uh, anything -- man, you almost can't name a good deal. I agree, she's got experience, but it's bad experience. And this country can't afford to have another four years of that kind of bad experience.

(CHEERS AND APPLAUSE)

HOLT: We are at the final question.

CLINTON: One thing, Lester. He tried to switch from looks to stamina. But this is a man who has called women pigs, slobs, and dogs. And someone who has said pregnancy is an inconvenience to employers, who has said --

TRUMP: I never said that.

CLINTON: Women don't deserve equal pay unless they do as good a job as men.

TRUMP: Didn't say that.

CLINTON: And one of the worst things he said was about a woman in a beauty contest. He loves beauty contests, supporting them and hanging around them. And he called this woman Ms. Piggy. Then he called her Ms. Housekeeping, because she was Latina. Donald, she has a name.

TRUMP: Where did you find this? Where did you find this?

CLINTON: Her name is Alicia Machado and she has become a U.S. citizen, and you can bet she's going to vote this November.

TRUMP: OK, good. Let me just tell you.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, just take 10 seconds, and then we've got the final question.

TRUMP: Hillary is hitting me with tremendous commercials. Some of it's said in entertainment, some of it's said to somebody who's been very tough to me, Rosie O'Donnell. I said very tough things to her and I think that everybody would agree that she deserves it and nobody feels sorry for her. But you want to know the truth? I was going to say something --

HOLT: Please, very quickly.

TRUMP: Extremely rough to Hillary, to her family, and I said to myself, I can't do it. I just can't do it. It's inappropriate. It's not nice. But she's spent hundreds of millions of dollars on negative ads on me, many of which are absolutely untrue, they're and they're misrepresentations, and I will tell you this, Lester, it's not nice, and I don't deserve that, but it's certainly not a nice thing that she's done. It's hundreds of millions of ads. And the only gratifying thing is I saw the polls come in today, and with all of that money--

HOLT: We have to move on to the final question.

TRUMP: -- over \$200 million spent, and I'm either winning or tied. And I've spent practically nothing.

HOLT: One of you will not win this election, so many final question to you tonight: are you willing to accept the outcome as the will of the voters?

CLINTON: Well, I support our democracy. And sometimes you win. Sometimes you lose. But I certainly will support the outcome of this election. And I know Donald's trying very hard to plant doubts about it, but I hope the people out there understand: This election's really up to you. It's not about us so much as it is about you and your families and the kind of country and future you want. So I sure hope you will get out and vote as though your future depended on it because it does.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, very quickly, same question: Will you accept the outcome as the will of the voters?

TRUMP: I want to make America great again. We are a nation that is seriously troubled. We're losing our jobs, people are pouring into our country.

The other day we were deporting 800 people. And perhaps they pressed the wrong button, they press the wrong button, or perhaps worse than that, it was corruption. But These people that we were going to deport for good reason ended up becoming citizens. Ended up becoming citizens, and it was 800, and now it turns out, it might be 1800, and they don't even know.

HOLT: Will you accept the outcome of the election?

TRUMP: I want to make America great again. I'm going to be able to do it, I don't think Hillary will. The answer is, If she wins, I will absolutely support her.