

# Donald Trump's Securitization Campaign

An Analysis of Donald Trump's Security Rhetoric During his 2016 Presidential Campaign



Universiteit Leiden

**Course:** Thesis

**Supervisor:** Dr. Myriam Benraad

**Second Reader:** Dr. Pauline Aarten

**Name:** Calvin Smid

**Studentnumber:** S2095882

**Word count:** 16011 (excluding footnotes and appendix)

**Date:** 6/7/18

## **Abstract:**

This thesis looks to apply the securitization theory to the electoral campaign of Donald Trump in 2016. Securitization theory holds that certain political topics can be securitized to be given the attention of a topic of the utmost importance. This is because the topics are framed as an existential threat to the nation, people, or its values. This thesis finds that Donald Trump employed this strategy on several topics, ultimately leading to the framing of Hillary Clinton and her policies as the looming destruction of the United States of America. Moreover, because of the unique style of rhetoric of Donald Trump, this thesis looks into what rhetorical aspects of Donald Trump's speeches might help facilitate the acceptance of the security threat by the larger audience. The results indicate that simple, short, and repetitive speech, combined with the frequent use of image-based wording and allusions to collective themes could all facilitate securitization.

## Table of Contents

<b>Table of Figures:</b> .....	3
<b>Introduction:</b> .....	4
Research Question: .....	6
<b>Theoretical framework:</b> .....	8
The Development of Securitization: .....	8
Vuori's five strands of Securitization theory: .....	10
Critiques on Securitization Theory: .....	11
Facilitating conditions of securitization: .....	12
<b>Method:</b> .....	14
Research Design: .....	14
Speech act Analysis: .....	17
Vuori's Speech Act Analysis: .....	19
Rhetorical Analysis Trump's Security Rhetoric: .....	20
<b>Results:</b> .....	22
Topics of the campaign: .....	22
Differences in Degree of Strength: .....	23
Topical Analysis of Securitizations in the Trump Campaign: .....	25
<i>Polls, Campaign and success:</i> .....	25
<i>Constitutional rights:</i> .....	26
<i>Military and Veterans:</i> .....	26
<i>Domestic Policies:</i> .....	27
<i>Hillary and other Political Opponents:</i> .....	28
<i>Trade Deals and Jobs:</i> .....	30
<i>Corrupt Political System:</i> .....	32
<i>Illegal Immigration:</i> .....	34
Textual analysis of the securitizing phrases: .....	38
<i>The Simplicity of Trump Rhetoric:</i> .....	38
<i>over-used-terms:</i> .....	41
<i>Image Based words and thematic content of the speeches:</i> .....	42
<b>Conclusion:</b> .....	47
<b>Bibliography:</b> .....	50
<b>Appendix:</b> .....	53

**Table of Figures:**

Figure 1 The Five Strands of Securitization by Vuori ..... 10

Figure 2 Speeches Selected for Analysis ..... 17

Figure 3 Example Sentences of Securitizations per Topic..... 25

Figure 4 Topical Speech Act Analysis of Donald Trump's Speeches ..... 38

Figure 5 Four Global Stylistic Measurements According to TV Debates as Identified by Savoy ..... 39

Figure 6 Grade-Level Scores of Speeches by Political Actors as Identified by Kayam ..... 40

Figure 7 Image Based words vs Concept Based Words ..... 43

Figure 8 Vuori's Strands of Securitization Including The new 6th Strand of winning the popular vote.... 47

## Introduction:

On June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2015, Donald J Trump officially announced his presidential candidacy. His speech, held at the symbolic Trump Tower, will however primarily be remembered by the comments Trump made on illegal immigrants, saying ‘they bring drugs, problems, and are rapists, oh and some, I assume, are good people’ (Leibovich, 2015) (Trump, Announcement bid, 2015). Few people thought it possible that this man, more than a year later, would be elected President of the United States of America. Even more peculiar, is the fact that Donald Trump won the elections continuing the style in which his campaign started off. Trump dominated the news with one scandal, rumor or misplaced comment after another. To name just a few of these instances, Donald Trump publicly supported the ‘Obama has a fake birth certificate’ movement (Acosta & Tatum, 2017). He disrespected the parents of a fallen Muslim Soldier (Hattenstone, 2017). Moreover, he suggested a female moderator of a debate was asking him uncomfortable questions because she was menstruating (Yan, 2015). He questioned whether John McCain was a war hero because he was captured (Leibovich, 2015). He was caught engaging in ‘locker room’ conversation about ‘grabbing’ women in certain places (Fahrentold, 2016). These are just a handful of scandals (leaving out, for instance, his tax situation, and the numerous sexual misconduct accusations) which, individually, should have been campaign ending, however, somehow, it only seemed to gain him voters and traction in the polls. With betting companies giving Trump odds of winning of 150/1 at the start of his campaign, and the multitude of ‘scandals’ which followed, it is truly remarkable how he managed to win the elections. However, it is time to accept this, and time to start looking at how this has happened.

In looking for explanations of Trump’s unlikely victory, many reasons have been given. He was the anti-politician, refused to take money for his campaign, making him independent, or maybe it was simply because Hillary Clinton was unpopular. While there might be merit to all those arguments, recently academics such as Savoy have linked his victory to his unique rhetoric, and bold style of argumentation (Edwards, 2017) (Kayam, 2018) (Savoy, 2018). All of the aforementioned scandals were examples of Trump speaking his mind bluntly and without filter. This style is what set him apart from his political opponents who were usually far more careful in choosing their words, and his supporters seemed to love it (Goldhill, 2017). Moreover, Williams argued Trump’s victory was a result of his simplistic rhetoric, combined with, ‘catastrophic

thinking'. Williams further notes that there is a tendency in Trump's rhetoric in which he seems to demand pre-emptive actions. What she means is exemplified by one of Trump's most infamous tweets, the skittle tweet:

"If I had a bowl of Skittles and I told you just three would kill you. Would you take a handful? That's our Syrian refugee problem." (Trump, 2016)

By saying 'if', Trump constructs a hypothetical scenario of imminent danger, the outcomes of which are directly threatening to 'our' society. This is, according to Williams, an example of how Trump tries to picture a current situation of danger, a situation in which swift response is necessary. Such a linguistic trick that creates hypotheticals to imply the need for immediate action, is one that can be seen throughout the campaign. Examples of this throughout the campaign include: "a challenge to be met, a mountain to be climbed, an America to be regained, a message to be spread, a wall that must be built, an enemy that must be annihilated, as well as the always reflexively terrifying terrorist who must be stopped" (Williams, 2017, p. 12). In this way he seems to be telling his audience that he will pre-emptively tackle certain societal problems, leading Williams to fear that, because of this 'catastrophized thinking' due process of normal political decisions will be placed under stress. (Williams, 2017)

This demand for preemptive action as the result of catastrophic thinking is closely related to the securitization theory of Ole Weaver, however, it has not officially been connected to the theory yet. The theory of Weaver was first explained in *Security: a new Framework for Analysis*, (Weaver, 1998), where he laid out that security issues are created by a political actor to create a legitimate basis for extraordinary measures. In other words, securitization is the extreme of politicizing a topic, to create support from your audience in applying some unconventional or even illegal measure to deal with your threat.

The theory was further built on by many, one of which is Juha Vuori, who, In his book, *How to Do Security with Words*, demonstrates through several case studies within the Peoples Republic of China, how securitization can have different political goals, and not just legitimate actions (Vuori, 2011, p. 2). One of Vuori's five strands of securitization aims for control over a society. Instead of aiming for legitimacy, this strand of securitization rather aims for obedience and discipline (Vuori, 2011, p. 195). Hence what I intend to find out, is whether Donald Trump made

use of securitization in the context of his political campaign. Whether he uses the construction of security threats to gain support from its audience, and eventually win the elections.

Moreover, the success or failure of a securitization partially depends on the 'internal facilitating condition' of the securitization, a term coined by Ole Weaver. The internal facilitating condition is the 'grammar' of the securitization, so in other words the ways in which the securitization is phrased. Because the success or failure of securitization lies with audience acceptance of your intended goal (legitimacy for Weaver's original work), the language used in your securitization is essential to convince the audience. The parameters of what successful securitization language entails, are however largely unknown, and little research has been conducted in this area (McDonald, 2008). Because of the particular, yet successful, style of Donald Trump's speeches, establishing securitizations in the campaign would also lead to insights in the internal facilitating condition of this phenom.

With this in mind, I intend to answer the following research question:

**To what extent can patterns of securitization be discerned in the 2016 Electoral Campaign, and what does Trump's rhetorical style mean for the internal facilitating condition of securitization theory?**

In order to successfully answer this question, I will start with a theoretical overview of Securitization theory. Starting with Ole Weaver's original work I try to show how the theory has developed into a broader, more enveloping theory that could possibly include securitization in electoral campaigns. After this theoretical overview, I discuss the method of speech act analysis and discuss the selection of Donald Trump's campaign rallies. This method section outlines the different steps I have taken to find patterns of securitization. In my results section I give a topical overview of Donald Trump's campaign rallies and conclude that securitization has indeed taken place. Finally, in my conclusions I analyze the securitizations that have been identified and discuss what these might mean for the internal facilitating condition

Moreover, this research intends to address several gaps in the body of work of securitization. As mentioned before, if securitization theory can help explain the rhetoric of Donald Trump's campaign, it might also give insights its internal facilitating condition. According to McDonald, research into this 'facilitating condition' has not yet been conducted, rendering it, 'near obsolete'

(McDonald, 2008, p. 564). By conducting research on ‘if’ he securitized issues, and consequently, ‘how’, using what language, provides insights into the internal facilitating condition. Therefore, looking at the specific grammar and rhetoric of the Donald Trump campaign may help to identify some of the elements of this ‘grammar’ that facilitates securitization.

Moreover, looking at securitization theory in the context of elections opens up the possibilities of new uses for securitization theory. Waever originally held that securitization was intended to legitimize ‘extraordinary measures’. Vuori expanded its use to encompass other ‘strands of securitization, such as trying to gain obedience, but also deterrence and agenda setting. Furthermore, he holds that his list is not conclusive, and there may be other strands of securitization, ones that he did not identify in his own research. Therefore, this research intends to broaden the different strands of securitization and apply it in a new setting of elections.

On top of that, this research attempts to address the more societal question of how Donald Trump got elected. If the hypothesis proves to be right, this thesis will increase the understanding of the ‘campaign tricks’ that politicians employ. This will allow us to better understand the upset victory of Donald Trump in the 2016 elections, as well as any future political campaigns employing a similar rhetoric.

## Theoretical framework:

### The Development of Securitization:

Securitization theory is part of the larger body of works within security studies, which begs the question as to what security, and its respective academic field, entails. Barry Buzan was clear in his answer to this question: “security is pursuit of freedom from threats” (Sulovic, 2010). Consequently, one could conclude that the academic field of security studies concerns itself with the theories that concern threats, freedom of threats, and the responses to threats, however vague this may be. Traditionally, the threats with which security studies dealt, were state-centric (as the state had to guarantee a freedom of threats) and focused on the military (as the military was the only institute capable of dealing with the threats which were posed to the state). This is certainly understandable considering the timeframe from which the security studies originate, the cold-war era. However, there was a growing dissatisfaction with such a narrow frame of the security field. Starting in the 1970’s scholars started noting that threats may originate from other areas than just other States. With economic and environmental agendas identifying threats in the 1970’s and threats to identity, as well as threats posed by international crime appearing in the 1990’s (Buzan, 1998), an effort was made to enlarge this narrow approach to security studies, to return to what security studies was supposed to concern, all threats, and not just the military ones. This is how securitization theory was born.

As is usually the case with paradigm shifts in academic studies, the move towards a wider security studies was not without objections. Traditionalist hold that security studies focuses on ‘military conflict’ centered around the state, and that the any widening of the security studies would disrupt its logical coherence (Buzan, 1998). Threats posed by economic or environmental issues simply would require a different response, one which was not yet developed within the security studies. Stephen Walt eloquently put this concern into words:

*“Defining the field in this way would destroy its intellectual coherence and make it more difficult to devise solutions to any of these [pollution, disease, child abuse, or economic recession] important problems” (Buzan, 1998, pp. 3-4)*

And while these are certainly valid concerns, one of the attempts to widen the security studies, and arguably the most successful one, was created with these concerns in mind. The securitization

theory conceived by the Copenhagen School, wanted to expand the scope of security issues which could be addressed by the security studies, without automatically applying the traditional logic. Or in the words of Barry Buzan:

*“We seek coherence not by confining security to the military sector but by exploring the logic of security itself to find out what differentiates security and the process of securitization from that which is merely political”* (Buzan, 1998, pp. 4-5)

Therefore, it is the task of the securitization theory to differentiate between those threats which are every day and mundane, and those which might constitute security issues. The problem with this, is that such a distinction is not always clear. In a world of threats, there are very few threats which can be deemed objective, of which all people see that not dealing with the threat will lead to destruction. Therefore, one could argue security issues are subjective, and thus constructed by actors through ‘discursive politics’ (Balzacq, 2011, p. 1). And this is exactly how the theory of securitization widened the scope of security studies. To offer an example, the current nuclear threat North Korea poses, and the nature of its relationship with the United States of America, fit in the traditional security paradigm. Its state centric, and military solutions will eventually have to be employed to reach a complete absence of threat. However, is the situation as it stands now sufficient to constitute an existential threat to the United States of America? Or is the situation constructed by politicians, the media, and other actors to constitute an existential threat to the United States? In other words, can political negotiations offer a way out of this deadlock? By using this frame, one widens the security scope to entail all those threats which actors deem of the utmost importance.

The problem then becomes an issue of distinguishing between political problems and security problems, and securitization theory does exactly this. Buzan and Weaver distinguish three features that lead to successful securitization:

- 1) The issue/topic is presented as an existential threat to the referent object
- 2) Extraordinary measures are required to resolve this threat
- 3) The audience needs to be convinced of the necessity of these extraordinary measures.

It is important to note, at this point that if a discourse conforms to points 1 and 2, so a topic is presented as an existential threat, requiring extraordinary measure, this is referred to as a

securitizing move (Weaver, 1998). Moreover, if all three features are satisfied, a topic has been successfully securitized. Topics or issues can be envisioned to lie on a spectrum, ‘ranging from non-politicized (no attention to a topic whatsoever) through politicized (on the political agenda) to securitized (presented as an existential threat, requiring extraordinary measures)’ (Weaver, 1998, pp. 23-24). Securitization as a process requires acceptance of the extraordinary measures by the audience in order to legitimize the proposed emergency measures. This is the essence of the securitization theory as it was originally introduced.

Vuori’s five strands of Securitization theory:

However, over time several additions have been made to the securitization theory, one of which focusses on expanding the scope of the securitization theory of Weaver. For Weaver, securitization constituted an attempt to legitimize extraordinary measures in response to an existential threat. However, Vuori argues this is only one strand of securitization. In total, Vuori envisions at least five different strands of securitization: 1) raising an issue on the agenda, 2) Legitimizing future acts (Weaver), 3) Deterrence, 4) control, and 5) legitimizing past acts or reproducing a security status: see below:

<b>Strand of Securitization</b>	<b>Elementary speech act sequence</b>	<b>Illocutionary point</b>	<b>Perlocutionary aim</b>	<b>Temporality</b>	<b>Degree of strength</b>
Raising an issue onto the agenda	Claim Warn <i>Suggest, urge, propose</i>	Directive	Agreement	Future	Has to be argued
Legitimizing Future acts	Claim Warn <i>request</i>	Directive	Legitimacy	Future	Has to be argued
Deterrence	Claim Warn <i>Declare</i>	Declarative	Intimidation/ Deterrence	Future	Declaration
control	Claim Warn <i>Require</i>	Directive	Obedience/ Discipline	Future	Compelling
Legitimizing past acts	Claim Warn <i>Explain</i>	Assertive	Legitimacy	Past	Has to be argued

Figure 1 The Five Strands of Securitization by Vuori

Vuori, through several case studies in the Peoples Republic of China, examines the process of securitization and identified that securitizing is a ‘political move through speech acts’. Actors may have different political rationales for engaging in securitization, even if this does not immediately become apparent from the actual phrasing of the securitization. Therefore, speech act analysis and especially the illocutionary point is important in discerning this political goal (more on this in the method section).

The notion of different strands of securitization is especially interesting because it entails that various political goals can lie at the foundation of a securitization move. Whereas the success of the securitization still resonates within audience acceptance, its goal could be different from merely legitimizing future actions. With an eye on the electoral campaign, one strand of securitization is particularly interesting for this analysis, the strand of control. This strand aims to achieve obedience from the society. Therefore, it attempts to get the audience to do certain things, or to forbid them from doing certain things (Vuori, 2011, p. 208). Therefore, one could argue that in the context of the electoral campaign of Donald Trump, securitization attempts would fit within this strand of securitization, as it attempts to make the audience vote for him. However, Vuori constructed this strand of securitization on the basis of a historical analysis of the People’s Republic of China, a context in which obedience means something more than just casting a vote for a certain presidential candidate. Securitization within the presidential elections would thus constitute a milder form of obedience, however this will not matter for the analysis because of the fact that the political goal determines the strand of securitization. As long as there is a securitizing move, that intends to convince the audience of a certain aim, securitization is taking place. Vuori specifies that there are *at least* five strands of securitization (Vuori, 2011, p. 195), opening up the possibility of many different strands of securitization, one of which could be the securitization strand of electoral victory.

