

Terrorism: a weapon for both sides?

A political discourse analysis on the rhetoric used by Trump during his campaign period towards the 2016 elections.

Naam: Judith van der Vrande Studentnummer: s4259483

Datum: 13-08-2018

Begeleider: B. Bomert

Aantal woorden: 19.635



Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen

Abstract

In this thesis a political discourse analysis will examine to what extent the securitization theory is able to explain the framing pattern that is used by candidate Trump in the run-up to the 2016 elections. Framing can be done in different ways with divergent functions. Trump is seen as a (potentially) misleading guide to where terrorism originates, namely by creating an alarming picture of the Islam, the Middle East and its adherents. The outcome is that candidate Donald Trump did frame the Islam and its adherents to a certain extent by using securitization theory in during his campaign.

Keywords: Donald Trump, presidential campaign, securitization, Islam, framing

Table of contents

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	6
Chapter 1: Introduction	7
1.1 Puzzle	10
1.2 Research question	13
1.3 Relevance	14
<i>1.3a. Scientific relevance</i>	
<i>1.3b Societal relevance</i>	
1.4 Structure	15
Chapter 2: Theoretical framework	17
2.1 Framing	17
<i>2.1a. Definition</i>	
<i>2.1b. Functions of framing</i>	
<i>2.1c. Framing in (American) politics</i>	
<i>2.1d. Recapitulation framing</i>	
2.2 Copenhagen school	22
<i>2.2a. Aim of securitization</i>	
<i>2.2b. What is and what is not a security issue?</i>	
<i>2.2c. Process of securitization</i>	
<i>2.2d. Who securitizes?</i>	
<i>2.2e. Critical view on Copenhagen School</i>	
2.3 Securitization and Islam	27
<i>2.3a. Islamophobia and securitization</i>	
<i>2.3b. US examples</i>	
2.4 Hypotheses	29
Chapter 3: Method	31
3.1 Research design and the purpose of the political discourse analysis (PDA)	31
3.2 How to do a discourse analysis?	32
<i>3.2a. Context</i>	

3.2b. <i>Political discourse structures</i>	
3.3 Limitations	34
3.4 Case selection and data	34
3.4a. <i>Speeches</i>	
3.4b. <i>Debates</i>	
3.4c. <i>Twitter</i>	
3.5 Operationalization theoretical concepts and coding	36
3.5a. <i>Recapitulation hypothesis 1</i>	
3.5b. <i>Recapitulation hypothesis 2</i>	
3.5c. <i>Recapitulation hypothesis 3</i>	
3.6 Reliability of research data	39
Chapter 4: Analysis	40
4.1 General description context of campaigning speeches and debates	40
4.2 Recapitulation codes and operationalization	40
4.3 Analysis speeches	41
4.3a. <i>Analysis announcement speech June 16th 2015</i>	
4.3b. <i>Outcome speech June 16th 2015 in relation to hypotheses</i>	
4.3c. <i>Analysis acceptance speech July 21th 2016</i>	
4.3d. <i>Outcome speech July 21th 2016 in relation to hypotheses</i>	
4.3e. <i>Recapitulation of outcome speeches in relation to research question</i>	
4.4 Analysis debates	44
4.4a. <i>Analysis debate September 26th 2016</i>	
4.4b. <i>Outcome debate September 26th 2016 in relation to hypotheses</i>	
4.4c. <i>Analysis debate October 9th 2016</i>	
4.4d. <i>Outcome debate October 9th 2016 in relation to hypotheses</i>	
4.4e. <i>Analysis debate October 19th 2016</i>	
4.4f. <i>Outcome debate October 19th 2016 in relation to hypotheses</i>	
4.4g. <i>Recapitulation of outcome debates in relation to research question</i>	
4.5 Analysis Twitter account	49
4.5a. <i>Outcome Twitter in relation to hypotheses</i>	
4.5b. <i>Recapitulation of outcome Twitter in relation to research question</i>	
Chapter 5: Conclusion and reflection	52

5.1 Recapitulation findings	52
5.2 Reflection and implications for further research	53
References	55
Appendix	62
6.1 Transcript presidential announcement speech, July 15 th 2015	
6.2 Transcript acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention, July 21 th 2016	
6.3 First presidential debate, September 26 th 2016	
6.4 Second presidential debate, October 9 th 2016	
6.5 Third presidential debate, October 19 th 2016	
6.6 Selected tweets between June 15 th 2015 and November 8 th 2016	

LIST OF TABLES

Table

Table 1. Context announcement speech

Table 2. Political discourse announcement speech

Table 3. Context acceptance speech

Table 4. Political discourse announcement speech

Table 5. Context debate September 26th 2016

Table 6. Political discourse debate September 26th 2016

Table 7. Context debate October 9th 2016

Table 8. Political discourse structures debate October 9th 2016

Table 9. Context debate October 19th 2016

Table 10. Political discourse structures debate October 16th 2016

Table 11: Outcome Twitter analysis

1. Introduction

“We are treating this as a terrorist incident until we know otherwise“ (Metropolitan Police, 2017), according to the Twitter statement of the London Metropolitan Police following the attack on the British Parliament. Today, this is a rather typical response regarding incidents in the Western world. People’s perceptions of terrorism as a contemporary phenomenon can be described as alarming. In response to this London police tweet someone responded by posting a picture of members of a police department visiting a mosque, accompanied by the text: “obviously lying in bed with the enemy doesn’t help much, does it??“ (Mr Infidel Esquire, 2017) This response in itself is an illustration of people’s perceptions, of how people collect and share their knowledge and opinions about terrorism and also how they are influenced by media sources and the frames that are used.

Since most people tend to have only limited historical knowledge and lack long-term memories regarding the way in which terrorism is framed in and by various news sources, they are generally convinced that terrorist attacks are and therefore should be automatically linked to Islam. When people nowadays think of terrorists, they more often than not see a colored young man with a long beard, carrying a Muslim name (Mythen, Walkate & Khan, 2009). A majority of the population of Europe and the United States is convinced that this stereotype of an ‘Arab terrorist’ is a stereotype for a reason – it has become an internalized concept amongst them. This is, however, in stark contrast with, for instance, Pope Francis, who argued that we should deny the existence of ‘Islamic’ terrorism, but rather think of the peace all religions promote. According to him, “Christian terrorism does not exist, Jewish terrorism does not exist, and Muslim terrorism does not exist. They do not exist.” (Pope Francis, 2017) However, Pope Francis and his arguments are largely standing on their own. Nowadays, terrorist attacks are more often framed as being the result of a religious ideology rather than the result of an absence of equal opportunities, conflict in society or radicalization.

This Islamophobic attitude is being fed by politicians that choose a particular rhetoric to spread their messages, in other words, a certain speech act. Governments and political leaders all over the world have used and still use various tools to combat terrorism, on both a national and international level. This process of fighting (Islamic) terrorism got a worldwide impulse after the 9/11 attacks; in the United States this resulted in the formulation of a counter-terrorism strategy, targeted at Al-Qaeda. It became a top priority for president Bush, who in 2001 began a War on Terror, based on the idea: “Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists”

(Bush, 2001). Since then, the United States has built an extensive structure for fighting this jihadist terrorist organization (Cronin, 2015). Over the years this label of a 'War on Terror' has been internalized by various US presidents and numerous politicians and in the process has been transformed into a concept that nowadays lives a life of its own (Reese & Lewis, 2009). This concept has also been taken over by the media and is no longer just used for its original policy goals (ibid.).

Not only the characterization of terrorists has changed since 2001, the terrorist 'arena' itself has also been substantially transformed and therefore influences the concept as well. Al-Qaeda, the terrorist group claiming responsibility for the 9/11 attacks, is no longer considered to be the largest global threat as far as terrorist groups are concerned (Cronin, 2015). Nowadays Islamic State (IS) claims most, if not all, terrorist attacks in the United States and Europe. Although the strategy and ideology of IS partly overlap with Al Qaeda's, in the end it is a completely different organization. According to former US Secretary of State, John Kerry: "Even as it [IS] is losing ground in the Middle East, we know already that they're going to try to transform themselves into (a) global terrorist organization, (a) network capable of orchestrating attacks, as we have seen in various places." (Kerry, 2016) Not just the growth of this specific terrorist group is seen as a serious concern all over the world. The expansion of this particular terrorist group contributes to a perceived increase of terrorist acts being linked to Islam. Both Al-Qaeda and IS are considered to be jihadist organizations, competing for a leading position in the jihadist arena (Hofstee, 2014). Western news media in general portray Islam and Muslims from an increasingly Islamophobic perspective. Linking terrorism and Islam creates an irrational fear amongst the people. Every time a terrorist attack has taken place in the post-9/11 Western world, newspapers were filled with speculative headlines. Since people are more likely to base their opinions on their short-term memory instead of reflecting upon events that took place in previous decades – in which for example 'left-wing terrorism' like the one committed by the German Rote Armee Fraktion or the Irish Republican Army was more prominent – people will become easily convinced that terrorism is automatically linked to Islam and vice versa.

Since 9/11, the construction of Islam can almost be considered to be an object of governance (Sunier, 2014). Since the 9/11 tragedy, the definition of the notions of 'Muslim' and 'Islam' have changed over and over again. Being Muslim became the most important characteristic, thereby diminishing the value of nationality (Feddersen, 2015). In the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, Muslims were re-described in the public imagination, which resulted in a new lens for looking at Muslims and their religion. Although there is not a sudden appearance of Islamophobia, governments try to minimize the risk of radicalization and terrorist attacks in

their respective countries. Fighting terrorism is a pressing issue for them, especially given the severe consequences if governments and their (inter)national intelligence agencies don't succeed in protecting its civilians.

In the United States, every election and the preceding campaign are characterized by a few substantial and crucial points for the candidates running for office, most importantly the Presidency. These crucial points can often be seen as a product of, or a response to, previous election campaigns (Campbell, 2008) – what is going on in the world, what topics are relevant on a national level, what did the previous president achieve?, etc. Those issues are relevant for formulating a political program and essential for the determination of 'propaganda' methods. Candidates running for President try obviously to identify themselves with themes and topics that appeal to the electorate, in order to gain as much support as possible.

A recurring topic in almost every election campaign during the 21st century are the challenges related to security and terrorism. An often made claim is that terrorism is an effective strategy to achieve political goals, while it can also be seen as a useful method of propaganda (Steinsson, 2014). Every American president in charge has used this method from a different, at times opposing perspective: the *threat* of terrorism has been used as an effective strategy to achieve political goals, while it has also been used as a method of propaganda. For example, the combination of post-9/11 security concerns and the war in Iraq made the Presidential elections of 2004 different from previous ones (Campbell, 2008). As mentioned before, former President Bush started the War on Terror, which was seen as a necessary policy in order to be reelected during the elections of 2004. This focus on his anti-terrorism policy had the advantage of taking the attention away from the failures of his administration regarding other issues (Kellner, 2007). Although (the threat of) terrorism was still a highly relevant issue during President Obama's administrations, he reframed this issue and used 'terrorism' in another way. His administration tried to change the perception of reality and the reality itself on how the US government "complies with the law when acting in the interest of national security (Feldman, 2010)". Obama made a clear difference between "to be at war with those who 'materially support' the Taliban or al Qaeda and its associates, [and] those who offer indirect support (ibid.)". In his campaign speeches Obama vowed to confront the terrorists with "everything we've got", but also addressed the importance of rebuilding alliances and ideals that bring hope (Obama, 2007). In a speech in Ankara, Obama stated that the US relations with Muslim communities around the world would not be about security and terrorism, but rather about shared interests and partnerships. He initiated a new program, spending hundreds of millions of dollars in order to reduce this 'clash of civilizations'. A contested issue was the 2009 Obama appointment of a

Special Representative for the Muslim community. This was interpreted as being controversial, since by making this appointment the Obama administration gave the impression of seeing this religion as some kind of global ‘Muslim-ness’. According to critics, if you’re trying to normalize relations, you have to treat Muslims the same as you treat anyone else; otherwise it is another example of the United States being fixated on them being Muslim.

Obama’s view was in stark contrast with candidate, later President Trump. The Trump administration took away passports from radicalized individuals who have travelled to certain regions in the world. One of Trump’s campaign promises was to ban Muslims from entering the United States, by creating a Muslim registry. Where former Presidents Bush and Obama tried to avoid a direct link between terrorism and the Muslim world (and faith) in general, President Trump is more focused on emphasizing the efforts of his administration in fighting terrorism: “We are also taking strong measures to protect our nation from radical Islamic terrorism”. (Trump, 2017a) According to Holley (2017), exactly those last three words separate President Trump from his predecessors. The notion of ‘Radical Islamic Terrorism’ has been used by Trump quite often to emphasize the struggle between Western democracies on the one hand and Islam on the other. During a campaign speech in August 2016, then-candidate Trump argued that: “We cannot let this evil continue. Nor can we let the hateful ideology of radical Islam [...] be allowed to reside or spread within our country. Just can’t do it.” (Trump, 2016b) During his campaign Trump consistently blamed his opponent Hillary Clinton for facilitating terrorist attacks (DelReal, 2016). One of the issues he specifically referred to was the ‘open immigration system’ which, at least according to Trump, lacked the ability to properly screen every single individual that enters American territory. In addition, he blamed Clinton for ignoring, even denying, the radical Islamic threat, since she never addressed this issue (ibid).

1.1 Puzzle

This striking difference between President Trump’s attitude towards Islam in comparison to previous presidents, is why this thesis focuses on the discourse as used by (candidate) Trump. Statements made by Trump are being judged and criticized by a lot of people, on a national as well as international level. In the United states, members of the House Representatives, Senators, Governors and other politicians have called upon President Trump to step down. Even during his election campaign, Republicans openly argued not to vote for candidate Trump, who was running on a Republican ticket. Nevertheless, Trump got elected and the remarkable issue here is that in the end a large number of people did accept and adhere to the prescribed perceptions as given by such a controversial character as Donald Trump.

An example of the remarkable framing by Trump relates to the so-called travel ban for Muslims and refugees, as brought up during his campaign. A few days after his inauguration, Trump signed Executive Order 13769, designed to ban citizens of seven countries with a Muslim majority from travelling to the United States for a period of at least 90 days. This travel ban in the form of an Executive Order frames the origins of terrorism in a particular way, and was designed as an action to increase the safety and security of American citizens: "It is the policy of the United States to protect its citizens from foreign nationals who intend to commit terrorist attacks in the United States." (Trump, 2017b). By some, Trump's policy is seen as a (potentially) misleading guide to where today's terrorism originates from, as an alarming picture of (illegal) immigrants.

Another example of this kind of rhetoric and discourse is Trump's response to the London attack on June 3, 2017. Just a couple of hours after the attack, Trump tweeted: "We need to be smart, vigilant and tough. We need the courts to give us back our rights. We need the Travel Ban as an extra level of safety!" (Trump, 2017c). Even before there was any specific evidence regarding the perpetrators, President Trump already pointed to his Executive Order, directly linking this attack to Islam. The Executive Order was once again presented as the solution for terrorist attacks, as if terrorism would just disappear if people from Muslim countries can't travel to the United States anymore.

This particular Islamophobic vision is obviously not only spread by Trump himself, but is shared by an inner circle within his administration. For example, Steve Bannon, former chief strategist and senior White House counsel, stated: "We are in an outright war against jihadist Islamic fascism. And this war is, I think, metastasizing far quicker than governments can handle it (Bannon, 2014)." A top priority for Bannon was to do something about the main danger he'd been warning for: radical Islam (Kirk & Wiser, 2017). Since Bannon was Trump's right-hand man, it was not surprising that the President presented such an alarming frame on Islam.

The framing of particular issues is of course influenced by real life events like '9/11' or other terrorist attacks, but not each and every real life event has the same impact on policy making and framing. 'Terrorism' means different things to different people (Abdullah & Elareshi, 2015). The 'understanding' of terrorism and terrorist attacks is strongly influenced by media reports and the framing by relevant actors, for instance political leaders. By framing issues in a certain way, the so-called speech act, a particular definition of a problem can be promoted and eventually become internalized. This is where the so-called securitization theory comes in. The securitization theory deals with how public issues emerge, how they are distributed and how they might eventually vanish. The theory is about how threats are securitized: language is not

only concerned with what is ‘out there’, but is also constitutive of that very social reality (Balzaq, 2005).

The current US political leadership uses the notion of ‘terrorism’ to justify particular actions and policies that the American public would not accept in another context (Winkler, 2012). In the past, US presidents have approved measures as assassinations, military coups and sabotage in response to terrorism (ibid.). Actions like these were undertaken in the name of fighting (Islam-related) terrorism, and were used as a way of selling policies to the people. Politicians and other prominent actors let people believe that the policies will have a positive effect on the safety of the people and therefore claim to guarantee security.

Since the start of his election campaign in June 2015, Donald Trump has received a record-breaking amount of media-attention. Trumps rhetoric on (Islam-related) terrorism, foreigners and immigrants more or less defined his campaign. There has been a constant nourishment of fear of Muslims and their potential animosity; received by citizens that seem to take this opinion for granted. Political actors use, misuse and abuse people’s fears, for example by referring to national traumas like ‘9/11’. The fear that is created by such a tragedy creates an opportunity for political actors to shift their discourse. They use this anxiety and target a particular group by using specific types of frames. For instance, during the Presidential election campaign of 2016, the international refugee crisis was high on the political agenda. Trump followed this up by launching an explicit plan to build a wall along the US-Mexican border. Trump promised to ‘Make America Great Again’ – a great America where Muslims were banned from crossing US borders. Referring to previous terrorist attacks in Europe and the United States, Trump called for closing mosques (Abdelkader, 2016). In response to the shooting of Americans in an LGBT nightclub in Orlando, Florida, in June 2016, Trump stated: “People cannot, they cannot believe that President Obama is acting the way he acts and can’t even mention the words ‘radical Islamic terrorism’. There’s something going on. It’s inconceivable (Trump, 2016c)”. With this tweet he succeeded once more in drawing attention to himself, at the same time spreading his Islamophobic views.

This example shows how Trump tried to degrade the perceptions of the Other, in this case President Obama, and to strengthen the idea of the Self. Where during his presidency Obama had a rather nuanced perspective on Islam, Trump took advantage of this particular tragedy by framing this nuance in just a negative way. He presented the events like there is no in-between. Another example is the War on Terror, which is also based on idea of a dichotomy, meaning that issues are viewed in a straightforward black vs. white way. The black-and-white idea of the Self versus the Other is presented as if there’s no in-between those options, no neutrality.

This Manichean dichotomy can be used to justify violence, or at least a violent and negative attitude towards those that aren't a member of the Self group (Gillombardo, 2016). This dichotomy is a perspective we see more often in Trump's representations. He has a particular rhetoric regarding immigrants and Islam – and the way in which he links the Islam to terrorism divides people. Political actors all over the world, even Republicans within the United States, openly call it 'hate rhetoric'. Trump's outspoken rhetoric also influences diplomatic relationships. In general people do not favor a (potential) president that seems to be out of control, or at least unpredictable, but how come that so many Americans still remain adamant in their support for Presidential candidate Trump? Arguably, this is partly as result of the skills Trump and his supporters display in positioning and framing his critics, as if these critics don't believe in the greatness of the United States. In that sense his arguments are based on emotion, rather than reason.

1.2. Research question

This thesis explores how Presidential candidate Trump during his election campaign identified and defined specific 'enemies' – in this case terrorists, the Islam and/or Muslims. By analyzing Trump's hate rhetoric, I hope to explore how a collective understanding of this created enemy, the Islam, has been produced. How is it possible that this – although we might be aware of the use of framing and the creation of an enemy, for example through securitization and speech acts – still strongly influences our thoughts on political leaders and their policies. In a way we accept the fact that political actors spread (unreliable) information to a public – the receiver – which has probably less information to base its vision on than the politician(s). Political actors use and misuse terrorism-related topics in order to benefit from it through fake, or at least biased, news. During his campaign Trump has used the Islam and placed this topic within a particular (terrorist and danger-related) context that in the end contributed to his election victory over Hillary Clinton.

The central research question in this thesis is:

To what extent did Presidential candidate Donald Trump's framing of Islam and its adherents become a securitized topic during the Presidential campaign of 2016?

In order to be able to answer this research question, some sub-questions should be answered first: what is framing and how is framing used by political actors? Not only the media, political actors as well can be seen as a news source for people. Citizens base their opinions and (voting)

behavior on the information and frames that are given by the media and political actors. What is the potential function of framing? Can the rhetoric of Trump be identified as so-called speech acts of securitization?

This thesis uses a political discourse analysis to analyze what the characteristic rhetoric of presidential candidate Trump was regarding the link between Islam and terrorism and whether or not this rhetoric fits the patterns of the securitization theory. The analysis focuses on different types of media representations: mainly Trump's Twitter account, two campaign speeches, and three election debates.

1.3 Relevance

1.3a. Scientific relevance

This thesis is scientifically relevant for a couple of reasons. First, this specific analysis of Trump's discourse will contribute to a better understanding of the notion of framing and the function of framing for political actors. For example, the last three American presidents tend to have their own definitions of terrorism (in relation to Islam). This has resulted in a divergent variation in Presidential rhetoric after 9/11 in relation to this topic. The definition of certain (securitized) topics influences the rhetoric that is used towards and accepted by the audience. Based on this research more insight can be gained in considerations of Presidential candidates regarding the type of framing that best fits the chosen definition of topics.

A second argument is that up till now there is no consensus within the academic debate about the impact of the use of media channels like speeches, campaigning debates and Twitter or other social media by political actors. Is the use of (social) media by politicians a way of agenda setting, or is it just a channel through which candidates directly spread their messages? The internet in general, and social media in particular, have become more and more important in politics, especially during times of campaigning and elections. (Fake) news or information has been spread through the (new) media with a high frequency, in which every politician has his or her own strategy. By analyzing the rhetoric as used by Presidential candidate Trump, this thesis will contribute to a better understanding of and insight in the discourse strategy of candidates running for presidency. This can, as a consequence, serve as a basis for future discourse analyses of political actors.

1.3b. Societal relevance

Since media frames can be seen as the lenses through which citizens perceive (their) reality, it is societally relevant to address this issue. Today media function as a social institution with a

great amount of power and influence. What frames are most salient, how do particular frames interact? The answer to these questions will contribute to gaining more insight in how political actors decide to react in response to threats and influence (American) citizens in a particular way. The prime audience of Presidential candidates and the media are the citizens of the United States. They partly base their views on the information as given by news sources like newspapers and TV programs, but also by political actors as analyzed in this thesis. When people interpret the idea of ‘the Other’ in a particular way, their response and reaction to it will be likewise. If important political actors, like Presidential candidate Trump, use news sources to constantly promote the idea of a terrorist as a young Muslim man with a beard, people that are receptive to this kind of frame will perceive all young Muslim men likewise. Frames used by important political actors like Trump create certain stereotypes within society. This thesis will give more insight in why and how political actors choose this strategy. This might result in the possibility to better inform and even confront the audience with this knowledge.

Another argument, in line with the previous one, is a more ethical one. This thesis raises the question to what extent is it ‘good’ to securitize a particular topic and therefore spread biased, ‘colored’ information. Is it possible at all to think of a mechanism that monitors the way in which political leaders or Presidential candidates use securitization as a way of framing in order to gain votes? Shouldn’t there be an institution that monitors the dependency of the audience to its leaders, in order to prevent leaders from creating even larger cleavages between social groups.

1.4 Structure

This thesis contains five chapters, including this introduction which sets the outline for this thesis. Chapter 2 entails a theoretical framework in which the relevant concepts and their mutual relationships are addressed. Based on these mutual relationships, three hypotheses regarding the expectations for this thesis have been formulated. These hypotheses contribute to answering the main research question. Chapter 3 deals with and justifies the methodology that has been used for this thesis. In addition, the collection of the relevant data and the extent to which this has contributed to the research question is addressed. Chapter 4 includes background information and mainly sets the context for the empirical part of this research. Chapter 5 focuses on the analysis of the data in relation to the research question; to what extent is this data able to contribute to a plausible answer to the main question? In addition, Chapter 6 reflects upon the analysis and formulates a conclusion, including a discussion and recommendations for further research. Topics like the limitations or shortcomings of this research and the consequences for

the theories, are addressed as well. It should be noted that the Appendix includes all analyzed transcripts and tweets.

2. Theoretical framework

This chapter addresses relevant debates and theoretical notions that have been used in order to answer the main research question. In response to the 9/11 events, the War on Terror was initiated. This response can be seen as the lens of the Bush administration as well as the American people: “Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists” (Bush, 2001). This constructed perception has, since 2001, created and shaped the discussion on Islam, on terrorism, and on Islamic terrorism – and in the end on the way in which this phenomenon is understood.

2.1 Framing

2.1a Definition

The theoretical and operational understanding of the notion of ‘framing’ differs significantly amongst scholars of various academic disciplines. What exactly is framing? In short, framing is about the selection and therefore inclusion and exclusion of information about specific issues with an emphasis on specific parts. This is also what Tankard et al. (2001, p. 100-101) argue: “A frame is a central idea for news content that supplies a context and suggests what the issue is through the use of selection, emphasis, exclusion and elaboration.” Framing refers to how (public) actors or the media construct messages in such a way that some elements and dimensions are considered to be salient, where others are not (Goffman, 1974).

Another definition of framing is suggested by Entman (1993, p. 3):

“to frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described.”

In essence, the concept of framing refers to an emphasis of particular facts over others, the active promotion of specific information. In general, people aren’t aware of this emphasis because frames ‘work’ partly between the lines. Some things will be left unsaid, a silent strategy that can nevertheless speak volumes (Poland & Pederson, 1998). Framing is a partly silent tool, in which not saying things can be as revealing as saying them (ibid., p. 294). It is a useful tool for establishing the terms for public debate and changes in attitude (Callaghan & Schnell, 2005). Framing can have an indirect, subtle effect on the audience, but on the other hand it can completely determine the way of thinking. Framing can help the audience in understanding complex issues, and in that sense it is a necessary tool for members of society. According to

Reese, Gandy & Grant (2001, p. 97) it is “the ability to define the terms of a debate without the audience realizing it is taking place”, that makes frames such a powerful tool. Therefore, framing as such is not bad because it can benefit the public in providing knowledge about and understanding of certain structures.

What should be pointed out here, however, is that framing does neglect complexities, affecting the ability for people to have in-depth discussions. Frames create a certain simplification of reality and make it therefore easier to digest issues. In that respect it can be argued that frames lead to polarization and create a setting in which citizens are no longer open-minded towards other perceptions.

2.1b. Functions of framing

A function of framing is to isolate particular information and subsequently draw attention to it (Reese et al., 2001). This isolated information, for example specific words or images, can be helpful in propagating a specific perspective. This specific perspective or frame can therefore serve as an internal structure of the mind, but also as a device that is embedded politics. Entman (1993, p. 52) makes a distinction between four functions of framing:

“Frames, then, *define problems* – determine what a causal agent is doing with what cost and benefits, usually measured in terms of common cultural values; *diagnose causes* – identify the forces creating the problem; *make moral judgments* – evaluate causal agents and their effects; and *suggest remedies* – offer and justify treatments for the problems and predict their likely effects. “

Benford & Snow (2000) argue that the two main functions of framing are to select and highlight; the highlighted elements are used to construct an argument about the causation, evaluation and solution of problems. Dardis (2007) in turn states that the use of frames by socio-political actors is so effective through the realization of four functions: “defining an issue as a problem, blaming a cause, suggesting solutions and invoking a moral appeal (p. 247)”.

The first function – defining an issue as a problem – has a kind of logic: it involves the identification of a problem (ibid., p. 249). The second function – blaming a cause – is an almost automatic reflection or response for human beings: ‘Who’s to blame’ when things seem to go wrong (Ibid., p. 251). People can make more sense of the world as long as they are able to identify causes of a certain behavior or event. Human beings try to understand the world around them and are therefore in desperate need of combining a socio-political problem with a specific

source for this problem (ibid.). The third function – suggesting solutions – entails that “[a] message should present the benefits of the proposed behavior, as well as the conversely negative consequences of inaction, to create a cognitive dissonance [...] within individuals in relation to their existing behaviour or the current situation (Dardis, 2007, p. 252).” Presenting a solution to the audience that seems feasible can be of great importance. Providing a tenable solution or remedy will lead to an acceptance of people in facing and combating the problem (ibid.). The last function that is described – invoking a moral appeal – is explained by Snow and Benford (2000,) who argue that it “calls to arms or incentives to actually urge people to act (in some way) on behalf of the movement (p. 199)”. These incentives can therefore have a moral aspect.

2.1c. Framing in (American) politics

When it comes to politics, two main approaches can be distinguished. The first is called ‘frames in thought’, which means that it describes an individual perception of a situation, in other words, someone’s perception of reality (Klar, Robison & Druckman, 2012). The second is called ‘frames in communication’, which means that the speaker chooses a frame in the form of phrases, pictures, words or a typical presentation style to hand over information (ibid.).

Influence on US election outcome

The outcome of an election process is influenced by whom, or which political party, is in the end more successful in framing. Political actors use traumatic national events as a ‘window of opportunity’ to modify the perceptions regarding particular policy issues (Callaghan & Schnell, 2005). Specific frames can, for example, result in the mobilization of issue activism, specific agenda-setting and certain emotional responses in society (ibid.).

Political actors use language and linguistics to influence cues about how an issue should be interpreted by their audience. In the words of Callaghan and Schnell (ibid., p. 2), “This process by which all political players, including the media, use linguistic cues to define and give meaning to issues and connect them to a larger political environment has come to be known as framing.” Since the US political system is dominated by just two parties, Democrats and Republicans, the importance of framing is strategically improved. This argument is based on the idea of Lakoff, who argues that “candidates must integrate their everyday rhetoric and positions on policy issues into an overarching philosophy of governance (Lakoff, in Iyengar, 2005, p. 1)”. In the United States, Democrats interpret frames differently than Republicans. This argument is based on the idea that the American culture can be divided in two competing worldviews (ibid.) – a contestation between those who believe in a ‘strict’ role of the parent

versus a ‘nurturing’ role, where the ‘parent’ is a metaphor for the US government. The believers in a strict role argue that nature is weak and therefore in need of a demanding father who brings discipline, rules and punishment to keep people on the right path of human development (ibid.). They value individual responsibility and believe that governance should maintain law and order. Social welfare programs are counterproductive and if people are unemployed, they should just try harder. On the other hand there is a nurturing role for the parent, which means that “[w]ith appropriate parental care and nurturance, all children have the potential to develop into fundamentally decent and productive human being (ibid)”. According to this point of view, government has large responsibilities in order to eliminate inequalities and other social barriers (ibid.). This distinction in worldviews plays a role in the interpretation of frames that are being used by politicians.

Frames can be used through various types of communication. Political actors, for example, use verbal as well as non-verbal frames. Since this research focuses on the verbal dimension of Trump’s framing tactics, two examples of a verbal way to influence cues are given here. The first example is brought up by Lakoff (2006) and entails the term ‘tax relief’. This example illustrates the power of framing a word or notion in order to realize social change. The notion of ‘tax relief’ is differently understood by Republicans and Democrats in the United States. Republicans in general strongly promote a decrease in tax rates, because they believe this can activate the (weak) American economy (Pluwak, 2011). On the other hand, Democrats see tax rates as an investment in the common wealth (ibid.). Following this line of argument, it seems legit for Republican politicians to focus on cutting taxes. By adding the word ‘relief’, it has led to the creation of the idea of a group that has been harmed. According to Lakoff (2006), five elements are relevant in this process: (1) the hero (the reliever of pain); (2) the victim (the afflicted); (3) the crime (the affliction); (4) the villain (the cause of affliction); and (5) the rescue (pain relief). The proponent of tax relief will be seen as the hero who deserves a vote, the afflicted are the taxpayers, the crime is the fact that taxes should be paid, the villain is the proponent of taxes, while the rescue is the fact that taxes will be cut by the hero (ibid.). If the word ‘relief’ had not been added and just cutting taxes had been the statement, people’s minds would have been less rewired.

Another good example is framing the notion of the environment and its contributors in light of the issue of global warming. Is consuming large amounts of meat the worst thing people can do, or is it rather the pollution of air and water, or the loss of biodiversity? All of these ‘problems’ have a negative connotation amongst people. In 2003, a language advisor of the Bush administration brought up the idea to talk about ‘climate change’ instead of ‘global

warming' (Lakoff, 2010, p. 71). His argument was that the term global warming includes human causes, and therefore it blames people. The concept of climate change has a nice connotation, however, and is less frightening for people in terms of regulations (ibid.)

In a political environment many prominent actors can facilitate media attention. Without any doubt the American president plays a prominent role and is most capable of influencing the (national) media (ibid., p. 8). His daily activities – be it visits, speeches, debates or tweets – generate constant media attention. Prior to the elections, during a long period of campaigning, candidates already get a lot of media attention (ibid., p. 9). Based on this, candidates can set their own theme of the campaign, in which they announce their own goals and intentions. Voters (partly) base their preferences on frames that are outlined by politicians and in the end on which frame is of greater importance to them. For example, some Americans might have preferred Trump's frame on immigration and education over Clinton's, but if the voter valued Clinton's economic frame over Trump's as a dominant one, this can eventually determine his/her choice. It is therefore of great advantage to politicians to be able to determine which frames are most relevant in society and among the electorate.

Political actors and their supporters send 'twisted messages', to the press as well as to a broader audience, moulded in a particular frame from which they hope to gain political leverage. A frame can help in activating and influencing the public debate on topics that are politically relevant, for example by allowing elites to apply a certain policy or during electoral campaigning. This does not mean that political actors or elites, like Trump, have carte blanche in shaping topics entirely in their favor. The frames of dominant players in the political arena may be more powerful and overrule the frames of others (Callaghan & Schnell, 2005).

Political actors do try to be the dominant player, so as to have the audience adopt their own issue frames (ibid., p. 6). An issue has to become salient to the public; '9/11' is a good example in this respect. People in the United States strongly supported the military strikes against the Taliban and Al-Qaida, and this can be seen as a strong incentive for President Bush in framing the US involvement in Afghanistan in favor of his own position and policies.

2.1d. Recapitulation of the notion of framing

As mentioned before, framing means that a specific part of information is being used in order to draw attention to this particular part. For political actors it can be a useful method to gain political leverage for their political agenda. Since for the electorate terrorism is a highly relevant issue, politicians seem to use and misuse this topic by framing it in a certain way by securitizing (fairly or unfairly) related topics. Trump seemed to securitize the Islam, also reframed it as a

security issue and link it to terrorist attacks. In order to analyze whether or not he actually used this theory in order to gain political leverage, it is of course relevant to address this securitization theory first. When do we speak of securitization, what is the aim of a securitizing speech act, who is able to securitize?

2.2 The Copenhagen School

This theoretical framework continues with addressing a concept as developed by the so-called Copenhagen School, a school of thought regarding international relations with a specific focus on the social/societal dimensions of security. Securitization is seen as a special way of using frames, namely framing with a particular goal. It is about the process of endorsing 'security' on behalf of a specific entity, like a group identity or a state (Wilkinson, 2007). Securitization is a rather novel approach and an evolving concept within the IR literature. The 'old', traditional concept of security is mainly seen in military terms, it is about the use of armed forces in protecting and freeing the state as the main political actor (Özcan, 2013). This traditional, primarily Realistic, perspective is state-centric and therefore mainly focuses on topics like territory, sovereignty, power, and threats. This approach is in stark contrast with the 'new' view that tries to broaden the perspective. The distinction between 'old' and 'new' has resulted into a debate between the 'wide' and the 'narrow' view within security studies.