#### Critiques on Securitization Theory:

Arguably the biggest critique that securitization theory has faced concerns itself with the notion that the securitizing speech act constitutes the security problem. In other words, Weaver argues that by saying that something is a security problem, one makes it so as well. One of the most influential developments on securitization theory came from Thierry Balzacq who emphasizes the importance of the audience and context in this process. He argues that there is a sociological variant of the Securitization theory that sees securitization more as a process, rather than a speech act.

This view places more emphasis on the power relations between actors, the practices surrounding security and politics and the context in which it finds place (Balzacq, 2011). McDonald subscribes to such a view as well, arguing that the ‘form of act constructing security is defined narrowly, with the focus on the speech of dominant actors’ (McDonald, 2008, p. 563). To illustrate, post 9/11, the tv images of the planes flying into the Twin Towers have been suggested to be extremely influential in the construction of the security problem (McDonald, 2008). Therefore, there is a call towards the inclusion of different forms of securitizing moves. Despite these calls, I argue, it is still fruitful to discuss the method of the speech act. This is firstly because, despite agreeing with the need of the extension of the securitization theory to focus on methods beyond the speech act, the speech act still constitutes one of the main initiations of securitizations, albeit sometimes in combination with the other factors that the sociological securitization specifies. If we would reverse the logic, it would be very difficult for securitization to occur without the speech act of the political actor. Therefore, extending the research on rhetoric of the securitization move is still needed.

#### Facilitating conditions of securitization:

Next to some objections to securitization theory being too narrow, there are also aspects to the theory which are under investigated, such as the conditions which facilitate the process of securitization and render such a move either successful or not. Weaver specified these conditions in his original work, by creating two categories of facilitating conditions, internal and external conditions. Firstly, the external, social and contextual condition, which focuses, for example, on the right social capital for the actors involved, and an appropriate power relation with the audience that must accept the extraordinary measures. Another aspect of the external condition is that there are features of the alleged threat which could help make or break your case for securitization (think of incidents, such as attacks or military drills). But more important for this research are the internal conditions, defined by Weaver as the: ‘internal linguistic-grammatical’ condition. This is explained as the condition ‘to follow the rules of the act’, or as Austin argues, ‘accepted conventional procedures must exist, and the act has to be executed according to these procedures’ (Weaver, 1998, p. 32). This is further specified as following the ‘grammar of security’ and it is important to ‘construct a plot that includes existential threat, point of no return, and a possible way out’ (Weaver, 1998, p. 33). Furthermore, it is important to use the right vocabulary depending on the sector that you are addressing, for instance referring to ‘identity’ when talking about issues in

the societal sector or talking about ‘sovereignty’ when talking about issues in the national sector. This is as far as the explanation of the internal facilitating condition goes in the works of Weaver. Hence, it is lacking any information concerning the rhetoric and persuasiveness necessary to securitize a given topic, whereas using the right rhetoric would certainly facilitate the success of securitization. The ambiguity, and the incompleteness, of the facilitating conditions is therefore also one of the most criticized aspects of the securitization theory. McDonald even argues that ‘the role of the facilitating condition is so undertheorized as to ultimately remain out of the framework itself’ (McDonald, 2008, p. 564). Thierry Balzacq is more nuanced, however proposed three different conditions, one of which involves:

*“the capacity of the securitizing actor to use appropriate words and cogent frames of reference in a given context, in order to win the support of the target audience for political purposes”* (Balzacq, 2005, p. 192)

This comes closer to looking into rhetoric, however is also not further specified in Balzacq’s works. Therefore, further research on this condition, in the context of one of the most unlikely electoral wins, where the political leader used ‘unorthodox’ rhetoric, is how I intend to further explicate this condition. This is one of the ways in which this research hopes to contribute to the larger body of work. Vuori similarly holds that who ‘speaks’ is very important with regards the construction of security issues (Vuori, 2011, p. 12). Moreover, the power of the speaker is important with regards to recognition of the audience. In as such, the social and political capital is important in the success of the securitization attempt. This social capital partially derives from the institutionalization of the actor, being in a position of power, however his/her is also instrumental to the success of the securitization.

## **Method:**

### Research Design:

Before going into the specific method of analysis, the research design of this thesis must be defended. The research design is a qualitative, holistic single case study, of the 2016 American election which was selected because of the unlikely success it turned out to be. Vuori notes that the analysis of crucial cases is the most appropriate way to develop theory (Vuori, 2011, p. 14), and that “the main criterion for the selection of a case was that it had a major, ‘visible’ political outcome” (Vuori, 2011, p. 19). The election of Donald Trump constitutes such a crucial case for two distinct reasons, one academic, one societal. Academically, the case of Donald Trump’s election would be one of the first cases of electoral securitization analysis. On a societal level, the election of Donald Trump is crucial because of the political implications his election has had, the public outcry with which his presidential election was received, and his consistently low approval ratings (something he himself calls fake news). (Silver, Mehta, & Bycoffe, 2018). I attribute at least some of his success to rhetoric of the campaign (Edwards, 2017) (Savoy, 2018), the unorthodox techniques and speeches that he used seemed to work, and are distinctly different from the rhetoric of his opponents, making this case extremely suited to the intended investigation into the internal facilitating condition. The unit of analysis of this research is what both Balzacq and Buzan et al. call the second level, for Balzacq this level is called ‘acts’, and for Buzan et al. this is called ‘actors’. However, since the focus of this thesis lies on the specific rhetoric of the securitizing speech act employed by Donald Trump, the unit of analysis can best be categorized as the act of the actor (Balzacq, 2011) (Weaver, 1998).

In researching the securitization, I will conduct a discourse analysis, more specifically speech act analysis of Donald Trump’s speech acts. In the field of securitization studies, speech act analysis is arguably the most applicable research method (Watson, 2012), ‘however the majority of empirical studies done within the framework have not relied on speech act analysis as such’. (Vuori, 2011, p. 15). Speech act analysis, however, will be used since this is the method that Buzan, Weaver, and De Wilde suggested for the analysis of security in their book (Weaver, 1998), and because Vuori uses it in his analysis on the different strands of securitization (Vuori, 2011, p. 15). Several scholars after this have suggested that other avenues of methods should be pursued (Balzacq, 2011) (Baele & Thomson, 2017). Examples of these new methods include, experimental designs, ethnographic research, process-tracing, and content analysis. The argument put forward

here is that, because the body of work concerning securitization is growing, new methods, and even a combination of these methods, could lead to new angles and insights into the securitization. And while there is certainly merit to this notion, my angle on the specific rhetoric of securitization leads to discourse analysis being the most logical and viable option. One disadvantage of discourse analysis is that it cannot provide the same rigorous formalism as some other research methods (Balzacq, 2011). Balzacq, for example, argues that there is no set requirement for data collection, which depends on the subject that one investigates. He further denies a necessity for triangulation of data, due to this being ‘too deterministic’ (Balzacq, 2011, p. 41). This will somewhat impact the external validity of the research; however, this does not imply that this research cannot be replicated. Using the methodological framework of Vuori, provides enough formalism to adequately replicate the research in different contexts, as well as yield the same result in the case of Donald Trump.

Moreover, data will primarily originate from YouTube, where all of Donald Trump’s speeches are made available. Secondary texts (legislation, news articles, etc) will be excluded from this study, Trump, or his campaign, might not have drafted these texts themselves. Moreover, some secondary sources will have a different nature, as they are not conducted with the aim of reaching the largest audience possible (which is the case for his campaign speeches). An argument could be made that Donald Trump’s speeches are made by his spin doctors, and not by himself. However, Donald Trump must always act out the speech that was given to him, giving him the last say over the execution of the text, what to disregard, what to emphasize, and how to sell his views. On top of that, Trump himself regularly declared within his speeches that he does not have pre-prepared speeches, and that this is one factor that distinguishes him from other politicians (Trump, 2016). Moreover, for the sake of the influence the unorthodox rhetoric has on securitization it is not too relevant to take spin doctors into account.

In establishing securitization of an electoral campaign, the scope of the entire campaign has to be taken into account. The entire campaign, all its interviews, speeches and communications are widely distributed and readily available for use. However, As Balzacq acknowledges, it is impossible to read all the data which is available, and therefore ‘researchers should not be perturbed a priori by the quantity of data’ (Balzacq, 2011, p. 42) having said that, it is important to neither over- nor under shoot the number of speeches analyzed. In reducing the number of

available texts for analysis, I only look at texts that fit certain requirements. The first of the requirements is that they have to be relatively distributed over the course of the entire campaign. Therefore, I select as many texts from the primaries, as from the secondaries of the election. The second requirement is that, when choosing Trump Rallies to analyze, I only look at the larger events (of over 10 thousand estimated attendants), which is to reduce the risk of encountering speeches aimed at particular audiences. I intend to establish a securitization discourse in the general message of the campaign, not necessarily in speeches aimed at certain groups of society. A full list of Trump Rallies, including estimated attendants is widely available on the internet (my list of rallies originates from ipfs.io). Studies on the rhetoric that Trump used during the elections ranged from 3 different texts, to 20 different texts (Savoy, 2018) (Kayam, 2018). The most important thing in coming to the is to be able to discern patterns between text to establish securitization on a certain topic. Only when such intertextual patterns of securitization are established, can it really be deemed an act of securitization. Therefore, I have chosen for a stratified random selection of ten speeches of Donald Trump rallies that fit all of these criteria.

I selected the speeches as follows: I listed all of Donald Trump’s speeches of which the attendance was over 10,000 people. This resulted in a list with a total of 44 speeches, in a timespan of July 11<sup>th</sup> 2015 to November 7<sup>th</sup> 2016 (a day before election day). These were placed in chronological order and divided in groups of 5, of which I randomly selected one speech out of each group of five. These steps were taken to ensure that I would get speeches covering the entirety of the campaign, while upholding the principle of random selection. Next to that I analyzed both Donald Trumps, announcement bid on June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2015 and his inauguration speech on January 20<sup>th</sup> 2017, which marked the start and the end of the campaign respectively. This resulted in the selection of the following speeches, all of which can be found on YouTube:

Date	City	State	Venue	Attendance
<b>Primaries:</b>				
June 16 2015	New York	NY	Trump tower	unknown
August 21, 2015	Mobile	AL	Ladd–Peebles Stadium	15–30,000
January 2, 2016	Biloxi	MS	Mississippi Coast Coliseum	15,000

January 18, 2016	Lynchburg	VA	Vines Center, Liberty University	10,000
February 3, 2016	Little Rock	AR	Barton Coliseum	11,500
March 12, 2016	Dayton	OH	Dayton International Airport	20,000
<b>Secondaries:</b>				
August 3, 2016	Daytona Beach	FL	Ocean Center	10,000
September 9, 2016	Pensacola	FL	Pensacola Bay Center	12,500
October 22, 2016	Virginia Beach	VA	Library Plaza, Regent University	10,000
November 2, 2016	Orlando	FL	CFE Arena, Central Florida Fairgrounds	10,000
November 6, 2016	Moon Township	PA	Atlantic Aviation	12,000
January 20, 2017	Washington DC	DC	Capitol	300,000 +

Figure 2 Speeches Selected for Analysis (data from ipfs.io)

A typical Trump Rally lasted between 50 minutes and one hour, however the rallies closer to election day (November 2016) only lasted around 30- 35 minutes, due to a higher frequency of rallies on one day.

Furthermore, this study takes a deductive approach, with a pre-defined frame of securitization. This is in order to focus specifically on the securitization frame and disregard all the other frames in our analysis. It is, however, important to note that we chose the speech acts on the basis of a securitizing move, and not necessarily on the basis of the referent object. Therefore, multiple political topics can be taken into the analysis, ranging from immigrational issues, to environmental issues, as long as the premises of threat construction are met.

#### Speech act Analysis:

Following the example of both the original securitization works of Ole Weaver et al., and Vuori, Speech act analysis will be used to discern the securitization moves and with that the securitization. The formulation of the Speech act analysis originates from the works of Austin and Searle, who hold that speech is an act made in order to perform an action (Dylgjeri, 2017). Hence, for

securitization, the words and utterances by Donald Trump are made to create a security issue, to gain support for his campaign.

In the analysis we conform to Austin's distinction of three classes of speech acts, namely:

- 1) Locutionary acts: The act of saying something, the words themselves.
- 2) Illocutionary acts: The intended message of the words which were uttered
- 3) perlocutionary acts: The consequential effects of the words.

Searle elaborates on the illocutionary acts, which to him constitutes the performative action, by identifying five basic categories of illocutionary points:

- 1) Assertives: when a locution states or postulates something. It commits the actor to the truth.  
(e.g. statements, claims)
- 2) Directives: statements that intend to make the audience take a particular action  
(e.g. requests, advice)
- 3) Commissive: When the actor commits itself to future actions  
(e.g. promises)
- 4) Expressives: a locution which expresses certain emotions or thoughts.  
(e.g. apologies)
- 5) Declaratives: these statements intend to make something the truth  
(e.g. dismissing) (Dylgjeri, 2017) (Hashim, 2015)

Within these illocutionary points, there are varying degrees of strength, that depend on its locution. For instance, within a directive, one can 'demand' something, which is a high degree of strength, or one can 'advice' someone to do something, which is a lower degree of strength. Therefore, in analyzing the speeches, one must take into account the locution, illocution and perlocution of the speech act, as well as identify the illocutionary point, and its concurring degree of strength. This constitutes the speech act analysis.

To illustrate, when person A says: 'let's go out for lunch', to Person B, who happens to be hungry. The speech act analysis is as follows: locution: 'let's go out for lunch'. Illocution: to try and get the other person to come to lunch with you: Directive (proposing), with a low degree of strength as it is suggesting/proposing a plan, not enforcing it. Perlocution: going to lunch, as person B will

happily go to lunch. This is the foundation on which the speech act analysis which is necessary for identifying patterns of securitization is needed.

#### Vuori's Speech Act Analysis:

The starting point of Vuori's speech act analysis is the constitution of securitization moves (Vuori, 2011, p. 15). In analyzing the different Donald Trump speech acts, I annotate the different threat constructions, and group these together on the basis of topics. One of the areas in which the analysis of a political campaign is different from other empirical enquiries into securitization, is that within one speech act, different topics can be securitized, albeit with the same political goal: gaining votes. By grouping the securitizing moves together per topic, one is able to identify the intertextual construction of security threats with regards to the single topic. The threat constructions, according to Buzan occur when discourse has been uttered through a 'lens of security' (Buzan, 1998). Vuori elaborates on this by arguing that one has to identify "rhetorical structures that define security, and rhetorical and other means of facilitating the various securitization speech acts" (Vuori, 2011, p. 16). In other words, I look at the arguments Trump has for identifying an existential threat and its referent object that are essential in construction of the security threat.

In analyzing these different securitization moves, its locution is important, however not as important as its illocutionary effect. Vuori argues that, if the success of securitization depends on the acceptance of the audience, the cultural differences will partially determine its success (Vuori, 2011, p. 16). One can remove such cross-cultural obstacles by looking at the illocutionary point of the securitizing move. The illocutionary point, as identified by Searle, determine the intended message of the speech, not the means through which it was achieved. When looking at the intended message of a text, which for securitization is the fulfilling of some political goal, it is easier to compare the securitization with those in other cultures (Vuori, 2011, p. 184). In the case of Donald Trump's electoral campaign, the political goal that the securitizations serve is the winning of the election. In the second part of the thesis we ignore the cultural differences and focus on the internal facilitating condition of language for the American elections.

The main addition of Vuori's work is the introduction of the various strands of securitization, which extends the use of securitization beyond merely legitimating future acts. As each strand of securitization has a different political aim, the way the securitization is constructed differs as well.

Furthermore, whereas the illocutionary point of a speech act may be the same for some strands of securitization (for instance directive for Control, Legitimizing future actions and Raising an issue on the agenda), the degree of strength of the illocutionary point helps to determine the strand of securitization, and with that perlocutionary aim of a speech act. All securitizations are constructed through a sequence of locutions, the first two of which are universal, as these two, together, construct the security threat. These two steps are: 1) claim, and 2) warn. As Vuori explains: “The combination of these acts commits the securitizing actor to the view that there is an existential threat to a valued referent object, and that its continued existence requires or has required drastic measures” (Vuori, 2011, p. 161). This together constitutes the securitizing move. These two elements are the first two elements I note down in the analysis of Donald Trump’s speeches. The last element in the sequence better identifies the political aim. Because the ultimate goal of an electoral campaign is to gain votes, and with that win the elections, we argue for a constant perlocutionary aim of gaining votes. When looking at the illocutionary point of the claim and warning that is issued, the degree of strength can also be determined. However, the degree of strength has to be argued, as this may be different for each individual. These items can all be seen in Figure one as well.