Critical scholars have become dissatisfied with the rather narrow perspective of security studies, with the military and nuclear obsessions of the Cold War period (ibid., p. 2). This dissatisfaction was stimulated by a growing importance of other topics, like identity issues and the economic and environmental agenda. According to this wider perspective, the security agenda should open up to many other types of threats – it entails more than just war and force.

According to Buzan, Waever & De Wilde (1998) there is “a need to construct a conceptualization of security that means something much more specific than just any threat or problem (p. 5)”. This is where the Copenhagen School comes in with its concept of securitization, a notion developed by Buzan, Waever and De Wilde in the 1990s. Buzan et al. (1998) argue that “the term security was too narrowly founded, thus, the main purpose is to offer a broader framework of security (p. 25)”. Their type of analysis of security can be characterized as a more constructivist perspective in which it is tried to construct a model in which not only war- and force-related security issues are relevant threats. In this theory, security is described as the result of a social process (Williams, 2003, p. 513).

“Securitization theory argues that language is not only concerned with what is 'out there', as realists and neo-realists assume, but is also constitutive of that very social reality (Balzaq, 2009,

p. 56).’’ Rational theories within IR theory have an individualistic ontological view, their unit of analysis is the individual. This in contrast with a constructivist perspective which focuses on social ontology; individuals and states are social creatures that cannot be separated from the context, actions must always be understood from within.

2.2a. The aim of securitization

The concept of securitization means that non-political issues can become highly political and important. The core of this securitization theory is the notion that reality itself does not have to change as such; the theory “aims to gain an increasingly precise understanding of who securitizes, on what issues (threats), for whom (referent objects), why, with what results, and, not least, under what conditions (i.e., what explains when securitization is successful), (Buzan, Waever & De Wilde, 1998, p. 32).’’ This idea is in line with what was referred earlier regarding the events of 9/11, which created a shift in the dominant news frame of national security in relation to terrorism. (Norris, Kern & Just, 2004) As a consequence of ‘9/11’, American perceptions on the real threat of terrorism changed considerably and the importance of a counter-terrorism strategy was placed high on the political agenda (ibid). The purpose of bringing up this example here is to understand the process of constructing a shared understanding of what should be considered a ‘threat’ – and subsequently, what should collectively be responded to as a ‘threat’. An element of this theory is that securitization might lead to an increase in peoples’ fears and thus strengthens nationalistic feelings.

2.2b. What is and what is not a security issue?

In order to explain how issues become securitized, it is necessary to know what is and what is not a security issue. From a traditionalist perspective, the answer seems to be quite easy: just find the issues that are linked to the military and the use of force (ibid.). According to Lebow (1988), we should restrict the notion of security to “anything that concerns the prevention of superpower nuclear war (508).’’ Critical scholars of security studies noted, however, that such a traditionalist perspective could not deal with any other global threat that had nothing to do with military issues. Their aim was to emphasize human security rather than state security, based on the idea that the concept of security is important for both policymakers and society itself. (Fox & Akbaba, 2013)

Over time some traditionalists began to accept the relevance of broadening the perspective and looked more at non-military causes of conflict in the international system (Buzan, Waever & De Wilde, 1998). At the same time they hardly supported a solely state-centric perspective,

probably because there were by now many non-state actors actively participating in the military game. On the other hand, they pointed at the risk of widening the security concept, since that would lead to a situation where the essential meaning of security became void (ibid., p. 2).

According to Buzan, Waever and De Wilde (1998), “[s]ecurity is the move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics (p. 23).” In addition, traditionally the term security meant that a state representative declared an emergency condition or an existential threat by which he/she claimed the right to use whatever means were necessary, so as to block a threatening development (Waever, 1988). An existential threat can only be understood “in relation to the particular character of the referent object in question” (Buzan, Waever & De Wilde, 1998). In politics, a referent object is for example the notion of sovereignty, while in the economic sector it could be bankruptcy, whereas in the societal sector it could refer to collective identity (ibid., p. 22). According to Buzan et al. (1998), security should be looked at in the following way:

“ The way to study securitization is to study discourse (speech) and political constellations (gathering): When does an argument with this particular rhetorical and semiotic structure achieve sufficient effect to make an audience tolerate violations of rules that would otherwise have to be obeyed? If by means of an argument about the priority and urgency of an existential threat the securitizing actor has managed to break free of procedures or rules he or she would otherwise be bound by, we are witnessing a case of securitization (p. 25). ”

2.2c. The process of securitization

According to Buzan et al (1998), the exact definition and the criteria of what securitization really is, are “constituted by the intersubjective establishment of an existential threat with a saliency sufficient to have substantial political effects (p. 25)”. Given the intersubjective nature of social reality, the nature of an issue can be changed “from one where it can be understood to be in the realm of politics, to one where it can be called into the realm of security, by the performative nature of speech (Croft, 2012, p. 80).” According to Buzan et al (1998), a particular security label does not by definition mean that it refers to a security problem, since it can be a political choice as well and therefore been influenced by the perceptions and understandings of people.

Every issue in society can be identified and placed somewhere on the spectrum ranging from non-politicized to securitized. In this context non-politicized means that an issue it is not a topic of public debate and is not dealt with by the state, whereas politicized means that the state is

dealing with an issue and it is therefore a part of public policy, while securitized means that “the issue is presented as an existential threat, justifying actions outside the normal bounds of political procedure (ibid., pp. 23-24)”.

Buzan et al (1998, p. 26) have introduced three conditions for securitization: (1) the presence of *existential threats* to the survival of some kind of referent object that, (2) requires exceptional measures to protect the threatened referent object (*emergency action*), which (3) justify and legitimize the breaking free of normal democratic procedures (*effects on inter-unit relations by breaking free of rules*). Existential threats are prioritized over others and are related to the referent object, the object against which the threat is directed. The (future) existence of this threat is fundamental. In terms of terrorism, the threat is about the sovereignty of a state or a collective identity that has to be maintained.

The Copenhagen School has come up with a process of securitization in which naming a threat as a security threat elevates it above all others (Fierke, 2013). In this process the identification of an existential threat, a threat to the survival of a community, is important, since it allows and justifies extraordinary measures that would not have been allowed in other circumstances (ibid). It should be noted here that a discourse that takes the form of presenting an issue as an existential threat to a referent object does not by itself create securitization – this is rather called *a securitizing move*. An issue is securitized only if and when the audience accepts it as such (Buzan et al., 1998).

2.2d. Who securitizes?

“A securitizing actor is someone, or a group, who performs the security speech act (ibid., p. 40).” Good examples of this are pressure groups, a government, lobbyists and obviously political actors. According to Buzan et al., actors like this will declare it is necessary to defend the security of the state, its territory, a community, groups, etc. (ibid.). They will only occasionally, if at all, defend security in terms of their own survival. Buzan makes a distinction between the securitizing actor on the one hand and the referent object on the other. In many cases they will not be the same, except for the state that can speak for itself through its certified administration.

In the line of reasoning of the Copenhagen School, securitization is a so-called speech act, which means that a security issue can be labelled as relevant or urgent and therefore justifies the use of special policies to deal with it. (Buzan & Waever, 2003, p. 491) The process of securitization is defined here as a speech-act, “through which an intersubjective understanding is constructed within a political community to treat something as an existential threat to a valued

referent object, and to enable a call for urgent and exceptional measures to deal with the threat.” (ibid.) This is a typical perception of security, in which securitization is based on and refers to the constructive part of this theory: “a form of linguistic representation that positioned a particular issue as an existential threat.” (McDonald, 2008, p. 566)

“Articulating a threat or declaring a war are speech acts that bring a particular state of affairs into being (Fierke, 2013, p. 200).” In addition to a speaker (the one using a speech act), or some news source that acts like a speaker, an audience is also necessary, where the audience is a group of people at which the speech act is directed. In the end, it is the audience that determines whether or not a state of affairs is legitimate and whether or not they accept the securitized speech act.

Another perspective on this theory is given by Balzacq (2005, p. 171), who states that the core of this theory is that “power is derived from the use of ‘appropriate’ words in conformity with established rules governing speech acts”. According to him, this school of thought believes that actors introduce extraordinary arrangements they would not have been able to introduce without securitization.

2.2e. A critical view on the Copenhagen School

According to Stritzel (2014), the Copenhagen School struggles with three main problems. First, there is a struggle with the construction problems of the theory itself, followed by the second problem which embraces a shortcoming of background information for this theory. The last critique focuses on the insufficient reflection on problems of empirical application.

Another critique comes from Wæver (in Buzan et al, 1998), who states that the securitizing speech act is equal to a securitising-act; this is in contrast with Stritzel (2014), who argues that there is a difference between these two acts. Stritzel (2014) believes that the process of securitization takes place following the securitizing speech act, and that it are therefore two different things.

The debate in security studies is about what should or what should not be defined in terms of security (Wilkinson, 2007). The Copenhagen School tried to come up with a definition or concept of security that includes all new issues that might be relevant (ibid.). The definition of security can thus be extremely extended, since if we can’t observe security and the notion of security is actually created or constructed, than in the end everything can be categorized as security. The critique is thus that the concept is too broad. Wæver’s response to this critique is emphasizing the importance of making a distinction between what is and what is not a security issue. In a way he returns to the more positivistic perspective of the traditional IR theories, by

underlining the importance of threats in political practice, and not focus too much on a scientific definition of security issues.

Another critique on the Copenhagen School is that it is a very controversial theory. From a normative perspective, one can argue that this concept might have very negative consequences. Aradau (2004) argues that securitization produces categories of ‘enemy others’ as the outcome of policy, for example, and that it institutionalizes fast-track decision-making (in Roe, 2012, p.249). In contemporary society safety and security are two institutionalized concepts. There is a major network of FBI-like organizations that develop new safety techniques. This network and the collection of a huge amount of data creates a world in which every individual can be followed. Securitization influences the openness of a liberal democratic context.

The next point of critique comes from Huysman (1998), which he refers to as ‘the normative dilemma of speaking and writing about security’. The core of his critique is that securitization can not only be seen as a purpose to analyze, but also as a political means. Whether or not the Islam and climate change can be categorized as security issues, depends on their definitions. Wendt said earlier in a different context, but it can be argued here as well: security is what an agent makes of it. This is exactly where the critique comes in: who is the agent? In this thesis the author can function as agent as well. This thesis can be interpreted as a speech act of the author. This critique is contradicted by arguing that there is a difference between securitization as a theory and securitization as a normative practice. Of course this thesis might contribute to securitization, but if an analysis focuses on what already is presented as a security issue and not on what should or should not be a security issue, this dilemma can be avoided.

2.3 Securitization and Islam

A significant event like ‘9/11’ provoked a securitization response, in the sense that Islamic extremism became a key security issue. Immigrants have been characterized as risky and Muslim men with beards as terrorists. Differences between ‘civilisations’ – Christian vs. Islam or the West vs. the non-West – were highlighted. ‘9/11’ was followed by other anti-Western terrorist acts, like the 2004 Madrid train bombings, the assassination of Theo van Gogh, or the bombings in London in 2005 (Fox & Akbaba, 2013). Over the years tensions surrounding this clash of civilizations increased, which resulted in a change of the US and European security agendas. National discourses were hardened, which translated into new political discourses, new institutions, and policy changes (ibid., p. 175). New policies justified new forms of control, new anti-terror rules of law, and an increased scrutiny because of national security (ibid., p.

178). Over the years the power of discourse has become a more important element in the analysis of security (Balzacq, 2005, p. 171).

The framing of the War on Terror and the focus on Islam is perhaps the most important framing case of our time (ibid.). Issues like Islam, immigration and the refugee crisis are portrayed as factors that play a role in (the growth of) terrorism and radicalization. The framing by President Trump goes way beyond the framing by his predecessors. During the Presidential campaign, Trump tried to build and increase the negative shared understanding of Islam, and tried to continue the concept of the War on Terror in his own way. In that sense he has used a securitization move, which Vultee (2010, p. 35) refers to as the invocation of a “war on terrorism”.

2.3a. Islamophobia and securitization

The concept of ‘Islamophobia’ has been defined as the dislike of or prejudices against Islam or Muslims, especially as a political force (Sheridan, 2006). Another definition is given by the European Muslim Initiative for Social Cohesion (EMISCO), which sees Islamophobia as “a form of intolerance and discrimination motivated with fear, mistrust and hatred of Islam and its adherents.” (EMISCO, 2010) Islamophobes ignore the basic facts that not all Muslims are Arabs, not all Arabs are Muslims, not all Muslims come from the Middle East, not all Middle Easterners are Muslim and, foremost, not all Muslims are terrorists and not all terrorists are Muslim. (Cabili, 2011)

Partly as a consequence of this kind of Islamophobia, there has been an increase in reported crimes against Muslims after 9/11, and a growing fear and hate of Islam and Muslims. This includes not only violent abuses, but also verbal abuses, acts of aggression and harassment towards this group. (Sheridan, 2006) This negative attitude towards the Islam and the anti-Muslim agenda is supported by numerous political actors, both within and outside the United States. They are feeding Islamophobic tendencies and therefore shape people’s perceptions in a negative manner. According to previous research, the dominant (at least in the United States) political discourse about the Islam is mainly negative and often related to acts of terrorism. This negative attitude amongst US citizens is a consequence of the fear for radicalization that has been created.

An important concept of Islam, often misinterpreted in the West, is the concept of ‘jihad’. The actual idea behind this notion is that people should strive for a better way of life (Cabili, 2011). It means that one should put effort in actions to free oneself if suffering. In the West, however,

it is often interpreted as a ‘holy war’, and has almost become synonymous to terrorism. The word ‘jihad’ becomes related to violence and war, and therefore gets a negative meaning.

2.3b. US examples

A good example to start with, is the Syrian refugee crisis that has resulted in an increase of Islamophobic attitudes amongst people. People became concerned about potential terrorists entering the United States, and an attitude of suspiciousness towards refugees was born. Politicians further influenced the public discourse by arguing that only Christian refugees should enter the United States.

More recent examples are the numerous terrorist attacks in Europe and the United States, between November 2015 and the Summer of 2017, claimed by IS. In response to the mass shooting in San Bernardino in December 2015, candidate Trump stated he seriously considered having all mosques closed as part of his counter-terrorism policy (. Even if there was no proof that IS rightly claimed these attacks, the audience immediately jumped to conclusions. They continued to fear for their lives as long as refugees were being displaced and crossed American borders, because they see every Muslim as a potential terrorist. The negative US discourse on the refugee crisis will continue as long as politicians securitize this topic in the media, the way they are doing now.

During election campaigns politicians are often asked to give their opinions, and they actively use and create frames that will be accepted by the audience, at least by large parts of it. Trump framed the refugee crisis as follows: “Now I hear we want to take in 200,000. We don’t know where they’re coming from. We don’t know who they are. They could be ISIS (Trump, 2015b).”

2.4 Hypotheses

Now the concept of framing has been explained, its potential functions have been discussed and the securitization theory has been described as a specific type of framing, it is relevant to apply these insights to the research question. In order to answer the research question in a proper way, three hypotheses have been formulated, in line with the key elements of the securitization theory:

Hypothesis 1: In his campaign rhetoric Trump had an Islamophobic point of view regarding terrorism by presenting the Islam and its adherents as an existential threat to the survival of ‘the Self’ as the referent object.

Hypothesis 2: In his campaign rhetoric Trump had an Islamophobic point of view regarding terrorism by presenting the Islam and its adherents as an issue that requires exceptional measures and/or emergency action to protect ‘the Self’.

Hypothesis 3: In his campaign rhetoric Trump had an Islamophobic point of view regarding terrorism by presenting the Islam and its adherents as an issue that justifies and legitimizes the breaking free of normal democratic procedures.

These three hypotheses are all necessary elements in an analysis based on the securitization theory. In order to test these hypotheses, the concepts will be operationalized in the next chapter and the method that is to be used will be addressed.

Chapter 3: Method

This chapter explains why I opted for a so-called political discourse analysis; the advantages and disadvantages of this method will be discussed. It will examine the discourse used by Presidential candidate Trump in various speeches, debates and tweets, in order to discover strategic patterns. I expect to find a recurring strategy in which Trump constantly uses the same rhetoric, and using securitization as a speech act. In the process, I will also deal with the question to what extent this type of research is relevant and how this method can yield relevant insights in the rhetoric of political actors. Next, I will operationalize the relevant concepts as discussed in Chapter 2. Based on this, it will be possible to actually address the expectations as formulated in the hypotheses. Finally, I will briefly discuss the issue of how reliable the sources used in this research are.

3.1 Research design and the purpose of political discourse analysis (PDA)

First, it is important to understand what (political) discourse analysis actually entails. Johnstone (2006) describes discourse analysis as:

“a research method that can be (and is being) used by scholars with a variety of academic and non-academic affiliations, coming from a variety of disciplines, to answer a variety of questions. It is therefore not aimed at the collection of facts but sets out to answer many kinds of questions about language, about speakers and about society and culture (p. 11).”

Another, rather simplistic, albeit common, definition of PDA is that it focuses on the analysis of political discourse (Van Dijk, 1997). It is a helpful method for studying the political meanings that appear in written and spoken texts. According to Van Dijk (1997), it focuses on the texts and media representations of politicians or political institutions. According to Van Dijk (in Fairclough & Fairclough, 2013, p. 17), “PDA is understood as the analysis of political discourse from a critical perspective, a perspective which focuses on the reproduction and contestation of political power through political discourse.”

The next obvious question is then, what is political? According to scholars, this includes for example the rhetoric that is being used by presidents, members of political parties, members of parliament or ministers, be it at a local, national or international level. On the other side are the recipients, the group that acts as the audience of the political actors. This group plays an important role, because they can vote or demonstrate and therefore can be highly active in the

political process. Although this audience is not by definition active in politics, it is still a necessary part of the process of interaction (ibid.). A PDA should include a systematic account of the context and its relations to discursive structures instead of only focusing on the structural properties of text or talk itself. (ibid., p. 15)

Another relevant question is: should we talk about micro-politics or macro-politics? Does politics take place, as Chilton (2004) argues, between individuals, social groups and is it formed based on arguments and discussion (micro-level), or is it something in-between political institutions? According to Van Dijk (1997) the concept of political discourse is identified by its actors or authors, viz. politicians; it is about all participants in the political process. Participants and their actions are the core of the context PDA aims to analyze (ibid). Such contexts can be analyzed very broadly, by looking at the settings of time, place, circumstances, occasions, intentions, functions, goals, and legal or political implications (ibid).

A last important element here is: what does discourse mean? The definition of discourse is the way of talking about and understanding the social world. This means that a certain discourse constructs the social world in meaning, and that “owing to the fundamental instability of language, meaning can never be permanently fixed (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 6).”

The key element in the research design is intertextuality. Political actors try to fix the meaning of language in a certain way and dominate this single perspective. A discourse analysis searches for intertextuality in oral, written and other utterances.

What can political discourse analysis tell us about the discourse and practice of politics? According to Wodak & De Cilia (2006), politics and political action are the key issues in research about politics and language. By performing a political discourse analysis, I expect to discover (a) frame(s) in the discourse of Trump.

3.2 How to do a discourse analysis?

After describing what a discourse analysis entails, it is relevant to understand how PDA can be performed. The first step is to establish the context: how does the data used fit into the big picture? According to Van Dijk (1997), one has to start with analyzing the particular properties of political contexts in PDA. In order to define the context, he suggests the following properties (Van Dijk, 1997, p. 18):

- overall domain (health, law, politics, etc.);
- overall societal action (legislation, campaigning, passing laws, etc.);
- current setting (time, location);

- current circumstances (bill to be discussed);
- current interaction (political debate);
- current discourse genre (speech, political advertising, media interviews, parliamentary debate);
- the various types of role of participants (speaker, male, female, etc.);
- the cognitions of the participants (goals, knowledge, beliefs, the shared social knowledge and political attitudes, as well as more specific knowledge (models) of concrete political events)

Political discourse structures

After the first step, describing the context, you'll continue with the specifics of the political discourse structures (Van Dijk, 2002). Van Dijk mentions several discourse structures, some of which will be discussed here briefly. The first one is "what information is defined and emphasized to be important (topics)", which entails the spread of mainly positive self-interpretation and a negative interpretation of the Other. This is a very common manner in political discourse, and can be seen as the polarization of us versus them.

This discourse structure fits the idea of securitization in which is spoken of an existential threat. The interpretation of the Other entails a description of the Other as something (potentially) dangerous, which might require emergency action to protect the Self or even legitimizes the breaking free of normal democratic procedures.

This is the first structure I expect to be necessary in order to analyze whether or not Trump during his campaign securitized this topic. I'll test here if he uses securitization – the specific form of framing – to identify the forces that create the problem: does he present the Islam and its adherents as an existential threat to the survival of the Self?

This structure is relevant for the second hypothesis as well, because it is in a way in line with the previous hypothesis. The negative association of the Other (emphasized information) might make it easier to call for emergency action for changing the status quo. A call for action following a rather positive description of the Other does probably not seem very convincing to the audience.

Another structure that is mentioned by Van Dijk, is the structure of local semantics, meaning that "political context models define what information of models of current events will be relevantly included in discourse or not (ibid.)." Strategies like exaggeration, for example of numbers, or the use of metaphors can strengthen the biased perspective of the Other. This might be used by Trump as well, since it might be helpful in order to strengthen his argument. When it comes to the third hypothesis, exaggerated numbers can be very appealing to the audience in

order to accept the need for exceptional measures or policies. Using a specific (high) number of incoming refugees will be interpreted differently than, for example, the words ‘a lot’.

3.3 Limitations

Some scholars argue that there has to be a quite restrictive concept of politics and political discourse. This means that such an analysis has to focus mainly on the discourse which is produced by the “central players in the polity.” (Van Dijk, 1997, p. 13) Others describe the political arena as a social construction that can’t be delimited. (Fairclough, 2006, p. 33) The focus in this thesis is just on the rhetoric as used by Trump, so in that sense this is based on a rather delimited discourse. Broadening the analysis might be an option for further research in which the amount of data can be expanded.

Another main problem with performing a discourse analysis is the specific focus that should be on the coding, since otherwise the reliability of this type of research is very low. Coding has to be trustworthy and attention should be paid on inter- and intra-coder reliability. (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak & Vetter, 2000, p. 65) A discourse analysis is somehow always a matter of interpretation and therefore not completely objective. By operationalizing correctly, this problems can obviously be partly overcome. It might not lead to conclusions based on ‘hard science’, but it will definitely contribute to more in-depth knowledge and new insights for debates. Since this method does read between the lines of text and spoken words, it can help in understanding and give meaning to utterances. I consider it relevant to properly analyze the meaning of certain means of communication, since it will otherwise be left to intuition.

3.4 Case selection and data

Donald Trump

The divide between (radical) Islam and the West has been widened by the way in which former President Bush responded on 9/11. It gave the idea of the Self versus the Other an impulse and therefore only helped in creating an even stronger fight. Trump seems to benefit from this post-9/11 America that former President Bush built and President Obama partly allowed to continue. Feelings of hate and negative attitudes towards Muslims have been an problem for years, due to framing by important political actors. The Trump administration is perhaps the most Islamophobic administration so far. Since Trump appears to be the first US Presidential candidate that was so outspoken on several media channels, Trump can certainly be seen as a relevant case. Of course, debates and speeches are of all times, but never before has Twitter,

thanks to Donald Trump, been so relevant in a Presidential campaign. This in itself is another reason to analyze Trump instead of any other (former) US Presidential candidate.

Data selection

3.4a. Speeches

The speeches that have been used for analytical purposes in this thesis are:

- the presidential announcement speech of Donald Trump for the Republican nomination, June 15, 2015;
- the acceptance speech of Donald Trump at the Republican National Convention, July 21, 2016.

3.4b. Debates

The debates that have been analyzed:

- the first Presidential debate, Hofstra University, September 26, 2016, moderated by Lester Hold;
- the second Presidential debate, Washington University, October 9, 2016, moderated by Anderson Cooper and Martha Raddatz;
- the third Presidential debate, Nevada University, Las Vegas, October 19, 2016, moderated by Chris Wallace.

Relevant in the selection of data – for the speeches as well as for the debates – is that they have to mark critical moments in Trump's campaign, keeping in mind to look for written and/or spoken utterances that were directed at a broad audience. Since the United States is made up of many states and regions, their political landscape is as well. It therefore makes less sense to focus on speeches directed at the local level, given the different values in each and every region. A good example in this respect is the border region with Mexico; giving a speech in a region not bordering on Mexico while referring to problems on the Mexican border won't help in winning votes in this region where the electorate can't and does not identify with this subject matter.

3.4c. Twitter

A third means of communication, arguably the most important one nowadays, is the Twitter account of Donald Trump. Twitter is an easy and direct way to send message to the world. His tweets are highly appreciated by his followers and have therefore been of great importance for his political campaign. In order to analyze the Twitter account of Donald Trump, I have made a selection of tweets during his campaign period, ranging June 15, 2015, until November

8, 2017. The total number of tweets during this period was 7.803. Within this selection I've focused on the tweets that matter for this research. The words that I have used in order to find relevant tweets in this database are: 'Islam', 'Terrorism', 'Terrorist', 'Terror', 'War on Terror', 'Middle East', 'Radical Islam', 'ISIS', 'Radical Islamic Terrorism', 'Radical Islamic Terrorist', 'Radical Islamic Terrorists' and 'Muslims'.

3.5 Operationalization of theoretical concepts and coding

In Chapter 2, I have formulated three hypotheses based on the theoretical framework, expressing my expectations. In order to test these hypotheses and potentially find strategic patterns, the concepts as used in these hypotheses should be clear and properly operationalized. For that reason, the hypotheses are once more brought up, followed by a discussion of the main concepts.

Hypothesis 1: In his campaign rhetoric Trump had an Islamophobic point of view regarding terrorism (1), by presenting Islam and its adherents as an existential threat (2) to the survival of 'the Self' as the referent object (3).

(1) Islamophobic point of view regarding terrorism

In this thesis, this concept is based on the definition as given by EMISCO (2010): "Islamophobia is a form of intolerance and discrimination motivated by fear, mistrust and hatred of Islam and its adherents" – for example, by referring to terrorism as the consequence of an open immigration system in times of a refugee crisis, with a specific focus on refugees with their origins in Islamic countries, in particular in the Middle East. Another element referred to earlier in this thesis, is the fact that terrorist attacks are often directly linked to the notion of radical Islam and ISIS as an organization.

This anticipated Islamophobic point of view is translated into a negative description or association with the Other, and entails a particular description of Islam, Muslims, refugees with their origins in the Middle East, etc.

(2) Existential threat

According to the definition of Buzan, Waever & De Wilde (1998, p. 24), an existential threat threatens the survival of some kind of referent object: 'If we do not tackle this particular problem, everything else will be irrelevant (because we will not be here or we will not be free to deal with it in our own way)'. Within security discourses, issues are presented as a case of

supreme and acute emergency, which will lead to the acceptance of extraordinary measures, just by labelling it as a security topic (Buzan, Waever & De Wilde, 1998, p. 26). The idea of an existential threat includes the perception of a real possibility of violent death (Huysmans, 1998, p. 571).

In this thesis an existential threat will be coded as such when the Other is presented or described as a (potential) danger for the world, for security, for society or any other part of the referent object, in this case the Self.

(3) 'The Self' as the referent object

As mentioned previously in the theoretical framework, an existential threat can only be understood in relation to the particular character of a referent object in question (Buzan & Waever 1998): "[T]hings that are seen to be existentially threatened and that have a legitimate claim to survival." (Buzan, Waever & De Wilde, 1998, p. 36) What is a referent object in this case? Buzan, Waever & De Wilde (1998) give several examples of what can be a referent object, varying from bankruptcy in the economic sector to a collective identity as a threat to society.

In this thesis the notion of the referent object will be operationalized based on the creation of a dichotomy between us and them, the confrontation between good and evil. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists, according to the distinction made by former president Bush after 9/11. The referent object that is seen to be existentially threatened in this case is 'the good', or 'us', which has (certainly according to Trump) a legitimate claim to survival. This requires a good, positive representation of the Self, at the same time a negative presentation of the Other (Cap, 2013). "The necessary condition that must obtain for such a strategy to work is, naturally, that the addressee of the presentation possesses predispositions which stand in contrast with those traits or qualities of the 'other' which the speaker has chosen to criticize (Cap, 2013, p. 80)." The Self should be presented as the (potential) victim of the behaviour or actions of the Other.

The Self will be coded as such when, for instance, Trump refers to the strength of the United States and its citizens and calls for some sort of mobilization of the American people. For example by using phrases as 'my fellow Americans', 'our citizens', 'we have to be strong', or any other call for some sort of teamwork amongst US citizens. In addition to this, it is considered to be a positive association of the Self if Trump describes his own potential as a president in a positive way; for example, if he refers to some of his great and successful plans for the future if he were to become the President of the United States.

Hypothesis 2: In his campaign rhetoric Trump had an Islamophobic point of view regarding terrorism by presenting Islam and its adherents as an issue that requires exceptional measures and/or emergency action (4) in order to protect ‘the Self’.

4) Exceptional measures and/or emergency action

The existential threat requires exceptional measures to protect the threatened referent object. From now on, “the issue is [...] moved out of the sphere of normal politics into the realm of emergency politics, where it can be dealt with swiftly and without the normal (democratic) rules and regulations of policy-making (Taureck, 2006, p. 55).” This means it is accepted to go beyond the standard rules and continue in some sort of emergency mode (ibid.).

This is coded as such when there is a particular warning in the text and some sort of demand for action. For example, when Trump refers to the need to recognize the danger of the Other, a warning for current or upcoming failing policies, capabilities from other politicians in relation to this topic, or the fact that the situation cannot go on like this.

Hypothesis 3: In his campaign rhetoric Trump had an Islamophobic point of view regarding terrorism, by presenting Islam and its adherents as an issue that justifies and legitimizes the breaking free of normal democratic procedures (5).

5) Justify and legitimize the breaking free of normal democratic procedures

Once an actor has convinced the audience, a suspension towards ‘normal politics’ will appear: “Attempts on the part of the speaker to gain the approval or collaboration of the audience: this involves the use of humor, the elicitation of applause, thanking the audience or other public figures of importance, or appeals to a shared heritage (Croninck, 2002, p. 8).” Following Buzan et al (1998), a security act is described as a negotiation between the audience and the securitizer. Since the securitizer itself is internally involved in the same unit as the audience, “the securitizing agent can obtain permission to override rules that would otherwise bind it”. The securitizer gains legitimacy in the sense that the situation cannot be dealt with on a regular basis, so the securitizer will override rules. In this thesis, the attempt of the securitizer to justify and legitimize the breaking free of normal democratic procedures or rules will be perceived as being step three in the process of securitization.

This is coded as such when the securitizer, in this case Trump, acts as some kind of ‘mediator’ (middle man) between the audience and the specific danger and tries to gain legitimacy by

proposing policies or measures that normally would not be accepted so easily by the people. For example, by describing the situation as being at war with Islam, since this helps in accepting the fact that being in war might require exceptional measures.

3.6 Reliability of research data

The transcripts of the speeches that have been analyzed in this thesis were obtained via reputable news sources and the transcripts of the debates have been checked by comparing them with the original video. Regarding Trump's Twitter account, I have only used those tweets that were disseminated through the official and verified account of Donald Trump: @realDonaldTrump. The archive of his tweets even includes tweets that have been deleted. This source collects his tweets several times a day, so it might be possible that a few tweets are missing, but if at all, the number is most likely very small.

Another aspect of performing a PDA that should be kept in mind is that it won't produce an universal outcome. Since a specific discourse is always occasional and topical, it isn't very likely to produce an outcome that is very generalizable (Gill, 2000). This does, however, not mean that this method will not produce a representative outcome at all. Focusing on the content of a written or spoken text can lead to far more interesting outcomes than particular quantitative research.

A question that remains, is how can one produce reliable and valid data due to a PDA? According to Gill (2000), "A discourse analysis is a careful, close reading that moves between text and context to examine the content, organization and functions of discourse (p. 187)." In the end, through a specific choice of definitions and coding discourse analysis is just one interpretation of how a text can be interpreted. The codes should therefore be as inclusive as possible and the understanding of the codes should be to point as well. (ibid., p. 189)

Chapter 4: Analysis

4.1 General description context of campaigning speeches and debates

Before analyzing the various speeches and debates, it is relevant to outline the (chronological) context. In this ‘timeline’, only the major events during Trump’s Presidential campaign will be highlighted.

The Presidential elections were held on November 8, 2016, the 58th quadrennial elections in the United States. Donald Trump officially announced his candidacy on June 16, 2015, being one of the initially seventeen Republican candidates. Six Democrats announced their candidacy. After the various state caucuses and primaries, most candidates from both parties withdrew. By March 1, 2016, Super Tuesday, the only candidates left were Donald Trump and Ted Cruz on the Republican side, and Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders for the Democrats. After Cruz also withdrew, Donald formally accepted the Republican nomination on July 21, 2017. On that day Trump held his nomination speech.

The first Presidential election debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton (who had won the Democratic nomination) took place on September 26, 2016, in Hempstead, New York. A second important debate was held on October 4, 2016, between the candidates for the vice-Presidency, Mike Pence and Tim Kaine. The second Presidential election debate was held on October 9, 2016, in St. Louis, Missouri. The final debate took place three weeks before election day at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

On November, 8, 2016, Donald Trump was elected to be the next American President. The next day, he gave another speech.

4.2 Analysis

Next, the various speeches, debates and tweets are analyzed; first, by describing their context based on some of the properties as mentioned by Van Dijk (1997), followed by looking for potential patterns in the texts by testing the hypotheses. The main research question in this thesis entails the question to what extent did Trump’s framing of Islam become a securitized topic during his campaign? The hypothesis is threefold and, according to the scholars, all three parts have to be confirmed in order to conclude that this particular topic has been securitized. If one just looks at this rather ‘thin’ definition, the three parts are all present, and therefore it could be concluded that the framing of Islam has become a securitized topic. If one looks at a more complex definition, for example by setting clear boundaries for the number (percentage) of

references to ‘emergency action’, or how many requests for a ‘justification of exceptional procedures’ are necessary, the outcome might be less convincing. On the other hand, in reference to the third hypothesis, it is not expected that asking for exceptional measures and the breaking free of normal procedures will be used very often, since it can harm the liability of a Presidential candidate, or at least put his popularity at risk.

The colors used in the following tables refer to the highlighted text that can be found in the Appendix, specifically par. 1 through 5.

4.3 Analysis of the relevant speeches

4.3a. The announcement speech, June 16, 2015

Table 1. Context of the announcement speech

Overall domain	Politics
Overall societal action	Campaigning, announcement speech
Current setting	June 16, 2016, Trump Tower, New York City
Current interaction	Speaking to the public, his (potential) voters in order to keep them as a voter or convince the potential ones.
Current discourse genre	Political speech, propaganda.
The various types of role of participants	Speaker: Presidential candidate Trump, the people as the recipients.

Table 2. Political discourse announcement speech

	Hypothesis 1	Hypothesis 2	Hypothesis 3
Number of paragraphs with a positive association to the Self	24/181 = 13.3% 24/39 = 61.5%	15/37= 40.5%	2/37 = 5.4%
Number of paragraphs with an association to terrorism without being related to Islam and/or refugees (from the Middle East) or the other way around	10/181 = 5.5%		
Number of paragraphs with a negative association to the Other	13/181 = 7.2% 13/37 = 35.1%		
Paragraphs with no specific relation to The topic of research	134/181 = 74.0%		

4.3b. The announcement speech, June 16, 2015, in relation to the hypotheses

As for the first hypothesis, Table 2 shows that candidate Trump made a positive association to the Self in 24 out of 39 paragraphs that had a relation to the topic and in which he made a

distinction between the Self and the Other. This is in stark contrast with the 35.1% of the paragraphs that had a negative association towards the Other. If one looks at the total number of paragraphs, nearly 13.5% had a positive association to the Self. Just 5.5% of the paragraphs made no specific association between terrorism and the Middle East, Islam, or its adherents. What is left, is 74.0% of the paragraphs that had no relation with the topic at all.