Therefore, in our analysis, we divide and differentiate between the different claims and warnings, which we group together under the same topic. For instance, if one topic is migration, I note down the general claim(s) and warning(s) concerning migration with. After this I identify its illocutionary point and argue for the degree of strength of this illocutionary point. From all these securitizing claims and warnings per topic, I can conclude whether there is an intertextual construction of threat, or whether they are merely loose instances of threat construction. Therefore, per topic I note:

- 1) Claims
- 2) Warnings
- 3) The illocutionary point
- 4) Degree of Strength

#### Rhetorical Analysis Trump’s Security Rhetoric:

The second part of the analysis looks specifically at the rhetoric of Donald Trump. With the help of several analyses of Donald Trump’s speech rhetoric (specifically Savoy and Kayam) , I try to

gain insights into the rhetoric of Donald Trump. Savoy's four stylistic features: 1) Mean Sentence Length (MSL), 2) Lexical Density (LD), 3) Big Words (BW), and 4) Type-Token Ratio (TTR), help to understand the basics of Donald Trump's rhetoric. Moreover, I compare the general findings to the securitizations that I have found in my analysis to see if there are any differences or aspects that stand out. In this way I can draw comparisons between Savoy's conclusions of Donald Trump's overall rhetorical style, and the rhetorical style which was used in the construction of the threats. Special attention is also given to the most 'over-used' words, to see if these occur in the constructions of threat as well, as well as a thematic content linked to Weberian charisma.

It has to be noted that the linguistic analysis of the securitizations is hampered in two different ways. Firstly, there is no full completed list of securitizations, as securitizations go beyond the mere locutions of the phrases. In the intended effect of the words, or the insinuated message plays a large role in the securitization, and basic linguistic analysis cannot take this into account. Secondly, I am not a linguist, and therefore not equipped to conduct an in-depth analysis of the speech rhetoric of Donald Trump. However, this would also go beyond the main purpose of this thesis, which is to identify patterns of securitization throughout the Trump campaign. The uniqueness of the Trump rhetoric is the reason that I look at the internal facilitating condition as well, as this is a promising avenue to explore the concept. However, I already encourage future research into the matter, as this analysis will not be complete.

## **Results:**

### Topics of the campaign:

The first step in analyzing the different rallies was to identify the topics Donald Trump addressed in each speech. Whereas Trump himself has prided himself on his impromptu speech making, claiming he does not use spin doctors or pre-written texts: ‘whatever it is, it is’ (Trump, Rally Mississippi Coast Coliseum, 2016), the same topics, stories and examples are used throughout his speeches. In order to determine the general message of the campaign and see whether this message uses securitization as a way of gaining votes, these overlapping stories, topics and examples are most interesting. Therefore, identifying the recurrent topics was the starting point of my analysis. The recurrent topics were, in no particular order:

- Polls, voters and attendance numbers, and his own success (Usually the starting point of his speeches). (no securitization)
- Trade deals, and jobs. special emphasis on deals with China and Mexico, as well as Nafta, and Trans Pacific Partnership
- Hillary Clinton (and other political opponents Kasich) and her policies (borders, economics)
- Corrupt system, dishonest media, politicians, super pacs, special interests, and Hillary Clinton’s connection to the system. (including the dangerous deals they have made (iran nuclear, sanctions on north Korea)
- Constitution (second amendment gun laws) as well as supreme court justice.
- Domestic policies such as Obamacare, infrastructure, education/common core, and inner cities.
- Illegal immigration, specifically from Mexico (build the wall) and the middle east (ISIS).
- Military and veterans.

Some of these topics overlap, such as illegal immigration and the current corrupt political system (which allows for the illegal immigration (Trump, Rally Atlantic Aviation, 2016)), or the trade deals which are ‘ripping the jobs out of the country’ (Trump, Rally Library Plaza Regent University, 2016). Other topics that were addressed in the speeches were either location specific (steel industry in Pennsylvania) or time specific (Martin Luther King Day in his Lynchburg speech). These topics are therefore not as relevant for determining the overall message of the campaign,

and his statements on these topics were disregarded from the analysis because inter-textual threat constructions on these issues could not be established.

Of these 8 general topics, I identified securitizing moves in seven out of eight topics. Only the topic of Polls, voters, attendance numbers and his own success were not securitized. In identifying securitizations, I looked at words linked with the traditional security logic (disaster, threat, destroyed etc.) as well as implied dangers (or we are in big trouble). However, the degree of strength of the securitization differed per topic, therefore I made a general division between securitizations of a lighter degree (2<sup>nd</sup>), and those of a higher degree (1<sup>st</sup>) to indicate this degree of strength. The difference between these two degrees lies in the degree of strength of the illocutionary points (e.g, ask or demand) and the urgency of the threat at hand.

#### Differences in Degree of Strength:

The securitization of the second degree were allusions to death, destruction or other violent acts where the audience should know that the use of this phrase is merely imagery. For example: “China is killing us, is impossible for our companies to compete. They are killing us” (Trump, Announcement bid, 2015), “or we are gonna save the second amendment, which is totally under siege. Totally under siege” (Trump, Rally Atlantic Aviation, 2016). Whereas words such as ‘killing’ and ‘under siege’, are securitizing the issues of trade and law changes, the audience is expected to understand that these words are merely imagery. Therefore, the degree of strength of the securitization is somewhat lesser than in the case of 1<sup>st</sup> degree of securitization.

The securitizations of a higher degree were those in which Trump used the securitization in a way in which it is unknown for the listener whether the referent object is truly in danger. For instance, the following quote on illegal immigration plans of Hillary Clinton:

*“Hillary Clinton wants a 550% increase in Syrian refugees pouring into our country. And virtually unlimited immigration from the most dangerous regions in the world pouring into our country. Her plan will import generations of terrorism, extremism, and radicalism into your schools and throughout your communities. When I’m elected president, we will suspend the Syrian refugee program. And we will keep radical Islamic terrorism the hell out of our country. I’ll tell you that. We have enough problems folks, we have enough problems.”* (Trump, Rally Atlantic Aviation, 2016)

In this quote Donald Trump identifies a danger that could lead to severe security issues in the United States, namely the increasing the refugees, as intended by his political opponent Hillary Clinton, which will lead to terrorism, extremism and radicalism. For the listener this securitization is no mere imagery, but an actual threat to their direct safety. Moreover, the illocutionary point of these statements is thus stronger than those of the second degree. The urgency of the threat is even larger than those of the threats in the 2<sup>nd</sup> degree securitizations.

For all topics, Trump intends to direct the audience to do something (namely vote for him) because of the direct security threat it would pose if they would not vote for him, however this illocutionary point remains largely unstated and is merely implied. What is stated, usually are the commissive and assertive illocutionary points. Assertive illocutionary points try to state Trumps truth, so that his audience believe they have to vote for him. The commissive illocutionary point promises certain actions, if he would get elected (so he would first have to get elected, and he would need the audience's votes for this). I leave the directive aspect of the illocutionary point out of the topical analysis, unless it is specified rather than merely implied, because it is more the implied consequence of the speech in general than the implied effect of these specific words.

Having made this distinction, I will now identify the degree of securitization per general campaign topic, and the (most recurring) phrases while dealing with this topic. An overview of the results can be seen in the tables below:

	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Degree of Securitization</b>	<b>(examples of) Recurring Phrase(s)</b>
<b>1.</b>	Polls, and campaign success	No securitization	--
<b>2.</b>	Constitutional rights (2 <sup>nd</sup> )	2 <sup>nd</sup> degree	“We will save the second amendment which as you know is under tremendous siege”.
<b>3.</b>	Military and Veterans	2 <sup>nd</sup> degree	“We will also rebuild our badly depleted military, we need our military”
<b>4.</b>	Domestic policies	2 <sup>nd</sup> degree	“We will also repeal and replace the disaster known as Obamacare.”
<b>5.</b>	Hillary and other political opponents	1 <sup>st</sup> degree	“She unleashed death, destruction and failure in every country she touched”, “She doesn’t know what victory is. And I hope she won’t find out on November 8 <sup>th</sup> , because if she does. Our country is in big big trouble”
<b>6.</b>	Trade deals and jobs	1 <sup>st</sup> degree	“Now Nafta Has destroyed New England. But its destroyed. It it I mean you have fought for years and years and you’ll never recover completely from it but you will if I get elected, cause we are bringing those businesses back”, “We don’t have anything left. We are running on fumes (2x). there is nothing here. They are so much sharper, they are so much sharper. And we are not gonna have a country left. ”
<b>7.</b>	Corrupt political system	1 <sup>st</sup> degree	“I have seen how the career of politicians the big donors and special interests have bled this country dry.”, “We are fighting for all the people that believe that government should serve the people and not the donors or Hillary’s special interests”.
<b>8.</b>	Illegal Immigration	1 <sup>st</sup> degree	“I won’t let the Syrians, we got no idea who they are, they wanna get into our country, They may be ISIS. It May be the Great Trojan horse of all time. Who knows.”

Figure 3 Example Sentences of Securitizations per Topic

### Topical Analysis of Securitizations in the Trump Campaign:

#### *Polls, Campaign and success:*

As briefly stated before this was the only recurring theme in which no securitizing move of any kind was made. When discussing polls, rally attendance and campaign success Donald Trump tried to show how successful he was, and how much progress he had already made, as a testimony to his character. In his own words: ‘I only win’, this topic emphasized this aspect, however it is not relevant for the current analysis.

### *Constitutional rights:*

Topics of conversation that fall under Constitutional rights were primarily concerning the second amendment right to bear arms, as well as the rights to free speech, and religious freedom<sup>1</sup>. These three core principles of the American constitution were framed by the campaign as if they were under direct attack from a third party, which, although never stated directly, can be presumed to be the Democrats. Most commonly, the second amendment was ‘*under tremendous siege*’, whereas ‘*religious liberty*’, needed ‘*defending*’. In short. Trump phrased issues of constitutional changes into an issue of protecting and defending those principles his followers hold dearest.

Therefore, the main claim of the securitization of constitutional rights is that certain rights, such as the second amendment, and religious liberty are under attack by an unspecified actor, presumably the democrats and Hillary Clinton. The warning that is issued by the Trump campaign is that, if nothing changes, or a democrat (Hillary Clinton) is elected, these constitutional rights will be amended, and therefore disappear. The illocutionary point of the securitization of constitutional rights is therefore a commissive one, which becomes clear from statements such as “We are gonna cherish and Defend faith and religious liberty” (Trump, Rally Library Plaza Regent University, 2016). These statements commit Trump to future actions. The degree of strength is not too severe. The commissive aspect is identified by ‘we will’ or ‘we need’ both identifying a sense of urgency, however not to the extent as on some other topics.

### *Military and Veterans:*

*\* It could be argued that speaking about the military in a political context is always speaking about security and can therefore not be securitized. Traditionally security was always defined in terms of military. However, I argue that talking about ‘rebuilding military’ in such an urgent fashion without a clear threat present, constitutes a securitization because the political topic of military expenditure/ military modernization is suddenly brought into highest form of politics.*

Trump’s discussion of military and veterans has primarily focused around two themes: firstly, how poorly the current government is treating the veterans. And secondly, and more importantly for the securitization analysis, how bad the current state of the military is, and how badly they need to improve on this<sup>2</sup>. Discussion of the Military and veterans usually started with Trump saying he

---

<sup>1</sup> We are gonna save the second amendment which is totally under siege. Totally under siege. (Trump, Rally Atlantic Aviation, 2016)

<sup>2</sup> “We will also rebuild our badly depleted military, we need our military” (Trump, Rally Atlantic Aviation, 2016)

loves the military<sup>3</sup>, before he emphasizes the need for militarization by sketching situations in which the military failed, or fell short<sup>4</sup>, or by repeating that there is a danger from unknown enemies.<sup>5</sup> And even though he specifies that they need the military ‘now more than ever’ there is no real sense of urgency behind the words. The threat that failing to militarize poses to the referent object is unclear, and therefore the securitization is not strong resulting into a 2<sup>nd</sup> degree securitizing move.

Hence the claim that Donald Trump is making is that the military is depleted and outdated. The warning is that they need their military ‘now more than ever’ and throughout the campaign the danger that requires rebuilding of the military differs from Russia<sup>6</sup>, to simply negotiating from strength<sup>7</sup>. Therefore, failing to rebuild the military presents a great security threat to the United States. The illocutionary point of the securitization of the military is a commissive one, which becomes clear from the repetitive promises to ‘rebuild’ the military. The strength of the illocution being not too severe, the frequent use of the ‘we need to’ implies a sense of urgency, however not to the extent of which we are going to see on different topics.

#### *Domestic Policies:*

Domestic policies that are most often discussed are: 1) Obamacare, 2) education (and Common Core programming) 3) infrastructure, and 4) inner cities. These topics are mostly discussed in similar tone with similar phrasing. All these issues are ‘disastrous’ and ‘destroying the country’<sup>8,9,10</sup>. Words such as ‘disaster’, ‘crumbling’, and ‘rebuild’ all allude to the fact that the country was destroyed by the previous governments. It goes beyond painting a picture in which previous governments have instituted bad policies and paints a picture as if a continuation of these policies

---

<sup>3</sup> “I’m the most militaristic person in this room” (Trump, Rally Mississippi Coast Coliseum, 2016)

<sup>4</sup> “our military can’t beat Isis” (Trump, Rally Dayton International Airport, 2016)

<sup>5</sup> “Our enemies are getting stronger and stronger by the day. And we as a country are getting weaker. Even our nuclear arsenal doesn’t work” (Trump, Announcement bid, 2015)

<sup>6</sup> Our enemies are getting stronger and stronger by the day. And we as a country are getting weaker. Even our nuclear arsenal doesn’t work.... And 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.” (Trump, Announcement bid, 2015)

<sup>7</sup> To avoid war we need to remember those three words: peace through strength. Nobody is gonna mess with us. We have such depleted military. (Trump, Rally Pensacola Bay Center, 2016 )

<sup>8</sup> *We will also repeal and replace the disaster known as Obamacare.* (Trump, Rally Vines Center Liberty University, 2016)

<sup>9</sup> *End common core, it’s a disaster* (Trump, Announcement bid, 2015)

<sup>10</sup> *And our roads are collapsing, think of it, our roads, our bridges, our tunnels our hospitals, everything, Our country is collapsing* (Trump, Rally Pensacola Bay Center, 2016 )

will result into the complete destruction of the country. This however is never specifically mentioned and only implied. Because words such as disaster, and crumbling can also be interpreted as mere imagery, and because it should be obvious to the target audience that the country is not actually ‘destroyed’, as well as the absence of current present danger, this securitizing move is only of a 2<sup>nd</sup> degree.

However, what already comes closer to the first-degree securitization is the way in which the ‘rebuilding of the inner cities’ is described. Because next to stressing the need of rebuilding the inner-cities, he attaches this to violence and shootings in the inner cities<sup>11 12</sup>. By painting a situation of extreme violence and war zones, Donald Trump claims that there is a direct and pressing danger to Americans living in those areas. But again, I believe that the imagery of comparing warzones between inner cities is rather clear for the target audience, resulting in only a second-degree securitizing move.

Therefore, the claims of the securitization on domestic policies largely revolve around the fact that something (Obamacare, Common Core, our inner cities) are a disaster. The warning is that a continuation of the current policies will destroy the country, as becomes apparent from the phrases such as ‘small businesses and middle-class Americans are getting killed’ and ‘our country is collapsing’. Once again, the illocutionary act is a Commissive one, as Trump promises to fix certain aspects, and therefore save the country. This becomes clear from phrases such as ‘We will repeal and replace the disaster known as Obamacare’ or ‘we will save and protect your social medicare’. They are promising certain political moves if elected.

#### *Hillary and other Political Opponents:*

The first topic which was heavily securitized was the topic of Hillary Clinton, which is the main theme of securitization throughout the campaign discourse. The campaign tries to paint Clinton,

---

<sup>11</sup> *We are also going to rebuild our inner cities. For years and years and years you’ve been hearing this from the democrats they get the votes they don’t do a thing. African Americans and Hispanics living in the inner cities are suffering. The violence is unbearable. You walk to the store with your child and you get shot* (Trump, Rally Library Plaza Regent University, 2016).

<sup>12</sup> *Nearly three thousand five hundred people have been shot in Chicago since the beginning of the year think of that since January three thousand five hundred people have been shot that’s as bad as, and worse, than some of the warzones you are reading about in the middle east. Homicides are up nearly 50 % in Washington ddc and more than 60 % in Baltimore and it is getting worse. To the African Americans and Hispanic voters I say what have you got to lose Vote for Donald Trump. I will fix it, It can get worse I will fix it.* (Trump, Rally Library Plaza Regent University, 2016)

as an existential threat to the existence of America on the basis of past political acts and personal character. Next to this the campaign also attacks her ties to big companies, as well as her policies, however this section deals specifically with her character and competence, whereas the next sections will deal with her policies.

It is interesting to have a look at the difference between the way the campaign pictures Clinton in the secondaries, and the way in which the campaign pictures other political opponents in the primaries, for instance John Casich. They try to discredit both in similar, yet different, ways. When discussing Casich the campaign connects him to the Leeman Brothers which was one of the banks to first collapse in the global banking crisis of 2007<sup>13</sup>. Similarly, for Clinton, who is held responsible for creating ISIS amongst other things<sup>14</sup>. Thus, they are both connected to major international crises, clearly to discredit the competence of the candidate. However, Trump concludes on Casich: “he’s not the right guy to be president. He’s not tough enough he’s not sharp enough” (Trump, Rally Dayton International Airport, 2016) whereas he concludes that if Clinton wins, “*They will have a field day, it will be pillage time*” because ‘they’, an unspecified enemy, do not respect her as a person and that the country will be in “*big big trouble*” (Trump, Rally Pensacola Bay Center, 2016 ). This is a different and specific rhetoric on Hillary Clinton which insinuates that she is not just unfit to lead the United States, she presents a security threat to the United States.

Therefore, the general claim is that Hillary is completely unfit to become the president of the United States. This claim is made with the allusions to her past ‘disastrous’ actions, and her ‘weak’ character. The warning that is issued is that, if Hillary becomes president, either other enemies, ‘who do not respect her’ will destroy America, or she will do it herself just like she has done before, with the mayhem she has caused in the world today (unleashing ISIS).The illocutionary effect is therefore an assertive one, as Trump tries to assert his truth about Clinton presenting a direct security threat. The degree of the ‘disaster’ that might await if Hillary is elected president paints a dire picture (constitutional crisis, death and destruction, pillaging by enemies) which

---

<sup>13</sup> : “He [Casich] was the managing director of the Leeman brothers which was one of the great catastrophes in the world. Leeman Brothers failed, and almost brought down the world if you remember” (Trump, Rally Dayton International Airport, 2016).

<sup>14</sup> “Her (Hillary) policies have caused massive global disorder. She has handed Iraq over to Isis, unleashing that terror group all over the world, including the United states,” (Trump, Rally Pensacola Bay Center, 2016 ).

means the urgency is higher than that of the previous topics. There is no real way of knowing, for the audience at large, whether Hillary caused the international crises Trump ascribes to her, and whether she is so unfit to lead that a similar faith would await the United States if she would be elected, resulting in a first degree of securitization.

#### *Trade Deals and Jobs:*

Another area in which Donald Trump uses security discourse is in the area of trade deals and jobs. This is usually connected to how either Obama or the current establishment has, or Hillary will, conduct these trade deals. There is an abundance of examples in which words such as ‘death’, ‘destruction’, ‘killing’, and ‘ripping apart’ are used in relation to the way the current establishment has dealt with trade deals<sup>15 16 17 18</sup>. The discourse is set up in two ways: Firstly, as if trade deals are ‘wars’<sup>19</sup> with other nations and this is not a battle that the current establishment or Hillary Clinton can win. And secondly, as if other countries are robbing the United States, and the current government is allowing them to do this through these one-sided deals, without fighting back<sup>20 21</sup><sup>22</sup>. In both scenarios the topic of trade and jobs is seen as a topic for which the United States must fight, to prevent further theft, or even death of the industries.

Moreover, the campaign brings the danger of the trade deals by the current establishment, and Hillary Clinton in existential terms. The future, and existence of the United States will depend on improving the trade deals. In several instances Trump warns his listeners, after describing the

---

<sup>15</sup> “China is killing us (10 55). Impossible for our companies to compete. They are killing us (Trump, Announcement bid, 2015)

<sup>16</sup> “It’s a horrible, horrible trade agreement you got twelve countries, all of which want to rip our heart out” (Trump, Rally Dayton International Airport, 2016)

<sup>17</sup> “And the most important weapon that they have to kill our industry and to destroy us on trade is monetary manipulation, devaluation of their currencies” (Trump, Rally Dayton International Airport, 2016)

<sup>18</sup> “So China is dumping tremendous amounts of steel into our country. The government is subsidizing it, its almost like they just want us to die, and they have no respect for us”

<sup>19</sup> “You have a problem with ISIS, you have a bigger problem with china, and in my opinion, the new China in terms of trade is Mexico” (Trump, Announcement bid, 2015)

<sup>20</sup> “The theft of American prosperity will end. And It’ll end I’ll tell you we are being it is being stolen from us folks.” (Trump, Rally CFE Arena Central Florida Fairgrounds, 2016 )

<sup>21</sup> “We’re living through the greatest jobs theft in the history of the world the greatest job theft that’s what it is” (Trump, Rally Pensacola Bay Center, 2016 )

<sup>22</sup> “We are going to bring back the jobs and the wealth that have been stolen from us. The economic policies of Bill and Hillary Clinton have bled Pennsylvania dry you know it I know it we’ve watched it happen.” (Trump, Rally Atlantic Aviation, 2016)

‘destruction’ of an industry<sup>23</sup>, the ‘job killing’ trade deal<sup>24</sup> or, the ‘dying’ from a negative trade balance’<sup>25</sup>, that the end of the United States is imminent, if they are to continue on this path of conducting trade deals. The way in which this warning is phrased ranges from “it’s got to change, cause we can’t go on like this” (Trump, Rally Mississippi Coast Coliseum, 2016) to a more urgent: “We don’t have anything left. We are running on fumes (2x). there is nothing here. They are so much sharper(2x). And we are not gonna have a country left.” (Trump, Rally Ladd-Peebles Stadium, 2015). At this point the message that is conveyed to the voters is that the economy of the United States is under direct threat from foreign countries, and that Hillary Clinton will allow the economy to be completely destroyed.

Therefore, the claim that is being made is that the United States gets ‘killed’ in the trade deals that the current establishment (of which Hillary is a part) has made, resulting in the ‘greatest job theft of all time’. The warning that follows from this is that, if this continues, ‘we are not gonna have a country left’, so ‘we can’t go on like this’. The illocutionary point differs on the situation. Sometimes Trump concluded the topic (or started it) with a Commissive illocutionary point such as: “We are not gonna allow our jobs to be taken from our states anymore” (Trump, Rally Atlantic Aviation, 2016). However more often than not, this was implied rather than stated, leading to a more assertive illocutionary point. Trump tried to claim that these deals were destroying the country, making this the truth for his listeners. Because of the sense of urgency with which the topic was addressed in some instances I gave the topic a first degree of securitization. This however depended on the way in which Trump addressed the issue, as sometimes (especially when addressing the topic with a commissive illocutionary point) a securitization of 2<sup>nd</sup> degree can be attributed to this topic. However, because usually it was unclear for the audience, especially those who lost their jobs already, whether other countries would indeed destroy America with Hillary at the helm of the ship, I believe 1<sup>st</sup> degree of securitization is more accurate.

---

<sup>23</sup> “Now trans pacific is gonna destroy your auto industry in ohio. They are gonna take it away from you just like you were a bunch of babies, not gonna happen if I am president okay not gonna happen.” (Trump, Rally Dayton International Airport, 2016)

<sup>24</sup> “We will also immediately stop the job killing transpacific partnership.” (Trump, Rally CFE Arena Central Florida Fairgrounds, 2016 )

<sup>25</sup> “We need money, We’re dying, We’re dying, we need money. We have to do it. And we need the right people.” (Trump, Announcement bid, 2015)

*Corrupt Political System:*

Another one of the main topics of every speech was the corruptness of the American political system. This corruptness stems from the role the donors, special interests and Super PACs play in the careers and campaigns of politicians. Moreover, his political opponents, Clinton in particular, made frequent use of special donor funding. According to the campaign this would lead to the United States being ruled by a puppet of the donors, catering the needs of the big businesses and corporations, rather than by the people (for those who are unknown with the subject: these donors and PACs are essentially large companies funding the campaigns of politicians, demanding favors in return were these politicians elected into office).

He tried to convince the audience of the corruptness of the system in three different contexts. Firstly, by alluding to his experience as a big businessman, of being on the side of the donors, he argued he knew the system. Secondly, one could see the corruptness because Hillary Clinton is a criminal who is not prosecuted because she is protected by the corrupt political system. And lastly how the Media is unfair towards him, trying to get Hillary Clinton elected.

When discussing the system of the special interests and Super PACs, Trump usually started out by reminding everyone that he was self-funded ('I'm really really rich okay') to then continue to remind the voters that Clinton was not<sup>26</sup>. He continued to paint the image of the anti-politician, to separate himself from other politicians who were all controlled by super PACs<sup>27 28</sup>. To convince the audience of the danger, he claims that he himself, being 'on the other side for so long' exactly knows what is going on with these donors and special interests. He addresses the fact that he used to be part of the Super PACs and donors to create credibility, and to claim that 'out of love for this country', and the 'trouble it is in', he decided to try and save America from its destruction by the Super PACs. This quote from The Library Plaza rally summarizes this rhetoric unusually well (unusual because of the chaotic style and frequent topical changes that Trump is known for):

*“Despite all of the wall street money that’s being spent against us. It (our campaign) is gonna take on, and we’re gonna take on big donors. We’re gonna*

---

<sup>26</sup> “Its [loss of jobs] been happening long enough. and the reason they are not doing anything about it is because the special interests and the donors control our politicians and control Hillary Clinton”. (12min)

<sup>27</sup> “I’m a non-politician, the other day I served jury duty. Right?. I told you They asked occupation. I refused to put down politician” (Trump, Rally Ladd-Peebles Stadium, 2015)

<sup>28</sup> “These politicians are a bunch of dishonest cookies I’ll tell you this much.” (Trump, Rally Barton Coliseum , 2016).

*take on big donors. And I'll tell you what the big business in this country. And I'm a part of it. But I decided, I been on the other side you do know that right. I understand the other side. It's a very easy side to be on and I've been there a long time. Until I looked out and I said if I'm gonna stay there, I will tell you our country is in big trouble. Our country is in trouble. Because it's the wrong thing. I love this country I didn't need to do this. I love this country. And that's why I am doing this and we have a movement going like they've never had before.”* (Trump, Rally Library Plaza Regent University, 2016)

A second way in which Trump argues one can see that that the system is rigged, is that ‘Hillary Clinton is even allowed to run’ due to the ongoing FBI investigation and her role in the destruction of emails. Trump argues that the corruptness of the system is the thing that allowed Clinton to run for presidency, and her connection to the special interests and the donors vested interest in her running for president was the only reason she was not in prison<sup>29</sup>. This became a very well received story among the audience, as Trumps stories about this topic were often followed up with ‘lock her up chants’.

A last way in which Trump tries to convince the audience of the corruptness of the system is by pointing at the media, which he calls, like the politicians, ‘very very dishonest’<sup>30</sup>. He employed a routine in which he (usually when addressing the success of his campaign) would point to the camera operator and address him directly as the face of the media, calling him corrupt and unfair, resulting in a crowd of 10,000 plus people to direct their anger at the individual. Trump argues that the unwillingness of the media to show the size of the crowds, their much friendlier treatment of Hillary Clinton (‘can you imagine if Donald Trump had stolen the debate questions’?) prove that they are ‘vital cogs in the rigged system under which we live.’<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> “Our system is rigged, and I’m saying it for a long time. And the best evidence is that Hillary Clinton is even allowed to run for the presidency of the US in the first place. (lock her up chants). She lied to congress under oath, she lied to the fbi, and she made 13 phones disappear, some with a hammer.”

<sup>30</sup> “The media is btw the most dishonest group of people I’ve ever met. The worst. They are. They’ll say today: Donald trump came to Dayton, and he had a small crowd with a smithering of people. They wont’ say it was so big its bursting out of the biggest hangar I have seen” (Trump, Rally Dayton International Airport, 2016)

<sup>31</sup> “I’ll tell you what, you take a look at the media. These are some of the most dishonest people anywhere. These are the most. They (points to camera), the media. The media is a part, and one of the vital cogs in the rigged system under which we live. They are a big fat cog.” (Trump, Rally CFE Arena Central Florida Fairgrounds, 2016 )

Hence, having convinced the audience of the corruptness of the current government and Hillary Clinton, he argues that getting rid of this corruptness is of the utmost importance for the survival of the United States. This corruptness has either already taken the United States from the people (and thus creates a need to recapture America)<sup>32 33</sup>, or more often as an ongoing battle between the corrupt special interests and Donald Trump, who presented their last hope of keeping America in the hands of the Americans<sup>34</sup>. In this way Trump tries to convey to the audience that the regular politicians are all controlled by the special interests, which pose an existential threat to American democracy, and that he is their last hope to save their country<sup>35</sup>.

Therefore, the claim that Trump makes is that the American political system is so corrupt that the normal democratic process is in jeopardy. The consequent warning is, that a continuation on this path will lead to the destruction of the American democracy, with this election being the last chance to save it from destruction. The illocutionary point of the message is twofold. Firstly, the message is assertive, trying to bring out how bad the current system actually is (I was part of the system, I know). And secondly, directive, because unlike all other topics so far, he directly states that a vote for him would be their last chance to save the country. This topic too, is a topic in which there was first degree of securitization. Largely because the audience is unknown to know the extent of threat of Super PACs and special interests and deem Trump a credible source of knowing more about this. Hence when he asserts his truth, it is easily accepted.

### *Illegal Immigration:*

This is the last topic on which securitization was employed by the Trump campaign. The focus of the illegal immigration discourse was on immigration from Mexico, and immigration from the Middle East, both of which were presented as security threats to the United States. When the campaign developed, and it became clear that Hillary Clinton was going to be the opponent of

---

<sup>32</sup> "We are going to take our country back, we lost our country we are gonna take it back, we lost it"

<sup>33</sup> "We'll be taking our country back". (Trump, Rally Barton Coliseum , 2016)

<sup>34</sup> "And the establishment said: hey Jim do you know this Trump is running this is bad he is self funding his campaign he doesn't want our money we are not gonna be able to control him. We've got to Fight him. We've got to fight him. Cause I know what has to be done." (Trump, Rally Dayton International Airport, 2016)

<sup>35</sup> "I'll tell you what, the system is rigged the system is rigged. I've been saying it for a lo... its rigged and we are gonna straighten it out. The system is rigged. Hillary is not the victim, the American people are the victims of this system. So corrupt in so many ways, and this is your one chance to change it, because you know what in four years it's not gonna happen" (Trump, Rally CFE Arena Central Florida Fairgrounds, 2016 ).

Donald Trump in the presidential race, the plans of Clinton on immigration became a third source of security threats.

Trump started the campaign off, in the announcement speech, with harsh words on Mexican immigrants, as they were bringing in problems such as violence and drugs<sup>36</sup>, and he continued this throughout his campaign. On immigrants from the Middle-East, and particularly Syria, he held that the background of the immigrants was unsure, and often alluded to the fact that they are strong and young men that could very well commit terrorist acts in the United States.<sup>37</sup> An often-used simile was that of the Trojan horse, from the Odyssey:

*“where we are taking these people in and we don’t even know who they are. This could be one of the great Trojan horses of all time. They won’t be talking about the Trojan horse that happened 500 years ago they will talk about what happened in the United States.”*

The insinuation being that the Syrian immigrants who are coming into the country are pretending to be refugees while actually being ISIS affiliates. Moreover, Trump describes the situation in the Middle East, as an extremely brutal one, where Isis soldiers are ‘chopping off the heads’ of the Christians living in those areas<sup>38 39</sup>. The specification of Christians further indicates that Trump intends to show that the American Christian population is at risk of becoming a victim to these attacks. And therefore, the audience is left with the conclusion that they cannot let in the Syrian immigrants, or they are at risk of serious attacks by these groups.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> “When Mexico is sending us people, they are not sending its best.... They are sending people that have lots of problems. And they are bringing those problems with us. They are bringing drugs, they are bringing crime, they are rapists, and some, I assume, are good people. But I speak to border guards, and it is common sense” (Trump, Announcement bid, 2015)

<sup>37</sup> “I won’t let the Syrians, we got no idea who they are, they wanna get into our country, They may be ISIS. It May be the Great Trojan horse of all time. Who knows.” (Trump, Rally Vines Center Liberty University, 2016)

<sup>38</sup> “In the middle east. And other places. But in the middle east they’re chopping off heads, they’re drowning people, they are killing people. They would kill us so quickly if they had the capability and they are trying to get the capability. Which is btw why we have to kill them just so you understand its why we have to kill them.” (Trump, Rally Dayton International Airport, 2016)

<sup>39</sup> “They’re chopping the heads off, people that we know. All over the middle east. And by the way if you’re a Christian, its almost guaranteed. They’re chopping heads off. We are living in medieval times.” (Trump, Rally Barton Coliseum , 2016)

<sup>40</sup> “And btw we have to get to the bottom of it. We cannot allow people into the country that want to destroy us we can’t do it. We can’t allow the Syrians we can’t allow the migration of Syrians in the country we don’t know who they are or where they come from” (Trump, Rally Dayton International Airport, 2016)