A clear example in the first speech that has been analyzed is the following sentence: “So ladies and gentlemen.. I am officially running... for president of the United States, and we are going to make our country great again. It can happen. Our country has tremendous potential. We have tremendous people (Trump, 2015)”

In reference to the second hypothesis; it shows that 15 out of 37 paragraphs that had a negative association to the Other are also linked to the requirement of emergency action, which is 40.6%. A Regarding the third hypothesis, this is a percentage of 5.4. This means that only 2 out of 37 paragraphs asked for the justification of exceptional measures instead of normal procedures in order to cope with the threat for survival of the Self.

An example in which both the negative association towards the other and the second hypothesis emergency action are mentioned is the following paragraph: “‘They’re building up their military to a point that is very scare. You have a problem with ISIS. You have a bigger problem with China. (Trump, 2015).” In those sentences, Trump mentioned ISIS as a problem for the US and describes the situation a something to be scared about, so it requires action.

4.3c. The acceptance speech, July 21, 2016

Table 3. Context acceptance speech

Overall domain	Politics
Overall societal action	Campaigning, accepting nomination
Current setting	July 21th 2016, Republican National Convention
Current interaction	Speaking to the public, his (potential) voters in order to keep them as a voter or convince the potential ones
Current discourse genre	Political speech, propaganda.
The various types of role of participants	Speaker: Presidential candidate Trump, the people as the recipients.

Table 4. Political discourse announcement speech

Hypothesis 1		Hypothesis 2	Hypothesis 3
Paragraphs with a positive association to the Self	14/129= 10.9% 14/34 = 41.2%	15/36 = 41.7%	3/36 = 8.3%
Paragraphs with an association to terrorism without being related to Islam and/or refugees (from the Middle East) or the other way around	6/129 = 4.7%		
Paragraphs with a negative association to the Other	20/129 = 15,5% 20/34 = 58.8%		
Paragraphs with no specific relation to the topic of research	89/129 = 69%		

4.3d. The acceptance speech, July 21, 2016, in relation to the hypotheses

As for the first hypothesis, as can be seen in Table 4 , Trump made a positive association to the Self in 14 out of 34 paragraphs that had a relation to the topic and in which he made a distinction between the Self and the Other. This is contrary to the 58.8% of paragraphs that had a negative association towards the Other. Looking at the total number of paragraphs, 10.9% had a positive association to the Self. Just 4.7% of the paragraphs had no specific association between terrorism and the Middle East, the Islam, or etc. What is left is 69% of the paragraphs that had no relation to the topic at all.

The second hypothesis shows that 15 out 36 paragraphs that had a negative association to the Other are also linked to the requirement of emergency action, which is 41.7%.

Regarding the third hypothesis, this shows a percentage of 8.3%. This means that 3 out of 36 paragraphs asked for the justification of exceptional measures instead of normal procedures in order to cope with the threat for survival of the Self.

A speaking example that shows both the negative association as the need for emergency action perfectly is the following paragraph: “To make life safe in America, we must also address the growing threats from outside the country. We are going to defeat the barbarians of ISIS. And we are going to defeat them bad (Trump, 2016)” Apparently ISIS is something that has to be defeated and are all barbarians. Action is required, because a safe life in America is being at risk. Another example that shows both the positive association as the need to break free for former normal procedures is the following paragraph: “But now, my sole and exclusive mission is to go to work for our country, to go to work for you. It is time to deliver a victory for the

American people. We don't win anymore, but we are going to start winning again. But to do that, we must break free from the petty politics of the past.(Trump, 2016)''.

4.3e. Results of the analysis of the speeches in relation to the research question

To what extent did Trump's framing of Islam and its adherents become a securitized topic, based on the results of the analysis of those two speeches? The percentage of paragraphs in which Trump made a distinction between the Self and the Other in relation to the research topic, was 13.5% and 11%, respectively – a number that cannot be neglected. What stands out are the percentages that came up as a result of the second hypothesis, 41% and 42%, respectively. This means that in at least 4 out of 10 paragraphs with a relation to Islam and its adherents, Trump linked it to the need of emergency action. Concerning the third hypothesis, with results of 5.5% and 8%, I consider these percentages as rather high, given the consideration that for politicians asking for exceptional measures going beyond the normal procedures is more often than not an exception.

Overall, I argue that all three hypotheses can be accepted, which means during the speeches Trump did securitize Islam and its adherents – if not at all, than at least to a certain extent.

4.4 Analysis of the Presidential debates

4.4a. Analysis of the first Presidential debate, September 26, 2016

Table 5. Context of the first Presidential debate, September 26, 2016

Overall domain	Politics
Overall societal action	Campaigning
Current setting	September 26, 2016, Hempstead, New York
Current interaction	Propaganda of party program and own ideas, try to infest image of the other, convince the people which are the recipients.
Current discourse genre	Election debate
The various types of role of participants	Presidential candidates Clinton (Democrat) & Trump (Republican), moderator Lest Holt,
The cognitions of the participants	Discussion of attitudes about the following issues: America's direction, achieving prosperity and securing America.

Table 6. Political discourse structures first Presidential debate, September 26, 2016

Hypothesis 1		Hypothesis 2	Hypothesis 3
Paragraphs with a positive association to the Self	7/137 = 5.1% 7/20 = 35%	8/20 = 40%	2/20 = 10%
Paragraphs with an association to terrorism without being related to Islam and/or refugees (from the Middle East) or the other way around	0		
Paragraphs with a negative association to the Other, presentation of Islam/Middle East as a danger	13/137 = 9.5 % 13/20 = 65%		
Paragraphs with no specific relation to topic of research	116/137 = 84.7%		

4.4b. First Presidential debate, September 26, 2016, in relation to the hypotheses

As for the first hypothesis, as can be seen in Table 6, Trump made a positive association to the Self in 7 out of 20 paragraphs that had a relation to the topic and in which he made a distinction between the Self and the Other. This is in clear contrast with the 65% of paragraphs that had a negative association towards the Other. Looking at the total number of paragraphs, just over 5% had a positive association to the Self. None of the paragraphs that mentioned terrorism had no specific association between terrorism and the Middle East, the Islam, or etc. What is left is a nearly 85% of paragraphs that had no relation with the topic at all.

The outcome of the second hypothesis shows that 8 out of 20 paragraphs (40%) that had a negative association to the Other are also linked to the need for emergency action. The results regarding the third hypothesis show a percentage of 10%; 2 out of 20 paragraphs asked for the justification of exceptional measures instead of normal procedures in order to cope with the threat to the survival of the Self.

In this debate, only the most exceptional example will be mentioned: “Yes, I’m very embarrassed by it. I hate it. But it’s locker room talk, and it’s one of those things. I will knock the hell out of ISIS. We’re going to defeat ISIS. ISIS happened a number of years ago in a vacuum that was left because of bad judgement. And I will tell you, I will take care of ISIS.” In this example is it obvious that he made a negative association, but he also used words like knock the hell out of ISIS, that I would not count as normal procedures.

4.4c. Analysis of the second Presidential debate, October 9, 2016

Table 7. Context second Presidential debate, October 9, 2016

Overall domain	Politics
Overall societal action	Campaigning
Current setting	October 9 th 2016, St. Louis, Missouri
Current interaction	Propaganda of party program and own ideas, try to infest image of the other, convince the people which are the recipients.
Current discourse genre	Election debate
The various types of role of participants	Presidential candidates Clinton (Democrat) & Trump (Republican), moderators Martha Raddatz & Anderson Cooper
The cognitions of the participants	Discussion of attitudes about the following issues: Trump tape and Clinton's email, affordable care act, Islamophobia and Syrian refugees, Wikileaks and taxes, Syria, leadership, the Supreme Court and energy policy.

Table 8. Political discourse structures second Presidential debate, October 9, 2016

	Hypothesis 1	Hypothesis 2	Hypothesis 3
Paragraphs with positive association to the Self	4/166 = 2.4% 4/35 = 11%	17/35 = 48.6%	2/35 = 5.7%
Paragraphs with association to terrorism without being related to islam/refugees (from Middle East) or the other way around	0.0%		
Paragraphs with negative association to the Other, presentation of the Islam/Middle East as a danger	31/166 = 18.7% 31/35 = nearly 89%		
Paragraphs with no specific relation to topic of research	131/166 = 79%		

4.4.d. Second Presidential debate, October 9, 2016, in relation to the hypotheses

Regarding the outcome of the first hypothesis, as can be seen in Table 8, Trump made a positive association to the Self in 4 out of 35 of the paragraphs that had a relation to the topic and in which he made a distinction between the Self and the Other. This is in stark contrast with the nearly 89% of paragraphs that had a negative association towards the Other. If one looks at the

total number of paragraphs, 2.4% had a positive association to the Self. Non of the paragraphs in which terrorism was mentioned, had no specific association between terrorism and the Middle East, the Islam, or its adherents. This means that all the paragraphs in which terrorism was mentioned were related to the Islam or its adherents. What is left is a nearly 79% of the paragraphs that had no relation with the topic at all.

The results of the second hypothesis show that 17 out of 37 paragraphs that had a negative association to the Other are also linked to the requirement of emergency action, which is 48.6%. The outcome of the third hypothesis shows a percentage of nearly 5.7%. This means that 2 out of 35, nearly 6% of the paragraphs asked for the justification of exceptional measures instead of normal procedures in order to cope with the threat to the survival of the Self.

4.4e. Analysis of the third Presidential debate, October 19, 2016

Table 9. Context of the third Presidential debate, October 19, 2016

Overall domain	Politics
Overall societal action	Campaigning
Current setting	October 19 th 2016, Paradise, Nevada
Current interaction	Propaganda of party program and own ideas, try to infest image of the other, convince the people which are the recipients.
Current discourse genre	Election debate
The various types of role of participants	Presidential candidates Clinton (Democrat) & Trump (Republican), moderator Chris Wallace.
The cognitions of the participants	Discussion of attitudes about the following issues: debt and entitlements, immigration, economy, Supreme Court, foreign hot spots and fitness to be President.

Table 10. Political discourse structures third Presidential debate, October 19, 2016

	Hypothesis 1	Hypothesis 2	Hypothesis 3
Paragraphs with positive association to the Self	3/195 = 1.5 % 3/35 = over 8.5%	15/35= 42.9%	0/35= 0%
Paragraphs with association to terrorism without being related to islam/refugees (from Middle East) or the other way around	2/195 = 1%		
Paragraphs with negative association to the Other, presentation of the Islam/Middle East as a danger	32/195 = 16.4% 32/35= 91.4%		
Paragraphs with no specific relation to topic of research	158/195 = 81%		

4.4f. Results of the third Presidential debate, October 19, in relation to the hypotheses

As for the first hypothesis, as can be seen in table 10, Trump made a positive association to the Self in only 3/35 paragraphs that had a relation to the topic and in which he made a distinction between the Self and the Other. This is the opposite of the 91.4% of paragraphs that had a negative association towards the Other. If you look at the total amount of paragraphs, 1,5% had a positive association to the Self. Only a bit more than 1% of the paragraphs had no specific association between terrorism and the Middle East, the Islam, or etc. What is left is a 81% of paragraphs that had no relation with the topic at all.

The second hypothesis shows that 15/35 paragraphs that had a negative association to the Other are also linked to the requirement of emergency action, which is 42.9%.

A notable outcome here is the outcome of the third hypothesis, which shows us a percentage of zero. This means that no single paragraph asked for the justification of exception measures instead of normal procedures in order to cope with the threat for survival of the Self. An example here is the following: “And frankly, when you look at her real record, take a look at Syria. Take a look at the migration. Take a look at Libya. Take a look at Iraq. She gave us ISIS, because her and Obama created this huge vacuum, and a small group came out of that huge vacuum because when — we should never have been in Iraq, but once we were there, we should have never got out the way they wanted to get out. She gave us ISIS as sure as you are sitting there. And what happened is now ISIS is in 32 countries. And now I listen how she’s going to get rid of ISIS. She’s going to get rid of nobody (Trump, 2016).”

4.4g. Results of the analysis of the Presidential debates in relation to the research question

To what extent did Donald Trump's framing of Islam and its adherents become a securitized topic, based on those two speeches? The percentages of paragraphs in which Trump made a distinction between the Self and the Other in relation to the topic of research and framed the Other in a negative way, was 65%, 89% and 91%, respectively. Those percentages are significant. The percentages that came up as related to the second hypothesis, 40%, 49% and 43%, respectively, is kind of consistent through all different debates. This means that in at least 4 out of 10 paragraphs with a relation to Islam and its adherents, Trump linked it to the need for emergency action. Concerning the third hypothesis, with an outcome of 10%, 6% and 0%, respectively, it can be concluded that the outcome is less consistent. However, these percentages, in particular those referring to the first two debates, cannot be neglected since these percentages are relevant. The non-presence of the element of the third hypothesis might be explained by the fact that asking for a justification of the breaking free of normal procedures might be deemed too risky so close to the election date.

To sum up, in the three Presidential that have been analyzed, all three elements of the securitization theory are present.

4.5 Analysis of Donald Trump's Twitter account

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the words used in order to find relevant tweets for the analysis are: 'Islam', 'Terrorism', 'Terrorist', 'Terror', 'War on Terror', 'Middle East', 'Radical Islam', 'ISIS', 'Radical Islamic Terrorism', 'Radical Islamic Terrorist', 'Radical Islamic Terrorists', and 'Muslims'. The total number of tweets during the research period is 7.803. The number of relevant tweets derived from the database is 176. After corrections, deleting all the tweets that were mentioned more than once, 156 tweets were left for the analysis. The words 'Islam' and 'Radical Islamic Terrorism' are no longer included, in the sense that all the tweets were mentioned before that came with those two terms. For example Islam as a word on its own never occurred without being linked to another word combination as well.

Different color codes have been used in order to highlight the various elements of the hypotheses. The table below shows the outcome of the analysis, which can be found in paragraph 4 of the Appendix: Twitter analysis between 15-06-2015 and 08-11-2017. I began with testing the first hypothesis in order to find if Trump made a distinction between the Self and the Other and in particular if he presented the Other with a negative association. Next, the second hypothesis was tested by looking at the use of rhetoric that contributes to the need for emergency action. Finally, in relation to the third hypothesis, it was checked whether or not

Donald Trump described the need for exceptional measures that in another situation might not have been accepted by the people.

For me, the most outstanding examples can be found in the tweets, for example the following two tweets: “Eight Syrians were just caught on the southern border trying to get into the U.S. ISIS maybe? I told you so. WE NEED A BIG & BEAUTIFUL WALL!,11-19-2015 13:11:49” and “In my speech on protecting America I spoke about a temporary ban which includes suspending immigration from nations tied to Islamic terror.,06-13-2016 21:10:26”. Both tweets present a negative association towards the Islam or its adherents and require a justification of the breaking free of normal procedures. It seems that the language used in tweets is more explicit than in some types of communication.

Table 11. Results of the Twitter analysis

Hypothesis 1		Hypothesis 2	Hypothesis 3
Paragraphs with a positive association to the Self	10/156= 6.4% 10/143= 7%	51/133 = 38.3%	8/133= 6%
Paragraphs with an association to terrorism/etc without being related to islam/refugees from Middle East	14/156= 9%		
Paragraphs with a negative association to the Other	133/156= 85.3% 133/143= 93%		
Paragraphs with no specific relation to topic of research	5/156= 3.2%		

4.5a. Analysis of tweets in relation to Hypothesis 1

As can be seen in Table 11, 10 out 156 tweets have a positive association to the Self, whereas 14 out of 156 (9%) have an association to terrorism without being related to the Islam, etc., and 133 out of 156 (85.3%) tweets have a negative association towards the Other; only 5 tweets have no specific relation to the topic of research. This means that candidate Trump made a distinction between the Self and the Other in 143 of 156 tweets, which is 91.7%. In light of those results, I consider this hypothesis to be approved: Trump had an Islamophobic point of view regarding terrorism by presenting the Islam and its adherents as an existential threat to the survival of ‘the Self’ as the referent object. The Other is presented as a (potential) danger for the referent object in 133 out of 156 paragraphs, which is nearly 85.3%.

4.5b. Analysis of tweets in relation to Hypothesis 2

As can be seen in Table 11, 51 out of 156 tweets had an Islamophobic point of view regarding terrorism, by presenting the Islam and its adherents as an issue that requires emergency action to protect ‘the Self’. This means that more or less one third of all the tweets include a reference to the need of (emergency) action in the current situation. I would consider 38.8% as a significant percentage and in that sense this hypothesis to be approved.

4.5c. Analysis of tweets in relation to Hypothesis 3

According to the analysis, as presented in Table 11, Trump had an Islamophobic point of view regarding terrorism by presenting the Islam and its adherents as an issue that justifies and legitimizes the breaking free of normal democratic procedures in 8 out of a total of 156 tweets that were relevant for this research; in other words, in 5,1% of the tweets (seem to) call for the need and justification of exceptional procedures or policies.

Given this rather low percentage, it is doubtful to approve this hypothesis. On the other hand, it can be argued that the breaking free of normal procedures is an exceptional measure in itself. If a politician constantly asks for the justification of the breaking free of normal procedures, the audience might become suspicious. In that sense it can be seen as a strategy to keep the amount of comments that entails such a distinct opinion low. Since this hypothesis is just a smaller part of the securitization theory and in that sense mainly a requirement that has to be present in order to decide whether or not a topic is being securitized, a lower percentage on this specific hypothesis might be sufficient to approve this hypothesis.

4.5d. Results of the analysis of Trump’s Twitter account in relation to the research question

What can be concluded is that in the tweets that were analyzed in this thesis, Donald Trump did frame Islam in a particular way, resulting in a securitization of this topic, at least to a certain extent. The results regarding the first two hypotheses are convincing, and the rather low percentage relating to the third hypothesis can simply be explained. To sum up, based on the tweets that are analyzed in this research, Presidential candidate Donald Trump definitely did use Islam as a securitized topic.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

5.1 Summary of the main findings

The analysis in this research is based on a political discourse analysis, with a specific focus on whether or not a securitization of Islam and its adherents as ‘the Other’ can be seen as being present. By using the theory of securitization and by formulating three hypotheses, I’ve tried to answer the main research question:

To what extent did candidate Donald Trump’s framing of Islam and its adherents become a securitized topic during the Presidential campaign of 2016?

The hypotheses that have been tested in this thesis are all based on necessary elements of the securitization theory. Issues are framed in such a way, referred to as a speech act, that only that particular frame is promoted and in the end can become internalized. The necessary elements were tested by looking at whether or not Presidential candidate Donald Trump made a distinction between the Self and the Other, in which the Other was referred to with a negative connotation. The second relevant element entails the question of whether or not Trump called for the need for emergency action, for example by warning for the dangers of sticking to status quo in the United States, by calling out the failing policies of former administrations and political actors – essentially, by asking the audience to wake up. The last element of the securitization theory deals with asking for a justification of the breaking-free of normal procedures, with the question of whether or not Trump referred to such serious dangers that require the acceptance of exceptional measures, going beyond the normal.

The analysis itself was performed by using three forms of political communication: speeches, debates, and tweets. A first noteworthy result of the analysis is the high percentage of paragraphs and tweets containing a negative connotation towards the Other. These percentages vary from 35% up to 93%, highly significant percentages. In addition, around 40% of the highlighted paragraphs in which Donald Trump made a distinction between the Self and the Other, also included a clear call for emergency action. The third hypothesis, finally, showed, except for one debate, percentages of at least 5.5% of the paragraphs or tweets. This percentage can be considered to be significant, because the element derived from the securitization theory and included in the third hypothesis might be deemed to be too risky (in a political sense) to

bring up close to the election date. Therefore, I would argue that it seems logical that the percentages on this hypothesis are somewhat lower.

Overall, it can be concluded that Presidential candidate Donald Trump definitely did securitize Islam and its adherents to a large extent during his Presidential campaign of 2015-2016.

5.2 Reflection

The theory that has been used for this thesis, the so-called securitization theory, has been criticized by some scholars, for instance for the fact that the definition of the concept of security can be extended (too much); many topics can be categorized as a security issue. However, this critique isn't really applicable to this thesis, since the topic that was central in this research is related to terrorism, a clear and uncontested example of a security issue.

Another point of critique appealing to me is a normative one, in the words of Wendt described as 'Security is what an agent makes of it'. The securitization theory is (too) dependent on the definition of security, because in the end an agent (for example, the author of this thesis) is able to even frame this in such a way that it can be helpful for his/her own (political) means. This potential weakness of the securitization theory can be partly solved, however, by using proper and widely accepted definitions.

The method that has been used in this research also has its flaws. The personal interpretation of the one doing the coding, can always be questioned. The reliability of the results can be improved, however, by using more people doing the coding. Doing so, the outcome will be less subjective and therefore the reliability will increase. If other coders would have read the same speeches, debates and tweets, and would have coded it the same way as has been done in this thesis, the conclusion would arguably be that this kind of research can be reproduced. The (potential) subjectivity of this thesis has been reduced, however, by using a rather comprehensive operationalization of the concepts and elements that are being measured.

Another limitation of this research method, already mentioned in Chapter 3, is the fact that some scholars argue that "the political arena is a social construction that can't be delimited". (Fairclough, 2006, p. 33) This thesis has indeed focused on a delimited discourse of only one Presidential candidate, but broadening the amount of data might be an achievable goal for further research.

The findings can be helpful for research in the future; for example, if scholars want to compare it over time or making a comparison between several (Presidential) candidates. In addition, it can serve as an example for other issues that are (potentially) being securitized. Obviously, the outcome would be more valid if more speeches, debates or tweets (or other forms of political

communication, like interviews) would have been analyzed. Nevertheless, this thesis is based on a relevant selection of data.

Being aware of the fact that issues such as the Islam are being securitized, at least to a certain extent, can be helpful for the audience in order to form a more honest opinion about information that is spread by political actors or the media; in particular in light of the recently growing importance of ‘fake news’. Not just journalists disseminate information which is not true meant to influence public opinion, politicians do this as well in order to strengthen their own position or policies.

References

- Abdelkader, E. (2016). When Islamophobia turns violent: the 2016 US presidential elections.
- Abdullah, S., & Elareshi, M. (2015). Building Narratives: A Study of Terrorism Framing by Al Jazeera and Al Arabiya TV Networks. *Arab Media & Society*, 21, 1-14.
- Balzacq, T. (2005). The three faces of securitization: Political agency, audience and context. *European journal of international relations*, 11(2), 171-201.
- Balzacq, T. (2009). Constructivism and securitization studies. In C.M. Dunn & V. Mauer, *The Routledge handbook of security studies*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Bannon, S. (2014, July). Skype-conversation at conference at the Vatican. Retrieved from: <http://the-american-catholic.com/2016/11/18/remarks-of-stephen-bannon-at-a-conference-at-the-vatican/>
- Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual review of sociology*, 26(1), 611-639.
- Bergoglio, J. M. (Pope Francis). (2017, February 10). Message of his holiness pope Francis on the occasion of the world meetings of popular movements in Modestp (California). Retrieved from: http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/messages/pont-messages/2017/documents/papa-francesco_20170210_movimenti-popolari-modesto.html
- Bush, G. W. (2001). Transcript of Adress to a joint session of Congress and the American people. Retrieved from: <https://2001-2009.state.gov/coalition/cr/rm/2001/5025.htm>
- Buzan, B., Wæver, O., & De Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: a new framework for analysis*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Buzan, B., Waever, O. (2003). *Regions and powers: the structure of international security* (Vol. 91). Cambridge University Press.
- Cabili, D. M. (2011). *Islamophobia in America*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of South Florida St. Petersburg.
- Callaghan, K., & Schnell, F. (2005). *Framing american politics*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Campbell, J. E. (2008). *The American campaign: US presidential campaigns and the national vote*. Texas A&M University Press.

Cap, P. (2013). *Legitimisation in Political Discourse: A Cross-Disciplinary Perspective on the Modern US War Rhetoric Second Edition*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.

Croft, S. (2012). A post-Copenhagen securitization theory. In *Securitizing Islam: Identity and the Search for Security* (pp. 73-109). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cronick, K. (2002). The discourse of President George W. Bush and Osama Bin Laden: A rhetorical analysis and hermeneutic interpretation. In *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research* (Vol. 3, No. 3).

Cronin, A. K. (2015). ISIS is not a terrorist group: Why counterterrorism won't stop the latest jihadist threat. *Foreign Affairs*, 94, 2, p.6.

Dardis, F. E. (2007). The role of issue-framing functions in affecting beliefs and opinions about a sociopolitical issue. *Communication Quarterly*, 55(2), 247-265.

DelReal, J. A. (19 September 2016). Trump blames Clinton's 'weakness' for attacks. *The Washington post*. Retrieved from:

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2016/09/19/trump-blames-clintons-weakness-for-attacks/?utm_term=.72b692454819https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2016/09/19/trump-blames-clintons-weakness-for-attacks/?utm_term=.72b692454819

EMISCO (European Muslim Initiative for Social Cohesion). (2016, October 8). *A proposed Definition of Islamophobia*. Retrieved from: <https://www.emisco.eu/a-proposed-definition-of-islamophobia/>

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of communication*, 43(4), 51-58.

Fairclough, N. (2006). *Genres in political discourse*. Ed. By Keith Brown. Boston: Elsevier.

Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2013). *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. Routledge.

Feddersen, A. (2015). Same but different: Muslims and foreigners in public media discourse. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 21(2), 287-301.

Feldman, N. (2010, September 3). *How different is Obama from Bush on Terrorism?* Retrieved from: <http://foreignpolicy.com/2010/09/03/how-different-is-obama-from-bush-on-terrorism/>

Fierke, K.M. (2013). Constructivism. In T. Dunne, M. Kurki & S. Smith (Eds.), *International Relations Theories* (pp. 187-204). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fox, J., & Akbaba, Y. (2015). Securitization of Islam and religious discrimination: Religious minorities in Western democracies, 1990–2008. *Comparative European Politics*, 13(2), 175-197.

Gill, R. (2000). Discourse analysis. *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound*, 172-190.

Gillombardo, T. C. (2016). Bush, Obama, and Terrorism: A New Framework for Analyzing Threat Response Rhetoric.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hofstee, G. (2014, September 12). *De IS vs al-Qaeda; de strijd om jihadistisch leiderschap*. Retrieved from: <http://defusie.net/vs-al-qaeda-de-strijd-om-jihadistisch-leiderschap/>

Holley, P. (2017, March 1). ‘Radical Islamic terrorism’: Three words that separate Trump from most of Washington. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2017/02/28/radical-islamic-terrorism-three-words-that-separate-trump-from-most-of-washington/?utm_term=.f5487f1ab7d3

Huysmans, J. (1998). Discussing and Writing about Security: The Normative Dilemma of Security Studies. *Cultures & Conflits*, (3), 9-9.

Iyengar, S. (2005, November). Speaking of values: The framing of American politics. In *The Forum*, (Vol. 3, No. 3).

Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Sage.

Kellner, D. (2007). *Bushspeak and the politics of lying: presidential rhetoric in the “war on terror”*. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 37(4), 622-645.

Kerry, J. (2016, July 21). Press Availability after the Counter-ISIL Ministerial Meeting. Retrieved from: <https://fr.usembassy.gov/press-availability-counter-isil-ministerial-meeting/>

Kirk, M., Wiser, M., Bennett, P. & Wiser, M. (2017). *Bannon’s War [documentary]*. United States. WHBH Educational Foundation.

Klar, S., Robison, J., & Druckman, J. N. (2013). Political dynamics of framing. *New directions in media and politics*, 173-192.

Lakoff, G. (2006). Simple framing. *Rockridge Institute*, 14.

Lakoff, G. (2010). Why it matters how we frame the environment. *Environmental Communication*, 4(1), 70-81.

Lebow, R. N. (1988). Interdisciplinary Research and the Future of Peace and Security Studies. *Political Psychology*, 507-525.

Mcclay, R. (2017) *Us and Them: A Descriptive analysis of Donald Trump’s campaign speeches*. (Master thesis). Retrieved from:
<https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/appliedlinguistics/McClay2017.Trump-Speech-Discourse-Analysis.pdf>

McDonald, M. (2008). Securitization and the Construction of Security. *European journal of international relations*, 14(4), 563-587.

Metropolitan Police. (2017, March 22). *Incident in #Westminster: We are treating this as a terrorist incident until we know otherwise*. [Tweet]. Retrieved from:
<https://twitter.com/metpoliceuk/status/844572599342518273>

Mr Infidel esquire. (2017, March 22). *@jesuiscanard obviously lying in bed with the enemy doesn't help much does it??*. [Tweet]. Retrieved from:
<https://twitter.com/metpoliceuk/status/844572599342518273>

Mythen, G., Walklate, S., & Khan, F. (2009). ‘I’m a Muslim, but I’m Not a Terrorist’: *Victimization, Risky Identities and the Performance of Safety*. *British Journal of Criminology*, 49(6), 736-754.

- Norris, P., Kern, M., & Just, M. (2004). *Framing Terrorism: The News Media, the Government and the Public*. Psychology Press.
- Obama, B. (2007, February 10). Transcript of Obama's campaign speech. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2007/feb/10/barackobama>
- Özcan, S. (2013). Securitization of energy through the lenses of Copenhagen School.
- Pluwak, A. (2011). The linguistic aspect of strategic framing in modern political campaigns. *Cognitive Studies/ Études cognitives*, (11).
- Poland, B., & Pederson, A. (1998). Reading between the lines: Interpreting silences in qualitative research. *Qualitative inquiry*, 4(2), 293-312.
- Reese, S. D., Gandy Jr, O. H., Gandy Jr, O. H., & Grant, A. E. (Eds.). (2001). *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world*. Routledge.
- Reese, S. D., & Lewis, S. C. (2009). *Framing the war on terror: The internalization of policy in the US press*. *Journalism*, 10(6), 777-797.
- Roe, P. (2012). Is securitization a 'negative' concept? Revisiting the normative debate over normal versus extraordinary politics. *Security Dialogue*, 43(3), 249-266.
- Sheridan, L. P. (2006). Islamophobia pre-and post-September 11th, 2001. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 21(3), 317-336.
- Steinsson, S. (2014, June 22). Is Terrorism an effective way to attain political goals? Retrieved from: <http://www.e-ir.info/2014/06/22/is-terrorism-an-effective-way-to-attain-political-goals/>
- Stritzel, H. (2014). *Security in Translation: Securitization Theory and the Localization of Threat*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sunier, T. (2014). Domesticating Islam: exploring academic knowledge production on Islam and Muslims in European societies. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37(6), 1138-1155.
- Tankard, J. W., Jr. (2001). The empirical approach to the study of media framing. In S. D. Reese, O. H. Gandy Jr., & A. E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Taureck, R. (2006). Securitization theory and securitization studies. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 9(1), 53-61.

Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R. & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London: SAGE Publications

Trump, D. (2015a, June 15) Presidential Announcement speech for the Republican Nomination.

Trump, D. (2016a, July 21) Acceptance Speech at the Republican National Convention.

Trump, D. (2015b, October 3). Trump's repeated claim that Obama is accepting 200.000 Syrian Refugees. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from:

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2015/10/08/trumps-repeated-claim-that-obama-is-accepting-200000-syrian-refugees/>

Trump, D. (2016b, August 15). Ohio Speech on Immigration and Terrorism. Retrieved from:

<http://time.com/4453110/donald-trump-national-security-immigration-terrorism-speech/>

Trump, D. (2016c, June 13). Donald Trump hint that Barack Obama may be connected to Orlando gay nightclub shooting. Retrieved from:

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/orlando-nightclub-shooting-donald-trump-barack-obama-involved-a7079836.html>

Trump, D. (2017a, March 7). Terrorism's Terminology. "Radical Islamic Terrorism" Won't suffice. *Foreign Affairs*. Retrieved from:

<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2017-03-07/terrorisms-terminology>

Trump, D. (2017b, January 27). Executive Order Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States. Retrieved from: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states/>

Trump, D. (2017c, June 3). *We need to be smart, vigilant and tough. We need the courts to give us back our rights. We need the Travel Ban as an extra level of safety!* [Tweet]. Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/871143765473406976>

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *What is political discourse analysis*. *Belgian journal of linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2002). *Political discourse and political cognition*. *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse*, 203.

Vultee, F. (2010). Securitization: A new approach to the framing of the “war on terror”. *Journalism practice*, 4(1), 33-47.

Wæver, O. (1995). Securitization and Desecuritization. In R. D. Lipschutz (Ed.), *On Security* (Chapter 3, pp. 46-87). Columbia University Press.

Wilkinson, C. (2007). The Copenhagen School on tour in Kyrgyzstan: Is securitization theory useable outside Europe?. *Security dialogue*, 38(1), 5-25.

Williams, M. C. (2003). Words, images, enemies: Securitization and international politics. *International studies quarterly*, 47(4), 511-531.

Winkler, C. K. (2012). *In the name of terrorism: Presidents on political violence in the post-World War II era*. SUNY Press.

Wodak, R., & de Cillia, R. (2006). *Politics and language—overview*. Vol. 9, ed. By Keith Brown, 707-717. Boston.

Appendix

1. Transcript presidential announcement speech, July 15th 2015

1. Wow. Whoa. That is some group of people. Thousands.
2. So nice, thank you very much. That's really nice. Thank you. It's great to be at Trump Tower. It's great to be in a wonderful city, New York. And it's an honor to have everybody here. This is beyond anybody's expectations. There's been no crowd like this.
3. And, I can tell, some of the candidates, they went in. They didn't know the air-conditioner didn't work. They sweated like dogs.
4. They didn't know the room was too big, because they didn't have anybody there. How are they going to beat ISIS? I don't think it's gonna happen.
5. Our country is in serious trouble. We don't have victories anymore. We used to have victories, but we don't have them. When was the last time anybody saw us beating, let's say, China in a trade deal? They kill us. I beat China all the time. All the time.
6. When did we beat Japan at anything? They send their cars over by the millions, and what do we do? When was the last time you saw a Chevrolet in Tokyo? It doesn't exist, folks. They beat us all the time.
7. When do we beat Mexico at the border? They're laughing at us, at our stupidity. And now they are beating us economically. They are not our friend, believe me. But they're killing us economically.
8. The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems.
9. Thank you. It's true, and these are the best and the finest. When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people.
10. But I speak to border guards and they tell us what we're getting. And it only makes common sense. It only makes common sense. They're sending us not the right people.
11. It's coming from more than Mexico. It's coming from all over South and Latin America, and it's coming probably— probably— from the Middle East. But we don't know. Because we have no protection and we have no competence, we don't know what's happening. And it's got to stop and it's got to stop fast.
12. Islamic terrorism is eating up large portions of the Middle East. They've become rich. I'm in competition with them.
13. They just built a hotel in Syria. Can you believe this? They built a hotel. When I have to build a hotel, I pay interest. They don't have to pay interest, because they took the oil that, when we left Iraq, I said we should've taken.
14. So now ISIS has the oil, and what they don't have, Iran has. And in 19— and I will tell you this, and I said it very strongly, years ago, I said— and I love the military, and I want to have the strongest military that we've ever had, and we need it more now than ever. But I said, "Don't hit Iraq," because you're going to totally destabilize the Middle East. Iran is going to take over the Middle East, Iran and somebody else will get the oil, and it turned out that Iran is now taking over Iraq. Think of it. Iran is taking over Iraq, and they're taking it over big league.
15. We spent \$2 trillion in Iraq, \$2 trillion. We lost thousands of lives, thousands in Iraq. We have wounded soldiers, who I love, I love — they're great — all over the place, thousands and thousands of wounded soldiers.
16. And we have nothing. We can't even go there. We have nothing. And every time we give Iraq equipment, the first time a bullet goes off in the air, they leave it.
17. Last week, I read 2,300 Humvees— these are big vehicles— were left behind for the enemy. 2,000? You would say maybe two, maybe four? 2,300 sophisticated vehicles, they ran, and the enemy took them.
18. Last quarter, it was just announced our gross domestic product— a sign of strength, right? But not for us. It was below zero. Whoever heard of this? It's never below zero.
19. Our labor participation rate was the worst since 1978. But think of it, GDP below zero, horrible labor participation rate.
20. And our real unemployment is anywhere from 18 to 20 percent. Don't believe the 5.6. Don't believe it.
21. That's right. A lot of people up there can't get jobs. They can't get jobs, because there are no jobs, because China has our jobs and Mexico has our jobs. They all have jobs.

22. But the real number, the real number is anywhere from 18 to 19 and maybe even 21 percent, and nobody talks about it, because it's a statistic that's full of nonsense.
23. Our enemies are getting stronger and stronger by the way, and we as a country are getting weaker. Even our nuclear arsenal doesn't work.
24. It came out recently they have equipment that is 30 years old. They don't know if it worked. And I thought it was horrible when it was broadcast on television, because boy, does that send signals to Putin and all of the other people that look at us and they say, "That is a group of people, and that is a nation that truly has no clue. They don't know what they're doing. They don't know what they're doing."
25. We have a disaster called the big lie: Obamacare. Obamacare.
26. Yesterday, it came out that costs are going for people up 29, 39, 49, and even 55 percent, and deductibles are through the roof. You have to be hit by a tractor, literally, a tractor, to use it, because the deductibles are so high, it's virtually useless. It's virtually useless. It is a disaster.
27. And remember the \$5 billion website? \$5 billion we spent on a website, and to this day it doesn't work. A \$5 billion website.
28. I have so many websites, I have them all over the place. I hire people, they do a website. It costs me \$3. \$5 billion website.
29. Well, you need somebody, because politicians are all talk, no action. Nothing's gonna get done. They will not bring us— believe me— to the promised land. They will not.
30. As an example, I've been on the circuit making speeches, and I hear my fellow Republicans. And they're wonderful people. I like them. They all want me to support them. They don't know how to bring it about. They come up to my office. I'm meeting with three of them in the next week. And they don't know— "Are you running? Are you not running? Could we have your support? What do we do? How do we do it?"
31. I like them. And I hear their speeches. And they don't talk jobs and they don't talk China. When was the last time you heard China is killing us? They're devaluing their currency to a level that you wouldn't believe. It makes it impossible for our companies to compete, impossible. They're killing us.
32. But you don't hear that from anybody else. You don't hear it from anybody else. And I watch the speeches.
33. I watch the speeches of these people, and they say the sun will rise, the moon will set, all sorts of wonderful things will happen. And people are saying, "What's going on? I just want a job. Just get me a job. I don't need the rhetoric. I want a job."
34. And that's what's happening. And it's going to get worse, because remember, Obamacare really kicks in in '16, 2016. Obama is going to be out playing golf. He might be on one of my courses. I would invite him, I actually would say. I have the best courses in the world, so I'd say, you what, if he wants to— I have one right next to the White House, right on the Potomac. If he'd like to play, that's fine.
35. In fact, I'd love him to leave early and play, that would be a very good thing.
36. But Obamacare kicks in in 2016. Really big league. It is going to be amazingly destructive. Doctors are quitting. I have a friend who's a doctor, and he said to me the other day, "Donald, I never saw anything like it. I have more accountants than I have nurses. It's a disaster. My patients are beside themselves. They had a plan that was good. They have no plan now."
37. We have to repeal Obamacare, and it can be— and— and it can be replaced with something much better for everybody. Let it be for everybody. But much better and much less expensive for people and for the government. And we can do it.
38. So I've watched the politicians. I've dealt with them all my life. If you can't make a good deal with a politician, then there's something wrong with you. You're certainly not very good. And that's what we have representing us. They will never make America great again. They don't even have a chance. They're controlled fully— they're controlled fully by the lobbyists, by the donors, and by the special interests, fully.
39. Yes, they control them. Hey, I have lobbyists. I have to tell you. I have lobbyists that can produce anything for me. They're great. But you know what? it won't happen. It won't happen. Because we have to stop doing things for some people, but for this country, it's destroying our country. We have to stop, and it has to stop now.
40. Now, our country needs— our country needs a truly great leader, and we need a truly great leader now. We need a leader that wrote "The Art of the Deal."
41. We need a leader that can bring back our jobs, can bring back our manufacturing, can bring back our military, can take care of our vets. Our vets have been abandoned. And we also need a cheerleader.

42. You know, when President Obama was elected, I said, “Well, the one thing, I think he’ll do well. I think he’ll be a great cheerleader for the country. I think he’d be a great spirit.” He was vibrant. He was young. I really thought that he would be a great cheerleader.
43. He’s not a leader. That’s true. You’re right about that. But he wasn’t a cheerleader. He’s actually a negative force. He’s been a negative force. He wasn’t a cheerleader; he was the opposite.
44. We need somebody that can take the brand of the United States and make it great again. It’s not great again.
45. We need— we need somebody— we need somebody that literally will take this country and make it great again. We can do that.
46. And, I will tell you, I love my life. I have a wonderful family. They’re saying, “Dad, you’re going to do something that’s going to be so tough.”
47. You know, all of my life, I’ve heard that a truly successful person, a really, really successful person and even modestly successful cannot run for public office. Just can’t happen. And yet that’s the kind of mindset that you need to make this country great again.
48. So ladies and gentlemen...I am officially running... for president of the United States, and we are going to make our country great again. It can happen. Our country has tremendous potential. We have tremendous people.
49. We have people that aren’t working. We have people that have no incentive to work. But they’re going to have incentive to work, because the greatest social program is a job. And they’ll be proud, and they’ll love it, and they’ll make much more than they would’ve ever made, and they’ll be— they’ll be doing so well, and we’re going to be thriving as a country, thriving. It can happen.
50. I will be the greatest jobs president that God ever created. I tell you that.
51. I’ll bring back our jobs from China, from Mexico, from Japan, from so many places. I’ll bring back our jobs, and I’ll bring back our money.
52. Right now, think of this: We owe China \$1.3 trillion. We owe Japan more than that. So they come in, they take our jobs, they take our money, and then they loan us back the money, and we pay them in interest, and then the dollar goes up so their deal’s even better.
53. How stupid are our leaders? How stupid are these politicians to allow this to happen? How stupid are they?
54. I’m going to tell you— thank you. I’m going to tell you a couple of stories about trade, because I’m totally against the trade bill for a number of reasons.
55. Number one, the people negotiating don’t have a clue. Our president doesn’t have a clue. He’s a bad negotiator.
56. He’s the one that did Bergdahl. We get Bergdahl, they get five killer terrorists that everybody wanted over there.
57. We get Bergdahl. We get a traitor. We get a no-good traitor, and they get the five people that they wanted for years, and those people are now back on the battlefield trying to kill us. That’s the negotiator we have.
58. Take a look at the deal he’s making with Iran. He makes that deal, Israel maybe won’t exist very long. It’s a disaster, and we have to protect Israel. But...
59. So we need people— I’m a free trader. But the problem with free trade is you need really talented people to negotiate for you. If you don’t have talented people, if you don’t have great leadership, if you don’t have people that know business, not just a political hack that got the job because he made a contribution to a campaign, which is the way all jobs, just about, are gotten, free trade terrible.
60. Free trade can be wonderful if you have smart people, but we have people that are stupid. We have people that aren’t smart. And we have people that are controlled by special interests. And it’s just not going to work.
61. So, here’s a couple of stories happened recently. A friend of mine is a great manufacturer. And, you know, China comes over and they dump all their stuff, and I buy it. I buy it, because, frankly, I have an obligation to buy it, because they devalue their currency so brilliantly, they just did it recently, and nobody thought they could do it again.
62. But with all our problems with Russia, with all our problems with everything— everything, they got away with it again. And it’s impossible for our people here to compete.
63. So I want to tell you this story. A friend of mine who’s a great manufacturer, calls me up a few weeks ago. He’s very upset. I said, “What’s your problem?”
64. He said, “You know, I make great product.”
65. And I said, “I know. I know that because I buy the product.”
66. He said, “I can’t get it into China. They won’t accept it. I sent a boat over and they actually sent it back. They talked about environmental, they talked about all sorts of crap that had nothing to do with it.”

67. I said, “Oh, wait a minute, that’s terrible. Does anyone know this?”
68. He said, “Yeah, they do it all the time with other people.”
69. I said, “They send it back?”
70. “Yeah. So I finally got it over there and they charged me a big tariff. They’re not supposed to be doing that. I told them.”
71. Now, they do charge you tariff on trucks, when we send trucks and other things over there.
72. Ask Boeing. They wanted Boeing’s secrets. They wanted their patents and all their secrets before they agreed to buy planes from Boeing.
73. Hey, I’m not saying they’re stupid. I like China. I sell apartments for— I just sold an apartment for \$15 million to somebody from China. Am I supposed to dislike them? I own a big chunk of the Bank of America Building at 1290 Avenue of the Americas, that I got from China in a war. Very valuable.
74. I love China. The biggest bank in the world is from China. You know where their United States headquarters is located? In this building, in Trump Tower. I love China. People say, “Oh, you don’t like China?”
75. No, I love them. But their leaders are much smarter than our leaders, and we can’t sustain ourself with that. There’s too much— it’s like— it’s like take the New England Patriots and Tom Brady and have them play your high school football team. That’s the difference between China’s leaders and our leaders.
76. They are ripping us. We are rebuilding China. We’re rebuilding many countries. China, you go there now, roads, bridges, schools, you never saw anything like it. They have bridges that make the George Washington Bridge look like small potatoes. And they’re all over the place.
77. We have all the cards, but we don’t know how to use them. We don’t even know that we have the cards, because our leaders don’t understand the game. We could turn off that spigot by charging them tax until they behave properly.
78. Now they’re going militarily. They’re building a military island in the middle of the South China sea. A military island. Now, our country could never do that because we’d have to get environmental clearance, and the environmentalist wouldn’t let our country— we would never build in an ocean. They built it in about one year, this massive military port.
79. They’re building up their military to a point that is very scary. You have a problem with ISIS. You have a bigger problem with China.
80. And, in my opinion, the new China, believe it or not, in terms of trade, is Mexico.
81. So this man tells me about the manufacturing. I say, “That’s a terrible story. I hate to hear it.”
82. But I have another one, Ford.
83. So Mexico takes a company, a car company that was going to build in Tennessee, rips it out. Everybody thought the deal was dead. Reported it in the Wall Street Journal recently. Everybody thought it was a done deal. It’s going in and that’s going to be it, going into Tennessee. Great state, great people.
84. All of a sudden, at the last moment, this big car manufacturer, foreign, announces they’re not going to Tennessee. They’re gonna spend their \$1 billion in Mexico instead. Not good.
85. Now, Ford announces a few weeks ago that Ford is going to build a \$2.5 billion car and truck and parts manufacturing plant in Mexico. \$2.5 billion, it’s going to be one of the largest in the world. Ford. Good company.
86. So I announced that I’m running for president. I would...
87. ... one of the early things I would do, probably before I even got in— and I wouldn’t even use— you know, I have— I know the smartest negotiators in the world. I know the good ones. I know the bad ones. I know the overrated ones.
88. You get a lot of them that are overrated. They’re not good. They think they are. They get good stories, because the newspapers get buffaloed. But they’re not good.
89. But I know the negotiators in the world, and I put them one for each country. Believe me, folks. We will do very, very well, very well.
90. But I wouldn’t even waste my time with this one. I would call up the head of Ford, who I know. If I was president, I’d say, “Congratulations. I understand that you’re building a nice \$2.5 billion car factory in Mexico and that you’re going to take your cars and sell them to the United States zero tax, just flow them across the border.”
91. And you say to yourself, “How does that help us,” right? “How does that help us? Where is that good”? It’s not.
92. So I would say, “Congratulations. That’s the good news. Let me give you the bad news. Every car and every truck and every part manufactured in this plant that comes across the border, we’re going to charge you a 35-percent tax, and that tax is going to be paid simultaneously with the transaction, and that’s it.

93. Now, here's what is going to happen. If it's not me in the position, it's one of these politicians that we're running against, you know, the 400 people that we're (inaudible). And here's what's going to happen. They're not so stupid. They know it's not a good thing, and they may even be upset by it. But then they're going to get a call from the donors or probably from the lobbyist for Ford and say, "You can't do that to Ford, because Ford takes care of me and I take care of you, and you can't do that to Ford."
94. And guess what? No problem. They're going to build in Mexico. They're going to take away thousands of jobs. It's very bad for us.
95. So under President Trump, here's what would happen:
96. The head of Ford will call me back, I would say within an hour after I told them the bad news. But it could be he'd want to be cool, and he'll wait until the next day. You know, they want to be a little cool.
97. And he'll say, "Please, please, please." He'll beg for a little while, and I'll say, "No interest." Then he'll call all sorts of political people, and I'll say, "Sorry, fellas. No interest," because I don't need anybody's money. It's nice. I don't need anybody's money.
98. I'm using my own money. I'm not using the lobbyists. I'm not using donors. I don't care. I'm really rich. I (inaudible).
99. And by the way, I'm not even saying that's the kind of mindset, that's the kind of thinking you need for this country.
100. So— because we got to make the country rich.
101. It sounds crass. Somebody said, "Oh, that's crass." It's not crass.
102. We got \$18 trillion in debt. We got nothing but problems.
103. We got a military that needs equipment all over the place. We got nuclear weapons that are obsolete.
104. We've got nothing. We've got Social Security that's going to be destroyed if somebody like me doesn't bring money into the country. All these other people want to cut the hell out of it. I'm not going to cut it at all; I'm going to bring money in, and we're going to save it.
105. But here's what's going to happen:
106. After I'm called by 30 friends of mine who contributed to different campaigns, after I'm called by all of the special interests and by the— the donors and by the lobbyists— and they have zero chance at convincing me, zero— I'll get a call the next day from the head of Ford. He'll say, "Please reconsider," I'll say no.
107. He'll say, "Mr. President, we've decided to move the plant back to the United States, and we're not going to build it in Mexico." That's it. They have no choice. They have no choice.
108. There are hundreds of things like that. I'll give you another example.
109. Saudi Arabia, they make \$1 billion a day. \$1 billion a day. I love the Saudis. Many are in this building. They make a billion dollars a day. Whenever they have problems, we send over the ships. We say "we're gonna protect." What are we doing? They've got nothing but money.
110. If the right person asked them, they'd pay a fortune. They wouldn't be there except for us.
111. And believe me, you look at the border with Yemen. You remember Obama a year ago, Yemen was a great victory. Two weeks later, the place was blown up. Everybody got out— and they kept our equipment.
112. They always keep our equipment. We ought to send used equipment, right? They always keep our equipment. We ought to send some real junk, because, frankly, it would be— we ought to send our surplus. We're always losing this gorgeous brand-new stuff.
113. But look at that border with Saudi Arabia. Do you really think that these people are interested in Yemen? Saudi Arabia without us is gone. They're gone.
114. And I'm the one that made all of the right predictions about Iraq. You know, all of these politicians that I'm running against now— it's so nice to say I'm running as opposed to if I run, if I run. I'm running.
115. But all of these politicians that I'm running against now, they're trying to disassociate. I mean, you looked at Bush, it took him five days to answer the question on Iraq. He couldn't answer the question. He didn't know. I said, "Is he intelligent?"
116. Then I looked at Rubio. He was unable to answer the question, is Iraq a good thing or bad thing? He didn't know. He couldn't answer the question.
117. How are these people gonna lead us? How are we gonna— how are we gonna go back and make it great again? We can't. They don't have a clue. They can't lead us. They can't. They can't even answer simple questions. It was terrible.
118. But Saudi Arabia is in big, big trouble. Now, thanks to fracking and other things, the oil is all over the place. And I used to say it, there are ships at sea, and this was during the worst crisis, that

- were loaded up with oil, and the cartel kept the price up, because, again, they were smarter than our leaders. They were smarter than our leaders.
119. There is so much wealth out there that can make our country so rich again, and therefore make it great again. Because we need money. We're dying. We're dying. We need money. We have to do it. And we need the right people.
120. So Ford will come back. They'll all come back. And I will say this, this is going to be an election, in my opinion, that's based on competence.
121. Somebody said — thank you, darlin'.
122. Somebody said to me the other day, a reporter, a very nice reporter, "But, Mr. Trump, you're not a nice person."
123. That's true. But actually I am. I think I am a nice person. People that know me, like me. Does my family like me? I think so, right. Look at my family. I'm proud of my family.
124. By the way, speaking of my family, Melania, Barron, Kai, Donnie, Don, Vanessa, Tiffany, Ivanka did a great job. Did she do a great job?
125. Great. Jared, Laura and Eric, I'm very proud of my family. They're a great family.
126. So the reporter said to me the other day, "But, Mr. Trump, you're not a nice person. How can you get people to vote for you?"
127. I said, "I don't know." I said, "I think that number one, I am a nice person. I give a lot of money away to charities and other things. I think I'm actually a very nice person."
128. But, I said, "This is going to be an election that's based on competence, because people are tired of these nice people. And they're tired of being ripped off by everybody in the world. And they're tired of spending more money on education than any nation in the world per capita, than any nation in the world, and we are 26th in the world, 25 countries are better than us in education. And some of them are like third world countries. But we're becoming a third world country, because of our infrastructure, our airports, our roads, everything. So one of the things I did, and I said, you know what I'll do. I'll do it. Because a lot of people said, "He'll never run. Number one, he won't want to give up his lifestyle."
129. They're right about that, but I'm doing it.
130. Number two, I'm a private company, so nobody knows what I'm worth. And the one thing is that when you run, you have to announce and certify to all sorts of governmental authorities your net worth.
131. So I said, "That's OK." I'm proud of my net worth. I've done an amazing job.
132. I started off— thank you— I started off in a small office with my father in Brooklyn and Queens, and my father said — and I love my father. I learned so much. He was a great negotiator. I learned so much just sitting at his feet playing with blocks listening to him negotiate with subcontractors. But I learned a lot.
133. But he used to say, "Donald, don't go into Manhattan. That's the big leagues. We don't know anything about that. Don't do it."
134. I said, "I gotta go into Manhattan. I gotta build those big buildings. I gotta do it, Dad. I've gotta do it."
135. And after four or five years in Brooklyn, I ventured into Manhattan and did a lot of great deals—the Grand Hyatt Hotel. I was responsible for the convention center on the west side. I did a lot of great deals, and I did them early and young. And now I'm building all over the world, and I love what I'm doing.
136. But they all said, a lot of the pundits on television, "Well, Donald will never run, and one of the main reasons is he's private and he's probably not as successful as everybody thinks."
137. So I said to myself, you know, nobody's ever going to know unless I run, because I'm really proud of my success. I really am.
138. I've employed— I've employed tens of thousands of people over my lifetime. That means medical. That means education. That means everything.
139. So a large accounting firm and my accountants have been working for months, because it's big and complex, and they've put together a statement, a financial statement, just a summary. But everything will be filed eventually with the government, and we don't [use] extensions or anything. We'll be filing it right on time. We don't need anything.
140. And it was even reported incorrectly yesterday, because they said, "He had assets of \$9 billion." So I said, "No, that's the wrong number. That's the wrong number. Not assets."
141. So they put together this. And before I say it, I have to say this. I made it the old-fashioned way. It's real estate. You know, it's real estate.
142. It's labor, and it's unions good and some bad and lots of people that aren't in unions, and it's all over the place and building all over the world.

143. And I have assets— big accounting firm, one of the most highly respected— 9 billion 240 million dollars.
144. And I have liabilities of about \$500 million. That’s long-term debt, very low interest rates.
145. In fact, one of the big banks came to me and said, “Donald, you don’t have enough borrowings. Could we loan you \$4 billion”? I said, “I don’t need it. I don’t want it. And I’ve been there. I don’t want it.”
146. But in two seconds, they give me whatever I wanted. So I have a total net worth, and now with the increase, it’ll be well-over \$10 billion. But here, a total net worth of—net worth, not assets, not— a net worth, after all debt, after all expenses, the greatest assets— Trump Tower, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, Bank of America building in San Francisco, 40 Wall Street, sometimes referred to as the Trump building right opposite the New York— many other places all over the world.
147. So the total is \$8,737,540,00.
148. Now I’m not doing that...
149. I’m not doing that to brag, because you know what? I don’t have to brag. I don’t have to, believe it or not.
150. I’m doing that to say that that’s the kind of thinking our country needs. We need that thinking. We have the opposite thinking.
151. We have losers. We have losers. We have people that don’t have it. We have people that are morally corrupt. We have people that are selling this country down the drain.
152. So I put together this statement, and the only reason I’m telling you about it today is because we really do have to get going, because if we have another three or four years— you know, we’re at \$8 trillion now. We’re soon going to be at \$20 trillion.
153. According to the economists— who I’m not big believers in, but, nevertheless, this is what they’re saying— that \$24 trillion— we’re very close— that’s the point of no return. \$24 trillion. We will be there soon. That’s when we become Greece. That’s when we become a country that’s unsalvageable. And we’re gonna be there very soon. We’re gonna be there very soon.
154. So, just to sum up, I would do various things very quickly. I would repeal and replace the big lie, Obamacare.
155. I would build a great wall, and nobody builds walls better than me, believe me, and I’ll build them very inexpensively. I will build a great, great wall on our southern border. And I will have Mexico pay for that wall.
156. Mark my words.
157. Nobody would be tougher on ISIS than Donald Trump. Nobody.
158. I will find — within our military, I will find the General Patton or I will find General MacArthur, I will find the right guy. I will find the guy that’s going to take that military and make it really work. Nobody, nobody will be pushing us around.
159. I will stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons. And we won’t be using a man like Secretary Kerry that has absolutely no concept of negotiation, who’s making a horrible and laughable deal, who’s just being tapped along as they make weapons right now, and then goes into a bicycle race at 72 years old, and falls and breaks his leg. I won’t be doing that. And I promise I will never be in a bicycle race. That I can tell you.
160. I will immediately terminate President Obama’s illegal executive order on immigration, immediately.
161. Fully support and back up the Second Amendment.
162. Now, it’s very interesting. Today I heard it. Through stupidity, in a very, very hard core prison, interestingly named Clinton, two vicious murderers, two vicious people escaped, and nobody knows where they are. And a woman was on television this morning, and she said, “You know, Mr. Trump,” and she was telling other people, and I actually called her, and she said, “You know, Mr. Trump, I always was against guns. I didn’t want guns. And now since this happened”— it’s up in the prison area— “my husband and I are finally in agreement, because he wanted the guns. We now have a gun on every table. We’re ready to start shooting.”
163. I said, “Very interesting.”
164. So protect the Second Amendment.
165. End— end Common Core. Common Core should— it is a disaster. Bush is totally in favor of Common Core. I don’t see how he can possibly get the nomination. He’s weak on immigration. He’s in favor of Common Core. How the hell can you vote for this guy? You just can’t do it. We have to end education has to be local.
166. Rebuild the country’s infrastructure.
167. Nobody can do that like me. Believe me. It will be done on time, on budget, way below cost, way below what anyone ever thought.

168. I look at the roads being built all over the country, and I say I can build those things for one-third. What they do is unbelievable, how bad.
169. You know, we're building on Pennsylvania Avenue, the Old Post Office, we're converting it into one of the world's great hotels. It's gonna be the best hotel in Washington, D.C. We got it from the General Services Administration in Washington. The Obama administration. We got it. It was the most highly sought after— or one of them, but I think the most highly sought after project in the history of General Services. We got it. People were shocked, Trump got it.
170. Well, I got it for two reasons. Number one, we're really good. Number two, we had a really good plan. And I'll add in the third, we had a great financial statement. Because the General Services, who are terrific people, by the way, and talented people, they wanted to do a great job. And they wanted to make sure it got built.
171. So we have to rebuild our infrastructure, our bridges, our roadways, our airports. You come into La Guardia Airport, it's like we're in a third world country. You look at the patches and the 40-year-old floor. They throw down asphalt, and they throw.
172. You look at these airports, we are like a third world country. And I come in from China and I come in from Qatar and I come in from different places, and they have the most incredible airports in the world. You come to back to this country and you have LAX, disaster. You have all of these disastrous airports. We have to rebuild our infrastructure.
173. Save Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security without cuts. Have to do it.
174. 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.
175. Renegotiate our foreign trade deals.
176. Reduce our \$18 trillion in debt, because, believe me, we're in a bubble. We have artificially low interest rates. We have a stock market that, frankly, has been good to me, but I still hate to see what's happening. We have a stock market that is so bloated.
177. Be careful of a bubble because what you've seen in the past might be small potatoes compared to what happens. So be very, very careful.
178. And strengthen our military and take care of our vets. So, so important.
179. Sadly, the American dream is dead.
180. But if I get elected president I will bring it back bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and we will make America great again.
181. Thank you. Thank you very much.

2. Transcript acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention, July 21th 2016

1. Friends, delegates and fellow Americans: I humbly and gratefully accept your nomination for the presidency of the United States.
2. Who would have believed that when we started this journey on June 16, last year, we — I say we because we are a team — would have received almost 14 million votes, the most in the history of the Republican party?
3. And that the Republican Party would get 60 percent more votes than it received eight years ago. Who would have believed it? The Democrats on the other hand, received 20 percent fewer votes than they got four years ago, not so good.
4. Together, we will lead our party back to the White House, and we will lead our country back to safety, prosperity, and peace. We will be a country of generosity and warmth. But we will also be a country of law and order.
5. Our convention occurs at a moment of crisis for our nation. The attacks on our police, and the terrorism in our cities, threaten our very way of life. Any politician who does not grasp this danger is not fit to lead our country.
6. Americans watching this address tonight have seen the recent images of violence in our streets and the chaos in our communities. Many have witnessed this violence personally. Some have even been its victims.
7. I have a message for all of you: The crime and violence that today afflicts our nation will soon — and I mean very soon come to an end. Beginning on January 20th 2017, safety will be restored.
8. The most basic duty of government is to defend the lives of its citizens. Any government that fails to do so is a government unworthy to lead.
9. It is finally time for a straightforward assessment of the state of our nation. I will present the facts plainly and honestly. We cannot afford to be so politically correct anymore.
10. So if you want to hear the corporate spin, the carefully-crafted lies, and the media myths — the Democrats are holding their convention next week. Go there.
11. But here, at our convention, there will be no lies. We will honor the American people with the truth, and nothing else.
12. These are the facts: Decades of progress made in bringing down crime are now being reversed by this administration's rollback of criminal enforcement.
13. Homicides last year increased by 17% in America's fifty largest cities. That's the largest increase in 25 years.
14. In our nation's capital, killings have risen by 50 percent. They are up nearly 60 percent in nearby Baltimore.
15. In the president's hometown of Chicago, more than 2,000 have been the victims of shootings this year alone. And almost 4,000 have been killed in the Chicago area since he took office.
16. The number of police officers killed in the line of duty has risen by almost 50 percent compared to this point last year.
17. Nearly 180,000 illegal immigrants with criminal records, ordered deported from our country, are tonight roaming free to threaten peaceful citizens.
18. The number of new illegal immigrant families who have crossed the border so far this year already exceeds the entire total of 2015.
19. They are being released by the tens of thousands into our communities with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources.
20. One such border-crosser was released and made his way to Nebraska. There, he ended the life of an innocent young girl named Sarah Root. She was 21 years old and was killed the day after graduating from college with a 4.0 grade point average. Her killer was then released a second time, and he is now a fugitive from the law. I've met Sarah's beautiful family. But to this administration, their amazing daughter was just one more American life that wasn't worth protecting. One more child to sacrifice on the altar of open borders.
21. What about our economy? Again, I will tell you the plain facts that have been edited out of your nightly news and your morning newspaper:
22. Nearly four in 10 African-American children are living in poverty, while 58% of African-American youth are now not employed.
23. 2 million more Latinos are in poverty today than when the president took his oath of office eight years ago. Another 14 million people have left the workforce entirely.
24. Household incomes are down more than \$4,000 since the year 2000. That is 16 years ago.
25. Our trade deficit in goods reached — think of this — our trade deficit is \$800 hundred billion dollars. Think of that. \$800 billion last year alone. We will fix that.
26. The budget is no better. President Obama has almost doubled our national debt to more than \$19 trillion, and growing.
27. Yet, what do we have to show for it? Our roads and bridges are falling apart, our airports are in third world condition, and 43 million Americans are on food stamps.

28. Now let us consider the state of affairs abroad. Not only have our citizens endured domestic disaster, but they have lived through one international humiliation after another. One after another.
29. We all remember the images of our sailors being forced to their knees by their Iranian captors at gunpoint. This was just prior to the signing of the Iran deal, which gave back to Iran \$150 billion and gave us absolutely nothing. It will go down in history as one of the worst deals ever negotiated.
30. Another humiliation came when President Obama drew a red line in Syria and the whole world knew it meant absolutely nothing.
31. In Libya, our consulate, the symbol of American prestige around the globe was brought down in flames.
32. America is far less safe and the world is far less stable than when Obama made the decision to put Hillary Clinton in charge of America's foreign policy. I am certain it is a decision he truly regrets.
33. Her bad instincts and her bad judgment, something pointed out by Bernie Sanders are what caused the disasters unfolding today. Let's review the record.
34. In 2009, pre-Hillary, ISIS was not even on the map. Libya was stable. Egypt was peaceful. Iraq had seen a big reduction in violence. Iran was being choked by sanctions. Syria was somewhat under control.
35. After four years of Hillary Clinton, what do we have? ISIS has spread across the region and the entire world. Libya is in ruins, and our ambassador and his staff were left helpless to die at the hands of savage killers. Egypt was turned over to the radical Muslim Brotherhood, forcing the military to retake control. Iraq is in chaos. Iran is on the path to nuclear weapons. Syria is engulfed in a civil war and a refugee crisis that now threatens the West. After 15 years of wars in the Middle East, after trillions of dollars spent and thousands of lives lost, the situation is worse than it has ever been before.
36. This is the legacy of Hillary Clinton: Death, destruction and terrorism and weakness.
37. But Hillary Clinton's legacy does not have to be America's legacy. The problems we face now — poverty and violence at home, war and destruction abroad — will last only as long as we continue relying on the same politicians who created them. A change in leadership is required to produce a change in outcomes.
38. Tonight, I will share with you for action for America. The most important difference between our plan and that of our opponents, is that our plan will put America first. Americanism, not globalism, will be our credo.
39. As long as we are led by politicians who will not put America first, then we can be assured that other nations will not treat America with respect. The respect that we deserve. The American people will come first once again.
40. First, my plan will begin with safety at home which means safe neighborhoods, secure borders, and protection from terrorism. There can be no prosperity without law and order.
41. On the economy, I will outline reforms to add millions of new jobs and trillions in new wealth that can be used to rebuild America.
42. A number of these reforms that I will outline tonight will be opposed by some of our nation's most powerful special interests. That is because these interests have rigged our political and economic system for their exclusive benefit. Believe me. It is for their benefit. For their benefit.
43. Big business, elite media and major donors are lining up behind the campaign of my opponent because they know she will keep our rigged system in place. They are throwing money at her because they have total control over every single thing she does. She is their puppet, and they pull the strings. That is why Hillary Clinton's message is that things will never change. Never ever.
44. My message is that things have to change and they have to change right now. Every day I wake up determined to deliver a better life for the people all across this nation that had been ignored, neglected and abandoned.
45. I have visited the laid-off factory workers, and the communities crushed by our horrible and unfair trade deals. These are the forgotten men and women of our country, and they are forgotten, but they will not be forgotten long. These are people who work hard but no longer have a voice. I am your voice.
46. I have embraced crying mothers who have lost their children because our politicians put their personal agendas before the national good.
47. I have no patience for injustice. No tolerance for government incompetence. When innocent people suffer, because our political system lacks the will, or the courage, or the basic decency to enforce our laws, or worse still, has sold out to some corporate lobbyist for cash I am not able to look the other way. And I won't look the other way.
48. And when a Secretary of State illegally stores her emails on a private server, deletes 33,000 of them so the authorities can't see her crime, puts our country at risk, lies about it in every different form and faces no consequence — I know that corruption has reached a level like never ever before in our country.
49. When the FBI director says that the Secretary of State was "extremely careless" and "negligent" in handling our classified secrets, I also know that these terms are minor compared to what she actually did. They were just used to save her from facing justice for her terrible, terrible crimes.
50. In fact, her single greatest accomplishment may be committing such an egregious crime and getting away with it, especially when others who have been far less have paid so dearly.

51. When that same Secretary of State rakes in millions of dollars trading access and favors to special interests and foreign powers, I know the time for action has come.
52. I have joined the political arena so that the powerful can no longer beat up on people that cannot defend themselves.
53. Nobody knows the system better than me, which is why I alone can fix it. I have seen firsthand how the system is rigged against our citizens, just like it was rigged against Bernie Sanders. He never had a chance.
54. But his supporters will join our movement, because we will fix his biggest issue: Trade deals that strip our country of jobs and the distribution of wealth in the country.
55. Millions of Democrats will join our movement, because we are going to fix the system so it works fairly and justly for each and every American.
56. In this cause, I am proud to have at my side the next Vice President of the United States: Governor Mike Pence of Indiana. And a great guy. We will bring the same economic success to America that Mike brought Indiana, which is amazing. He is a man of character and accomplishment. He is the right man for the job.
57. The first task for our new administration will be to liberate our citizens from the crime and terrorism and lawlessness that threatens their — our communities.
58. America was shocked to its core when our police officers in Dallas were so brutally executed. Immediately after Dallas, we have seen continued threats and violence against our law enforcement officials. Law officers have been shot or killed in recent days in Georgia, Missouri, Wisconsin, Kansas, Michigan and Tennessee.
59. On Sunday, more police were gunned down in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Three were killed, and three were very badly injured. An attack on law enforcement is an attack on all Americans.
60. I have a message to every last person threatening the peace on our streets and the safety of our police: When I take the oath of office next year, I will restore law and order to our country.
61. I will work with, and appoint, the best prosecutors and law enforcement officials in the country to get the job properly done. In this race for the White House, I am the law and order candidate.
62. The irresponsible rhetoric of our president, who has used the pulpit of the presidency to divide us by race and color, has made America a more dangerous environment than frankly, I have ever seen and anybody in this room has ever watched or seeing.
63. This administration has failed America's inner cities. Remember, it has failed America's inner cities. It's failed them on education. It's failed them on jobs. It's failed them on crime. It's failed them in every way and on every single level.
64. When I am president, I will work to ensure that all of our kids are treated equally, and protected equally. Every action I take, I will ask myself: Does this make life better for young Americans in Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit, and Ferguson who have really come in every way, have the same right to live out their dreams as any other child in America?
65. To make life safe in America, we must also address the growing threats from outside the country. We are going to defeat the barbarians of ISIS. And we are going to defeat them bad.
66. Once again, France is the victim of brutal Islamic terrorism. Men, women and children viciously mowed down. Lives ruined. Families ripped apart. A nation in mourning. The damage and devastation that can be inflicted by Islamic radicals has been proven over and over. At the World Trade Center, at an office party in San Bernardino, at the Boston Marathon, and a military recruiting center in Chattanooga, Tennessee. And many other locations.
67. Only weeks ago, in Orlando, Florida, 49 wonderful Americans were savagely murdered by an Islamic terrorist. This time, the terrorist targeted LGBTQ community. No good. And we're going to stop it. As your president, I will do everything in my power to protect our LGBTQ citizens from the violence and oppression of a hateful foreign ideology. Believe me. And I have to say as a Republican, it is so nice to hear you cheering for what I just said. Thank you.
68. To protect us from terrorism, we need to focus on three things.
69. We must have the best, absolutely the best, gathering of intelligence anywhere in the world. The best.
70. We must abandon the failed policy of nation- building and regime change that Hillary Clinton pushed in Iraq, Libya, in Egypt, and Syria.
71. Instead, we must work with all of our allies who share our goal of destroying ISIS and stamping out Islamic terrorism and doing it now, doing it quickly. We're going to win. We're going to win fast. This includes working with our greatest ally in the region, the state of Israel.
72. Recently I have said that NATO was obsolete. Because it did not properly cover terror. And also that many of the member countries were not paying their fair share. As usual, the United States has been picking up the cost. Shortly thereafter, it was announced that NATO will be setting up a new program in order to combat terrorism. A true step in the right direction.
73. Lastly, and very importantly, we must immediately suspend immigration from any nation that has been compromised by terrorism until such time as proven vetting mechanisms have been put in place. We don't want them in our country.