The campaign goes on to discuss immigration by highlighting certain incidents that have occurred involving illegal (mostly Mexican) immigrants as the perpetrator. His stories were sometimes region specific, however the stories of Kathryn Steinle, who was killed by a misfire bullet from an illegal immigrant, Jamiel Shaw, who was shot by an illegal immigrant gang member, and Marilyn Pharis (who was never mention by name), who was raped and killed by an illegal immigrant<sup>41</sup>. These stories are meant to portray the danger that illegal immigrants pose to the United States and justify the building of the infamous wall<sup>42</sup>. Furthermore, he uses these stories to discredit the current government (and with that Hillary Clinton).<sup>43</sup>

Having established that the continuation of illegal immigration constitutes a direct security threat to the lives of the American people, the next step was to connect Hillary Clinton to allowing this illegal immigration to continue in her plans. He attacks her plans for increasing the intake of Syrian immigrants and her support for sanctuary cities (cities that are more lenient towards illegal immigration). For instance, after discussing the Night Club Shooting in Orlando, Trump holds that Hillary wants to increase the influx of Syrian immigrants, which will mean ‘mean generations of terrorism radicalism and extremism spreading in your schools and throughout your communities.’<sup>44</sup> Similarly, Clintons plan on Mexican immigration will lead to the loss of ‘thousands of lives’<sup>45</sup>. Another frequently used rhetoric is that Clinton supports ‘completely open borders’ which would

---

<sup>41</sup> “They saw that I was right between what happened san Francisco to to incredible Kate. and her family. and such an incredible family. And Jamil and so many other people have been so badly hurt the other day in California last week. A woman 66 years old, a veteran, was killed raped sodomized tortured and killed by an illegal immigrant and we have to do it, we have to do something” (Trump, Rally Ladd-Peebles Stadium, 2015)

<sup>42</sup> “We are also gonna have a very strong border. That’s gonna stop people, and that’s also gonna stop drugs. And drugs and those drugs are poisoning are youth and our people. And we will build a wall. And mexico will pay for the wall” (Trump, Rally Pensacola Bay Center, 2016 )

<sup>43</sup> “...beaten to death with a hammer by a repeat offending criminal illegal immigrant who should have been deported under the Obama administration, should have been deported but never was. What kind of a government would allow its citizens to suffer like this. And believe there is tremendous suffering going on.” (Trump, Rally Library Plaza Regent University, 2016)

<sup>44</sup> “Her plan will import generations of terrorism, extremism and radicalism into your schools and throughout your communities. When Im elected president we will suspend the Syrian refugee program. And we will keep radical Islamic terrorism the hell out of our country. I’ll tell you that. We have enough problems folks, we have enough problems” (Trump, Rally Atlantic Aviation, 2016)

<sup>45</sup> “Hillary wants to increase, by 550% syrian refugees pouring into our country. Her plan would mean generations of terrorism radicalism and extremism spreading in your schools and throughout your communities.” (Trump, Rally CFE Arena Central Florida Fairgrounds, 2016 )

<sup>46</sup> “The officers they’ve warned that Hillary’s plan is the most radical immigration proposal In United states history. And that it will lead to the loss of thousands and thousands of lives” (Trump, Rally CFE Arena Central Florida Fairgrounds, 2016 )

mean that the people of the United States ‘would not have a country left’.<sup>47</sup> Hence, in order to prevent this all from happening, the audience needs to vote for Trump. Because “a Trump administration will prevent this nightmare of violence” from happening.

The claim that is being made is that illegal immigrants are extremely dangerous. The illegal Immigrants from Syria might commit terrorist attacks, whereas the immigrants from Mexico have committed several serious crimes in which American lives have been lost. The warning is that Hillary is going to increase the influx of immigrants, rendering her, and her policies an even greater security threat than the immigrants themselves. Once again, the illocutionary point is twofold, the campaign tries to assert its own truths but framing the political topic of immigration and refugees into an issue about crime and terrorism. Secondly the commissive aspect is that, Trump promises to reduce immigration, especially illegal immigration, to counter the security threat this poses. Moreover, illegal immigration poses a first-degree securitization. This is because the illegal immigrants pose a direct, and urgent threat to the American citizens. Moreover, in order to stop these security threats from ‘spreading through your communities’, you must vote for Donald Trump. Because if Hillary Clinton (‘who supports totally open borders btw’) becomes president, it will mean that you have lost your country.

	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Degree of Securitization</b>	<b>Claim</b>	<b>Warning</b>	<b>Illocutionary point</b>	<b>Perlocutionary aim</b>
<b>1.</b>	Polls, and campaign success	No securitization	--	--	--	--
<b>2.</b>	Constitutional rights (2 <sup>nd</sup> )	2 <sup>nd</sup> degree (we will)	Certain rights are under siege.	Hillary and Democrats will get rid of the rights.	Commissive	Gain votes
<b>3.</b>	Military and Veterans	2 <sup>nd</sup> degree (we will)	Military is depleted	Our enemies are getting stronger	Commissive	Gain votes

<sup>47</sup> “Speaking in secret to a foreign bank Hillary Clinton said her dream is for a totally open trade, there goes your businesses, and open borders, there goes your country. You lose your businesses and your country. Anyone who supports open borders cannot be the president of the united states, you will not have a country left. Open borders would be the end of the United States as we know it. Believe me” (Trump, Rally Library Plaza Regent University, 2016)

4.	Domestic policies	2 <sup>nd</sup> degree (we will)	... is a disaster	Our country is going to hell	Commissive	Gain votes
5.	Hillary and other political opponents	1 <sup>st</sup> degree	Hillary caused massive global disorder	If she wins, our country is in big trouble	Assertive	Gain votes
6.	Trade deals and jobs	1 <sup>st</sup> degree	They are killing us	We are not going to have a country left	Assertive/ Commissive	Gain votes
7.	Corrupt political system	1 <sup>st</sup> degree	It is a rigged system	Our county is in big big trouble	Assertive	Gain votes
8.	Illegal Immigration	1 <sup>st</sup> degree	The Syrians, who may be ISIS, we don't know.	Generations of radicalism, extremism and terrorism	Assertive/ Commissive	Gain votes

Figure 4 Topical Speech Act Analysis of Donald Trump's Speeches

#### Textual analysis of the securitizing phrases:

Having established that there are patterns of securitization, I will now look at Donald Trump's rhetorical style to gain better insights into the internal facilitating condition of the securitization theory.

#### *The Simplicity of Trump Rhetoric:*

Several academics have noted that Trump's way of speaking was one foundational factor in his road to presidency (Edwards, 2017) (Savoy, 2018). Trump's speech was unique in several ways, however its ability to connect with his audience seems to be its underlying strength (Edwards, 2017). Moreover, the way in which Trump created this connection with his audience was through 'simple speech'. Kayam notes that Trump speaks at a 'readability level that is lower than the level of the average adult in the US', which means that he is understood by almost every voter (Kayam, 2018, p. 74). Even at his own Trump rallies, Trump regularly acknowledged that other people called him 'plane spoken', and his speeches 'simple'. He addresses this himself, commenting that "whatever it is, it is". (Trump, 2016). Given the recency of the 2016 electoral campaign the topic of Trump's rhetoric is yet to be fully researched, however research indeed seems to indicate that Trump uses uncharacteristically simple rhetoric. Jacques Savoy, in a comparative analysis of rhetorical styles of the presidential candidates in debates noted that Trump: "employed short sentences, reduced vocabulary, repeating the same arguments" (Savoy, 2018, p. 156). Savoy notes Trump's speech acts in the different TV debates in the primaries stood out in several ways. Savoy analyzed four different global stylistic measurements and found that Trump was an 'extreme case'

in all of these stylistic measurements (see below in table 3) These four global stylistic measures are: 1) Mean Sentence Length (MSL), 2) Lexical Density (LD), 3) Big Words (BW), and 4) Type-Token Ratio (TTR)

Measurements	Bush	Cruz	Kasich	Paul	Rubio	Trump	Clinton	O'Malley	Sanders
MSL	17.3	19.4	18.3	17.2	18.7	<b>13.7</b>	20.5	<b>21.9</b>	19.7
LD (%)	40.7	<b>44.6</b>	38.4	40.3	39.2	<b>36.6</b>	40.4	43.1	43.6
BW (%)	24.4	<b>26.4</b>	20.8	21.9	23.8	<b>18.3</b>	24.1	25.6	<b>26.4</b>
TTR	36.1	37.3	33.9	34.0	33.3	<b>29.7</b>	36.2	<b>37.9</b>	36.1

Note. Extreme values are depicted in bold.

Figure 5 Four Global Stylistic Measurements According to TV Debates as Identified by Savoy (Savoy, 2018)

MSL stands for ‘mean sentence length’, and Donald Trump has a significantly lower MSL than any of the other presidential candidates. This seems to be a recent tendency in politics, as Savoy notes that the average MSL in all ‘State of the Union’ speeches is an MSL of 39.6. However, this average has been significantly brought down in recent years. For example, Obama had a MSL of 18.5, which is still far below the average MSL. But Trump’s MSL of 13.7 is significantly lower than that of his predecessors as well as the next lowest MSL among presidential candidates in the 2016 Electoral Campaign, Jeb Bush (17.3).

Moreover, Donald Trump had the lowest lexical density throughout the presidential debates. Lexical density refers to the informativeness of a text, with a high LD suggesting a more complex text, which contains more information<sup>48</sup>. It shows whether a candidate uses more lexical words (nouns, names, adjectives, verbs and adverbs) or whether a candidate uses more function words (determiners (e.g. the, this), pronouns (e.g. you, us), prepositions (e.g. to, in), conjunctions (e.g. and, or), modal verbs, and auxiliary verb forms (e.g. has, would, can)) (Savoy, 2018). Trump had the lowest lexical density, with a density of 36.6, which indicates less topical answers and thus less informative speech.

Next to the lowest MSL and LD, Donald Trump, had the lowest frequency of big words. Big words in this context are composed of six or more letters. The lowest BW (18,3) indicates the lowest frequency of big words, which indicates the least complexity in the text or speech. Savoy notes

<sup>48</sup> LD is calculated through a formula of  $LD(t) = \frac{Lexicalword(t)}{n(t)} = 1 - \frac{Functionword(t)}{n(t)}$ , (Savoy, 2018, p. 148)

that Trump ‘is adopting a more direct communication style, selecting simple words and producing short sentences’ (Savoy, 2018, p. 149)

The last global stylistic measurement is TTR, the type-token ratio. This refers to the vocabulary size and the number to word types that each candidate uses. A high TTR means that a candidate has a rich and diverse vocabulary, meaning that a candidate can approach several topics, or approach a single topic using different vocabulary. The fact that Trump has the lowest TTR indicates that he has the least diverse vocabulary in discussing the different topics, placing emphasis on repetition in his speaking.

Savoy is not alone in concluding that Trump used simplistic language. Kayam similarly concludes that Trump speaks at a fourth to fifth grade level, which was 4 to 5 levels below the average score of the other electoral candidates (Kayam, 2018, p. 86) (For reference, this is at the age of 10-11-year old’s). Kayam analyzed 10 different interviews and debates from Donald Trump and compared this to 10 different interviews or debates from other candidates. Kayam used three different formulas: 1) the Flesh-Kincaid Formula, 2) the Gunning-Fog Index, 3) SMOG. All three of these formulas try to identify the difficulty of a certain text, and the age required to read those texts. By putting in the bare transcripts of the texts which were selected, Kayam obtained the following results:

Grade-Level Scores of All Analyzed Candidates in All Three Grade-Level Formulas.

Candidate	Average Flesch–Kincaid grade level	Average SMOG grade level	Average Gunning-Fog grade level	Total average grade level of three formulas
Donald Trump	3.96	5.17	6.4	5.18
Hillary Clinton	9.18	8.88	12.03	10.03
Bernie Sanders	8.57	8.4	10.87	9.28
Ted Cruz	7.87	8.08	10.12	8.69
Marco Rubio	7.32	7.65	10.08	8.35
Jeb Bush	7.23	7.85	10.05	8.38
Average of all candidates without Donald Trump	8.03	8.17	10.63	8.95

SMOG: Simple Measure of Gobbledygook.

Figure 6 Grade-Level Scores of Speeches by Political Actors as Identified by Kayam (Kayam, 2018)

These results indicate that the average grade level, that each of the formula's attribute to Donald Trump's speech acts is significantly lower than the speech acts of his adversaries.

*over-used-terms:*

Next to these four interesting findings on Trump's style, Savoy underlines Donald Trump's 10 most over-used terms in the debates<sup>49</sup>. The over-used words can therefore indicate the words and patterns specific to each candidate. For Trump, these 10 words are as follows: 1) I, 2) very, 3) Tremendous, 4) Nobody, 5) Going, 6) Mexico, 7) not, 8) Jeb, 9) Excuse, 10) deal. What is interesting about these words is that (together with Clinton) Trump is one of the two candidates that significantly over uses the term I. Savoy hypothesizes that this is important because in a presidential race, people ultimately elect an individual, not policies. These over used words become apparent when looking at some excerpts of Trump in these debates. For instance:

*They don't like seeing bad trade deals, they don't like seeing higher taxes, they don't like seeing a loss of their jobs where our jobs have just been devastated.' (D. Trump, 10 March 2016)*

*'I'm spending all of my money, I'm not spending, I'm not getting any, I turned down, I turn down so much, I could have right now from special interests and donors, I could have double and triple what he's got.'* (D. Trump, 16 September 2015)

These sentences show the over usage of some of the previously indicated words (I, don't, Deal), as well as show Savoy's previously mentioned stylistic features of Donald Trump's speech acts. There is a low frequency of big words, the sentences are shorter, and repetition of phrases is higher. Moreover, within these statements Donald Trump is able to cover several topics, using the same repetitive vocabulary. These features all add to the simplistic style of rhetoric that Donald Trump seemed to employ. Therefore, the research seems to indicate that Trump used a very simplistic rhetorical style. Overall, there is little evidence in the securitizations that would contrast these findings. The sentences are, in general, rather short and simple. Trump himself referred to it as

---

<sup>49</sup> Over used terms are calculated by comparing the actual  $p$  with the  $Zscore(t_{i0}) = \frac{tf_{i0} - n_0 * p(t_i)}{\sqrt{n_0 * p(t_i) * (1 - p(t_i))}}$ . When a term is significantly more used than it would have been predicted, the larger the z score, the higher the frequency of use compared to the predicted use. (Savoy, 2018, p. 153)

‘plain spoken’ in the Dayton International airport rally, which he seemed mean as a compliment rather than a critique. Moreover, in analyzing different speeches I found that topics were often discussed in similar fashion, with similar phrasing and wording throughout the entire campaign. This could indicate that simple, repetitive language was a choice by the campaign to successfully spread their message. However further research on this should be conducted before concluding that short, repetitive language is a definite aspect of the internal facilitating condition of securitization theory.

*Image Based words and thematic content of the speeches:*

In looking at persuasiveness of speech, which essentially is the internal facilitating condition of securitization, one could also look at Weber’s notion of charisma. Charisma is often tied with populism and the notion is often given as one of the main reasons for effective rise of populist parties. However, van der Burg and Mughan try to show that charisma is not necessarily tied to populism, and is an attribute that all politicians should have as it is necessary to inspire popular support for the causes that they believe in (van der Brug & Mughan, 2007). Therefore, assuming that Donald Trump has this ‘charisma’, looking into what this charisma would project his rhetoric to be, and the effects this might have on the audiences he addresses, will be valuable.

In Weber’s original works he discussed the concept of ‘charismatic leadership’, which is a quality of a leader that he inspires faith or hope in his constituents (van der Brug & Mughan, 2007). Van der Brug and Mughan note that, ‘In the short term, it is ‘a very rare virtue, power or talent which endows its holder with various capacities, most notably one for eliciting passionate popular support for a mission’ (van der Brug & Mughan, 2007, p. 31). Inspiring support for a mission, is closely related to trying to convince the audience of a certain security threat, and the necessity of a certain response to this threat. The use of language naturally is of the utmost importance in this process of inspiring popular support (Bligh, Kohles, & Meindl, 2004) (Emrich, Brower, Feldman, & Garland, 2001). The literature suggests that the most important factor in charisma is to be able to paint a verbal picture, in which the desired political moves are convincingly sketched (Emrich, Brower, Feldman, & Garland, 2001). This can be done using rhetorical devices such as alliteration and repetition, figurative language and imagery, and literary devices such as analogies, metaphors, and stories (Bligh, Kohles, & Meindl, 2004). Emrich et al., suggest that the capacity of painting verbal pictures depends on the number of image-based words as opposed to concept-based words. The distinctions between these two kinds of words is given in the table.