74. My opponent has called for a radical 550 percent increase — think of this, this is not believable, but this is what is happening — a 550 percent increase in Syrian refugees on top of existing massive refugee flows coming into our country already under the leadership of president Obama.
75. She proposes this despite the fact that there's no way to screen these refugees in order to find out who they are or where they come from. I only want to admit individuals into our country who will support our values and love our people. Anyone who endorses violence, hatred or oppression is not welcome in our country and never ever will be.
76. Decades of record immigration have produced lower wages and higher unemployment for our citizens, especially for African-American and Latino workers. We are going to have an immigration system that works, but one that works for the American people.
77. On Monday, we heard from three parents whose children were killed by illegal immigrants Mary Ann Mendoza, Sabine Durden, and my friend Jamiel Shaw. They are just three brave representatives of many thousands who have suffered so greatly.
78. Of all my travels in this country, nothing has affected me more, nothing even close than the time I have spent with the mothers and fathers who have lost their children to violence spilling across our borders, which we can solve. We have to solve it. These families have no special interests to represent them. There are no demonstrators to protect them and none too protest on their behalf.
79. My opponent will never meet with them, or share in their pain. Believe me. Instead, my opponent wants sanctuary cities. But where was sanctuary for Kate Steinle? Where was sanctuary for the children of Mary Ann, Sabine and Jamiel? Is so sad to even be talking about this. We can solve it so quickly. Where was sanctuary for all the other Americans who have been so brutally murdered, and who have suffered so horribly? These wounded American families have been alone. But they are not alone any longer.
80. Tonight, this candidate and this whole nation stand in their corner to support them, to send them our love, and to pledge in their honor that we will save countless more families from suffering the same awful fate.
81. We are going to build a great border wall to stop illegal immigration, to stop the gangs and the violence, and to stop the drugs from pouring into our communities.
82. I have been honored to receive the endorsement of America's Border Patrol agents, and will work directly with them to protect the integrity of our lawful, lawful, immigration system.
83. By ending catch-and-release on the border, we will stop the cycle of human smuggling and violence. Illegal border crossings will go down. We will stop it. It will not be happening very much anymore. Believe me.
84. Peace will be restored by enforcing the rules for the millions who overstay their visas, our laws will finally receive the respect they deserve.
85. Tonight, I want every American whose demands for immigration security have been denied and every politician who has denied them to listen very closely to the words I am about to say: On January 20 of 2017, the day I take the oath of office, Americans will finally wake up in a country where the laws of the United States are enforced.
86. We are going to be considerate and compassionate to everyone. But my greatest compassion will be for our own struggling citizens.
87. My plan is the exact opposite of the radical and dangerous immigration policy of Hillary Clinton. Americans want relief from uncontrolled immigration. Which is what we have now. Communities want relief. Yet Hillary Clinton is proposing mass amnesty, mass immigration, and mass lawlessness.
88. Her plan will overwhelm your schools and hospitals, further reduce your jobs and wages, and make it harder for recent immigrants to escape from the tremendous cycle of poverty they are going through right now and make it almost impossible for them to join the middle class.
89. I have a different vision for our workers. It begins with a new, fair trade policy that protects our jobs and stands up to countries that cheat — of which there are many.
90. It's been a signature message of my campaign from day one, and it will be a signature feature of my presidency from the moment I take the oath of office. I have made billions of dollars in business making deals. Now I'm going to make our country rich again. Using the greatest businesspeople of the world, I'm going to turn our bad trade agreements into great trade agreements.
91. America has lost nearly-one third of its manufacturing jobs since 1997, following the enactment of disastrous trade deals supported by bill and Hillary Clinton. Remember, it was Bill Clinton who signed NAFTA, one of the worst economic deals ever made by our country. Or frankly, any other country. Never ever again.
92. I am going to bring our jobs back our jobs to Ohio and Pennsylvania and New York and Michigan and all of America and I am not going to let companies move to other countries, firing their employees along the way, without consequences. Not going to happen anymore.
93. My opponent, on the other hand, has supported virtually every trade agreement that has been destroying our middle class. She supported NAFTA, and she supported China's entrance into the world trade organization. Another one of her husband's colossal mistakes and disasters. She supported the job killing trade deal with

- South Korea. She she supported the Trans-Pacific Partnership which will not only destroy our manufacturing but it will make America subject to the rulings of foreign governments. And it is not going to happen.
94. I pledge to never sign any trade agreement that hurts our workers, or that diminishes our freedom and Independence. We will never ever sign bad trade deals. America first again. American first.
95. Instead, I will make individual deals with individual countries. No longer will we enter into these massive transactions with many countries that are thousands of pages long and which no one from our country even reads or understands. We are going to enforce all trade violations against any country that cheats. This includes stopping China's outrageous theft of intellectual property, along with their illegal product dumping, and their devastating currency manipulation. They are the greatest that ever came about, they are the greatest currently manipulators ever.
96. Our horrible trade agreements with China, and many others, will be totally renegotiated. That includes renegotiating NAFTA to get a much better deal for America and will walk away if we don't get that kind of a deal. Our country is going to start building and making things again.
97. Next comes the reform of our tax laws, regulations and energy rules. While Hillary Clinton plans a massive, and I mean massive, tax increase, I have proposed the largest tax reduction of any candidate who has run for president this year, Democrat or Republican. Middle-income Americans will experience profound relief, and taxes will be greatly simplified for everyone. I mean everyone.
98. America is one of the highest-taxed nations in the world. Reducing taxes will cause new companies and new jobs to come roaring back into our country. Believe me. It will happen and it will happen fast.
99. Then we are going to deal with the issue of regulation, one of the greatest job killers of them all. Excessive regulation is costing our country as much as \$2 trillion a year, and we will end and it very quickly.
100. We are going to lift the restrictions on the production of American energy. This will produce more than \$20 trillion in job-creating economic activity over the next four decades.
101. My opponent, on the other hand, wants to put the great miners and steelworkers of our country out of work and out of business. That will never happen with Donald J trump as president. Our steelworkers and are miners are going back to work again.
102. With these new economic policies, trillions of dollars will start flowing into our country. This new wealth will improve the quality of life for all Americans. We will build the roads, highways, bridges, tunnels, airports, and the railways of our tomorrow. This, in turn, will create millions of more jobs.
103. We will rescue kids from failing schools by helping their parents send them to a safe school of their choice. My opponent would rather protect education bureaucrats than serve American children. That is what she is doing and that is what she has done.
104. We will repeal and replace disastrous Obamacare. You will be able to choose your own doctor again.
105. And we will fix TSA at the airports, which is a total disaster. Thank you.
106. We are going to work with all of our students who are drowning in debt to take the pressure off these young people just starting out in their adult lives. Tremendous problems.
107. We will completely rebuild our depleted military. And the countries that we protecting at a massive cost to us will be asked to pay their fair share.
108. We will take care of our great veterans like they have never been taken care of before. My just-released 10 point plan has received tremendous better support. We will guarantee those who serve this country will be able to visit the doctor or hospital of their choice without waiting five days in a line and dying.
109. My opponent dismissed the VA scandal, one more sign of how out of touch she really is.
110. We are going to ask every department head and government to provide a list of wasteful spending projects that we can eliminate in my first 100 days. The politicians have talked about this for years, but I'm going to do it.
111. We are also going to appoint justices to the United States Supreme Court who will uphold our laws and our constitution. The replacement of our beloved Justice Scalia will be a person of similar views, principles and judicial philosophies. Very important. This will be one of the most important issues decided by this election.
112. My opponent wants to essentially abolish the 2nd Amendment. I, on the other hand, received the early and strong endorsement of the National Rifle Association. And will protect the right of all Americans to keep their families safe.
113. At this moment, I would like to thank the evangelical community because, I will tell you what, the support they have given me — and I'm not sure I totally deserve it — has been so amazing. And has been such a big reason I'm here tonight. They have much to contribute to our policies.
114. Yet our laws prevent you from speaking your mind from your own pulpits. An amendment, pushed by Lyndon Johnson, many years ago, threatens religious institutions with a loss of their tax-exempt status if they openly advocate their political views. Their voice has been taken away. I will work hard to repeal that language and to protect free speech for all Americans.

115. We can accomplish these great things and so much more. All we need to do is start believing in ourselves again in our country again. Start believing. It is time to show the whole world that America is back, bigger and better and stronger than ever before.
116. In this journey, I'm so lucky to have at my side my wife Melania and my wonderful children Don, Ivanka, Eric, Tiffany, and Barron: You will always be my greatest source of pride and joy. And by the way, Melania and Ivanka, did they do a job?
117. My dad, Fred Trump, was the smartest and hardest working man I ever knew. I wonder sometimes what he'd say if he were here to see this tonight. It's because of him that I learned, from my youngest age, to respect the dignity of work and the dignity of working people.
118. He was a guy most comfortable in the company of bricklayers, carpenters, and electricians and I have a lot of that in me also. I love those people.
119. Then there's my mother, Mary. She was strong, but also warm and fair-minded. She was a truly great mother. She was also one of the most honest and charitable people I have ever known, and a great, great judge of character. She could pick them out from anywhere.
120. To my sisters, Mary Anne and Elizabeth, my brother Robert and my late brother Fred, I will always give you my love. You are most special to me. I have loved my life in business.
121. But now, my sole and exclusive mission is to go to work for our country, to go to work for you. It is time to deliver a victory for the American people. We don't win anymore, but we are going to start winning again. But to do that, we must break free from the petty politics of the past.
122. America is a nation of believers, dreamers, and strivers that is being led by a group of censors, critics, and cynics. Remember: All of the people telling you you can't have the country you want, are the same people, that would not stand, I mean they said Trump does not have a chance of being here tonight, not a chance, the same people. We love defeating those people, don't we? Love it.
123. No longer can we rely on those same people. In the media and politics who, will say anything to keep a rigged system in place. Instead, we must choose to believe in America.
124. History is watching us now. It's we don't have much time. We don't have much time. It's waiting to see if we will rise to the occasion, and if we will show the whole world that America is still free and independent and strong.
125. I am asking for your support tonight so that I can be year champion in the White House. And I will be a champion. Your champion.
126. My opponent asks her supporters to recite a three-word loyalty pledge. It reads: "I'm with her."
127. I choose to recite a different pledge. My pledge reads: "I'm with you the American people."
128. I am your voice. So to every parent who dreams for their child, and every child who dreams for their future, I say these words to you tonight: I'm with you, and I will fight for you, and I will win for you.
129. To all Americans tonight, in all our cities and towns, I make this promise: We will make America strong again. We will make America proud again. We will make America safe again. And we will make America great again! God bless you and goodnight! I love you!

3. First presidential debate, September 26th 2016

Lester Holt: Good evening from Hofstra University in Hempstead, New York, I'm Lester Holt, anchor of *NBC Nightly News*. I want to welcome you to the first presidential debate. The participants are Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. This debate is sponsored by a nonpartisan commission.

The commission drafted tonight's format and the rules have been agreed to by the campaigns. The 90-minute debate is divided into six segments, each 15 minutes long. We'll explore three topics area tonight, "Achieving Prosperity," "America's Direction," and "Securing America."

At the start of each segment, I will ask the same lead-off question to both candidates and they will have up to two minutes to respond.

The questions have not been shared with the commission or the campaigns.

The audience here in the room has agreed to remain silent so that we can focus on what the candidates are saying. I will invite you to applaud, however, at this moment, as we welcome the candidates, Democratic nominee for president of the United States, Hillary Clinton, and Republican nominee for president of the United States, Donald J. Trump.

Well, I don't expect us to cover all of the issues of this campaign tonight, but I remind everyone, there are two more presidential debates scheduled. We are going to focus on many of the issues that voters tell us are most important and we're going to press for specifics. I am honored to have this role, but this evening belongs to the candidates and, just as important, to the American people.

Candidates, we look forward to hearing you articulate your policies and your positions as well as your visions and your values. So, let's begin.

We're calling this opening segment "Achieving Prosperity," and central to that is jobs. There are two economic realities in America today. There's been a record six straight years of job growth, and new census numbers show income has increased at a record rate after years of stagnation.

However, income inequality remains stagnant, and Americans are living paycheck to paycheck. Beginning with you, Secretary Clinton, why are you a better choice than your opponent to create the kind of jobs that put more money into the pockets of American workers.

Hillary Clinton: Thank you, Lester, and thanks to Hofstra for hosting us. The central question in this election is really what kind of country we want to be in, what kind of future we'll build together.

Today is my granddaughter's 2nd birthday, so I think about this a lot. First, we have to build an economy that works for everyone, not just those at the top. That means we need new jobs, good jobs with rising incomes. I want us to invest in you. I want us to invest in your future. That means jobs in infrastructure, in advanced manufacturing, innovation and technology, clean renewable energy, and small business, because most of the new jobs will come from small business.

We also have to make the economy fairer. That starts with raising the national minimum wage and also guarantee, finally, equal pay for women's work. I also want to see more companies do profit sharing. If you help create the profits, you should be able to share in them, not just the executives at the top.

And I want us to do more to support people who are struggling to balance family and work. I've heard from so many of you about the difficult choices you face and the stresses that you're under. So let's have paid family leave, earned sick days — let's be sure we have affordable child care and debt-free college. How are we going to do it? We're going to do it by having the wealthy pay their fair share and close the corporate loopholes.

Finally, we tonight, are on the stage together, Donald Trump and I. Donald, it's good to be with you. We're going to have a debate where we are talking about the important issues facing our country. You have to judge us, who can shoulder the immense, awesome responsibilities of the presidency. Who can put into action the plans that will make your life better. I hope that I will be able to earn your vote on November 8th.

Holt: Secretary Clinton, thank you. Mr. Trump, the same question to you. It's about putting money — more money into the pockets of American workers. You have up to two minutes.

Donald Trump:

1. Thank you, Lester. Our jobs are fleeing the country. They are going to Mexico, they are going to many other countries. You look at what China is doing to our country in terms of making our product. They are devaluing their currency and there's nobody in our government to fight them and we have a very good fight and we have a winning fight because they are using our country as a piggy bank to rebuild China and many other countries are doing the same thing. So we're losing our good jobs, so many of them.

2. When you look at what is happening in Mexico, a friend of mine who builds plants says it's the eighth wonder of the world, that the biggest plants in the world, the most sophisticated, some of the best plants — with the United States, as we said, not so much.

3. So Ford is leaving. You see that, a small car division leaving. Thousands of jobs leaving Michigan, leaving Ohio, they are all leaving. And we can't allow it to happen anymore. As far as child care is concerned and so many other things, I think Hillary and I agree on that. We probably disagree a little bit as to numbers and amounts and what we're going to do, but perhaps we'll be talking about that later. But we have to stop our jobs from being stolen from us. We have to stop our companies from leaving the United States, and with it, firing all of their people.

All you have to do is take a look at Carrier Air Conditioning in Indianapolis. They are going to Mexico. So many hundreds and hundreds of companies are doing this. We cannot let it happen.

4. Under my plan, I'll be reducing taxes tremendously from 35 percent to 15 percent for companies, small and big businesses. That's going to be a job creator like we haven't seen since Ronald Reagan. It's going to be a beautiful thing to watch. Companies will come, they will build, they will expand, new companies will start, and I look very, very much forward to doing it. We have to renegotiate our trade deals and we have to stop these countries from stealing our companies and our jobs.

Holt: Secretary Clinton, would you like to respond?

Clinton: Well, I think that trade is an important issue. Of course, we are 5 percent of the world's population. We have to trade with the other 95 percent. And we need to have smart, fair trade deals. We also, though, need to have a tax system that rewards work and not just financial transactions. And the kind of plan that Donald has put forth would be trickle-down economics. It would be the most extreme version — the biggest tax cuts for the top percents of the people in this country that we've ever had. I call it "trumped up trickle-down," because that's exactly what it would be.

That is not how we grow the economy. We just have a different view about what's best for growing the economy, how we make investments that will actually produce jobs and rising incomes. I think we come at it from somewhat different perspectives. I understand that.

You know, Donald was very fortunate in his life and that's all to his benefit. He started his business with \$14 million, borrowed from his father, and he really believes that the more you help wealthy people, the better off we'll be and that everything will work out from there. I don't buy that. I have a different experience. My father was a small-business man. He worked really hard. He printed drapery fabrics and went down with a silk screen and dumped the paint in and kept going. And so what I believe is the more we can do for the middle class, the more we can invest in you, your education, your skills, your future, the better we will be off and the better we'll grow. That's the kind of economy I want us to see again.

Holt: Let me follow up with Mr. Trump, if I can. You've talked about creating 25 million jobs and you've promised to bring back millions of jobs for Americans. How are we going to bring back the industries that have left this country for cheaper labor overseas? How specifically are you going to tell American manufacturers that you have to come back?

Trump:

5. Well, for one thing, and before we start on that, my father gave me a very small loan in 1975 and I built it into a company that's worth many, many billions of dollars with some of the greatest assets in the world, and I say that because that's the kind of thinking our country needs. Our country is in deep trouble. We don't know what we're doing when it comes to devaluations, and all of these countries all over the world, especially China, they are the best, the best ever at it. What they are doing to us is a very, very sad thing.

6. So we have to do that. We have to renegotiate our trade deals.

7. Lester, they are taking our jobs, giving incentives, doing things that frankly we don't do. Let me give you an example of Mexico. They have a VAT tax. We're in a different system.

8. When we sell into Mexico, there's a tax. When they sell, an automatic 16 percent approximately — when they sell into us, there's no tax. It's a defective agreement. It's been defective for a long time, many years. But the politicians haven't done anything about it. Now, in all fairness to Secretary Clinton, yes, is that okay? Good. I want you to be very happy. It's very important to me. But in all fairness to Secretary Clinton, when she started talking about this, it was really very recently. She's been doing this for 30 years. Why hasn't she made the agreements better? The NAFTA agreement is defective.

Holt: Let me interrupt a moment.

Trump:

9. Secretary Clinton and others, politicians, should have been doing this for years, not right now because of the fact that we've created a movement. They should have been doing this for years. What's happened to our jobs and our country and our economy generally is —look, we owe \$20 trillion. We can't do it any longer.

Holt: Back to the question, specifically, how do you bring back the jobs? American manufacturers, how do you bring the jobs back?

Trump:

10. First of all, you don't let the companies leave. The companies are leaving. There are thousands of them. They are leaving and they are leaving in bigger numbers than ever.

11. And what you do is you say, fine, you want to go to Mexico or some other country, good luck. We wish you a lot of luck. If you think you're going to make your air conditioners or your cars or cookies or whatever you make and bring them into our country without a tax, you're wrong.

12. And once you say you're going to have to tax them coming in and our politicians never do this because they have special interests and special interests want those companies to leave because in many cases they own the companies. So what I'm saying is, we can stop them from leaving. We have to stop them from leaving. And that's a big, big factor.

Holt: Let me let the secretary answer here.

Clinton: Let's stop for a second here and remember where we were eight years ago. We had the worst financial crisis, the worst since the 1930s in large part because of the policies that slashed taxes on the wealthy, failed to invest in the middle class, took their eyes off of Wall Street and created a perfect storm. In fact, Donald was one of the people who rooted for the housing crisis. He said back in 2006, "gee, I hope it does collapse because then I can go in and buy some and make some money." Well, it did collapse.

Trump:

13. That's called business, by the way.

Clinton: 9 million people — 9 million people lost their jobs, 5 million people lost their homes and \$13 trillion in family wealth was wiped out. Now, we have come back from that abyss and it has not been easy, so we're now on the precipice from having a lasting economy but we need to go back to the policies that failed us in the first place. Independent experts have looked at what I have proposed and looked at what Donald has proposed and basically they said this.

That if his tax plan, which would blow up the debt by over \$5 trillion and would, in some instances, disadvantage middle-class families compared to the wealthy, were to go into effect, we would lose 3 and a half million jobs and maybe have another recession. They looked at my plans and said, okay, if we can do this — and I intend to get it done — we will have 10 million more jobs because we'll make investments where we can grow the economy. Take clean energy. Some country is going to be the clean energy superpower of the 21st century. Donald thinks that climate change is a hoax perpetrated by the Chinese. I think it's real.

Trump:

14. I did not. I do not say that.

Clinton: Scientists say it's real and I think it's important that we grip this and deal with it both at home and abroad. And here's what we can do. We can deploy half a billion more solar panels. We can have enough clean energy to power every home. We can build a new modern electric grid. That's a lot of jobs. That's a lot of new economic activity. So I've tried to be very specific about what we can and should do and I am determined that that we're going to get the economy really moving again, building on the progress we've made over the last eight years but never going back to what got us in trouble in the first place.

Holt: Mr. Trump?

Trump:

15. She talks about solar panels. We invested in a solar company. They lost plenty of money on that one. Look, I'm a great believer in all forms of energy but we're putting a lot of people out of work. Our energy policies are a disaster. Our country is losing so much in terms of energy and paying off our debt. You can't look at what you're planning to do with \$20 trillion in debt. The Obama administration, from the time they have come in, is over 230 years worth of debt and he's topped it. He's doubled it in a course of almost eight years, seven and a half years, to be semi-exact.

16. So I will tell you this, we have to do a much better job at keeping our jobs. And we have to do a much better job at giving companies incentives to build new companies to expand, because they are not doing it. And all you have to do is look at Michigan and look at Ohio and look at all of these places where so many of their jobs and their companies are just leaving. They are gone. And Hillary, I'd just ask you this. You've been doing this for 30 years. Why are you just thinking about these solutions right now? For 30 years you've been doing it and now you are just starting to think of solutions.

Clinton: Actually, that's —

Trump:

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

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

Trump:

18. Yeah, for 30 years.

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

Trump:

19. He approved NAFTA, which is the single worst trade deal in this country.

Clinton: Incomes went up for everybody. Manufacturing went up in the 1990s if we're actually going to look at the facts. When I was in the Senate, I had a number of trade deals that came before me and I held them all to the same test: Will they create jobs in America and are they good for our national security. Some of them I voted for. The biggest one, a multinational one known as CAFTA, I voted against. And because I hold the same standards as I look at all of these trade deals. But let's not assume that trade is the only challenge we have in the economy. I think it is a part of it, and I've said what I'm going to do. I'm going to have a special prosecutor. We're going to enforce the trade deals we have and we're going to hold people accountable. When I was secretary of state, we actually increased American exports globally 30 percent. We increased them to China 50 percent. So I know how to really work to get new jobs and to get exports that helped to create more new jobs.

Trump:

20. You haven't done it in 30 years or 26 years or —

Clinton: I've been a senator and I have —

Trump:

21. Excuse me. Your husband signed NAFTA, which was one of the worst things that ever happened.

Clinton: Well, that's your opinion.

Trump:

22. To the manufacturing industry. You go to new England, Ohio, Pennsylvania, you go anywhere you want, Secretary Clinton, and you will see devastation where manufacturing is down 30, 40, sometimes 50 percent.

23. NAFTA is the worst trade deal maybe ever signed anywhere but certainly ever signed in this country and now you want to approve Trans-Pacific Partnership. You were totally in favor of it, and then you heard how I said how bad it was and if you win, you would approve it and it would be almost as bad as NAFTA. Nothing will ever top that.

Clinton: That is not accurate. Once the terms were laid out and —

Trump:

24. You called it the gold standard. You called it the gold standard of trade deals.

Clinton: You know what —

Trump:

25. You said it's the finest deal you've ever seen.

Clinton: No.

Trump:

26. And all of a sudden you were against it.

Clinton: Donald, I know you live in your own reality, but that is not the facts. The facts are I did say I hoped it would be a good deal, but when it was negotiated —

Trump:

27. Not.

Clinton: — which I was not responsible for, I concluded it wasn't. I wrote about that.

Trump:

28. So is it President Obama's fault? Is it President Obama's fault?

Clinton: Look, there are —

Trump:

29. So is it President Obama's fault?

Clinton: There are different views about what is good for our country, our economy, and our leadership in the world, and I think it's important to look at what we need to do to get the economy going again. That's why I said, new jobs with rising incomes, investments, not in more tax cuts that would add \$5 trillion to the debt.

Trump:

30. But you have no plan.

Clinton: Oh, I do.

Trump:

31. Secretary, you have no plan.

Clinton: I have written a book about it. It's called *Stronger Together*. You can pick it up tomorrow at the bookstore or at an airport near you.

Holt: We're going to move to —

Clinton: We need to have strong growth, fair growth, sustained growth. We also have to look at how we help families balance their responsibilities at home and the responsibilities of business. We have a very robust set of plans, and people have looked at both of our plans, have concluded that mine would create 10 million jobs and yours would lose us 3 and a half million jobs and —

Trump:

32. You are going to approve one of the biggest tax increases in history. You are going to drive business out. Your regulations are a disaster and you're going to increase regulations all over the place. And by the way, my tax cut is the biggest since Ronald Reagan. I'm very proud of it. It will create tremendous numbers of new jobs. But regulations, you are going to regulate these businesses out of existence. When I go around — Lester, I tell you this, I've been all over.

33. And when I go around, despite the tax cut, the things that businesses and people like the most is the fact that I'm cutting regulation. You have regulations on top of regulations and new companies cannot form and old companies are going out of business and you want to increase the regulations and make them even worse. I'm going to cut regulations. I'm going to cut taxes big league and you're going to raise taxes big league. End of story.

Holt: Let me get you to pause right there.

Clinton: Lester, that can't be left to stand.

Trump:

34. Thirty seconds and then we'll go on.

Clinton: I kind of assumed there would be a lot of these charges and claims and so —

Trump:

35. Facts.

Clinton: We have taken the homepage of my website, HillaryClinton.com and we've turned it into a fact checker. So if you want to see it in realtime, what the facts are, please go and take a look, because —

Trump:

36. And take a look at mine, also.

Clinton: I will not add a penny to the debt and your plans would add \$5 trillion to the debt. What I have proposed would cut regulations and streamline them for small businesses. What I have proposed would be paid for by raising taxes on the wealthy because they have made all the gains in the economy and I think it's time that the wealthy and corporations pay their fair share.

Holt: You just opened the next segment.

Trump:

37. ... She's going to raise taxes \$1.3 trillion. Look at her website. It's no different than this. She's telling us how to fight ISIS. She tells you how to fight ISIS on her website. I don't think General MacArthur would like that too much.

Clinton: At least I have a plan to fight ISIS.

Trump:

38. No, you're telling the enemy everything you want to do. No wonder you've been fighting ISIS your entire adult life.

Holt: Folks, let me —

Clinton: Go to — please, the fact checkers, get to work.

Holt: You are unpacking a lot here and we're still on the issue here of achieving prosperity and I want to talk about taxes, the fundamental difference between the two of you concerns the wealthy. Secretary Clinton, you're calling for an increase of taxes on the wealthiest and Mr. Trump, you're calling on tax cuts for the wealthy. I'd like for you to defend that, and this next two-minute answer goes to you, Mr. Trump.

Trump:

39. They are going to expand their companies and do a tremendous job. I'm getting rid of the great thing for the wealthy, it's a great thing for the middle class and for companies to expand and when these people are going to put billions and billions of dollars into companies and when they are going to bring \$2.5 trillion back from overseas where they can't bring the money back because politicians like Secretary Clinton won't allow them to bring the money back because the taxes are so onerous and the bureaucratic red tape, it's so bad.

40. So what they are doing is leaving our country and, believe it or not, they are leaving because taxes are too high and because some of them have lots of money outside of our country and instead of bringing it back and putting the money to work because they can't work out a deal and everybody agrees it should be brought back, instead of that, they are leaving our country to get their money because they can't bring their money back into our country because of bureaucratic red tape, because they can't get together. Because we have a president that can't sit them around a table and get them to approve something and here's the thing, Republicans and Democrats agree that this should be done. 2.5 trillion.

41. I happen to think it's double that. It's probably \$5 trillion that we can't bring into our country, Lester, and with a little leadership, you'd get it in here very quickly and it could be put to use on the inner cities and lots of other things and it would be beautiful. But we have no leadership. And honestly, that starts with secretary Clinton.

Holt: You have two minutes on the same question to defend tax increases of the wealthiest Americans, Secretary Clinton.

Clinton: I have a feeling by the end of this evening I'm going to be blamed for everything that's ever happened.

Trump:

42. Why not?

Clinton: Yeah. Why not? Just join the debate by saying more crazy things. Now, let me say this.

Trump:

43. There's nothing crazy about not letting our companies bring their money back into the country.

Holt: This is Secretary Clinton's two minutes, please.

Clinton: Let's start the clock again, Lester. We've looked at your tax proposals. I don't see changes in the corporate tax rates or the kinds of proposals you're referring to that would cause the repatriation, bringing back of the money stranded overseas.

Trump:

44. Then you didn't read it.

Clinton: I happen to support that in a way that will actually work to our benefit. But when I look at what you have proposed, you have what is called now the Trump loophole because it would so advantage you and the business you do. You've proposed —

Trump:

45. Who gave it that name? Who gave it that name.

Holt: I'm sorry. This is Secretary Clinton's two minutes.

Clinton: A tax benefit for your family.

Trump:

46. How much for my family? Lester? How much?

Clinton: Trumped up, trickle down. Trickle down did not work. It got us into the mess we were in in 2008 and 2009. Slashing taxes on the wealthy hasn't worked and a lot of really smart, wealthy people know that. And they are saying, hey, we need to do more to make the contributions we should be making to rebuild the middle class. I don't think top-down works in America.

I think building the middle class, investing in the middle class, making college debt-free so more young people can get their education, helping people refinance their debt from college at a lower rate, those are the kinds of things that will really boost the economy. Broad-based inclusive growth is what we need in America, not more advantages for people at the very top.

Trump:

47. Typical politician, all talk, no action, sounds good, doesn't work, never going to happen. Our country is suffering because people like Secretary Clinton have made such bad decisions in terms of our jobs and in terms of what's going on. Now, look, we have the worst revival of the economy since the great depression and, believe me, we're in a bubble right now. The only thing that looks good is the stock market but if you raise interest rates even a little bit, it's going to come crashing down.

48. We're in a big, fat, ugly bubble and we better be awfully careful and we have a fed doing political things. This Janet Yellen of the fed is [acting politically] by keeping the interest rates at this level and, believe me, the day Obama goes off and he leaves and goes out to the golf course for the rest of his life to play golf, when they raise interest rates, you're going to see some very bad things happen because the fed is not doing their job. The fed is being more political than Secretary Clinton.

Holt: Mr. Trump, we're talking about the burden that Americans have to pay, yet you have not released your tax returns and the reason nominees have released their returns for decades is so that voters will know if their potential president owes money, who he owes it to and any business conflicts. Don't Americans have a right to know if there are any conflicts of interest?

Trump:

49. I don't mind releasing. I'm under a routine audit. It will be released as soon as the audit is complete but you will learn more about Donald Trump by going down to the federal elections where I filed a 104-page, essentially, financial statement of sorts, the forms that they have. It shows income, in fact, the income, I just looked today, the income is filed at \$694 million for this past year.

50. If you would have told me I was going to make that 15 or 20 years ago, I would have been very surprised but that's the kind of thinking that our country needs. When we have a country that's doing so badly, that's being ripped off by every single country in the world, it's the kind of thinking that our country needs because everybody

51. Lester, we have a trade deficit with all of the countries that we do business with of almost \$800 billion a year. You know what that is? Who is negotiating these trade deals? We have people that are political hacks negotiating our trade deals.

Clinton: The IRS says an audit of your taxes — you're perfectly free to release your taxes during an audit. The question, does the public's right to know outweigh your —

Trump:

52. I told you, I'll release them after the audit. I've been under audit for almost 15 years. I know a lot of wealthy people that have never been audited. I get audited every year. In a way, I should be complaining.

53. I don't mind it. It's a way of life. I get audited by the IRS. Other people don't. I will say this. We have a situation in this country that has to be taken care of. I will release my tax returns, against my lawyer's wishes, when she releases her 33,000 emails that have been deleted. As soon as she releases them, I will release my tax returns and that's against my lawyers say don't do it. I will say this. In fact, watching shows to reading the papers, almost every lawyer says you don't release your returns until the audit is complete. When the audit's complete, I'll do it. But I would go against them if —

Holt: So it's negotiable?

Trump:

54. It's not negotiable, no. Why did she delete 33,000 —

Holt: I'll let her answer that. Let me admonish the audience one more time. There was an agreement. We asked you to be silent. It would be helpful for us. Secretary Clinton?

Clinton: I think you've just seen another example of bait and switch here. For 40 years, everyone running for president has released their tax returns. You can go and see nearly I think 39, 40 years of our tax returns but

everyone has done it. We know the IRS has made clear there is no prohibition on releasing it when you're under audit.

So you've got to ask yourself, why won't he release his tax returns? And I think there may be a couple of reasons. First, maybe he's not as rich as he says he is. Second, maybe he's not as charitable as he claims to be. Third, we don't know all of his business dealings but we have been told, through investigative reporting, that he owes about \$650 million to Wall Street and foreign banks.

Or maybe he doesn't want the American people, all of you watching tonight, to know that he's paid nothing in federal taxes because the only years that anybody has ever seen were a couple of years when had he to turn them over to state authorities when he was trying to get a casino license and they showed he didn't pay any federal income tax. So _

Trump:

55. **That makes me smart.**

Clinton: He paid zero. That means zero for troops, zero for vets, zero for schools or health. And I think probably he's not all that enthusiastic about having the rest of our country see what the real reasons are because it must be something really important, even terrible that he's trying to hide.

And the financial disclosure statement, they don't give you the tax rate. They don't give you all the details that tax returns would and it just seems to me that this is something that the American people deserve to see and I have no reason to believe that he's ever going to release his tax returns because there's something he's hiding.

And we'll guess, we'll keep guessing at what it is that he's hiding but I think the question is, will he ever, to get near the White House, what would be those conflicts? Who does he owe money to? Well, he owes you the answers to that and he should provide them.

Holt: He also raised the issue of your emails. Do you want to respond to that?

Clinton: I do. You know, I made a mistake using a private email.

Trump:

56. **That's for sure.**

Clinton: And if I had to do it over again, I would obviously do it differently. But I'm not going to make any excuses. It was a mistake and I take responsibility for that.

Holt: Mr. Trump?

Trump:

57. **That was more than a mistake. That was done purposely. Okay? That was not a mistake. That was done purposely. When you have your staff taking the fifth amendment, taking the fifth so they are not prosecuted, when you have the man that set up the illegal server taking the fifth, I think it's disgraceful. And believe me, this country thinks it's disgraceful — really thinks it's disgraceful, also.**

58. **As far as my tax returns, you don't learn that much from tax returns. You learn a lot from financial disclosures. I'm extremely under-leveraged. The report that said 650 — by the way, my friends said boy that's not a lot of money relative to what I had. The buildings in question, actually, it wasn't a bad story, to be honest with you, but the buildings are worth \$3.9 billion and the 650 isn't even on that.**

59. **But it's not 650. It's much less than that. But I could give you a list of banks, if that would help you, I would give you list of banks, these are fine institutions. I'm very under-leveraged. I have a great company and I have tremendous income.**

60. **I say that not in a braggadocios way but it's time that this country has somebody running the country who has an idea about money. When we are \$20 trillion in debt and our country is a mess. It's one thing to have \$20 trillion in debt and our airports and roads are good and — our airports are like from a third world country. You land at LaGuardia, Newark, LAX., and you come in from Dubai and Qatar, you come in from China, you see these incredible airports, we've become a third-world country.**

61. **So the worst of all things have happened. We owe \$20 trillion and we're a mess. Whether it's six or five but it looks like it's 6 — \$6 trillion in the Middle East we could have rebuilt our country twice and it's really a shame and it's politicians like Secretary Clinton that have caused this problem. Our country has tremendous problems. We're a debtor nation, we're a serious debtor nation and we need new bridges, airports, schools, new hospitals and we don't have the money because it's been squandered on so many of your ideas.**

Clinton: And maybe it's because you haven't paid any federal income tax for a lot of years. And the other thing I think is important —

Trump:

62. **It would be squandered, too, believe me.**

Clinton: And if your main claim to be President of the United States is your business, then I think we should talk about that.

You know, your campaign manager said that you built a lot of businesses on the backs of little guys. And indeed, I have met a lot of the people who were stiffed by you and your businesses, Donald. I've met dishwashers, painters, architects, glass installers, marble installers, drapery installers like my dad was who you refused to pay when they finished the work that you asked them to do.

We have an architect in the audience who designed one of your clubhouses at one of your golf courses. It's a beautiful facility. It immediately was put to use. And you wouldn't pay what the man needed to be paid what he was charging you.

Trump:

63. Maybe he didn't do a good job and I was unsatisfied with his work, which our country should do, too.

Clinton: For the thousands of people that you have stiffed over the course of your business, not deserve some kind of apology from someone who has taken their labor, taken the goods that they've produced and then refused to pay them.

I can only say that I'm certainly relieved that my late father never did business with you. He provided a good middle-class life for us but the people he worked for, he expected the bargain to be kept on both sides. And when we talk about your business, you've taken business bankruptcy six times. There are a lot of great business people that have never taken bankruptcy once.

You call yourself the king of debt. You talk about leverage. You even at one time suggested that you would try to negotiate down the national debt —

Trump:

64. Wrong.

Clinton: Of the United States. Well, sometimes there's not a direct transfer of skills from business to government but sometimes what happened in business would be really bad for government. So be very clear about that.

Trump:

65. Look, it's all words. It's all sound bites. I built an unbelievable company, some of the greatest assets anywhere in the world, real estate assets in the world beyond the United States and it's an unbelievable company. But on occasion, four times, we used certain laws that are there and when Secretary Clinton talks about people that didn't get paid, first of all, they did get paid a lot but taking advantage of the laws of the nation.

Now, if you want to change the laws, you've been there a long time, change the laws. But take advantage of the laws of the nation because I'm running a company. My obligation right now is to do well for myself, my family, my employees, for my companies. And that's what I do. But what she doesn't say is the tens of thousands of people that are unbelievably happy and they love me.

I'll give you an example. We're just opening up on Pennsylvania Avenue right next to the White House so if I don't get there one way, I'm going to get to Pennsylvania avenue another. But we're opening the old post office. Under budget, ahead of schedule, saved tremendous money, I'm a year ahead of schedule and that's what this country should be doing. We build roads and they cost two and three and four times what they are supposed to cost. We buy products for our military and they come at costs so far above what they are supposed to be because we don't have people that know what they are doing.

When we look at the budget, the budget is bad to a large extent because we have people that have no idea as to what to do and how to buy. The Trump International is way under budget and way ahead of schedule and we should be able to do that for our country.

Holt: We're well behind schedule so I'm going to move to our next segment. We move into our next segment talking about America's direction and let's talk about race. The share of Americans who say race relations are bad in this country is the highest it's been in decades. Much of it amplified by shootings in Arkansas and Tulsa. How do you heal the divide? Secretary Clinton, you get two minutes on this.

Clinton: Well, you're right. Race remains a significant challenge in our country. Unfortunately, race still determines too much. Often it determines where people live, determines what kind of education in their public schools they can get and, yes, it determines how they are treated in the criminal justice system.

We've just seen those two tragic examples in both Tulsa and Charlotte. And we've got to do several things at the same time. We have to restore trust between communities and the police. We have to work to make sure that our police are using the best training, the best techniques, that they are well-prepared to use force only when necessary. Everyone should be respected by the law and everyone should respect the law. Right now, that's not the case in a lot of our neighborhoods.

So I have, ever since the first day of my campaign, called for criminal justice reform. I've laid out a platform that I think would begin to remedy some of the problems we have in the criminal justice system.

But we also have to recognize, in addition to the challenges that we face with policing, there are so many good, brave police officers who equally want reform. So we have to bring communities together in order to begin working on that as a mutual goal. And we've got to get guns out of the hands of people who should not have them.

The gun epidemic is the leading cause of death of young African-American men, more than the next nine causes put together. So we have to do two things, as I said. We have to restore trust, we have to work with the police, we have to make sure they respect the communities and the communities respect them and we have to tackle the plague of gun violence, which is a big contributor to a lot of the problems that we're seeing today.

Holt: Mr. Trump, you have two minutes. How do you heal the divide?

Trump:

66. First of all, Secretary Clinton doesn't want to use a couple of words. And that's law and order. We need law and order. If we don't have it, we're not going to have a country. And when I look at what's going on in Charlotte, a city I love, a city where I have investments, when I look at what's going on in various parts of our country, I could keep naming them all day long, we need law and order in our country. And I just got today the — as you know, the endorsement of the fraternal order of police, it just came in.

67. We have endorsements from I think almost every police group — a large percentage of them in the United States. We have a situation where we have our inner cities, African-Americans, hispanics are living in hell because it's so dangerous. You walk down the street, you get shot. In Chicago, they've had thousands of shootings, thousands since January 1st. Thousands of shootings.

68. And I'm saying, where is this? Is this a war-torn country? What are we doing? And we have to stop the violence, we have to bring back law and order in a place like Chicago where thousands of people have been killed, thousands over the last number of years. In fact, almost 4,000 have been killed since Barack Obama became president, over 4 — almost 4,000 people in Chicago have been killed.

69. We have to bring back law and order. Now, whether or not in a place like Chicago you do stop and frisk, which worked very well, Mayor Giuliani is here, worked well in New York, brought the crime way down. But you take the gun away from criminals that shouldn't be having it. We have gangs roaming the street and in many cases they are illegally here, illegal immigrants, and they have guns and they shoot people. We have to be very strong and we have to be very vigilant.

70. We have to know what we're doing. Right now, our police, in many cases, are afraid to do anything. We have to protect our inner cities because African-American communities are being decimated by crime.

Holt: Your two minutes expired but I want to follow up. Stop-and-frisk was ruled unconstitutional in New York because it largely singled out black and hispanic —

Trump:

71. No, you're wrong. It went before a judge who was a very against police judge. It was taken away from her and our mayor, our new mayor, refused to go forward with the case. They would have won on appeal. If you look at it throughout the country, there are —

Holt: The argument is that it's a form of racial profiling.

Trump:

72. No. The argument is that we have to take the gun away from these people that have them and are bad people and shouldn't have them. These are felons. These are people that are bad people that shouldn't be — when you have 3,000 shootings in Chicago from January 1st, when you have 4,000 people killed in Chicago by guns from the beginning of the presidency of Barack Obama, his hometown, you have to have stop and frisk.

73. You need more police. You need a better community, you know, relation. You don't have good community relations in Chicago. It's terrible. I have property there. It's terrible what's going on in Chicago. And Chicago's not the only one.

74. You go to Ferguson, so many other places. You need better relationships. I agree with Secretary Clinton on this. You need better relationships. You need better relationships between the community and police, but you look at Dallas where the relationships were a beautiful thing. And then five police officers were killed. One night very violently. So there's some bad things going on. Some really bad things. But we need, Lester, we need law and order, and we need law and order in the inner cities. Because the people that are most affected by what's happening are African-Americans and hispanics, and it's very unfair to them what our politicians are allowing to happen.

Holt: Secretary Clinton?

Clinton: Well, I've heard Donald say this at his rallies, and it's really unfortunate that he paints such a dire, negative picture of black communities in our country.

Trump:

75. Oh.

Clinton: [He misses the] vibrancy of the black church. The black businesses that employ so many people. The opportunities that so many families are working to provide for their kids. We do always have to make sure we keep people safe. There are the right ways of doing it, then there are ways that are infective. Stop-and-frisk was found to be unconstitutional. And in part because it was infective. It did not do what it needed to do.

Now I believe in community policing. And in fact, violent crime is one half of what it was in 1991. Property crime is down 40 percent. We just don't want to see it creep back up. We've had 25 years of very good cooperation, but there were some problems, some unintended consequences. Too many young African-American and Latino men ended up in jail for non-violent offenses, and it's just a fact that if you're a young African-American man, and you do the same thing as a young white man, you are more likely to be arrested, charged, convicted and incarcerated. So we've got to address the systemic racism in our criminal justice system. We can't just say "law and order." We have to say, we have to come forward with a plan that is going to divert people from the criminal justice system. Deal with mandatory minimum sentences which have put too many people away for too long for doing too little. We need more second chance programs. I'm glad we're ending prisons. There are some positive ways we can work on this. And I believe strongly that common sense gun safety measures would assist us right now.

And this is something Donald has supported, along with the gun lobby, right now, we've got too many military-style weapons on the streets in a lot of places. Our police are outgunned. We have comprehensive background checks, and we need to keep guns out of the hands of those who will do harm, and we finally need to pass a prohibition on anyone who's on the terrorist watch list from being able to buy a gun. If you're too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun. So there are things that we can do, and we ought to do it in a bipartisan way.

Holt: You said we need do everything possible to improve policing to go right at implicit bias. Do you think police are implicitly biased against black people?

Clinton: I think implicit bias is a problem for everyone, not just police. I think too many of us in our great country jump to conclusions about each other. And therefore I think we need all of us to be asking hard questions about, why am I feeling this way?

But when it comes to policing, since it can have literally, fatal consequences, I have said in my first budget, we would put money into that budget to help us deal with implicit bias, by retraining a lot of our police officers. I've met with a group of very distinguished, experienced police chiefs a few weeks ago. They admit it's an issue.

They've got a lot of concerns. Mental health is one of the biggest concern, because now police are having to handle a lot of really difficult mental health problems on the street. They want support. They want more training. They want more assistance. And I think the federal government could be in a position where we would offer and provide that.

Trump:

76. I'd like to respond to that. Police. First of all, I agree, and a lot of people even within my own party want to give certain rights to people on watch lists and no fly lists. A person is on a watch list or no-fly list, and I have the endorsement of the NRA. But we have to look very strongly at no-fly lists and watch lists, and when people are on there, even if they shouldn't be on there, we'll help them legally, we'll help them get off, but I tend to agree with that.

77. But I want to bring up the fact that you were the one who brought up the term super predator about young black youth. And that's a term that's been horribly met. I think you've apologized for it. But I think it was a terrible thing to say, and when it comes to stop and frisk, you know, you're talking about taking guns away, I'm talking about taking guns away from gangs and people that use them. And I don't really think you disagree with me on this if you want to know the truth.

78. Maybe there's a political reason why you can't say it, but I really don't believe — in New York City we had 2,200 murders and stop-and-frisk brought it down to 500 murders. Five-hundred is a lot of murders, hard to believe, like 500 is supposed to be good? But we went from 2,200 to 500, and it was continued on by [former New York] Mayor Bloomberg, discontinued by the current mayor. So when you say it has no impact, it really did. It had a very, very big impact.

Clinton: It's also fair to say, if we're going to talk about mayors, that under the current mayor, crime has continued to drop, including murders.

Trump:

79. You're wrong.

Clinton: No, I'm not.

Trump:

80. Murders are up. You check it.

Clinton: I give credit, across the board, going back two mayors, two police chiefs, because it has worked. And other communities need to come together to do what will work as well. Look, one murder is too many. But it is important that we learn from things that were effective but not from things that sound good but don't have the impact that we would want. Who disagrees with keeping neighborhoods safe, but let's also add, no one should disagree about respecting the rights of young men who live in those neighborhoods. So we need to do a better job of working, again, with the communities, faith communities, business communities, as well as the police, to try to deal with this problem.

Holt: This conversation is about race.

Trump:

81. I'd like to respond if I might.

Holt: Please respond, then I have a follow up question.

Trump:

82. Look, the African-American community has been let down by our politicians. They talk good around election time, like right now. And after the election they say see you later, I'll see you in four year of the African American community, they've been abused and used in order to get votes by Democrats and politicians.

83. They've controlled these communities for up to 100 years. I'll tell you, you look at the inner cities, and I left Detroit and Philadelphia and you've seen me. I've been all over the place. You decided to stay home, and that's okay. But I will tell you. I've been all over, and I've met some of the greatest people I'll ever meet within these

communities, and they are very, very upset with what their politicians have told them and what their politicians have done.

Clinton: I think Donald just criticized me for preparing for this debate. And yes, I did. And you know what else I prepared for? I prepared to be president. And I think that's a good thing.

Holt: Mr. Trump, for five years you've perpetuated a false claim of the nation's first black president was not a natural-born citizen. You questioned his legitimacy.

In the last couple weeks you acknowledged what most Americans have accepted for years, the president was born in the United States, can you tell us what took you so long?

Trump:

84. I'll tell you, very simple to say. Sidney Blumenthal works for the campaign and close are, very close friend of secretary Clinton. And her campaign manager, Patty Doyle, went to, during the campaign, her campaign against Obama — Patty Doyle was on Wolf Blitzer, saying that this happened. Blumenthal sent McClatchy, highly respected reporter to Kenya to find out about it.

85. They were pressing it very hard. She failed to get the birth certificate. When I got involved, I didn't fail. I got him to give the birth certificate. So I'm satisfied with it, and I'll tell you why I'm satisfied with it, because I want to get on to defeating ISIS. Because I want to get on to creating jobs. Because I want to get on to having a strong border. Because I want to get on to things that are very important to me, and that are very important to the country.

Holt: I'll let you respond, it's important, but I just want to get answer — the birth certificate was produced in 2011. You continued to tell the story and question the president's legitimacy in 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, as recently as January. So the question is, what changed your mind?

Trump:

86. Well, nobody was pressing it. Nobody was caring much about it figured you'd asked question tonight, but I was one that got them to produce the birth certificate, and I think I did a good job. Secretary Clinton also fought it, you know everyone in mainstream's going to say that's not true. It's true. Sidney Blumenthal sent the reporter. You just have to take a look at CNN, the interview with your former campaign manager, and she was involved. But just like she can't bring back jobs, she can't produce.

Holt: I'm sorry, I will let you respond to that. There's a lot there. But we're talking about racial healing in this statement.

Trump:

87. I say nothing, because I was able to get him to produce it. He should have produced it a long time before. I say nothing, but when you talk about healing, I think that I've developed very, very good relationships, over the last little while with the African-American community, I think you can see that. And I feel that they really wanted me to come to that conclusion, and I think I did a great job and a great service, not only for the country, but even for the president in getting him to produce his birth certificate.

Holt: Secretary Clinton?

Clinton: Well, just listen to what you heard. [Laughter] And clearly, as Donald just admitted, he knew he was going to stand on this debate stage and Lester Holt was going to be asking us questions, so he tried to put the whole racist/birther lie to bed, but it can't be dismissed that easily. He has really started his political activity based on this racist lie that our first black president was not an American citizen. There was absolutely no evidence for it, but he persisted.

He persisted year after year, because some of his supporters, people that he was trying to bring into his fold, apparently believed it or wanted to believe it. But remember, Donald started his career back in 1973, being sued by the justice department for racial discrimination.

Because he would not rent apartments in one of his developments to African-Americans, and he made sure that the people who worked for him understood that was the policy.

He actually was sued twice by the justice department. So he has a long record of engaging in racist behavior. And the birther lie was a very hurtful one. And you know, Barack Obama is a man of great dignity. And I could tell how much it bothered him and annoyed him that this was being touted and used against him, but I like to remember what Michelle Obama said in her amazing speech at our democratic national convention. When they go low, we go high. And Barack Obama went high. Despite Donald Trump's best efforts to bring him down.

Holt: Mr. Trump, you can respond. And we're going to move on to the next segment.

Trump:

88. I'd like that respond. I got to watch in preparing for your debates for Barack Obama you treated him with terrible disrespect. And I watch the way you talk now about how lovely everything is. It doesn't work that way. Were you after him, you were trying to, you even sent out pictures of him in a certain garb, very famous pictures, I don't think you can deny that. But just last week your campaign manager said it was true. So when you try to act holier than thou, it really doesn't work. As far as the lawsuit, yes, when I was very young, I went into my father's company.

89. And we, along with many, many other companies throughout the country were sued. We settled the suit with no admission of guilt. Zero. I notice the nasty commercials that you do on me in so many different ways, which I

don't do on you, maybe I'm trying to save the money, but frankly, I look at that, and I say, isn't that amazing, because I settled that lawsuit, with no admission of guilt. But that was a lawsuit brought against many real estate firms, and it's just one of those things, I'll go one step further. In Palm Beach, Florida, tough community, a brilliant community, probably the wealthiest in the world. I opened a club, and really got great credit for it. No discrimination against African-Americans, against Muslims, against anybody.

90. And it's a tremendously successful club, and I'm so glad I did it, and I have been given great credit for what I did. And I'm very, very proud of it. And that's the way I feel. That is the true way I feel.

Holt: Our next segment is called securing America. We want to start with a 21st century war happening every day in this country, our institutions are under cyber attack, and our secrets are being stolen. So my question is who's behind it and how do we fight it? Secretary Clinton, this goes to you.

Clinton: I think cyber security, cyber warfare will be one of the greatest challenges facing the next president, because clearly we're facing at this point, two different kinds adversaries. There are the independent hacking groups that do it mostly for commercial reasons to try to steal information that they then can use to make money. But increasingly, we are seeing cyberattacks coming from states.

The most recent and troubling of these has been Russia. There's no doubt now that Russia has used cyberattacks against all kinds of organizations in our country, and I am deeply concerned about this. I know Donald very pie, praiseworthy of Vladimir Putin.

But Putin is playing a very tough, long game here. And one of the things he's done is to let loose cyber attackers to hack into government files, to personal files, the democratic national committee. And we recently learned that this is one of their preferred methods of trying to wreak havoc and collect information. We need to make it very clear, whether it's Russia, China, Iran, or anybody else, the United States has much greater capacity.

And we are not going to sit idly by and permit state actors to go after our information, our private sector information or our public sector information, and we're going to have to make it clear that we don't want to use the kinds of tools that we have. We don't want to engage in a different kind of warfare.

But we will defend the citizens of this country, and the Russians need to understand that. I think they've been treating it as almost a probing, how far would we go? How much would we do? And that's why I was so, I was so shocked when Donald publicly invited Putin to hack into Americans. That is, that is just unacceptable. It's one of the reasons why 50 national security officials who served in Republican information, administration have said that Donald is unfit to be the commander in chief. It's comments like that that really worry people who understand the threats that we face.

Holt: Mr. Trump, you have two minutes in the same question.

Trump:

91. I do want to say that I was just endorsed and more are coming next week, it will be over 200 admirals. Many of them are here, admirals and generals endorsed me to lead this country. That just happened. And many more are coming. And I'm very proud of it. In addition, I was just endorse the by ice. So when Secretary Clinton talks about I'll take the admirals and generals any day over the political hacks.

92. Look at the mess that we're in. Look at the mess that we're in. As far as the cyber, I agree to parts of what secretary Clinton said, we should be better than anybody else, and perhaps we're not. I don't know if we know it was Russia who broke into the DNC.

93. She's saying Russia, Russia, Russia. Maybe it was. It could also be China, it could be someone sitting on their bed that weighs 400 pounds. You don't know who broke into DNC, but what did we learn? We learn that Bernie Sanders was taken advantage of by your people. By Debbie Wasserman Schultz.

94. Look what happened to her. But Bernie Sanders was taken advantage of. Now, whether that was Russia, whether that was China, whether it was another country, we don't know, because the truth is, under president Obama we've lost control of things that we used to have control over. We came in with an internet, we came up with the internet.

95. And I think Secretary Clinton and myself would agree very much, when you look at what ISIS is doing with the internet, they're beating us at our own game. ISIS. So we have to get very, very tough on cyber and cyber warfare. It is a, it is a huge problem.

96. I have a son. He's 10 years old. He has computers. He is so good with these computers, it's unbelievable. The security aspect of cyber is very, very tough. And maybe it's hardly do-able. But I will say, we are not doing the job we should be doing, but that's true throughout our whole governmental society. We have so many things that we have to do better, Lester and certainly cyber is one of them.

Holt: Secretary Clinton?

Clinton: Well, I think there are a number of issues that we should be addressing. I have put forth a plan to defeat ISIS. It does involve going after them online.

I think we need do much more with our tech companies to prevent ISIS and their operatives from being able to use the internet, to radicalize, even direct people in our country and Europe and elsewhere, but we also have to intensify our airstrikes against ISIS and eventually support our Arab and Kurdish partners to be able to actually take out ISIS in Raqqa and their [inaudible] of being a caliphate.

We're making progress. Our military is assisting in Iraq. And we're hoping within a year we'll be able to push them out of Iraq and really squeeze them in Syria. But we have to be cognizant of the fact that they've had foreign fighters coming to volunteer for them, foreign money, foreign weapons, so we have to make this the top priority. And I would also do everything possible to take out their leadership. I was involved in a number efforts to take out Al Qaeda leadership when I was secretary of state, including of course taking out bin laden, and I think we need to go after Baghdadi as well, make that one of our organizing principles. Because we've got to defeat ISIS and do everything we can to disrupt their propaganda efforts online.

Holt: You mentioned ISIS, and we think of ISIS certainly as "Over there", but there are American citizens who have been inspired to commit acts of terror on American soil. For instance the recent attacks in New Jersey and New York and deadly attacks in San Bernardino and Orlando. Tell us specifically how you would prevent home-grown attacks by American citizens. Mr. Trump?

Trump:

97. First I have to say one thing very important. Secretary Clinton is talking about taking out ISIS. We will take out ISIS. Well, president Obama and secretary Clinton created a vacuum the way they got out of Iraq, because they got out, they shouldn't have been in, but once they got in, the way they got out — they got out was a disaster. She's been trying to take them out for a long time. But they wouldn't even have been formed if they left some troops behind. Like 10,000 or maybe something more than that.

98. And then you wouldn't have had them. Or, as I've been saying for a long time, and I think you'll agree, because I said it to you once, had we taken the oil, and we should have taken the oil, ISIS would not have been able to form either, because the oil was their primary source of income. And now they have the oil all over the place, including the oil, a lot of the oil in Libya. Which was another one of her disasters.

Clinton: Secretary Clinton?

Clinton: Well, I hope the fact checkers are turning up the volume and really working hard. Donald supported the invasion of Iraq.

Trump:

99. Wrong.

Clinton: That is absolutely --

Trump:

100. Wrong.

Clinton: Proved over and over again.

Trump:

101. Wrong.

Clinton: He actually advocated for the actions we took in Libya and urged that Gaddafi be taken out after actually doing some business with him one time. But the larger point, he says this constantly, is George W. Bush made the agreement about when American troops would leave Iraq.

Not Barack Obama. And the only way that American troops could have stayed in Iraq is to get an agreement from the then Iraqi government that would have protected our troops. And the Iraqi government would not give that. But let's talk about the question you asked, Lester.

The question you asked is what do we do here in the united States. That's the most important part of this. How do we prevent attacks. How do we protect our people? And I think we've got to have an intelligent surge, where we are looking for every scrap of information. I was so proud of law enforcement in New York, in Minnesota, in New Jersey, you know, they responded so quickly, so professionally to the attacks that occurred I and they brought him down. And we may find out more information because he is still alive, which may be an intelligence benefit.

So we need to do everything we can to vacuum up intelligence from the Middle East, from Europe, that means we have to work more closely with our allies, and that is something that Donald has been very dismissive of. We're working with nato, the longest military alliance in the history of the world to turn our attention to the Middle East. Our Muslim majority nations, Donald has consistently insulted muslims abroad, muslims at home, when we need to be cooperating with Muslim nations and with the American Muslim community. They're on the front lines. They can provide information to us that we might not get anywhere else. They need to have close, working, cooperation with law enforcement in these communities. Not be alienated and pushed away as some of Donald's rhetoric, unfortunately, has led to.

Trump:

102. Well, I'd have to respond.

Holt: Respond.

Trump:

103. The secretary said I have strongly about working with, we've been working with them for many years, and we have the greatest mess anyone's ever seen. Under your direction, to a large extent. But you look at the Middle East.

104. You started the Iran deal. That's another beauty where you have a country that was ready to fall, they were doing so badly. They were choking on the sanctions, and now they're probably going to be a major power at some

point the way they're going. But when you look at NATO, I was asked on a major show. You have to understand I'm a business person, I did well, but I have common sense.

105. I said well, I'll tell you, I haven't given lots of thought to nato, many of them aren't paying their fair share. That bothers me, because yes, we're defending them, they should be at least paying us what they are supposed to be paying by treaty and contract. And number two, I said in very strongly, NATO could be obsolete, because, and I was very strong on this, and it was actually covered very accurately in the New York Times, which is unusual for the New York Times, to be honest, but I said they do not focus on terror. And I was very strong. And I said it numerous times.

106. And about four months ago, I read on the front page of the Wall Street journal that NATO is opening up a major terror division, and I think that's great. And I think we should get, because we pay approximately 73 percent of the cost of NATO. It's a lot of money to protect other people. But I'm all for NATO. But I said they have to focus on terror also. And they're going to do that. And that was, believe me, I'm sure I'm not going to get credit for it, but that was largely because of what I was saying and my criticism of NATO.

107. I think we have to get nato to go into the Middle East with us. In addition to surrounding nations, and we have to knock the hell out of ISIS. And we have to it fast. When ISIS formed in this vacuum created by Barack Obama and Secretary Clinton, and believe me, you were the ones that took out the troops. Not only that, you named the day. They sat back and —

Clinton: We've covered this ground.

Trump:

108. When they formed, this is something that never should have happened. It should never happened. Now you're talking about taking out ISIS. But you were there, and you were secretary of state when it was a little infant. Now it's in over 30 countries, and you're going to stop them? I don't think so.

Holt: Mr. Trump, a lot of these judgment questions. You supported the War in Iraq.

Trump:

109. That is a mainstream media nonsense put out by her, because she frankly, I think the best person in her campaign is mainstream media. Would you like to hear? I was against the war, wait a minute. I was against the war in Iraq. Just so you put it out.

Clinton: The record shows otherwise, but.

Trump:

110. It does not show that. The record shows that I'm right. When I did an interview with Howard Stern, very lightly, first time anybody's asked me, I said who knows. Essentially, I then did an interview Neil Cavuto. I had numerous conversations with Sean Hannity at Fox, and he called me the other day and I spoke to him about it. He said you were totally, because he was for the war.

Holt: Why --

Trump:

111. And that is before the war started. Sean Hannity said very strongly, to me and other people, he's willing to say, but nobody wants to call him, I was against the war. He said you used to have fights with me, because Sean was in favor of the war. And I understand that side also. Not very much, because we should have never been there, but nobody called Sean Hannity. And then they did an article in a major magazine, shortly after the war started. I think in '04. But they did an article, which had me totally against the War in Iraq.

112. And one of your compatriots said, you know, whether it was before or right after, trump was, because if you read this article, there's no doubt. But if somebody, and I'll ask the press, if somebody would call up Sean Hannity, this was before the war started. He and I used to have arguments about the war. I said it's a terrible and a stupid thing. It's going to destabilize the Middle East. And that exactly what this's done.

Holt: My reference is to what you said in 2002.

Trump:

113. You didn't hear what I said.

Holt: Why is your judgment any different than Mrs. Clinton's?

Trump:

114. I have better judgment, I also have a much better temperament than she does, you know? I have a much better. She spent, let me tell you. She spent hundreds of millions of dollars on an advertising, you know, they get Madison Avenue into a room. Temperament, let's go after. I think my strongest asset, maybe by far is my temperament. I have a winning temperament. I know how to win. She does not.

Holt: Secretary —

Trump:

115. The AFL-CIO, the other day, behind the blue screen, I don't know who you were talking to, Secretary, Clinton, but you were totally out of control. I said there's a person with a temperament that's got a problem.

Holt: Secretary Clinton?

Clinton: Woo, okay. [Laughter] Let's talk about two important issues that were briefly mentioned by Donald. First, NATO. NATO, as a military alliance, has something called Article V. And basically it says this. An attack on one is an attack on all. And do you know the only time it's ever been invoked after 9/11.

When the 28 nations said that they would go to Afghanistan with us to fight terrorism. Something that they still are doing by our side. With respect to Iran, when I became secretary of state Iran was weeks away from having enough nuclear material to form a bomb. They had mastered the nuclear fuel cycle under the bush administration. They had built covert facilities, stocked them with centrifuges that were whirling away. And we had sanctioned them. I voted for every sanction against Iran when I was in the senate, but it wasn't enough.

So I spent a year and a half putting together a coalition that included Russia and China, to impose the toughest sanctions on Iran, and we did drive them to the negotiating table. And my successor, John Kerry and President Obama got a deal that put a lid on Iran's nuclear program. Without firing a single shot. That's diplomacy. That's coalition building. That's working with other nations. The other day I saw Donald saying that there were some Iranian sailors on a ship in the waters off of Iran, and they were taunting American sailors who were on a nearby ship. He said, you know, if they taunted our sailors, I'd blow them out of the water and start another war. That's

—
Trump:

116. That would not start a war.

Clinton: That's bad judgment. That is not the right temperament to be commander in chief, to be taunted and the worst part —

Trump:

117. They were taunting us —

Clinton: I heard Donald say has been about nuclear weapons. He has said repeatedly he didn't care if other countries got nuclear weapon, Japan, Saudi Arabia. It has been the policy of the United States, Republicans and Democrats to reduce the proliferation of nuclear weapons. He even said if there were nuclear war in east Asia, that's fine, you know.

Trump:

118. Wrong.

Clinton: Have a good time, folks.

Trump:

119. That's lies.

Clinton: And in fact, his cavalier attitude about nuclear weapons is so deeply troubling. That is the number one threat we face in the world, and it particularly threatening if terrorists get their hands on a nuclear weapon. So a man who can be as easily tweaked should not have his hands anywhere near the nuclear codes.

Trump:

120. This argument is getting a little old.

Clinton: It's a good one, though, well describes the problem.

Trump:

121. It's not an accurate one at all. Not an accurate one. I want to give a lot of things. I agree with her on one thing. The single greatest problem the world has is nuclear armament, nuclear weapons. Not global warming, like you think and your president thinks. Nuclear is the greatest threat. Just to go down the list, we defend Japan. We defend Germany. We defend South Korea, we defend Saudi Arabia. We defend countries. They do not pay us what they should be paying us, because we are providing tremendous service and losing a fortune. We lose on everything. I say who makes these? We lose on everything. What I said, it's very possible that if they don't pay a fair share, because this is isn't 40 years ago where we could do what we're doing. We can't defend Japan, a behemoth selling us cars by the millions.

Holt: We need to move on.

Trump:

122. All I said is they may have to defend themselves or help us out. We're a country that owes \$20 trillion. They have to help us out. Nuclear is concerned, I agree. It is the single greatest threat.

Holt: Which leads to the last subject. We're on the subject of securing America. On nuclear war, President Obama considered changing the policy on first use. Do you support that?

Trump:

123. I have to say, what Secretary Clinton was saying about nuclear aggression. Russia has been expanding there, they have a much newer capability than we do. We have not been updating from the new standpoint. I looked the other night, I was seeing B-52s that your father, your grandfather could be flying them. We are not keeping up with other countries. I'd like everybody to end it, just get rid of it, but I would certainly not do first strike. I think once the nuclear alternative happens, it's over. At the same time, we have to be prepared. I can't take anything off the table. Because you look at some of these countries. You look at North Korea, we're doing nothing there. China should solve that problem for us. China should go into north Korea, China is totally powerful as it relates to North Korea.

124. And by the way, another one is the worst deal, I think, I've ever seen negotiated that you started as the Iran deal — Iran is one of their biggest trading partners. Iran has power over North Korea. And when they made that horrible deal with Iran, they ought to have included the fact that they do something with respect to North Korea and Yemen and all these other places, and when asked of Secretary Kerry, why didn't you do that? One [inaudible] of all time, including \$400 million in cash. Nobody's ever seen that of about, that turned out to be wrong, it was actually \$1.7 billion in cash. Obviously, I guess for the hostages, it certainly looks that way. Why didn't they make the right deal? This is one of the worse deal the made by any country in history. The deal with Iran will lead to nuclear problems, all they have to do is sit back 10 years, and they don't have to do much. I met with [Prime Minister of Israel] Bibi Netanyahu. He's not a happy camper.

Clinton: Let me start by saying words matter. Words matter when you run for president, and they really matter when you are president.

We have mutual defense treaties, and we will honor them. It is essential that America's word be good. And so I know that this campaign has caused some questioning and some worries on the part of many leaders across the globe. I've talked with a number of them. But I want to, on behalf of myself and, I think on behalf of a majority of the American people say that, you know, our word is good. It's also important that we look at the entire globe situation.

There's no doubt that we have other problems with Iran, but personally, I'd rather deal with the other problems having put that lid on their nuclear program than still to be facing that. And Donald never tells you what he would do. Would he have started a war? Would he have bombed Iran? If he's going to criticize a deal that has been very successful in giving us access to Iranian facilities that we never had before, then he should tell us what his alternative would be. But it's like his plan to defeat ISIS. He says it's a secret plan, but the only secret is that he has no plan. So we need to be more precise in how we talk about these issues.

People around the world follow our presidential campaigns so closely, trying to get hints about what we will do. Can they rely on us? Are we going to lead the world with strength on our values? That's what I intend to do. I intend to be a leader of our country that people can count on both here at home and around the world to make decisions that will further peace and prosperity but also stand up to bullies, whether they're abroad or at home. We cannot let those who would try to destabilize the world, to interfere with American interests and security —

Holt: Two minutes is expired.

Trump:

125. One thing I'd like to say.

Holt: Very quickly.

Trump:

126. But I will tell you, Hillary tell you to go to her website and read all about how to defeat ISIS. Right now it's getting tougher and tougher to defeat them, because they're in more and more places and it's a big problem, and as far as Japan is concerned, I want to help all of our allies. But we are losing billions and billions of dollars. We cannot be the policeman of the world. We cannot protect countries all over the world.

Holt: We have just a —

Trump:

127. Where they're not paying us what we need.

Holt: We have just a few final questions.

Trump:

128. She didn't say that, because she has no business ability. We need heart, we need a lot of things, but you have to have some basic ability. And sadly, she doesn't have that. All of the things that she's talking about could have been taken care of during the last 10 years, let's say, while she has great power, but they weren't taken care. And if she ever wins this race, they won't be taken care of.