When a leader draws more on the image based-words, he (or she) is generally conceived to be more charismatic. (Emrich, Brower, Feldman, & Garland, 2001)

<b>Image-based Words and Concept-based Words from Martindale's (1969, 1973, 1975) Regressive Imagery Dictionary</b>	
<b>Image-based words</b>	<b>Concept-based words</b>
sweat	work
hand	help
root	source
heart	commitment
explore	inquire
rock	dependable
grow	produce
journey	endeavor
frontier	limit
path	alternative
clamor	request
sweet	agreeable
tranquil	moderate
dream	idea
imagine	think
listen	consider
see	understand

Figure 7 Image Based words vs Concept Based Words (Emrich, Brower, Feldman, & Garland, 2001)

In applying this to Donald Trump's rhetoric we can clearly see that image-based words were preferred by the campaign, especially in the securitizations. There are countless of examples which illustrate the use of image-based words over concept-based words, such as "knock em out"<sup>50</sup>, "fight"<sup>51</sup>, "killing"<sup>52</sup>, "disaster"<sup>53</sup>, "destroyed"<sup>54</sup> etc. Another good example is a motive in the speeches that was created at the end of the campaign, where Trump promises its people to "drain the swamp" in Washington DC. In concept-based words this message would have been to 'reduce corruption in the government', however Trump paints the picture of a swamp to convince its audience. Moreover, it seemed to be successful, as the audience regularly chimed in with "drain

<sup>50</sup> "Now I know we can knock em out in two days if we wanted to. You know I call ourselves the politically correct warriors you know" (Trump, Rally Dayton International Airport, 2016)

<sup>51</sup> "We are fighting for every community whose jobs and dreams have been ripped out and shipped to other countries all over the world, including Mexico" (Trump, Rally Atlantic Aviation, 2016)

<sup>52</sup> "China is killing us (10 55). Impossible for our companies to compete. They are killing us." (Trump, Announcement bid, 2015)

<sup>53</sup> "Gun free zones are a disaster in our country. It's like holding up candy to a baby. Please come and kill us, because we have absolutely no protection." (Trump, Rally Barton Coliseum , 2016)

<sup>54</sup> "Social security is gonna be destroyed" (Trump, Announcement bid, 2015)

the swamp” chants when discussing the topic of securitization. Other regularly used examples are the ‘trojan horse’ story, the ‘lock her up’ chants, and the many stories about the victims of crimes committed by illegal immigrants. Therefore, Trump made use of a lot of image-based words, especially when dealing with securitizations. Further research should identify whether he did use more imagery language than the average politician, and whether or not he used more image-based words when discussing securitized topics vis-a-vis, non-securitized topics. However, based on my analysis I would certainly believe so, as Trump always tried to be as picturesque as possible in discussing his threats (chopping off heads, etc.)

There is also evidence which suggests that the thematic content of the speeches contribute to the levels of charisma attributed to the leader ( for example, Bligh, Kohles, & Meindl, 2004). In their paper, the outline Shamir’s seven general propositions that increase the perceived levels of charisma, (and thus capacity of the leader to convince its audience) which are:

- 1) References to collective history,
- 2) References to the collective identity,
- 3) Positive references with regards to the follower’s worth,
- 4) References towards the similarity between the leader and the follower
- 5) References to values and morals
- 6) References to distant goals
- 7) References to hope and faith. (Bligh, Kohles, & Meindl, 2004)

Allusions to these propositions will thus likely increase the audience’s perception of charisma, which would lead them to accept the leader’s proposal more easily. Therefore, it is not surprising that I found all of these thematic references in Donald Trump’s speeches, more importantly I found several examples of these thematic references in the securitization construction of the campaign. For instance, when discussing securitized topics, Trump always uses ‘we’<sup>55</sup> and ‘our’<sup>56</sup> to indicate the threat is to the collective, and that the threat can consequently only be solved by the collective as well. This is especially interesting when considering that one of Savoy’s over-used terms is ‘I’

---

<sup>55</sup> “We are gonna save the second amendment which is totally under siege. Totally under siege” (Trump, Rally Atlantic Aviation, 2016)

<sup>56</sup> “So look: we cannot let our first amendment, we just can’t. we cannot let our first amendment rights be taken away from us folks we can’t let it happen, we cannot let it happen. Can’t let it happen. We have a right to speak!” (Trump, Rally Dayton International Airport, 2016)

(Savoy, 2018). This would indicate that, when discussing securitized issues, referring to yourself and the audience as one collective, with one collective history and identity could help facilitate the securitization. A second thematic reference that often came up was that of allusions to hope and faith, as well as to values and morals. Hope and faith primarily came up in discussions on constitutional rights<sup>57</sup>, as well as the discussion on illegal immigration<sup>58</sup>, where faith was used as a way to distinguish the two groups (they are ‘chopping off’ our heads). Moreover, with regards to the common values and morals, the allusions to Christianity, loving the military, patriotism come to mind. Moreover, these values are under ‘attack’ by common enemies. Christianity must be ‘defended’, the military must be ‘rebuilt’, and Trump’s patriotism is what made him decide to try and ‘eliminate government corruption’. The protection of the common values from existential threats seems to be a recurring theme in the campaign.

Therefore, the findings on the use of image-based words, as well as the thematic content of the speeches could indicate that charismatic speech helps facilitate securitizations. However, just as with the simplistic style of Trump’s rhetoric, further research should confirm these findings. An argument could be made that the charismatic speech is more convincing not just for securitized speech, but for speech in general. This could very well be the case, however in trying to convince an audience of an existential threat to their lives/political system/values, the ability to use descriptive speech, painting word pictures, seems even more important than when trying to convince an audience of, for instance, a certain budgetary change (or any other political issue). A comparative study between politicized speeches and securitized speeches on picturesque rhetoric could confirm this suspicion.

Furthermore, it is important to note that the persuasive factors of political actors depend on the society in which the political actor functions. Because a certain factor is found persuasive in one society does not automatically mean it is also found persuasive in another. Therefore, one could argue for different facilitating conditions depending on the society in which the securitization

---

<sup>57</sup> “We are gonna cherish and Defend faith and religious liberty” (Trump, Rally Vines Center Liberty University, 2016)

<sup>58</sup> “They’ve just chopped off 3 heads of Christians who were great people. Who went over there to help people. They get caught and not even a question of getting caught they aren’t hiding. They grab em and they chop off their hands because they are great people that are helping people right and I’m saying to myself and I have to defend this. Just so you understand. We have laws and rules and regulations. And rules of engagement. They have noting.” (Trump, Rally Dayton International Airport, 2016)

occurs. Which would mean that the factors of image-based words, short simplistic style, and thematic content would only facilitate securitization in the Western World, or the United States.

## Conclusion:

In conclusion, what Williams identified as catastrophic thinking, is in securitization employed in elections. The theoretical framework has shown the development of security studies throughout the years and suggested an increasing width of the topics which can be securitized. The addition of Vuori's five strands was fundamental in this development and allows securitization to be applied in different contexts and cultures. However, there is no strand of securitization in his work in which Donald Trump's securitizations fit perfectly. Vuori himself, however, argued that there could be many more strands of securitization than the ones that he identified in his works. Therefore, I conclude by arguing that there is a specific strand of securitization, the 6<sup>th</sup> strand, which focuses primarily on Electoral campaigns: called 'winning the popular vote'.

<b>Strand of Securitization</b>	<b>Elementary speech act sequence</b>	<b>Illocutionary point</b>	<b>Perlocutionary aim</b>	<b>Temporality</b>	<b>Degree of strength</b>
Raising an issue onto the agenda	Claim Warn <i>Suggest, urge, propose</i>	Directive	Agreement	Future	Has to be argued
Legitimizing Future acts	Claim Warn <i>request</i>	Directive	Legitimacy	Future	Has to be argued
Deterrence	Claim Warn <i>Declare</i>	Declarative	Intimidation/ Deterrence	Future	Declaration
control	Claim Warn <i>Require</i>	Directive	Obedience/ Discipline	Future	Compelling
Legitimizing past acts	Claim Warn <i>Explain</i>	Assertive	Legitimacy	Past	Has to be argued
Winning popular vote	Claim Warn <i>Strongly urge</i>	Directive	Electoral victory	Future	Has to be argued

Figure 8 Vuori's Strands of Securitization Including The new 6th Strand of winning the popular vote

In this strand of securitization is used to describe security threats that need to be dealt with immediately, which will happen once the actor gets elected into office. In the case of the Donald

Trump electoral campaign, securitizations on seven topics (as identified in figure 3) were found, most of which aimed to paint his direct political opponent Hillary Clinton as the security threat. This securitization process goes beyond mere politics as electing this political opponent would not just mean that the country would deteriorate, but the country will cease to exist. The elementary speech act sequence starts with a claim and a warning. For instance, ‘Hillary Clinton wants totally open borders’, followed by ‘our president cannot be in favor of open borders, because our country will cease to exist’. The last act, which in this strand is mostly unspoken and implied, would be to strongly urge the population to vote for you, and not your political adversary. In the analysis the illocutionary point of the specific securitization per topic differed. On some topics Trump merely promised change (commissive illocutionary point) and on other topics he merely stated things in a way that would indicate a security threat (assertive illocutionary point). However, the overall illocutionary point of this strand of securitization is directive, as it intends to get people to vote for him in the elections, albeit through promises or statements of ‘truth’. Therefore, the perlocutionary aim is also to win the elections, and the means through which this is obtained is by gaining the most votes. The degree of strength has to be argued, it depends on the topic, and it depends on the way in which he constructed the problem. Some problems had a higher sense of urgency than others (such as illegal immigration and the corrupt political system in the case of Trump). But overall the analysis has showed that there was a significant inter-textual threat construction throughout the campaign, on many different topics. Leading to the conclusion that patterns of securitization can be established throughout the Trump campaign.

Moreover, the preliminary analysis of the rhetorical style of Donald Trump seems to suggest that short and simplistic style of speech is an aspect of the internal facilitating condition, as it seems to speak to the largest audience. Moreover, frequent use of image-based words, as well as references to the thematic content, features of Weberian charisma, seem like they have been employed in the Trump campaign, and specifically in their securitizations. This could indicate that these attributes are also aspects of the internal facilitating condition of securitization theory. However, further research has to be conducted in this area to claim this.

One of the limitations of this thesis is the disregard of the propositional content conditions and preparatory conditions which are taken into account in Vuori’s methods. Identifying these aspects helps in understanding the audience’s response, and thus the success of the securitization.

Especially the preparatory conditions, conditions that facilitate the success of the illocutionary point, are important in this process. However, investigating the preparatory conditions requires a thorough investigation into the society and the context of the case. I have chosen to take the success of the securitization for granted, hypothesizing that the perlocutionary effect of winning the election was reached.

Further research should investigate the preparatory conditions to gain a better understanding of the context in which these securitizations found place. However, this limitation does not imply that the results of this research are not valuable. I intended to open up the discussion on the internal facilitating condition of securitization theory, by hypothesizing that certain aspects work in the American context. If these are proven to be true this will provide more insights in the use of securitization, and the ways in which it is employed. Moreover, by identifying patterns of securitization in the Trump campaign, a new strand of securitization, namely the winning the popular vote strand further opens up the uses of securitization theory. Hopefully this will allow us to better understand some of the electoral campaign tricks and prevent us from being influenced by securitization discourse during electoral campaigns.

## Bibliography:

- Acosta, J., & Tatum, S. (2017, November 30). Report: Trump continues to question Obama's birth certificate. *CNN politics*.
- Baele, S., & Thomson, C. (2017). An Experimental Agenda for Securitization Theory . *International Studies Review* , 646-666.
- Balzacq, T. (2005). The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context. *European Journal of International Relations*, 171-201.
- Balzacq, T. (2011). A Theory of Securitization: origins, core assumptions, and variants. In T. Balzacq, *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve* (pp. 1-30). New York: Routledge.
- Balzacq, T. (2011). Enquiries into Methods: a new framework for Securitization analysis . In T. Balzacq, *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve* (pp. 31-54). New York : Routledge.
- Bligh, M., Kohles, J., & Meindl, J. (2004). Charisma under crisis: Presidential leadership, rhetoric, and media responses before and after the September 11th terrorist attacks. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 211-239.
- Buzan, B. (1998). Introduction. In B. Buzan, o. Weaver, & J. de Wilde, *Security A new Framework for Analysis* (pp. 1-20). Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Dylgjeri, A. (2017). ANALYSIS OF SPEECH ACTS IN POLITICAL SPEECHES. *European Journal of Social Sciences Studies*, 19-26.
- Edwards, M. (2017). *Gotham: A Rhetorical Analysis of President Donald J. Trump's Republican National Committee Acceptance Speech*. Tennessee: Middle Tennessee State University .
- Emrich, C., Brower, H., Feldman, J., & Garland, H. (2001). Images in Words: Presidential Rhetoric, Charisma, and Greatness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 527-557.
- Fahrentold, D. (2016, October 8). Trump recorded having extremely lewd conversation about women in 2005. *The Washington Post*.
- Goldhill, O. (2017, April 22). Rhetoric scholars pinpoint why Trump's inarticulate speaking style is so persuasive. *Quartz*.
- Graves, L., & Morris, S. (2017, November 29). The Trump Allegations. *The Guardian*.
- Hashim, S. (2015). Speech Acts in Political Speeches. *Modern Education Review*, 699-706.
- Hattenstone, S. (2017, October 21). Khizr Khan: the patriotic American Muslim who called out Donald Trump. *The Guardian*.
- Kayam, O. (2018). The Readability and Simplicity of Donald Trump's Language. *Political Studies Review*, 73-88.
- Leibovich, M. (2015, September 29). Donald Trump Is Not Going Anywhere. *The New York Times*.

- Mcdonald, M. (2008). Securitization and the Construction of Security. *European Journal of International Relations*, 563-587.
- Nai, A., & Maier, J. (2018). Perceived personality and campaign style of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. *Personality and Individual Differences* 121, 80-83.
- Savoy, J. (2018). Analysis of the style and the rhetoric of the 2016 US Presidential Primaries. *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, 143-159.
- Silver, N., Mehta, D., & Bycoffe, A. (2018, March 26). *FiveThirtyEight*. Retrieved from Project.fivethirtyeight.com: <https://projects.fivethirtyeight.com/trump-approval-ratings/>
- Sulovic, V. (2010). Meaning of Security and Theory of Securitization. *Belgrade Center for Security Policy*, 1-7.
- Trump, D. (2015, June 16). Announcement bid. New York , New York.
- Trump, D. (2015, August 21). Rally Ladd-Peebles Stadium. Mobile, Alabama.
- Trump, D. (2016 , November 2). Rally CFE Arena Central Florida Fairgrounds. Orlando, Florida.
- Trump, D. (2016 , September 9). Rally Pensacola Bay Center. Pensacola, Florida.
- Trump, D. (2016, November 6). Rally Atlantic Aviation. Moon Township, Pennsylvania .
- Trump, D. (2016, February 3). Rally Barton Coliseum . Little Rock, Arizona.
- Trump, D. (2016, March 12). Rally Dayton International Airport. Dayton, Ohio.
- Trump, D. (2016, October 22). Rally Library Plaza Regent University. Virginia Beach, Virginia.
- Trump, D. (2016, January 2). Rally Mississippi Coast Coliseum. Biloxi, Mississippi.
- Trump, D. (2016, August 3). Rally Ocean Center. Daytona Beach, Florida.
- Trump, D. (2016, January 18). Rally Vines Center Liberty University. Lynchburg, Virginia.
- Trump, D. (2016, March 19). *Youtube*. Retrieved from Youtube.com: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Lozya\\_9a144](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Lozya_9a144)
- Trump, D. (2017, January 20). Inauguration Speech. Washington DC, District of Columbia.
- van der Brug, W., & Mughan, A. (2007). CHARISMA, LEADER EFFECTS AND SUPPORT FOR RIGHT-WING POPULIST PARTIES. *PARTY POLITICS*, 29-51.
- Vuori, J. (2011). *HOW TO DO SECURITY WITH WORDS*. Turku: Turku University .
- Watson, S. (2012). 'Framing' the Copenhagen School: Integrating the Literature on Threat Construction. *Millenium: Journal of International Studies*, 279-301.
- Weaver, O. (1998). Security Analysis: Conceptual Analysis. In B. Buzan, O. Weaver, & J. de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework For Analysis* (pp. 21-48). Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Williams, P. (2017, May 6). In Trump's English, moody tenses and tense moods demand "preemptive" action. *Nation*, pp. 10-11.

Yan, H. (2015, August 8). Donald Trump's 'blood' comment about Megyn Kelly draws outrage. *Cnn Politics*.

## Appendix:

Dark blue: Constitutional rights

Green: Dishonest media

Yellow: Hillary's political plans

Light blue: Obamacare, common core infra

brown: Military and veterans

Light red: Trade deals and jobs

Pink: corrupt political system including hillaries connection to it

Purple: ISIS and Middle East

Grey: Illegal immigration

### Announcement of bid (16 June 2015)

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 beat, lets say china, in a trade deal. They kill us.** (2 min)

**Mexico is not our friend believe me (3 10), they are killing us economically.**

When Mexico is sending us people, they are not sending its best.... They are sending people that have lots of problems. And they are bring those problems with us. They are bringing drugs, they are bringing crime, they are rapists, and some, I assume, are good people. But I speak to border guards, and it is common sense. 4 min

But we don't know, cause we have no protection. And no competence. We don't know whats happening, and its gotta stop, and its gotta stop fast. 4 min (creates urgency)

**I love the military and I want the strongest military and we need it now more than ever.**

Our Gross domestic product, a sign of strength, but not for us. It was below 0.

**China has our Jobs, and Mexico has our jobs, they all have our jobs.** (is this economic securitization?)

**Our enemies are getting stronger and stronger by the day. And we as a country are getting weaker. Even our nuclear arsenal doesn't work....** And 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."

**Obamacare..... It is a disaster.**

**China is killing us (10 55). Impossible for our companies to compete. They are killing us.**

And its going to get worse!

I have more accountants than I have nurses, it's a *disaster*.

On lobbyists, We have to stop, its **destroying our country**, we have to stop (14min) and it has to stop now.

We get bergdal, and they get 5 people who are now on the battlefield trying to **kill us**. (19 00)

If he makes this deal, (iran) Israel maybe won't exist very long, and we have to protect Israel.

I own part of a bank... that I got from China in a WAR (emphasized) very valuable.

**They are ripping us.**

Now they are going militarily. They are building a military island in the middle of the south china sea. We could never do that, because of environmental clearance.

**You have a problem with isis, you have a bigger problem with china, and in my opinion, the new China in terms of trade is Mexico.** (24 min)

**Ford, mexico, takes a company, that was going to build in Tennessee, **rips it out**, everyone thought the deal was **dead**.... On trade taxes and cars.**

**Social security is gonna be destroyed.**

Saudi arabia, without us, is gone.

**We need money, **We're dying, We're dying**, we need money. We have to do it. And we need the right people.**

**That's when we become a country that is unsalvageable, and we are gonna be there very soon. (on negative trade deals) (40)**

I would build a great wall, and nobody builds them better than me believe me, and I'll have mexico pay for that wall, mark my words.

Nobody will be pushing us around.

I will immediately terminate, obama's illegal executive order on immigration. Immediately.

**End common core, it's a disaster.**

**You come into laguardia airport, and its like a third world country. ... we are like a third world country. Lax disaster, you have all these disastrous airports.**

**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.**

Sadly, the American dream is dead.

## Mobile Alabama (8/21/15)

Illegal immigration: (opening topic), they saw that I was right between what happened san Francisco to to incredible kate. and her family. and such an incredible family. And Jamil and so many other people have been so badly hurt the other day in California last week. A woman 66 years old, a veteran, was killed raped sodomized tortured and killed by an illegal immigrant and we have to do it, we have to do something.

So we'll start with a little talk on illegal immigration, whats going on: we're gonna stop it. We are going to build a wall.

On Hillary: They destroyed General ... over less, and nothing seems to be happening here.

I'm a non-politician, the other day I served jury duty. Right?. I told you They asked occupation. I refused to put down politician.

Lobbyists: I said I don't want your money. Can I just take his money and screw him? I said I don't want your money because in two years, when you come to see me about something I'm not doing it unless its good and its gonna make America great again.

North korea is getting frisky. But the other day, and now today I see its pretty hot on the news, that our, very deary friend from north korea, is acting a little bit rambunctious again.

The press: Maybe they diidnt get it maybe they don't get it.

So China is dumping tremendous amounts of steel into our country. The government is subsidizing it, its almost like they just want us to die, and they have no respect for us

And then the rest of the show is her being wined and dined by all these killers. Wined and dined. (on being taken advantage of in trade negotiations.)

What China has done to the United States, is the single greatest jobs theft in the history of the world

I will rebuild our military, it will be so strong and so powerful and so great. It will be so powerful and so great, that we will never have to use it. Nobody is gonna mess with us folks. Nobody.

The press, which is btw, largely dishonest, I have to say. The political media.

On trade deals.

When you look at whats going on (2x). with nebisco is closing and so many places are closing. When you look at the kind of money that these countries are making. And I am naming a few, and I mean SO MANY COUNTRIES. We don't have anything left. We are running on fumes (2x). there is nothing here. They are so much sharper, they are so much sharper. And we are not gonna have a country left.

## Donald Trump Rally Mississippi Biloxi (Jan 2, 2016) 14000 people

We are going to take our country back, we lost our country we are gonna take it back, we lost it.

On taking oil → minute 2

I am the most militaristic person in this room (x3) → implies need for military need

*Whatever it is it is—on speeches*

I'll use him for one of the countries that is ripping us off, and there are a lot of them.

*He is plane spoken*

With funding all of these people that they wanna bring in from Syria, we are funding visa programs, No think of it, crowd boos, which by the way we have no idea who are they are where they came from. And they are young and they are strong and there are a lot of men. And you look at this migration and you say maybe it really is the ultimate trojan horse.

If I win, I'll kick out the Syrian migrants that they let in (12:00) paraphrase

'predicted osama bin laden, they didn't take him out → implies he could have prevented it? (14:00)

I'm gonna build our military so strong so powerful we are never gonna have to use it. We are never gonna use it, PROBABLY (emphasized) we are gonna be so strong, so powerfull so sharp, we are never gonna have to use it hopefully.

I'm somebody that believes in the military, but You gotta know when to use it (military) and we used it wrong. And then we backed people that are a disaster. They are a disaster.

we are weak, and we are soft and pathetic, (regards to terrorism) and what is going on has to be stopped. It has to be stopped.

Damn the incident with the cameraman. (min 19-24)→ in hindsight, not an incident

There is an assault on the 2<sup>nd</sup> amendment...

We will build the wall. Who wants to build the wall, we will. We will build the wall (2x). And This will be a real wall, this will not be one of these jabbers (mimes small wall). A little wall that costs like two billion right? We'll build a real wall for a hell of a lot less money.

On illegal immigration, talks about the killings of Kate and Jamil and a woman 66 year old vet. Sodomized raped and killed by an illegal immigrant. And many many more, this is three examples. And many many many more. Bad for the economy, bad for so many things, they gotta come in legally they gotta come in we can't let these people take over the country. Its no good its no good its no good.

That's our system. And nobody look I was a part of the system until six months ago and you know I used to be I shouldn't say this but part of the establishment. Nobody knows the system better than I do. Its no good, we gotta straighten out the country.

We need somebody very smart. We need somebody very strong, not just strong, you gotta be Smaart. Cause we are being outsmarted and outfoxed by the Entire World Right now. They are outsmarting us.

Massive trade deficits. On trade deals with japan and china (42 min) it's gotta change, cause we can't go on like this.

We are taking the jobs back from china, Vietnam is now opening, everyone is open to strip us.

We can't go on as a country like that. We will lose our jobs we will lose our base we will lose our factories we will lose our money.

Assault on 2<sup>nd</sup> amendment.

We need protection, if the... would have allowed to have guns, it wouldn't have been that way.

Their leaders are too smart and too cunning for our leaders. They are taking our jobs.

And now we have other problems we have Isis, and we have all these problems that have gotten out of control under the Obama administration, and we are gonna knock the hell out of them folks. We are gonna end them, we are gonna knock the hell out of them. Honestly we are not gonna take it anymore and we can't take it anymore.

We are gonna end it, and then we are going back to our country, and we are going to rebuild our country.

01/18/16 Lynchburg (not a rally but a university speech) (in a very christian uni) X

Topics:

1. **Mlk day**
2. **Polls**
3. **Syria**
4. **Crowds and records**
5. **Military**
6. **Deals (iran)**
7. **Protestor and camera work and dishonest press.**
8. **Build a wall**
9. **China**
10. **Infrastructure**
11. **Illegal immigration**
12. **Protecting other countries, but for free**

Christianity is under siege..... We gotta protect, cause bad things are happening. Very bad things

We need to build are military so strong so strong so powerful that no one is gonna mess with us. We have to do it. Some general ...iani, said that our military is the least prepared in generations. The least prepared. And we need it more now than we ever needed it.

We are a poor nation. We've been mismanaged, we've been misrun. We don't know what we're doing. Is that true or what?

On infrastructure: we spend 25, million on Iraq, and our country is going to hell

Btw I want to get a woman president soon, but not her. She's a disaster, she's a disaster, she's a disaster

And again free trade is good, But we gotta be smart about it or we are not gonna have a country left.

Kate and jamil again, (rape sodomized and killed) kind of horror.

I won't let the Syrians, we got no idea who they are, they wanna get into our country, They may be ISIS. It May be the Great Trojan horse of all time. Who knows.

Whats happening in Germany is a disaster, whats happening in Brussels you look whats happening all over Europe. Europe is being absolutely swamped and destroyed. Whats going on with the crime and the problems, and it could be some sinister plot.

And now I'm back, and really back, on security for our country. With a great great military. We're gonna build that military. Great great military.

## Little rock 3/2/16 X

- **Jobs**
- **Polls**
- **Isis V**
- **Deals**
- **Education**
- **Gun law V**
- **Dealing V**
- **Companies with power over politicians V**
- **Obamacare**
- **Showing he's good through hotel story.**

We'll be taking our country back.

These politicians are a bunch of dishonest cookies I'll tell you this much.

This political stuff is dangerous, and these political people are really really dishonest. Like the media.

The Iran Deal, this recent deal which is a catastrophe okay. We give them a 150 bn dollars and we get absolutely nothing. There will be nuclear proliferation, it s going to be a disaster. The iran deal is going to be a disaster.

We're gonna get isis out of there. Knock the shit out of them and be done.

Theyre chopping the heads off, people that we know. All over the middle east. And by the way if you're a Christian, its almost guaranteed. Theyre chopping heads off. We are living in medieval times.

We have no idea where they come from. They are strong young men. So many strong young men. We are not doing it folks we cant do it. And honestly it could be one of the great trojan horses of all time.

You look at whats going in in paris, and in los angeles. → attached to the Gun law. Also a securitization.

Gun free zones are a disaster in our country. Its like holding up candy to a baby. Please come and kill us, because we have absolutely no protection.

Christianity is under siege.

3/12/16 Dayton X

- His own success
- Media (in a them vs us way) They
- I have too many people (vs rubio and cruz)
- Nafta
- Losing
- Military
- Demilitarization of Iraq
- Jobs ohio
- Pacs
- Torture and waterboarding
- Jobs
- 2<sup>nd</sup> amendment
- Trade deals

A story about an attack “printed attack by professional people” 2016 Donald Trump Chicago rally protest. ‘ a problem you would not have believed’ . And we would have wiped them out.

Crowd goes wild over building the wall. And Mexico will pay for it.

They (our people) cause no problem, our people were taunted, they were harassed. By these other people.

1:03:00 After a group gets thrown the hell out : \*mumbles unbelievable\*: So look: we cannot let our first amendment, we just can't. we cannot let our first amendment rights be taken away from us folks we can't let it happen, we cannot let it happen. Can't let it happen. We have a right to speak! I mean we are law abiding people. We are a people that work very hard. We are the people that have built this country and made this country great. And we're all together. And we want to get along with everybody, but when they have Organized professionally staged wise guys. We gotta fight back. We gotta fight back.

The media is btw the most dishonest group of people I've ever met. The worst. They are. They'll say today: Donald Trump came to Dayton, and he had a small crowd with a smithering of people. They wont' say it was so big its bursting out of the biggest hangar I have seen.

He was the managing director of the Leeman brothers which was one of the great catastrophes in the world. Leeman Brothers failed, and almost brought down the world if you remember. (casich) .... And he voted for NAFTA, you people forgot, he voted for nafta. Now he was a congressman and he voted for nafta. Now Nafta Has destroyed New England. But its destroyed. It it I mean you have fought for years and years and you'll never recover completely from it but you will if I get elected, cause we are bringing those businesses back.

Nafta wiped out states. It wiped out entire states. It wiped out new England its taken years and years and years.

Do we have a great military right?! Right? But we have a problem, we have a problem, our military can't beat isis. Now I know we can knock em out in two days if we wanted to. You know I call ourselves the politically correct warriors you know.

Why can't we be unpredictable right. in war why it's like these dishonest people in there. They're always saying what would you do about ISIS and I'm supposed to lay out my plans. I never wanted to say attack the oil to them. I never wanted to say it. I wanted to knock the crap out of the oil okay. But BUT But I don't want to say it okay. I want to surprise the enemy.

On Kasich: he's not the right guy to be president. He's not tough enough he's not sharp enough..... He's very weak on illegal immigration. He is totally in favor of amnesty. Which you cannot be in favor of. Look folks, we. either we have a country or we don't okay.

Everything you have right now, your industries, that haven't been taken out of OHIO. Here's what we have to do. We have to protect your coal industry and we have to protect your steel industry. Your steel industry is being decimated, its being decimated.

Now your Governor is in favor of the trans pacific partnership, which is a disaster, btw im telling you it's a disaster.

Now trans pacific is gonna destroy your auto industry in ohio. They are gonna take it away from you just like you were a bunch of babies, not gonna happen if I am president okay not gonna happen.

It's a horrible horrible trade agreement you got twelve countries, all of which want to rip our heart out.

And the most important weapon that they have to kill our industry and to destroy us on trade is monetary manipulation, devaluation of their currencies.

Ohio is a target of TTP, and you have to get it stopped. Honestly folks, you got lucky you're sitting on oil or Ohio would be a disaster right now.

We spent billions of dollars protecting wealthy countries, and we are not a wealthy country. We owe 19 trillion dollars our country is weak our country is soft we have leadership that is pathetic and its got to change folks its gotta change.

Nobody knows all of the things like PACS which btw are a disaster.

And the establishment said: hey jim do you know this Trump is running this is bad he is self funding his campaign he doesn't want our money we are not gonna be able to control him. We've got to Fight him. We've got to fight him. Cause I know what has to be done.

I said here's a story: you ready? In the middle east. And other places. But in the middle east they're chopping off heads, they're drowning people, they are killing people. They would kill us so quickly if the had they capability and they are trying to get the capability. Which is btw why we have to kill them just so you understand its why we have to kill them.

\*this twitter facebook is so great, because when they (the dishonest media) lie, I type out you know ding ding ding I'll do it myself Ding ding dang doong ding press. And they go like 12 seconds later: we have breaking news from Donald Trump! It's the craziest thing.

I am 100% fine with waterboarding. Fine with waterboarding. And it should be Increased! (2x) And btw just so you understand: they say he wants to just disobey the laws. And it is true you know. We have laws. If youre too tough. think of this. We are too rough with our enemy. They've just chopped off 3 heads of Christians who were great people. Who went over there to help people. They get caught and

not even a question of getting caught they aren't hiding. They grab em and they chop off their hands because they are great people that are helping people right and I'm saying to myself and I have to defend this. Just so you understand. We have laws and rules and regulations. And rules of engagement. They have nothing. **They have nothing. Its very hard to beat somebody when you have rules and regulations at a very high level I mean this is never happened before.** So we catch one of these animals that just chopped off ten heads and we don't even know where we can try em. First of all they are going to Guantanamo bay okay. (arguing against laws)

So waterboarding is fine. And also if we can do much worse than waterboarding that is okay too. Right right? So they say ohhh he might not obey the laws and as of now we are actually not allowed to waterboard.

Look torture is terrible. right? we al agree its terrible but when somebody is doing what theyre doing. These horrible acts the cutting and the drowning. We have to fight we have to fight like we have to fight right we have no choice. So what happens, what happens this: we have to expand our laws. We have to get much tougher we want to knock them so fast and so furious.

And btw we have to get to the bottom of it. We cannot allow people into the country that want to destroy us we can't do it. We can't allow the Syrians we can't allow the migration of Syrians in the country we don't know who they are or where they come from.

After a story of a general shooting 50 terrorists in cold blood: We don't like this but im just saying if we gotta win or lets not play the game and lets not be a country anymore. Lets be blown up by everybody.

We are either gonna win the battle or we are gonna lose the battle.

**2<sup>nd</sup> amendment we are gonna fight and we are not gonna give it up.**

**We'd be better off with a trade war than losing 500 billion dollars.**

I just don't want her trading on automobiles, okayyy. I wanna get some ruthless crazy, I wanna get one of the killers right? Somebody that you don't want to have dinner with.

**Talk about the protest in the discussion, how this fits in the securitization and construction of the enemy**

**Our military is gonna be bigger and better than ever before and nobody is gonna mess with us folks.**

### August 3, Daytona beach, Fl

- Number of people
- How well he is doing
- 400 million to iran (incompetence of president)
- Isis
- The dishonest press.
- Special interests
- Taxes on the leavers

Lock her up chants on Hillary

Press they are actually really dishonest.

We're gonna get rid of Hillary, we are gonna get rid of Obama we're gonna get rid of crooked Hillary.

The infrastructure, so important, the infrastructure of our state is crumbling. We gotta fix it.

The biggest problem we have is the dishonest press.

If Hillary puts her people on The supreme court.. okay.. like who knows.... Elizabeth warren maybe will go.. maybe.. Pocahontas(2x). They'll put Pocahontas. What an insult to Pocahontas isn't it? I apologize ladies and gentlemen, to Pocahontas. But she will put people so far left that our country will become Venezuela. Big version of Venezuela. Believe me.

So I'll tell people I'm sorry you don't like me but you have to vote for me I'm sorry (because otherwise it turns into Venezuela)

Btw those people who knocked down the world trade center wouldn't have been here under Trump policy just so you know.

They are tired of seeing incompetent politicians like Obama running the country into the ground okay. They are tired of it. They're tired of seeing someone like Hillary Clinton, that shouldn't even be allowed to run for president, run this country into the ground, she'll be worse than Obama. Believe me she'll be worse than Obama.