Holt: This year, Secretary Clinton became the first woman nominated from a major party. Earlier you said she doesn't have a presidential look, she's standing here what did you mean by that?

Trump:

129. She doesn't have the look. She doesn't have the stamina. I said she doesn't have the stamina, and I don't believe she does have the stamina. To be president of this country, you need tremendous stamina.

Holt: The quote was I just don't think she has a presidential look.

Trump:

130. Did you ask me a question? You have to be able to negotiate our trade deals. You have to be able to negotiate. That's right. With Japan, with Saudi Arabia. I mean, can you imagine, we're defending Saudi Arabia and with all of the money they have, we're defending them, and they're not paying, all you have to do is speak to them. You have so many different things, you have to be able to do, and I don't believe that Hillary has the stamina.

Holt: Let's let her respond.

Clinton: Well, as soon as he travels to 112 countries and negotiates a peace deal, a cease-fire, a release of dissidents, an opening of new opportunities in nations around the world or even spends 11 hours testifying in front of a congressional committee, he can talk to me about stamina.

Trump:

131. The world. [Cheers and applause] Let me tell you. Let me tell you. Hillary has experience, but it's bad experience. We have made so many bad deals during the last — [cheers and applause] So she has experience I agree. But it's bad experience, whether it's the Iran deal you're so in love with where we gave them \$150 billion back. You almost can't name a good deal. She's got experience, but it's bad experience. And this country can't afford to have another four years of that kind of bad experience. [Cheers and applause]

Holt: We are at the final question.

Clinton: One thing, Lester. He tried to switch from looks to stamina. But this is a man who has called women pigs, slobs, and dogs. And someone who has said pregnancy is an inconvenience to employers, who has said —

Trump:

132. I never said that.

Clinton: Women don't deserve equal pay unless they do as good a job as men. And one of the worst things he said was about a woman in a beauty contest. He loves beauty contests, supporting them and hanging around them. And he called that woman Ms. Piggy. Then he called her Ms. Housekeeping, because she was Latina. Donald, she has a name.

Trump:

133. Where did you find this?

Clinton: She has become a US Citizen, and you can bet, she's going to vote this November.

Trump:

134. Let me just tell you.

Holt: Ten seconds.

Trump:

135. Hillary is hitting me with tremendous commercials. Some of it's in entertainment. Somebody who's been very tough to me, Rosie O'Donnell. But you want to know the truth? I was going to say something --

Holt: Please, very quickly.

Trump:

136. Extremely rough to Hillary, to her family, and I said to myself, I can't do it. I just can't do it. It's inappropriate. It's not nice. But she's hundreds of millions of dollars on negative ads even me, many of which are untrue, and they're misrepresentations, and I will tell you this, Lester, it's not nice, and I don't deserve that, but it's certainly not a nice thing that she's done. Hundreds of millions of ads. The only gratifying thing is I, and with \$200 million spent, and I'm either winning or tied.

Holt: One of you will not win this election, are you willing to accept the outcome as the will of the voters?

Clinton: I support our democracy. And sometimes you win. Sometimes you lose. But I certainly will support the outcome of this election. And I know Donald's trying very hard to plant doubts about it. It's not about us so much as it is about you and your families and the kind of country and future you want. So I sure hope you will get out and vote as though your future depended on it because it does.

Holt: Will you accept the outcome as the will of the voters?

Trump:

137. I want to make America great again. The other day we were deporting 800 people. Perhaps they pressed the wrong button, or perhaps worse than that, it was corruption. These people we were going to deport ended up becoming citizens. End the up becoming citizens, and it's 800, and now it turns out, it might be 1,800, and they don't even know.

Holt: Will you accept the outcome of the election?

Trump:

138. I'm going to make America great again. I will be able to do it. If she wins, I will absolutely support her.

Holt: That is going to do it for us. That concludes our debate for this evening, a spirited one. We covered a lot of ground. Not everything as I suspected we would. The next presidential debates are scheduled for October 9th at Washington University in St. Louis and October 19th at the University of Las Vegas. A vice presidential debate is October 4th in Farmville, Virginia. Many thanks to Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton and Hofstra University for hosting us tonight, good night, everyone.

4. Second presidential debate, October 9th 2016

RADDATZ: Ladies and gentlemen the Republican nominee for president, Donald J. Trump, and the Democratic nominee for president, Hillary Clinton.

(APPLAUSE)

COOPER: Thank you very much for being here. We're going to begin with a question from one of the members in our town hall. Each of you will have two minutes to respond to this question. Secretary Clinton, you won the coin toss, so you'll go first. Our first question comes from Patrice Brock. Patrice?

QUESTION: Thank you, and good evening. The last debate could have been rated as MA, mature audiences, per TV parental guidelines. Knowing that educators assign viewing the presidential debates as students' homework, do you feel you're modeling appropriate and positive behavior for today's youth?

CLINTON: Well, thank you. Are you a teacher? Yes, I think that that's a very good question, because I've heard from lots of teachers and parents about some of their concerns about some of the things that are being said and done in this campaign.

And I think it is very important for us to make clear to our children that our country really is great because we're good. And we are going to respect one another, lift each other up. We are going to be looking for ways to celebrate our diversity, and we are going to try to reach out to every boy and girl, as well as every adult, to bring them in to working on behalf of our country.

I have a very positive and optimistic view about what we can do together. That's why the slogan of my campaign is "Stronger Together," because I think if we work together, if we overcome the divisiveness that sometimes sets Americans against one another, and instead we make some big goals — and I've set forth some big goals, getting the economy to work for everyone, not just those at the top, making sure that we have the best education system from preschool through college and making it affordable, and so much else.

If we set those goals and we go together to try to achieve them, there's nothing in my opinion that America can't do. So that's why I hope that we will come together in this campaign. Obviously, I'm hoping to earn your vote, I'm hoping to be elected in November, and I can promise you, I will work with every American.

I want to be the president for all Americans, regardless of your political beliefs, where you come from, what you look like, your religion. I want us to heal our country and bring it together because that's, I think, the best way for us to get the future that our children and our grandchildren deserve.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, thank you. Mr. Trump, you have two minutes.

1. TRUMP: Well, I actually agree with that. I agree with everything she said. I began this campaign because I was so tired of seeing such foolish things happen to our country. This is a great country. This is a great land. I've gotten to know the people of the country over the last year-and-a-half that I've been doing this as a politician. I cannot believe I'm saying that about myself, but I guess I have been a politician.

2. TRUMP: And my whole concept was to make America great again. When I watch the deals being made, when I watch what's happening with some horrible things like Obamacare, where your health insurance and health care is going up by numbers that are astronomical, 68 percent, 59 percent, 71 percent, when I look at the Iran deal and how bad a deal it is for us, it's a one-sided transaction where we're giving back \$150 billion to a terrorist state, really, the number one terror state, we've made them a strong country from really a very weak country just three years ago.

3. When I look at all of the things that I see and all of the potential that our country has, we have such tremendous potential, whether it's in business and trade, where we're doing so badly. Last year, we had almost \$800 billion trade deficit. In other words, trading with other countries. We had an \$800 billion deficit. It's hard to believe. Inconceivable.

4. You say who's making these deals? We're going to make great deals. We're going to have a strong border. We're going to bring back law and order. Just today, policemen was shot, two killed. And this is happening on a weekly basis. We have to bring back respect to law enforcement. At the same time, we have to take care of people on all sides. We need justice.

5. But I want to do things that haven't been done, including fixing and making our inner cities better for the African-American citizens that are so great, and for the Latinos, Hispanics, and I look forward to doing it. It's called make America great again.

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump. The question from Patrice was about are you both modeling positive and appropriate behavior for today's youth? We received a lot of questions online, Mr. Trump, about the tape that was released on Friday, as you can imagine. You called what you said locker room banter. You described kissing women without consent, grabbing their genitals. That is sexual assault. You bragged that you have sexually assaulted women. Do you understand that?

6. TRUMP: No, I didn't say that at all. I don't think you understood what was — this was locker room talk. I'm not proud of it. I apologize to my family. I apologize to the American people. Certainly I'm not proud of it. But this is locker room talk.

7. You know, when we have a world where you have ISIS chopping off heads, where you have — and, frankly, drowning people in steel cages, where you have wars and horrible, horrible sights all over, where you have so many bad things happening, this is like medieval times. We haven't seen anything like this, the carnage all over the world.

8. And they look and they see. Can you imagine the people that are, frankly, doing so well against us with ISIS? And they look at our country and they see what's going on.

9. Yes, I'm very embarrassed by it. I hate it. But it's locker room talk, and it's one of those things. I will knock the hell out of ISIS. We're going to defeat ISIS. ISIS happened a number of years ago in a vacuum that was left because of bad judgment. And I will tell you, I will take care of ISIS.

COOPER: So, Mr. Trump...

10. TRUMP: And we should get on to much more important things and much bigger things.

COOPER: Just for the record, though, are you saying that what you said on that bus 11 years ago that you did not actually kiss women without consent or grope women without consent?

11. TRUMP: I have great respect for women. Nobody has more respect for women than I do.

COOPER: So, for the record, you're saying you never did that?

12. TRUMP: I've said things that, frankly, you hear these things I said. And I was embarrassed by it. But I have tremendous respect for women.

COOPER: Have you ever done those things?

13. TRUMP: And women have respect for me. And I will tell you: No, I have not. And I will tell you that I'm going to make our country safe. We're going to have borders in our country, which we don't have now. People are pouring into our country, and they're coming in from the Middle East and other places.

14. We're going to make America safe again. We're going to make America great again, but we're going to make America safe again. And we're going to make America wealthy again, because if you don't do that, it just — it sounds harsh to say, but we have to build up the wealth of our nation.

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

15. TRUMP: Right now, other nations are taking our jobs and they're taking our wealth.

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

16. TRUMP: And that's what I want to talk about.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, do you want to respond?

CLINTON: Well, like everyone else, I've spent a lot of time thinking over the last 48 hours about what we heard and saw. You know, with prior Republican nominees for president, I disagreed with them on politics, policies, principles, but I never questioned their fitness to serve. Donald Trump is different. I said starting back in June that he was not fit to be president and commander-in-chief. And many Republicans and independents have said the same thing. What we all saw and heard on Friday was Donald talking about women, what he thinks about women, what he does to women. And he has said that the video doesn't represent who he is. But I think it's clear to anyone who heard it that it represents exactly who he is. Because we've seen this throughout the campaign. We have seen him insult women. We've seen him rate women on their appearance, ranking them from one to ten. We've seen him embarrass women on TV and on Twitter. We saw him after the first debate spend nearly a week denigrating a former Miss Universe in the harshest, most personal terms. So, yes, this is who Donald Trump is. But it's not only women, and it's not only this video that raises questions about his fitness to be our president, because he has also targeted immigrants, African-Americans, Latinos, people with disabilities, POWs, Muslims, and so many others. So this is who Donald Trump is. And the question for us, the question our country must answer is that this is not who we are. That's why — to go back to your question — I want to send a message — we all should — to every boy and girl and, indeed, to the entire world that America already is great, but we are great because we are good, and we will respect one another, and we will work with one another, and we will celebrate our diversity.

CLINTON: These are very important values to me, because this is the America that I know and love. And I can pledge to you tonight that this is the America that I will serve if I'm so fortunate enough to become your president.

RADDATZ: And we want to get to some questions from online...

17. TRUMP: Am I allowed to respond to that? I assume I am.

RADDATZ: Yes, you can respond to that.

18. TRUMP: It's just words, folks. It's just words. Those words, I've been hearing them for many years. I heard them when they were running for the Senate in New York, where Hillary was going to bring back jobs to upstate New York and she failed.

19. I've heard them where Hillary is constantly talking about the inner cities of our country, which are a disaster education-wise, jobwise, safety-wise, in every way possible. I'm going to help the African-Americans. I'm going to help the Latinos, Hispanics. I am going to help the inner cities.

20. She's done a terrible job for the African-Americans. She wants their vote, and she does nothing, and then she comes back four years later. We saw that firsthand when she was United States senator. She campaigned where the primary part of her campaign...

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, Mr. Trump — I want to get to audience questions and online questions.

21. TRUMP: So, she's allowed to do that, but I'm not allowed to respond?

RADDATZ: You're going to have — you're going to get to respond right now.

22. TRUMP: Sounds fair.

RADDATZ: This tape is generating intense interest. In just 48 hours, it's become the single most talked about story of the entire 2016 election on Facebook, with millions and millions of people discussing it on the social network. As we said a moment ago, we do want to bring in questions from voters around country via social media, and our first stays on this topic. Jeff from Ohio asks on Facebook, "Trump says the campaign has changed him. When did that happen?" So, Mr. Trump, let me add to that. When you walked off that bus at age 59, were you a different man or did that behavior continue until just recently? And you have two minutes for this.

23. TRUMP: It was locker room talk, as I told you. That was locker room talk. I'm not proud of it. I am a person who has great respect for people, for my family, for the people of this country. And certainly, I'm not proud of it. But that was something that happened.

24. If you look at Bill Clinton, far worse. Mine are words, and his was action. His was what he's done to women. There's never been anybody in the history politics in this nation that's been so abusive to women. So you can say any way you want to say it, but Bill Clinton was abusive to women.

25. Hillary Clinton attacked those same women and attacked them viciously. Four of them here tonight. One of the women, who is a wonderful woman, at 12 years old, was raped at 12. Her client she represented got him off, and she's seen laughing on two separate occasions, laughing at the girl who was raped. Kathy Shelton, that young woman is here with us tonight.

26. So don't tell me about words. I am absolutely — I apologize for those words. But it is things that people say. But what President Clinton did, he was impeached, he lost his license to practice law. He had to pay an \$850,000 fine to one of the women. Paula Jones, who's also here tonight.

27. And I will tell you that when Hillary brings up a point like that and she talks about words that I said 11 years ago, I think it's disgraceful, and I think she should be ashamed of herself, if you want to know the truth.

(APPLAUSE)

RADDATZ: Can we please hold the applause? Secretary Clinton, you have two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, first, let me start by saying that so much of what he's just said is not right, but he gets to run his campaign any way he chooses. He gets to decide what he wants to talk about. Instead of answering people's questions, talking about our agenda, laying out the plans that we have that we think can make a better life and a better country, that's his choice.

When I hear something like that, I am reminded of what my friend, Michelle Obama, advised us all: When they go low, you go high.

(APPLAUSE) And, look, if this were just about one video, maybe what he's saying tonight would be understandable, but everyone can draw their own conclusions at this point about whether or not the man in the video or the man on the stage respects women. But he never apologizes for anything to anyone.

CLINTON: He never apologized to Mr. and Mrs. Khan, the Gold Star family whose son, Captain Khan, died in the line of duty in Iraq. And Donald insulted and attacked them for weeks over their religion.

He never apologized to the distinguished federal judge who was born in Indiana, but Donald said he couldn't be trusted to be a judge because his parents were, quote, "Mexican."

He never apologized to the reporter that he mimicked and mocked on national television and our children were watching. And he never apologized for the racist lie that President Obama was not born in the United States of America. He owes the president an apology, he owes our country an apology, and he needs to take responsibility for his actions and his words.

28. TRUMP: Well, you owe the president an apology, because as you know very well, your campaign, Sidney Blumenthal — he's another real winner that you have — and he's the one that got this started, along with your campaign manager, and they were on television just two weeks ago, she was, saying exactly that. So you really owe him an apology. You're the one that sent the pictures around your campaign, sent the pictures around with President Obama in a certain garb. That was long before I was ever involved, so you actually owe an apology.

29. Number two, Michelle Obama. I've gotten to see the commercials that they did on you. And I've gotten to see some of the most vicious commercials I've ever seen of Michelle Obama talking about you, Hillary.

30. So, you talk about friend? Go back and take a look at those commercials, a race where you lost fair and square, unlike the Bernie Sanders race, where you won, but not fair and square, in my opinion. And all you have to do is take a look at WikiLeaks and just see what they say about Bernie Sanders and see what Deborah Wasserman Schultz had in mind, because Bernie Sanders, between super-delegates and Deborah Wasserman Schultz, he never had a chance. And I was so surprised to see him sign on with the devil.

31. But when you talk about apology, I think the one that you should really be apologizing for and the thing that you should be apologizing for are the 33,000 e-mails that you deleted, and that you acid washed, and then the two boxes of e-mails and other things last week that were taken from an office and are now missing. And I'll tell you what. I didn't think I'd say this, but I'm going to say it, and I hate to say it. But if I win, I am going to instruct my attorney general to get a special prosecutor to look into your situation, because there has never been so many lies, so much deception. There has never been anything like it, and we're going to have a special prosecutor.

32. When I speak, I go out and speak, the people of this country are furious. In my opinion, the people that have been long-term workers at the FBI are furious. There has never been anything like this, where e-mails — and you get a subpoena, you get a subpoena, and after getting the subpoena, you delete 33,000 e-mails, and then you acid wash them or bleach them, as you would say, very expensive process.

So we're going to get a special prosecutor, and we're going to look into it, because you know what? People have been — their lives have been destroyed for doing one-fifth of what you've done. And it's a disgrace. And honestly, you ought to be ashamed of yourself.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton, I want to follow up on that.

(CROSSTALK)

RADDATZ: I'm going to let you talk about e-mails.

CLINTON: ... because everything he just said is absolutely false, but I'm not surprised.

33. TRUMP: Oh, really?

CLINTON: In the first debate...

(LAUGHTER)

RADDATZ: And really, the audience needs to calm down here.

CLINTON: ... I told people that it would be impossible to be fact-checking Donald all the time. I'd never get to talk about anything I want to do and how we're going to really make lives better for people.

So, once again, go to HillaryClinton.com. We have literally Trump — you can fact check him in real time. Last time at the first debate, we had millions of people fact checking, so I expect we'll have millions more fact checking, because, you know, it is — it's just awfully good that someone with the temperament of Donald Trump is not in charge of the law in our country.

34. TRUMP: Because you'd be in jail.

(APPLAUSE)

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton...

COOPER: We want to remind the audience to please not talk out loud. Please do not applaud. You're just wasting time.

RADDATZ: And, Secretary Clinton, I do want to follow up on e-mails. You've said your handling of your e-mails was a mistake. You disagreed with FBI Director James Comey, calling your handling of classified information, quote, "extremely careless." The FBI said that there were 110 classified e-mails that were exchanged, eight of which were top secret, and that it was possible hostile actors did gain access to those e-mails. You don't call that extremely careless? CLINTON: Well, Martha, first, let me say — and I've said before, but I'll repeat it, because I want everyone to hear it — that was a mistake, and I take responsibility for using a personal e-mail account. Obviously, if I were to do it over again, I would not. I'm not making any excuses. It was a mistake. And I am very sorry about that.

But I think it's also important to point out where there are some misleading accusations from critics and others. After a year-long investigation, there is no evidence that anyone hacked the server I was using and there is no evidence that anyone can point to at all — anyone who says otherwise has no basis — that any classified material ended up in the wrong hands.

I take classified materials very seriously and always have. When I was on the Senate Armed Services Committee, I was privy to a lot of classified material. Obviously, as secretary of state, I had some of the most important secrets that we possess, such as going after bin Laden. So I am very committed to taking classified information seriously. And as I said, there is no evidence that any classified information ended up in the wrong hands.

RADDATZ: OK, we're going to move on.

35. TRUMP: And yet she didn't know the word — the letter C on a document. Right? She didn't even know what that word — what that letter meant.

36. You know, it's amazing. I'm watching Hillary go over facts. And she's going after fact after fact, and she's lying again, because she said she — you know, what she did with the e-mail was fine. You think it was fine to delete 33,000 e-mails? I don't think so.

37. She said the 33,000 e-mails had to do with her daughter's wedding, number one, and a yoga class. Well, maybe we'll give three or three or four or five or something. 33,000 e-mails deleted, and now she's saying there wasn't anything wrong.

38. And more importantly, that was after getting a subpoena. That wasn't before. That was after. She got it from the United States Congress. And I'll be honest, I am so disappointed in congressmen, including Republicans, for allowing this to happen.

39. Our Justice Department, where our husband goes on to the back of a airplane for 39 minutes, talks to the attorney general days before a ruling is going to be made on her case. But for you to say that there was nothing wrong with you deleting 39,000 e-mails, again, you should be ashamed of yourself. What you did — and this is after getting a subpoena from the United States Congress.

COOPER: We have to move on.

40. TRUMP: You did that. Wait a minute. One second.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, you can respond, and then we got to move on.

RADDATZ: We want to give the audience a chance.

41. TRUMP: If you did that in the private sector, you'd be put in jail, let alone after getting a subpoena from the United States Congress.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, you can respond. Then we have to move on to an audience question.

CLINTON: Look, it's just not true. And so please, go to...

42. TRUMP: Oh, you didn't delete them?

COOPER: Allow her to respond, please.

CLINTON: It was personal e-mails, not official.

43. TRUMP: Oh, 33,000? Yeah.

CLINTON: Not — well, we turned over 35,000, so...

44. TRUMP: Oh, yeah. What about the other 15,000?

COOPER: Please allow her to respond. She didn't talk while you talked.

CLINTON: Yes, that's true, I didn't.

45. TRUMP: Because you have nothing to say.

CLINTON: I didn't in the first debate, and I'm going to try not to in this debate, because I'd like to get to the questions that the people have brought here tonight to talk to us about.

46. TRUMP: Get off this question.

CLINTON: OK, Donald. I know you're into big diversion tonight, anything to avoid talking about your campaign and the way it's exploding and the way Republicans are leaving you. But let's at least focus...

47. TRUMP: Let's see what happens...

(CROSSTALK)

COOPER: Allow her to respond.

CLINTON: ... on some of the issues that people care about tonight. Let's get to their questions.

COOPER: We have a question here from Ken Karpowicz. He has a question about health care. Ken?

48. TRUMP: I'd like to know, Anderson, why aren't you bringing up the e-mails? I'd like to know. Why aren't you bringing...

COOPER: We brought up the e-mails.

49. TRUMP: No, it hasn't. It hasn't. And it hasn't been finished at all.

COOPER: Ken Karpowicz has a question.

50. TRUMP: It's nice to — one on three.

QUESTION: Thank you. Affordable Care Act, known as Obamacare, it is not affordable. Premiums have gone up. Deductibles have gone up. Copays have gone up. Prescriptions have gone up. And the coverage has gone down. What will you do to bring the cost down and make coverage better?

COOPER: That first one goes to Secretary Clinton, because you started out the last one to the audience.

CLINTON: If he wants to start, he can start. No, go ahead, Donald.

51. TRUMP: No, I'm a gentlemen, Hillary. Go ahead.

(LAUGHTER)

COOPER: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I think Donald was about to say he's going to solve it by repealing it and getting rid of the Affordable Care Act. And I'm going to fix it, because I agree with you. Premiums have gotten too high. Copays, deductibles, prescription drug costs, and I've laid out a series of actions that we can take to try to get those costs down.

But here's what I don't want people to forget when we're talking about reining in the costs, which has to be the highest priority of the next president, when the Affordable Care Act passed, it wasn't just that 20 million got insurance who didn't have it before. But that in and of itself was a good thing. I meet these people all the time, and they tell me what a difference having that insurance meant to them and their families.

But everybody else, the 170 million of us who get health insurance through our employees got big benefits. Number one, insurance companies can't deny you coverage because of a pre-existing condition. Number two, no lifetime limits, which is a big deal if you have serious health problems.

Number three, women can't be charged more than men for our health insurance, which is the way it used to be before the Affordable Care Act. Number four, if you're under 26, and your parents have a policy, you can be on that policy until the age of 26, something that didn't happen before.

So I want very much to save what works and is good about the Affordable Care Act. But we've got to get costs down. We've got to provide additional help to small businesses so that they can afford to provide health insurance. But if we repeal it, as Donald has proposed, and start over again, all of those benefits I just mentioned are lost to everybody, not just people who get their health insurance on the exchange. And then we would have to start all over again.

Right now, we are at 90 percent health insurance coverage. That's the highest we've ever been in our country.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, your time is up.

CLINTON: So I want us to get to 100 percent, but get costs down and keep quality up.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, you have two minutes.

52. TRUMP: It is such a great question and it's maybe the question I get almost more than anything else, outside of defense. Obamacare is a disaster. You know it. We all know it. It's going up at numbers that nobody's ever seen worldwide. Nobody's ever seen numbers like this for health care.

53. It's only getting worse. In '17, it implodes by itself. Their method of fixing it is to go back and ask Congress for more money, more and more money. We have right now almost \$20 trillion in debt.

54. Obamacare will never work. It's very bad, very bad health insurance. Far too expensive. And not only expensive for the person that has it, unbelievably expensive for our country. It's going to be one of the biggest line items very shortly.

55. We have to repeal it and replace it with something absolutely much less expensive and something that works, where your plan can actually be tailored. We have to get rid of the lines around the state, artificial lines, where we stop insurance companies from coming in and competing, because they want — and President Obama and whoever was working on it — they want to leave those lines, because that gives the insurance companies essentially monopolies. We want competition.

56. You will have the finest health care plan there is. She wants to go to a single-payer plan, which would be a disaster, somewhat similar to Canada. And if you haven't noticed the Canadians, when they need a big operation, when something happens, they come into the United States in many cases because their system is so slow. It's catastrophic in certain ways.

57. But she wants to go to single payer, which means the government basically rules everything. Hillary Clinton has been after this for years. Obamacare was the first step. Obamacare is a total disaster. And not only are your rates going up by numbers that nobody's ever believed, but your deductibles are going up, so that unless you get hit by a truck, you're never going to be able to use it.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, your time...

58. TRUMP: It is a disastrous plan, and it has to be repealed and replaced.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, let me follow up with you. Your husband called Obamacare, quote, "the craziest thing in the world," saying that small-business owners are getting killed as premiums double, coverage is cut in half. Was he mistaken or was the mistake simply telling the truth?

CLINTON: No, I mean, he clarified what he meant. And it's very clear. Look, we are in a situation in our country where if we were to start all over again, we might come up with a different system. But we have an employer-based system. That's where the vast majority of people get their health care.

And the Affordable Care Act was meant to try to fill the gap between people who were too poor and couldn't put together any resources to afford health care, namely people on Medicaid. Obviously, Medicare, which is a single-payer system, which takes care of our elderly and does a great job doing it, by the way, and then all of the people who were employed, but people who were working but didn't have the money to afford insurance and didn't have anybody, an employer or anybody else, to help them.

That was the slot that the Obamacare approach was to take. And like I say, 20 million people now have health insurance. So if we just rip it up and throw it away, what Donald's not telling you is we just turn it back to the insurance companies the way it used to be, and that means the insurance companies...

COOPER: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: ... get to do pretty much whatever they want, including saying, look, I'm sorry, you've got diabetes, you had cancer, your child has asthma...

COOPER: Your time is up.

CLINTON: ... you may not be able to have insurance because you can't afford it. So let's fix what's broken about it, but let's not throw it away and give it all back to the insurance companies and the drug companies. That's not going to work.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, let me follow up on this. TRUMP: Well, I just want — just one thing. First of all, Hillary, everything's broken about it. Everything. Number two, Bernie Sanders said that Hillary Clinton has very bad judgment. This is a perfect example of it, trying to save Obamacare, which is a disaster.

COOPER: You've said you want to end Obamacare...

59. TRUMP: By the way...

COOPER: You've said you want to end Obamacare. You've also said you want to make coverage accessible for people with pre-existing conditions. How do you force insurance companies to do that if you're no longer mandating that every American get insurance?

60. TRUMP: We're going to be able to. You're going to have plans...

COOPER: What does that mean?

61. TRUMP: Well, I'll tell you what it means. You're going to have plans that are so good, because we're going to have so much competition in the insurance industry. Once we break out — once we break out the lines and allow the competition to come...

COOPER: Are you going — are you going to have a mandate that Americans have to have health insurance?

62. TRUMP: President Obama — Anderson, excuse me. President Obama, by keeping those lines, the boundary lines around each state, it was almost gone until just very toward the end of the passage of Obamacare, which, by the way, was a fraud. You know that, because Jonathan Gruber, the architect of Obamacare, was said — he said it was a great lie, it was a big lie. President Obama said you keep your doctor, you keep your plan. The whole thing was a fraud, and it doesn't work.

63. But when we get rid of those lines, you will have competition, and we will be able to keep pre-existing, we'll also be able to help people that can't get — don't have money because we are going to have people protected.

64. And Republicans feel this way, believe it or not, and strongly this way. We're going to block grant into the states. We're going to block grant into Medicaid into the states...

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

65. TRUMP: ... so that we will be able to take care of people without the necessary funds to take care of themselves.

COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

RADDATZ: We now go to Gorbah Hamed with a question for both candidates.

QUESTION: Hi. There are 3.3 million Muslims in the United States, and I'm one of them. You've mentioned working with Muslim nations, but with Islamophobia on the rise, how will you help people like me deal with the consequences of being labeled as a threat to the country after the election is over?

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, you're first.

66. TRUMP: Well, you're right about Islamophobia, and that's a shame. But one thing we have to do is we have to make sure that — because there is a problem. I mean, whether we like it or not, and we could be very politically correct, but whether we like it or not, there is a problem. And we have to be sure that Muslims come in and report when they see something going on. When they see hatred going on, they have to report it.

67. As an example, in San Bernardino, many people saw the bombs all over the apartment of the two people that killed 14 and wounded many, many people. Horribly wounded. They'll never be the same. Muslims have to report the problems when they see them.

68. And, you know, there's always a reason for everything. If they don't do that, it's a very difficult situation for our country, because you look at Orlando and you look at San Bernardino and you look at the World Trade Center. Go outside. Look at Paris. Look at that horrible — these are radical Islamic terrorists.

69. And she won't even mention the word and nor will President Obama. He won't use the term "radical Islamic terrorism." Now, to solve a problem, you have to be able to state what the problem is or at least say the name. She won't say the name and President Obama won't say the name. But the name is there. It's radical Islamic terror. And before you solve it, you have to say the name.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton? CLINTON: Well, thank you for asking your question. And I've heard this question from a lot of Muslim-Americans across our country, because, unfortunately, there's been a lot of very divisive, dark things said about Muslims. And even someone like Captain Khan, the young man who sacrificed himself defending our country in the United States Army, has been subject to attack by Donald.

I want to say just a couple of things. First, we've had Muslims in America since George Washington. And we've had many successful Muslims. We just lost a particular well-known one with Muhammad Ali.

CLINTON: My vision of America is an America where everyone has a place, if you're willing to work hard, you do your part, you contribute to the community. That's what America is. That's what we want America to be for our children and our grandchildren.

It's also very short-sighted and even dangerous to be engaging in the kind of demagogic rhetoric that Donald has about Muslims. We need American Muslims to be part of our eyes and ears on our front lines. I've worked with a lot of different Muslim groups around America. I've met with a lot of them, and I've heard how important it is for them to feel that they are wanted and included and part of our country, part of our homeland security, and that's what I want to see.

It's also important I intend to defeat ISIS, to do so in a coalition with majority Muslim nations. Right now, a lot of those nations are hearing what Donald says and wondering, why should we cooperate with the Americans? And this is a gift to ISIS and the terrorists, violent jihadist terrorists.

We are not at war with Islam. And it is a mistake and it plays into the hands of the terrorists to act as though we are. So I want a country where citizens like you and your family are just as welcome as anyone else.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Secretary Clinton.

Mr. Trump, in December, you said this. “Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country’s representatives can figure out what the hell is going on. We have no choice. We have no choice.” Your running mate said this week that the Muslim ban is no longer your position. Is that correct? And if it is, was it a mistake to have a religious test?

70. TRUMP: First of all, Captain Khan is an American hero, and if I were president at that time, he would be alive today, because unlike her, who voted for the war without knowing what she was doing, I would not have had our people in Iraq. Iraq was disaster. So he would have been alive today.

71. The Muslim ban is something that in some form has morphed into a extreme vetting from certain areas of the world. Hillary Clinton wants to allow hundreds of thousands — excuse me. Excuse me..

RADDATZ: And why did it morph into that? No, did you — no, answer the question. Do you still believe...

TRUMP: Why don’t you interrupt her? You interrupt me all the time.

RADDATZ: I do.

72. TRUMP: Why don’t you interrupt her?

RADDATZ: Would you please explain whether or not the Muslim ban still stands?

73. TRUMP: It’s called extreme vetting. We are going to areas like Syria where they’re coming in by the tens of thousands because of Barack Obama. And Hillary Clinton wants to allow a 550 percent increase over Obama. People are coming into our country like we have no idea who they are, where they are from, what their feelings about our country is, and she wants 550 percent more. This is going to be the great Trojan horse of all time.

74. We have enough problems in this country. I believe in building safe zones. I believe in having other people pay for them, as an example, the Gulf states, who are not carrying their weight, but they have nothing but money, and take care of people. But I don’t want to have, with all the problems this country has and all of the problems that you see going on, hundreds of thousands of people coming in from Syria when we know nothing about them. We know nothing about their values and we know nothing about their love for our country.

RADDATZ: And, Secretary Clinton, let me ask you about that, because you have asked for an increase from 10,000 to 65,000 Syrian refugees. We know you want tougher vetting. That’s not a perfect system. So why take the risk of having those refugees come into the country?

CLINTON: Well, first of all, I will not let anyone into our country that I think poses a risk to us. But there are a lot of refugees, women and children — think of that picture we all saw of that 4-year-old boy with the blood on his forehead because he’d been bombed by the Russian and Syrian air forces.

There are children suffering in this catastrophic war, largely, I believe, because of Russian aggression. And we need to do our part. We by no means are carrying anywhere near the load that Europe and others are. But we will have vetting that is as tough as it needs to be from our professionals, our intelligence experts and others.

But it is important for us as a policy, you know, not to say, as Donald has said, we’re going to ban people based on a religion. How do you do that? We are a country founded on religious freedom and liberty. How do we do what he has advocated without causing great distress within our own country? Are we going to have religious tests when people fly into our country? And how do we expect to be able to implement those?

So I thought that what he said was extremely unwise and even dangerous. And indeed, you can look at the propaganda on a lot of the terrorists sites, and what Donald Trump says about Muslims is used to recruit fighters, because they want to create a war between us.

And the final thing I would say, this is the 10th or 12th time that he’s denied being for the war in Iraq. We have it on tape. The entire press corps has looked at it. It’s been debunked, but it never stops him from saying whatever he wants to say.

75. TRUMP: That’s not been debunked.

CLINTON: So, please...

76. TRUMP: That has not been debunked.

CLINTON: ... go to HillaryClinton.com and you can see it.

77. TRUMP: I was against — I was against the war in Iraq. Has not been debunked. And you voted for it. And you shouldn’t have. Well, I just want to say...

RADDATZ: There’s been lots of fact-checking on that. I’d like to move on to an online question...

78. TRUMP: Excuse me. She just went about 25 seconds over her time.

RADDATZ: She did not.

79. TRUMP: Could I just respond to this, please?

RADDATZ: Very quickly, please.

80. TRUMP: Hillary Clinton, in terms of having people come into our country, we have many criminal illegal aliens. When we want to send them back to their country, their country says we don’t want them. In some cases, they’re murderers, drug lords, drug problems. And they don’t want them.

81. And Hillary Clinton, when she was secretary of state, said that’s OK, we can’t force it into their country. Let me tell you, I’m going to force them right back into their country. They’re murderers and some very bad people.

82. And I will tell you very strongly, when Bernie Sanders said she had bad judgment, she has really bad judgment, because we are letting people into this country that are going to cause problems and crime like you've never seen. We're also letting drugs pour through our southern border at a record clip. At a record clip. And it shouldn't be allowed to happen.