We have Obamacare, which we are gonna repeal and replace, it's a disaster. It's a total disaster

But the problem is their leaders are too smart for our leaders. Because they are killing us at the border. And they're killing us on trade.

## Friday September 9 2016, Pensacola (12500)

Intro by different guy: Donald Trump is not gonna let our soldiers slip to 420 000, not in a time in which Terrorrists are attacking us all over the world. He is gonna build our army to 600 000.

When Vladimir Putin sits down with Donald Trump, he is gonna sit down with a man who has the strongest army, the strongest navy, the strongest airforce the strongest marines, the strongest special forces in the world. That's called, negotiating from strength!

It's a movement They have never seen before (who is they?) → corrupt washington

Decades of corruption, new America will begin (4 30)

He does the camera bit again (6 min) crowd loves it and chants USA. of by and for the people.

Real change not partisan change, is the existential threat posed by the partisans? As a country we have been abused long enough. We have been abused long enough.

We are fighting for every last city, and every last person in the country. Everybody (jobs)

We are going to keep our jobs in our country. We are not gonna let them take our job anymore folks. Not gonna let it happen. Its been happening long enough. and the reason they are not doing anything about it is because the special interests and the donors control our politicians and control Hillary Clinton. (12min)

New york state is a disaster

And then you look at trade negotiations with china now, and they are trying to give us the Trans atlantic/pacific partnership now. It will be a total disaster..... nothing can be as bad as nafta, but its gonna be pretty (14) close

China is manipulating their currency, and they are taking advantage of you.

I am blaming our leaders for being so stupiddd.

We are also gonna have a very strong border. That's gonna stop people, and that's also gonna stop drugs. And drugs and those drugs are poisoning are youth and our people. And we will build a wall. And mexico will pay for the wall.

So called leaders are controlled by special interests. (19 00)

I know the system and the system is broken.

To avoid war we need to remember those three words: peace through strength. Nobody is gonna mess with us. We have such completed military.

Around 26, talking about army, for like 4 minutes. (take care, rebuild, navy, love em, missile defense, modernizing cruises.)

And By the way, with Iran when they circle our beautiful destroyers, with their little boats, and they make gestures at our people, that they shouldn't be allowed to make (crowd starts screaming and chanting) They will be shot out of the water. Okay believe me. (USA USA USA)

North Korea with their fourth nuclear test, They are getting Better! They are getting Better

On Hillary ( crowd chants lock her up)

Hillary Clinton could walk into this arena, shoot somebody, with 20 000 people watching, right smack in the middle of the heart. And she wouldn't be prosecuted okay. That's what happened. That is what happened to our country. I never thought id see the day that this is happening to our country.

Her (Hillary) policies have caused massive global disorder. She has handed Iraq over to Isis, unleashing that terror group all over the world, including the United states, where we are taking these people in and we don't even know who they are. This could be one of the great trojan horses of all time. They won't be talking about the trojan horse that happened 500 years ago (hahahaha) they will talk about what happened in the United States.

Isis would not be threatening the world today if it were not for the decisions by Hillary Clinton and now she wants to become president.

She has failed with china, which has only grown more aggressive. They have all grown more aggressive.

She doesn't know what victory is. And I hope she won't find out on November 8<sup>th</sup>, because if she does. Our country is in big big trouble.

Putin story:

Putin laughs! Believe me, he laughs at our leaders. And takes them to the cleaners again and again. Yesterday we had a plane, and he had his jets circling the plane, they were as close as 10 feet away. Taunting us, toying with us, just like Iran, taunting us, toying with us.

That is why, we will rebuild our military, and again so strong, that nobody is gonna miss with us. We are gonna strengthen our economy and our region, we gonna put ourselves in a position of leader of the world again. So we can negotiate in a position of great great strength. But more important of negotiating, is that we will be SECURE again. And we are not right now. 38: 30

We had a general recently who said, if attacked we are in no position to defend ourselves.

Money money money, trillion of dollars. We have now spent up to trillion of dollars. In the middle east. And our roads are collapsing, think of it, our roads, our bridges, our tunnels our hospitals, everything, Our country is collapsing.

But they have no respect for our leader, and they have less respect than that for Hillary Clinton. They hope that she wins, ohh do they hope that she wins. They will have a field day, it will be pillage time.

## 10/22/16 Virginia Beach Rally

And we are going to win back the white house. Early voting is underway so make sure you go and send your ballots. We've got to win this. November 8<sup>th</sup>. **We've got to win it. This is going to be our last chance folks I hate to tell you. This is about it.**

At the very top of the list is one of the most important promises of all. **If I'm elected president we are going to drain the swamp in Washington dc. In the contract I put forward a tough new ethics reform that will put the people back in charge of our government.**

We are gonna cherish and Defend faith and religious liberty.

And we are going to get rid of the johnson amendment. I hope you know what the johnson amendment is. Because it is a disaster for our great people and for our church.

We will also repeal and replace the disaster known as Obamacare.

**Many companies are being forced out of the country. They are creating jobs in other countries instead.**

He (bill Clinton) said that small businesses and middle class Americans are getting killed. And he was telling the truth. (on Obamacare). This election is our one chance to get rid of Obamacare.

She doesn't seem to know what the planet and what planet we are living in. Look at her record. She has been there for thirty years and what has she fixed? Nothing. **She unleashed death, destruction and failure in every country she touched in the Middle east. Irac Libya ryria Iran. Hillaries catastrophic failure unleashed ISIS. came right out of the vacuum. Which is now on a campaign of genocide against Christians in the middle east and all over the world. I mean think of what happened thing of whats going on.**

Despite all of the wall street money that's being spent against us. It (our campaign) is gonna take on, and **we're gonna take on big donors. We're gonna take on big donors. And I'll tell you what he big business in this country. And I'm a part of it. But I decided, I been on the other side you do know that right. I understand the other side. It's a very easy side to be on and ive been there a long time. Until I looked out and I said if I'm gonna stay there, I will tell you our country is in big trouble. Our country is in trouble. Because it's the wrong thing. I love this country I didn't need to do this. I love this country. And that's why I am doing this and we have a movement going like they've never had before.**

Our system is rigged, and I'm saying it for a long time. And the best evidence is that Hillary Clinton is even allowed to run for the presidency of the US in the first place. (lock her up chants). She lied to congress under oath, she lied to the fbi, and she made 13 phones disappear, some with a hammer.

She bleached and deleted 33000 emails and then two crucial boxes of email evidence mysteriously went missing.

**A Trump administration will end government corruption.**

**We're living through the greatest jobs theft in the history of the world the greatest job theft that's what it is.**

We are also going to rebuild our inner cities. For years and years and years you've been hearing this from the democrats they get the votes they don't do a thing. **African Americans and Hispanics living in**

the inner cities are suffering. The violence is unbearable. You walk to the store with your child and you get shot.

Nearly three thousand five hundred people have been shot in Chicago since the beginning of the year think of that since January three thousand five hundred people have been shot that's as bad as, and worse, than some of the warzones you are reading about in the middle east. Homicides are up nearly 50 % in Washington ddc and more than 60 % in Baltimore and it is getting worse. To the African Americans and Hispanic voters I say what have you got to lose Vote for Donald Trump. I will fix it, It can get worse I will fix it.

To be the country and to be a country of wealth we must also be a safe country. **National security begins at the border.** **Speaking in secret to a foreign bank Hillary Clinton said her dream is for a totally open trade, there goes your businesses,** and open borders, there goes your country. **You lose your businesses and your country.** Anyone who supports open borders cannot be the president of the united states, you will not have a country left. Open borders would be the end of the United States as we know it. Believe me.

Hillary's plan includes an open border with the middle east meaning generations of radicalism and terrorism spreading and growing within our shores. So let me state this as clearly as I can, If I'm elected president of the United States I am going to keep radical Islamic terrorists the hell out of our country.

We will also stop the crisis of illegal immigration, a Trump administration will secure and defend our borders. And yes we will build a wall and we will stop drugs from pouring in our country.

**As secretary of state, Hillary Clinton Allowed Thousand of thousands. I mean all over Thousands. Of criminal aliens to be released because their home countries wouldn't take them back.** Think of it. It was just reported that a man deported from our country 6 times in 10 years has just been charged with raping a 12 year old girl. In august Texas police arrest a serial immigrant rapist who had been deported 5 times his victims included one 68 year old woman with a cane, who took his offer to have her drive her to her home. He left her on the side of a dirt road in horrible horrible conditions. A 64 year old air force veteran was raped and beaten to death with a hammer by a repeat offending criminal illegal immigrant who should have been deported under the Obama administration, Should have been deported but never was. What kind of a government would allow its citizens to suffer like this. And believe there is tremendous suffering going on.

**Either we win this election or we lose our country as we know it today.**

**We are going to rebuild our depleted military.**

**We are going to save the second amendment which is under serious attack.**

**And we are gonna appoint supreme court justices who are gonna uphold and protect our constitutions.**

**I am going to fight for every citizen of every background from every stretch of this nation, I am going to fight for every child living in poverty, I'm going to fight for every mom and every dad that lost her child or his child, to illegal immigration and drugs and gang violence. And its happening all over. I am going to fight for every community whose jobs and factories have been ripped out of the states like virginia and shipped to other countries. We are gonna fight for your jobs. And they have not done that for many many years. I am going to fight for every person in this country who believes that government should**

serve the people and not the special donors and not the special interests. And I am going to fight to bring us all together as Americans.

And our religious liberty is being trampled on and we cant let that happen we cant let that happen.

Orlando November 2,

- Polls
- Obamacare
- Current administration
- Hillary Clinton
- Dishonest press

I have seen how the career of politicians the big donors and special interests have bled this country dry.

We have endless wars every community's hopes and dreams have been shattered.

Real change begins with immediately repealing and replacing Obamacare a disaster. A disaster. ( turns around asking crowd to cheer louder, which they do) it is a disaster. .... Obamacare is a total disaster, yet Hillary Clinton wants to double down on Obamacare.

Real change also means restoring honesty to our government.

I'll tell you what, the system is rigged the system is rigged. Ive been saying It for a lo its rigged and we are gonna straighten it out. The system is rigged. Hillary is not the victim, the American people are the victims of this system. So corrupt in so many ways, and this is your one chance to change it, because you know what in four years its not gonna happen.

If she would be elected, it would create an unprecedented constitutional crisis.

My contract with the American voter begins with a tough ethics reform. And it ends I'll tell you what we are going to end we have no choice we are going to end government corruption. Its going to end. I want the entire corrupt Washington establishment to hear and to head the words we all will say right now. When we win on November 8<sup>th</sup> we are going to Washington DC and we are going to: DRAIN THE SWAMP (with crowd).

We are living in the greatest job theft ever.

And you have an excellent governor he is fighting hard for you folks.

The theft of American prosperity will end. And It'll end ill tell you we are being it is being stolen from us folks.

We will also immediately stop the job killing transpacific partnership.

We are the highest tax nation in the world. Killing our jobs our companies are leaving killing our jobs.

But to be a rich nation we must also be a safe nation.

(after discussing the Night club attack in Orlando) Hillary wants to increase, by 550% syrian refugees pouring into our country. Her plan would mean generations of terrorism radicalism and extremism spreading in your schools and throughout your communities.

A Trump administration would also secure and defend the borders of the united states. And yes we will build a great wall.

The officers they've warned that hillaries plan is the most quote ' radical immigration proposal In United states history. And that it will lead to the loss of thousands and thousands of live quote. As secretary of state Hillary Clinton allowed Thousands of the most dangerous and violent criminal aliens to go free because their home countries were intelligent. They wouldn't take em back. We bring em to their countries. Murderers drugdealers gangmembers. We bring em to their countries and their countries would say get em out we wont take em back. And they would call the state department. Under Hillary Clinton. And the state department would say ohh bring em back we don't want to make waves.

Hillary wants totally open borders and strongly supports sanctuary cities. Like San Fransisco where Kate Steinly, incredible young woman who was murdered by an illegal immigrant who had been deported five times. A Trump administration will cancel all federal funding to sanctuary cities immediately. We will end illegal immigration, deport all criminal aliens the ones we just spoke about. And we will save american lives.

Hillary and her failed Washington establishment have spent six trillion dollars on wars in the middle east that we never won and that never end. And its now in worse shape than ever before. The middle east is a catastrophe its far worse off than had we spent nothing. They dragged us into foreign wars that have made us less safe. They have left our borders wide open at home and they have shipped are jobs and wealth to other countries. And just its disappearing. Our country in a certain sense is disappearing.

4 more years of Obama, we can't take it folks. Four more years of isis folks that is what it is. Four more years of no jobs.

Now she wants to start a shooting war in Syria. A cconflict with a nuclear Armed Russia. That could very well lead to world war 3. Russia is heavily armed. Doesn't like her. Putin does not respect her. Doesn't like her. What are we doing folks. Shes a mess.

We will save the second amendment which as you know is under tremendous siege.

I'll tell you what, you take a look at the media. These are some of the most dishonest people anywhere. These are the most. They (points to camera), the media. The media is a part, and one of the vital cogs in the rigged system under which we live. They are a big fat cog.

We are fighting for all the people that believe that government should serve the people and not the donors or hillaries special interests.

Together we will make America strong again. We will make America safe again. And we will make America great again.

**Moon township 6/11/16**

**Winning**

**Steel trade industry work (domestic economics)**

**Healthcare**

**Hillary**

**Government/establishment**

**Media**

**Polls**

**Crowds**

**Taxes**

**Innercities**

**Illegal immigration**

**Education/common core**

We are not gonna allow our jobs to be taken from our states anymore.

We are going to bring back the jobs and the wealth that have been stolen from us. The economic policies of Bill and Hillary Clinton have bled Pennsylvania dry you know it I know it weve watched it happen.

The job killing deal with south korea, another Hillary disaster.

Transpacific partnership. It will take what nafta hasn't taken.

As you all know, real change, begins with immediately repealing and replacing the disaster known as Obamacare.

I'm asking for your vote so we can save healthcare for every family in Pennsylvania.

Hillary Clinton is the most corrupt person ever to seek the office of presidency of the United States.

Right now shes being protected by a rigged system.

My contract with the american people begins with the plan to end government corruption and take our country back from the special interests.

You know I used to be on the other side in case you didn't know. But I love our country. And I saw our country not only heading in the wrong direction. We weren't going to have a country anymore. You look at whats happening. Trade: 800 billion dollar deficit worldwide. Our ddeals with china we have a deficit of almost 500 bn dollars each year. We weren't gonna make it folks, we weren't gonna make it. Drugs pouring through our borders. Our jobs taken away. Oh we will build a wall don't worry, we will build I promise we are building a wall. And Mexico will pay for the wall I promise.

I want the entire corrupt Washington establishment to hear the words we all ..... are about to say. When we win on November 8<sup>th</sup> we are going to drain the swamp.

America has lost 700 00 factories .... since china entered the WTO,... this was a Bill and Hillary disaster also.... We are living through the greatest jobs theft in the history of the world.

We will also immediately stop the job killing transpacific partnership. That will take the rest of the jobs folks.

We will also rebuild our innercities.

We are gonna bring back jobs we are gonna bring back education we are gonna bring back safety safety so unsafe.

To be a rich nation again, one must also be a safe nation.

Hillary Clinton wants a 550% increase in Syrian refugees pouring into our country. And virtually unlimited immigration from the most dangerous regions in the world pouring into our country. Her plan will import generations of terrorism, extremism and radicalism into your schools and throughout your communities. When Im elected president we will suspend the Syrian refugee program. And we will keep radical Islamic terrorism the hell out of our country. I'll tell you that. We have enough problems folks, we have enough problems.

A Trump administration will also secure and defend the borders of the united states.

Hillary supports total open borders. There goes your country. And strongly supports sanctuary cities like san Francisco. Where Kate Steinly was murdered by an illegal immigrant, deported perhaps 5 times. Thousands of Americans would be alive today if not for the open border policies of Obama and Clinton.

A Trump administration will prevent this nightmare of violence. We will protect American lives, we will cancel all federal fundings to sanctuary cities, we will stop illegal immigration, deport all criminal aliens, and dismantle all criminal organization and cartel threatening our citizens

We will also rebuild our badly depleted military, we need our military.

We will save and protect your social medicare.

We will eliminate all unnecessary job killing regulation

Protect Religious lliberty

We are gonna save the second amendment which is totally under siege. Totally under siege.

And appoint supreme court justices who will uphold and defend the constitution of the united states.

We are fighting for every community whose jobs and dreams have been ripped out and shipped to other countries all over the world, including Mexico. We are fighting for every American who believes government should serve the people, not the donors and not the special interests. We are fighting for every forgotten man and woman and child of this nation.

### **Inauguration speech Donald Trump 20 Jan 2017**

A great national effort to rebuild our country → implies it was destroyed

Rusted out factories, scattered like tombstones across the landscape our nation

This American Carnage stops right here, and stops right now 5: 45)

We have defended other nations borders, while refusing to defend our own.

We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries... And destroying our jobs. (9:00)

Unite the civilized world against radical Islamic terrorism, which we will eradicate completely of the face of the earth.