83. ICE just endorsed me. They've never endorsed a presidential candidate. The Border Patrol agents, 16,500, just recently endorsed me, and they endorsed me because I understand the border. She doesn't. She wants amnesty for everybody. Come right in. Come right over. It's a horrible thing she's doing. She's got bad judgment, and honestly, so bad that she should never be president of the United States. That I can tell you.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Mr. Trump. I want to move on. This next question from the public through the Bipartisan Open Debate Coalition's online forum, where Americans submitted questions that generated millions of votes. This question involves WikiLeaks release of purported excerpts of Secretary Clinton's paid speeches, which she has refused to release, and one line in particular, in which you, Secretary Clinton, purportedly say you need both a public and private position on certain issues. So, Tu (ph), from Virginia asks, is it OK for politicians to be two-faced? Is it acceptable for a politician to have a private stance on issues? Secretary Clinton, your two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, right. As I recall, that was something I said about Abraham Lincoln after having seen the wonderful Steven Spielberg movie called "Lincoln." It was a master class watching President Lincoln get the Congress to approve the 13th Amendment. It was principled, and it was strategic.

And I was making the point that it is hard sometimes to get the Congress to do what you want to do and you have to keep working at it. And, yes, President Lincoln was trying to convince some people, he used some arguments, convincing other people, he used other arguments. That was a great — I thought a great display of presidential leadership.

But, you know, let's talk about what's really going on here, Martha, because our intelligence community just came out and said in the last few days that the Kremlin, meaning Putin and the Russian government, are directing the attacks, the hacking on American accounts to influence our election. And WikiLeaks is part of that, as are other sites where the Russians hack information, we don't even know if it's accurate information, and then they put it out.

We have never in the history of our country been in a situation where an adversary, a foreign power, is working so hard to influence the outcome of the election. And believe me, they're not doing it to get me elected. They're doing it to try to influence the election for Donald Trump.

CLINTON: Now, maybe because he has praised Putin, maybe because he says he agrees with a lot of what Putin wants to do, maybe because he wants to do business in Moscow, I don't know the reasons. But we deserve answers. And we should demand that Donald release all of his tax returns so that people can see what are the entanglements and the financial relationships that he has...

RADDATZ: We're going to get to that later. Secretary Clinton, you're out of time.

CLINTON: ... with the Russians and other foreign powers.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump?

84. TRUMP: Well, I think I should respond, because — so ridiculous. Look, now she's blaming — she got caught in a total lie. Her papers went out to all her friends at the banks, Goldman Sachs and everybody else, and she said things — WikiLeaks that just came out. And she lied. Now she's blaming the lie on the late, great Abraham Lincoln. That's one that I haven't...

85. OK, Honest Abe, Honest Abe never lied. That's the good thing. That's the big difference between Abraham Lincoln and you. That's a big, big difference. We're talking about some difference.

86. But as far as other elements of what she was saying, I don't know Putin. I think it would be great if we got along with Russia because we could fight ISIS together, as an example. But I don't know Putin.

87. But I notice, anytime anything wrong happens, they like to say the Russians are — she doesn't know if it's the Russians doing the hacking. Maybe there is no hacking. But they always blame Russia. And the reason they blame Russia because they think they're trying to tarnish me with Russia. I know nothing about Russia. I know — I know about Russia, but I know nothing about the inner workings of Russia. I don't deal there. I have no businesses there.

88. I have no loans from Russia.

I have a very, very great balance sheet, so great that when I did the Old Post Office on Pennsylvania Avenue, the United States government, because of my balance sheet, which they actually know very well, chose me to do the Old Post Office, between the White House and Congress, chose me to do the Old Post Office. One of the primary area things, in fact, perhaps the primary thing was balance sheet. But I have no loans with Russia. You could go to the United States government, and they would probably tell you that, because they know my sheet very well in order to get that development I had to have.

89. Now, the taxes are a very simple thing. As soon as I have — first of all, I pay hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes. Many of her friends took bigger deductions. Warren Buffett took a massive deduction. Soros, who's a friend of hers, took a massive deduction. Many of the people that are giving her all this money that she can do many more commercials than me gave her — took massive deductions.

90. I pay hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes. But — but as soon as my routine audit is finished, I'll release my returns. I'll be very proud to. They're actually quite great.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

COOPER: We want to turn, actually, to the topic of taxes. We have a question from Spencer Maass. Spencer?

QUESTION: Good evening. My question is, what specific tax provisions will you change to ensure the wealthiest Americans pay their fair share in taxes?

COOPER: Mr. Trump, you have two minutes.

91. TRUMP: Well, one thing I'd do is get rid of carried interest. One of the greatest provisions for people like me, to be honest with you, I give up a lot when I run, because I knock out the tax code. And she could have done this years ago, by the way. She's a United States — she was a United States senator.

92. She complains that Donald Trump took advantage of the tax code. Well, why didn't she change it? Why didn't you change it when you were a senator? The reason you didn't is that all your friends take the same advantage that I do. And I do. You have provisions in the tax code that, frankly, we could change. But you wouldn't change it, because all of these people gave you the money so you can take negative ads on Donald Trump.

93. But — and I say that about a lot of things. You know, I've heard Hillary complaining about so many different things over the years. "I wish you would have done this." But she's been there for 30 years she's been doing this stuff. She never changed. And she never will change. She never will change.

94. We're getting rid of carried interest provisions. I'm lowering taxes actually, because I think it's so important for corporations, because we have corporations leaving — massive corporations and little ones, little ones can't form. We're getting rid of regulations which goes hand in hand with the lowering of the taxes.

95. But we're bringing the tax rate down from 35 percent to 15 percent. We're cutting taxes for the middle class. And I will tell you, we are cutting them big league for the middle class.

And I will tell you, Hillary Clinton is raising your taxes, folks. You can look at me. She's raising your taxes really high. And what that's going to do is a disaster for the country. But she is raising your taxes and I'm lowering your taxes. That in itself is a big difference. We are going to be thriving again. We have no growth in this country. There's no growth. If China has a GDP of 7 percent, it's like a national catastrophe. We're down at 1 percent. And that's, like, no growth. And we're going lower, in my opinion. And a lot of it has to do with the fact that our taxes are so high, just about the highest in the world. And I'm bringing them down to one of the lower in the world. And I think it's so important — one of the most important things we can do. But she is raising everybody's taxes massively.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, you have two minutes. The question was, what specific tax provisions will you change to ensure the wealthiest Americans pay their fair share of taxes?

CLINTON: Well, everything you've heard just now from Donald is not true. I'm sorry I have to keep saying this, but he lives in an alternative reality. And it is sort of amusing to hear somebody who hasn't paid federal income taxes in maybe 20 years talking about what he's going to do.

But I'll tell you what he's going to do. His plan will give the wealthy and corporations the biggest tax cuts they've ever had, more than the Bush tax cuts by at least a factor of two. Donald always takes care of Donald and people like Donald, and this would be a massive gift. And, indeed, the way that he talks about his tax cuts would end up raising taxes on middle-class families, millions of middle-class families.

Now, here's what I want to do. I have said nobody who makes less than \$250,000 a year — and that's the vast majority of Americans as you know — will have their taxes raised, because I think we've got to go where the money is. And the money is with people who have taken advantage of every single break in the tax code.

And, yes, when I was a senator, I did vote to close corporate loopholes. I voted to close, I think, one of the loopholes he took advantage of when he claimed a billion-dollar loss that enabled him to avoid paying taxes.

I want to have a tax on people who are making a million dollars. It's called the Buffett rule. Yes, Warren Buffett is the one who's gone out and said somebody like him should not be paying a lower tax rate than his secretary. I want to have a surcharge on incomes above \$5 million.

We have to make up for lost times, because I want to invest in you. I want to invest in hard-working families. And I think it's been unfortunate, but it's happened, that since the Great Recession, the gains have all gone to the top. And we need to reverse that.

People like Donald, who paid zero in taxes, zero for our vets, zero for our military, zero for health and education, that is wrong.

COOPER: Thank you, Secretary.

CLINTON: And we're going to make sure that nobody, no corporation, and no individual can get away without paying his fair share to support our country.

COOPER: Thank you. I want to give you — Mr. Trump, I want to give you the chance to respond. I just wanted to tell our viewers what she's referring to. In the last month, taxes were the number-one issue on Facebook for the first time in the campaign. The New York Times published three pages of your 1995 tax returns. They show you claimed a \$916 million loss, which means you could have avoided paying personal federal income taxes for years.

You've said you pay state taxes, employee taxes, real estate taxes, property taxes. You have not answered, though, a simple question. Did you use that \$916 million loss to avoid paying personal federal income taxes for years?

96. TRUMP: Of course I do. Of course I do. And so do all of her donors, or most of her donors. I know many of her donors. Her donors took massive tax write-offs.

COOPER: So have you (inaudible) personal federal income tax?

97. TRUMP: A lot of my — excuse me, Anderson — a lot of my write-off was depreciation and other things that Hillary as a senator allowed. And she'll always allow it, because the people that give her all this money, they want it. That's why.

98. See, I understand the tax code better than anybody that's ever run for president. Hillary Clinton — and it's extremely complex — Hillary Clinton has friends that want all of these provisions, including they want the carried interest provision, which is very important to Wall Street people. But they really want the carried interest provision, which I believe Hillary's leaving. Very interesting why she's leaving carried interest.

99. But I will tell you that, number one, I pay tremendous numbers of taxes. I absolutely used it. And so did Warren Buffett and so did George Soros and so did many of the other people that Hillary is getting money from. Now, I won't mention their names, because they're rich, but they're not famous. So we won't make them famous.

COOPER: So can you — can you say how many years you have avoided paying personal federal income taxes?

100. TRUMP: No, but I pay tax, and I pay federal tax, too. But I have a write-off, a lot of it's depreciation, which is a wonderful charge. I love depreciation. You know, she's given it to us.

101. Hey, if she had a problem — for 30 years she's been doing this, Anderson. I say it all the time. She talks about health care. Why didn't she do something about it? She talks about taxes. Why didn't she do something about it? She doesn't do anything about anything other than talk. With her, it's all talk and no action.

COOPER: In the past...

102. TRUMP: And, again, Bernie Sanders, it's really bad judgment. She has made bad judgment not only on taxes. She's made bad judgments on Libya, on Syria, on Iraq. I mean, her and Obama, whether you like it or not, the way they got out of Iraq, the vacuum they've left, that's why ISIS formed in the first place. They started from that little area, and now they're in 32 different nations, Hillary. Congratulations. Great job.

COOPER: Secretary — I want you to be able to respond, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Well, here we go again. I've been in favor of getting rid of carried interest for years, starting when I was a senator from New York. But that's not the point here.

103. TRUMP: Why didn't you do it? Why didn't you do it?

COOPER: Allow her to respond.

CLINTON: Because I was a senator with a Republican president.

104. TRUMP: Oh, really?

CLINTON: I will be the president and we will get it done. That's exactly right.

105. TRUMP: You could have done it, if you were an effective — if you were an effective senator, you could have done it. If you were an effective senator, you could have done it. But you were not an effective senator.

COOPER: Please allow her to respond. She didn't interrupt you.

CLINTON: You know, under our Constitution, presidents have something called veto power. Look, he has now said repeatedly, "30 years this and 30 years that." So let me talk about my 30 years in public service. I'm very glad to do so.

Eight million kids every year have health insurance, because when I was first lady I worked with Democrats and Republicans to create the Children's Health Insurance Program. Hundreds of thousands of kids now have a chance to be adopted because I worked to change our adoption and foster care system. After 9/11, I went to work with Republican mayor, governor and president to rebuild New York and to get health care for our first responders who were suffering because they had run toward danger and gotten sickened by it. Hundreds of thousands of National Guard and Reserve members have health care because of work that I did, and children have safer medicines because I was able to pass a law that required the dosing to be more carefully done.

When I was secretary of state, I went around the world advocating for our country, but also advocating for women's rights, to make sure that women had a decent chance to have a better life and negotiated a treaty with Russia to lower nuclear weapons. Four hundred pieces of legislation have my name on it as a sponsor or cosponsor when I was a senator for eight years.

I worked very hard and was very proud to be re-elected in New York by an even bigger margin than I had been elected the first time. And as president, I will take that work, that bipartisan work, that finding common ground, because you have to be able to get along with people to get things done in Washington.

COOPER: Thank you, secretary.

CLINTON: I've proven that I can, and for 30 years, I've produced results for people.

COOPER: Thank you, secretary.

RADDATZ: We're going to move on to Syria. Both of you have mentioned that.

106. TRUMP: She said a lot of things that were false. I mean, I think we should be allowed to maybe...

RADDATZ: No, we can — no, Mr. Trump, we're going to go on. This is about the audience.

107. **TRUMP:** Excuse me. Because she has been a disaster as a senator. A disaster.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, we're going to move on. The heart-breaking video of a 5-year-old Syrian boy named Omran sitting in an ambulance after being pulled from the rubble after an air strike in Aleppo focused the world's attention on the horrors of the war in Syria, with 136 million views on Facebook alone.

But there are much worse images coming out of Aleppo every day now, where in the past few weeks alone, 400 people have been killed, at least 100 of them children. Just days ago, the State Department called for a war crimes investigation of the Syrian regime of Bashar al-Assad and its ally, Russia, for their bombardment of Aleppo.

So this next question comes through social media through Facebook. Diane from Pennsylvania asks, if you were president, what would you do about Syria and the humanitarian crisis in Aleppo? Isn't it a lot like the Holocaust when the U.S. waited too long before we helped? Secretary Clinton, we will begin with your two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, the situation in Syria is catastrophic. And every day that goes by, we see the results of the regime by Assad in partnership with the Iranians on the ground, the Russians in the air, bombarding places, in particular Aleppo, where there are hundreds of thousands of people, probably about 250,000 still left. And there is a determined effort by the Russian air force to destroy Aleppo in order to eliminate the last of the Syrian rebels who are really holding out against the Assad regime.

Russia hasn't paid any attention to ISIS. They're interested in keeping Assad in power. So I, when I was secretary of state, advocated and I advocate today a no-fly zone and safe zones. We need some leverage with the Russians, because they are not going to come to the negotiating table for a diplomatic resolution, unless there is some leverage over them. And we have to work more closely with our partners and allies on the ground.

But I want to emphasize that what is at stake here is the ambitions and the aggressiveness of Russia. Russia has decided that it's all in, in Syria. And they've also decided who they want to see become president of the United States, too, and it's not me. I've stood up to Russia. I've taken on Putin and others, and I would do that as president. I think wherever we can cooperate with Russia, that's fine. And I did as secretary of state. That's how we got a treaty reducing nuclear weapons. It's how we got the sanctions on Iran that put a lid on the Iranian nuclear program without firing a single shot. So I would go to the negotiating table with more leverage than we have now. But I do support the effort to investigate for crimes, war crimes committed by the Syrians and the Russians and try to hold them accountable.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Secretary Clinton. Mr. Trump?

108. **TRUMP:** First of all, she was there as secretary of state with the so-called line in the sand, which...

CLINTON: No, I wasn't. I was gone. I hate to interrupt you, but at some point...

109. **TRUMP:** OK. But you were in contact — excuse me. You were...

CLINTON: At some point, we need to do some fact-checking here.

110. **TRUMP:** You were in total contact with the White House, and perhaps, sadly, Obama probably still listened to you. I don't think he would be listening to you very much anymore.

111. Obama draws the line in the sand. It was laughed at all over the world what happened.

Now, with that being said, she talks tough against Russia. But our nuclear program has fallen way behind, and they've gone wild with their nuclear program. Not good. Our government shouldn't have allowed that to happen. Russia is new in terms of nuclear. We are old. We're tired. We're exhausted in terms of nuclear. A very bad thing.

112. Now, she talks tough, she talks really tough against Putin and against Assad. She talks in favor of the rebels. She doesn't even know who the rebels are. You know, every time we take rebels, whether it's in Iraq or anywhere else, we're arming people. And you know what happens? They end up being worse than the people.

113. Look at what she did in Libya with Gadhafi. Gadhafi's out. It's a mess. And, by the way, ISIS has a good chunk of their oil. I'm sure you probably have heard that. It was a disaster. Because the fact is, almost everything she's done in foreign policy has been a mistake and it's been a disaster.

114. But if you look at Russia, just take a look at Russia, and look at what they did this week, where I agree, she wasn't there, but possibly she's consulted. We sign a peace treaty. Everyone's all excited. Well, what Russia did with Assad and, by the way, with Iran, who you made very powerful with the dumbest deal perhaps I've ever seen in the history of deal-making, the Iran deal, with the \$150 billion, with the \$1.7 billion in cash, which is enough to fill up this room.

115. But look at that deal. Iran now and Russia are now against us. So she wants to fight. She wants to fight for rebels. There's only one problem. You don't even know who the rebels are. So what's the purpose?

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, Mr. Trump, your two minutes is up.

116. **TRUMP:** And one thing I have to say.

RADDATZ: Your two minutes is up.

117. **TRUMP:** I don't like Assad at all, but Assad is killing ISIS. Russia is killing ISIS. And Iran is killing ISIS. And those three have now lined up because of our weak foreign policy.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, let me repeat the question. If you were president...

(LAUGHTER)

... what would you do about Syria and the humanitarian crisis in Aleppo? And I want to remind you what your running mate said. He said provocations by Russia need to be met with American strength and that if Russia

continues to be involved in air strikes along with the Syrian government forces of Assad, the United States of America should be prepared to use military force to strike the military targets of the Assad regime.

118. TRUMP: OK. He and I haven't spoken, and I disagree. I disagree.

RADDATZ: You disagree with your running mate?

119. TRUMP: I think you have to knock out ISIS. Right now, Syria is fighting ISIS. We have people that want to fight both at the same time. But Syria is no longer Syria. Syria is Russia and it's Iran, who she made strong and Kerry and Obama made into a very powerful nation and a very rich nation, very, very quickly, very, very quickly. I believe we have to get ISIS. We have to worry about ISIS before we can get too much more involved. She had a chance to do something with Syria. They had a chance. And that was the line. And she didn't.

RADDATZ: What do you think will happen if Aleppo falls?

120. TRUMP: I think Aleppo is a disaster, humanitarian-wise.

RADDATZ: What do you think will happen if it falls?

121. TRUMP: I think that it basically has fallen. OK? It basically has fallen. Let me tell you something. You take a look at Mosul. The biggest problem I have with the stupidity of our foreign policy, we have Mosul. They think a lot of the ISIS leaders are in Mosul. So we have announcements coming out of Washington and coming out of Iraq, we will be attacking Mosul in three weeks or four weeks.

121. Well, all of these bad leaders from ISIS are leaving Mosul. Why can't they do it quietly? Why can't they do the attack, make it a sneak attack, and after the attack is made, inform the American public that we've knocked out the leaders, we've had a tremendous success? People leave. Why do they have to say we're going to be attacking Mosul within the next four to six weeks, which is what they're saying? How stupid is our country?

RADDATZ: There are sometimes reasons the military does that. Psychological warfare.

122. TRUMP: I can't think of any. I can't think of any. And I'm pretty good at it.

RADDATZ: It might be to help get civilians out.

123. TRUMP: And we have General Flynn. And we have — look, I have 200 generals and admirals who endorsed me. I have 21 Congressional Medal of Honor recipients who endorsed me. We talk about it all the time. They understand, why can't they do something secretly, where they go in and they knock out the leadership? How — why would these people stay there? I've been reading now...

RADDATZ: Tell me what your strategy is.

124. TRUMP: ... for weeks — I've been reading now for weeks about Mosul, that it's the harbor of where — you know, between Raqqa and Mosul, this is where they think the ISIS leaders are. Why would they be saying — they're not staying there anymore. They're gone. Because everybody's talking about how Iraq, which is us with our leadership, goes in to fight Mosul.

125. Now, with these 200 admirals and generals, they can't believe it. All I say is this. General George Patton, General Douglas MacArthur are spinning in their grave at the stupidity of what we're doing in the Middle East.

RADDATZ: I'm going to go to Secretary Clinton. Secretary Clinton, you want Assad to go. You advocated arming rebels, but it looks like that may be too late for Aleppo. You talk about diplomatic efforts. Those have failed. Cease-fires have failed. Would you introduce the threat of U.S. military force beyond a no-fly zone against the Assad regime to back up diplomacy?

CLINTON: I would not use American ground forces in Syria. I think that would be a very serious mistake. I don't think American troops should be holding territory, which is what they would have to do as an occupying force. I don't think that is a smart strategy.

I do think the use of special forces, which we're using, the use of enablers and trainers in Iraq, which has had some positive effects, are very much in our interests, and so I do support what is happening, but let me just...

RADDATZ: But what would you do differently than President Obama is doing?

CLINTON: Well, Martha, I hope that by the time I — if I'm fortunate...

126. TRUMP: Everything.

CLINTON: I hope by the time I am president that we will have pushed ISIS out of Iraq. I do think that there is a good chance that we can take Mosul. And, you know, Donald says he knows more about ISIS than the generals. No, he doesn't.

There are a lot of very important planning going on, and some of it is to signal to the Sunnis in the area, as well as Kurdish Peshmerga fighters, that we all need to be in this. And that takes a lot of planning and preparation.

I would go after Baghdadi. I would specifically target Baghdadi, because I think our targeting of Al Qaida leaders — and I was involved in a lot of those operations, highly classified ones — made a difference. So I think that could help.

I would also consider arming the Kurds. The Kurds have been our best partners in Syria, as well as Iraq. And I know there's a lot of concern about that in some circles, but I think they should have the equipment they need so that Kurdish and Arab fighters on the ground are the principal way that we take Raqqa after pushing ISIS out of Iraq.

RADDATZ: Thank you very much. We're going to move on...

127. TRUMP: You know what's funny? She went over a minute over, and you don't stop her. When I go one second over, it's like a big deal.

RADDATZ: You had many answers.

128. TRUMP: It's really — it's really very interesting.

COOPER: We've got a question over here from James Carter. Mr. Carter?

QUESTION: My question is, do you believe you can be a devoted president to all the people in the United States?

COOPER: That question begins for Mr. Trump.

129. TRUMP: Absolutely. I mean, she calls our people deplorable, a large group, and irredeemable. I will be a president for all of our people. And I'll be a president that will turn our inner cities around and will give strength to people and will give economics to people and will bring jobs back.

130. Because NAFTA, signed by her husband, is perhaps the greatest disaster trade deal in the history of the world. Not in this country. It stripped us of manufacturing jobs. We lost our jobs. We lost our money. We lost our plants. It is a disaster. And now she wants to sign TPP, even though she says now she's for it. She called it the gold standard. And by the way, at the last debate, she lied, because it turned out that she did say the gold standard and she said she didn't say it. They actually said that she lied. OK? And she lied. But she's lied about a lot of things.

131. TRUMP: I would be a president for all of the people, African- Americans, the inner cities. Devastating what's happening to our inner cities. She's been talking about it for years. As usual, she talks about it, nothing happens. She doesn't get it done.

132. Same with the Latino Americans, the Hispanic Americans. The same exact thing. They talk, they don't get it done. You go into the inner cities and — you see it's 45 percent poverty. African- Americans now 45 percent poverty in the inner cities. The education is a disaster. Jobs are essentially nonexistent.

133. I mean, it's — you know, and I've been saying at big speeches where I have 20,000 and 30,000 people, what do you have to lose? It can't get any worse. And she's been talking about the inner cities for 25 years. Nothing's going to ever happen.

134. Let me tell you, if she's president of the United States, nothing's going to happen. It's just going to be talk. And all of her friends, the taxes we were talking about, and I would just get it by osmosis. She's not doing any me favors. But by doing all the others' favors, she's doing me favors.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, thank you.

135. TRUMP: But I will tell you, she's all talk. It doesn't get done. All you have to do is take a look at her Senate run. Take a look at upstate New York.

COOPER: Your two minutes is up. Secretary Clinton, two minutes?

136. TRUMP: It turned out to be a disaster.

COOPER: You have two minutes, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Well, 67 percent of the people voted to re-elect me when I ran for my second term, and I was very proud and very humbled by that.

Mr. Carter, I have tried my entire life to do what I can to support children and families. You know, right out of law school, I went to work for the Children's Defense Fund. And Donald talks a lot about, you know, the 30 years I've been in public service. I'm proud of that. You know, I started off as a young lawyer working against discrimination against African-American children in schools and in the criminal justice system. I worked to make sure that kids with disabilities could get a public education, something that I care very much about. I have worked with Latinos — one of my first jobs in politics was down in south Texas registering Latino citizens to be able to vote. So I have a deep devotion, to use your absolutely correct word, to making sure that an every American feels like he or she has a place in our country.

And I think when you look at the letters that I get, a lot of people are worried that maybe they wouldn't have a place in Donald Trump's America. They write me, and one woman wrote me about her son, Felix. She adopted him from Ethiopia when he was a toddler. He's 10 years old now. This is the only one country he's ever known. And he listens to Donald on TV and he said to his mother one day, will he send me back to Ethiopia if he gets elected?

You know, children listen to what is being said. To go back to the very, very first question. And there's a lot of fear — in fact, teachers and parents are calling it the Trump effect. Bullying is up. A lot of people are feeling, you know, uneasy. A lot of kids are expressing their concerns.

So, first and foremost, I will do everything I can to reach out to everybody.

COOPER: Your time, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Democrats, Republicans, independents, people across our country. If you don't vote for me, I still want to be your president.

COOPER: Your two minutes is up.

CLINTON: I want to be the best president I can be for every American.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, your two minutes is up. I want to follow up on something that Donald Trump actually said to you, a comment you made last month. You said that half of Donald Trump's supporters are, quote, "deplorables, racist, sexist, homophobic, xenophobic, Islamophobic." You later said you regretted saying half.

You didn't express regret for using the term "deplorables." To Mr. Carter's question, how can you unite a country if you've written off tens of millions of Americans?

CLINTON: Well, within hours I said that I was sorry about the way I talked about that, because my argument is not with his supporters. It's with him and with the hateful and divisive campaign that he has run, and the inciting of violence at his rallies, and the very brutal kinds of comments about not just women, but all Americans, all kinds of Americans.

And what he has said about African-Americans and Latinos, about Muslims, about POWs, about immigrants, about people with disabilities, he's never apologized for. And so I do think that a lot of the tone and tenor that he has said — I'm proud of the campaign that Bernie Sanders and I ran. We ran a campaign based on issues, not insults. And he is supporting me 100 percent.

COOPER: Thank you.

CLINTON: Because we talked about what we wanted to do. We might have had some differences, and we had a lot of debates...

COOPER: Thank you, Secretary.

137. TRUMP: ... but we believed that we could make the country better. And I was proud of that.

COOPER: I want to give you a minute to respond.

138. TRUMP: We have a divided nation. We have a very divided nation. You look at Charlotte. You look at Baltimore. You look at the violence that's taking place in the inner cities, Chicago, you take a look at Washington, D.C.

139. We have an increase in murder within our cities, the biggest in 45 years. We have a divided nation, because people like her — and believe me, she has tremendous hate in her heart. And when she said deplorables, she meant it. And when she said irredeemable, they're irredeemable, you didn't mention that, but when she said they're irredeemable, to me that might have been even worse.

COOPER: She said some of them are irredeemable.

140. TRUMP: She's got tremendous — she's got tremendous hatred. And this country cannot take another four years of Barack Obama, and that's what you're getting with her.

COOPER: Mr. Trump, let me follow up with you. In 2008, you wrote in one of your books that the most important characteristic of a good leader is discipline. You said, if a leader doesn't have it, quote, "he or she won't be one for very long." In the days after the first debate, you sent out a series of tweets from 3 a.m. to 5 a.m., including one that told people to check out a sex tape. Is that the discipline of a good leader?

141. TRUMP: No, there wasn't check out a sex tape. It was just take a look at the person that she built up to be this wonderful Girl Scout who was no Girl Scout.

COOPER: You mentioned sex tape.

142. TRUMP: By the way, just so you understand, when she said 3 o'clock in the morning, take a look at Benghazi. She said who is going to answer the call at 3 o'clock in the morning? Guess what? She didn't answer it, because when Ambassador Stevens...

COOPER: The question is, is that the discipline of a good leader?

143. TRUMP: ... 600 — wait a minute, Anderson, 600 times. Well, she said she was awake at 3 o'clock in the morning, and she also sent a tweet out at 3 o'clock in the morning, but I won't even mention that. But she said she'll be awake. Who's going — the famous thing, we're going to answer our call at 3 o'clock in the morning. Guess what happened? Ambassador Stevens — Ambassador Stevens sent 600 requests for help. And the only one she talked to was Sidney Blumenthal, who's her friend and not a good guy, by the way. So, you know, she shouldn't be talking about that.

144. Now, tweeting happens to be a modern day form of communication. I mean, you can like it or not like it. I have, between Facebook and Twitter, I have almost 25 million people. It's a very effective way of communication. So you can put it down, but it is a very effective form of communication. I'm not un-proud of it, to be honest with you.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, does Mr. Trump have the discipline to be a good leader?

CLINTON: No.

145. TRUMP: I'm shocked to hear that.

(LAUGHTER)

CLINTON: Well, it's not only my opinion. It's the opinion of many others, national security experts, Republicans, former Republican members of Congress. But it's in part because those of us who have had the great privilege of seeing this job up close and know how difficult it is, and it's not just because I watched my husband take a \$300 billion deficit and turn it into a \$200 billion surplus, and 23 million new jobs were created, and incomes went up for everybody. Everybody. African-American incomes went up 33 percent.

And it's not just because I worked with George W. Bush after 9/11, and I was very proud that when I told him what the city needed, what we needed to recover, he said you've got it, and he never wavered. He stuck with me. And I have worked and I admire President Obama. He inherited the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. That was a terrible time for our country.

COOPER: We have to move along.

CLINTON: Nine million people lost their jobs.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton, we have to...

CLINTON: Five million homes were lost.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton, we're moving.

CLINTON: And \$13 trillion in family wealth was wiped out. We are back on the right track. He would send us back into recession with his tax plans that benefit the wealthiest of Americans.

RADDATZ: Secretary Clinton, we are moving to an audience question. We're almost out of time. We have another... TRUMP: We have the slowest growth since 1929.

RADDATZ: We're moving to an audience question.

146. TRUMP: It is — our country has the slowest growth and jobs are a disaster.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, Secretary Clinton, we want to get to the audience. Thank you very much both of you.

(LAUGHTER)

We have another audience question. Beth Miller has a question for both candidates.

QUESTION: Good evening. Perhaps the most important aspect of this election is the Supreme Court justice. What would you prioritize as the most important aspect of selecting a Supreme Court justice?

RADDATZ: We begin with your two minutes, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Thank you. Well, you're right. This is one of the most important issues in this election. I want to appoint Supreme Court justices who understand the way the world really works, who have real-life experience, who have not just been in a big law firm and maybe clerked for a judge and then gotten on the bench, but, you know, maybe they tried some more cases, they actually understand what people are up against.

Because I think the current court has gone in the wrong direction. And so I would want to see the Supreme Court reverse Citizens United and get dark, unaccountable money out of our politics. Donald doesn't agree with that.

I would like the Supreme Court to understand that voting rights are still a big problem in many parts of our country, that we don't always do everything we can to make it possible for people of color and older people and young people to be able to exercise their franchise. I want a Supreme Court that will stick with Roe v. Wade and a woman's right to choose, and I want a Supreme Court that will stick with marriage equality.

Now, Donald has put forth the names of some people that he would consider. And among the ones that he has suggested are people who would reverse Roe v. Wade and reverse marriage equality. I think that would be a terrible mistake and would take us backwards.

I want a Supreme Court that doesn't always side with corporate interests. I want a Supreme Court that understands because you're wealthy and you can give more money to something doesn't mean you have any more rights or should have any more rights than anybody else.

So I have very clear views about what I want to see to kind of change the balance on the Supreme Court. And I regret deeply that the Senate has not done its job and they have not permitted a vote on the person that President Obama, a highly qualified person, they've not given him a vote to be able to be have the full complement of nine Supreme Court justices. I think that was a dereliction of duty.

I hope that they will see their way to doing it, but if I am so fortunate enough as to be president, I will immediately move to make sure that we fill that, we have nine justices that get to work on behalf of our people.

RADDATZ: Thank you, Secretary Clinton. Thank you. You're out of time. Mr. Trump?

147. TRUMP: Justice Scalia, great judge, died recently. And we have a vacancy. I am looking to appoint judges very much in the mold of Justice Scalia. I'm looking for judges — and I've actually picked 20 of them so that people would see, highly respected, highly thought of, and actually very beautifully reviewed by just about everybody.

148. But people that will respect the Constitution of the United States. And I think that this is so important. Also, the Second Amendment, which is totally under siege by people like Hillary Clinton. They'll respect the Second Amendment and what it stands for, what it represents. So important to me.

149. Now, Hillary mentioned something about contributions just so you understand. So I will have in my race more than \$100 million put in — of my money, meaning I'm not taking all of this big money from all of these different corporations like she's doing. What I ask is this.

150. So I'm putting in more than — by the time it's finished, I'll have more than \$100 million invested. Pretty much self-funding money. We're raising money for the Republican Party, and we're doing tremendously on the small donations, \$61 average or so.

151. I ask Hillary, why doesn't — she made \$250 million by being in office. She used the power of her office to make a lot of money. Why isn't she funding, not for \$100 million, but why don't you put \$10 million or \$20 million or \$25 million or \$30 million into your own campaign?

152. It's \$30 million less for special interests that will tell you exactly what to do and it would really, I think, be a nice sign to the American public. Why aren't you putting some money in? You have a lot of it. You've made a lot of it because of the fact that you've been in office. Made a lot of it while you were secretary of state, actually. So why aren't you putting money into your own campaign? I'm just curious.

CLINTON: Well...

(CROSSTALK)

RADDATZ: Thank you very much. We're going to get on to one more question.

CLINTON: The question was about the Supreme Court. And I just want to quickly say, I respect the Second Amendment. But I believe there should be comprehensive background checks, and we should close the gun show loophole, and close the online loophole. COOPER: Thank you.

RADDATZ: We have — we have one more question, Mrs. Clinton.

CLINTON: We have to save as many lives as we possibly can.

COOPER: We have one more question from Ken Bone about energy policy. Ken?

QUESTION: What steps will your energy policy take to meet our energy needs, while at the same time remaining environmentally friendly and minimizing job loss for fossil power plant workers?

COOPER: Mr. Trump, two minutes?

153. TRUMP: Absolutely. I think it's such a great question, because energy is under siege by the Obama administration. Under absolutely siege. The EPA, Environmental Protection Agency, is killing these energy companies. And foreign companies are now coming in buying our — buying so many of our different plants and then re-jiggering the plant so that they can take care of their oil.

154. We are killing — absolutely killing our energy business in this country. Now, I'm all for alternative forms of energy, including wind, including solar, et cetera. But we need much more than wind and solar.

155. And you look at our miners. Hillary Clinton wants to put all the miners out of business. There is a thing called clean coal. Coal will last for 1,000 years in this country. Now we have natural gas and so many other things because of technology. We have unbelievable — we have found over the last seven years, we have found tremendous wealth right under our feet. So good. Especially when you have \$20 trillion in debt.

I will bring our energy companies back. They'll be able to compete. They'll make money. They'll pay off our national debt. They'll pay off our tremendous budget deficits, which are tremendous. But we are putting our energy companies out of business. We have to bring back our workers.

156. You take a look at what's happening to steel and the cost of steel and China dumping vast amounts of steel all over the United States, which essentially is killing our steelworkers and our steel companies. We have to guard our energy companies. We have to make it possible.

157. The EPA is so restrictive that they are putting our energy companies out of business. And all you have to do is go to a great place like West Virginia or places like Ohio, which is phenomenal, or places like Pennsylvania and you see what they're doing to the people, miners and others in the energy business. It's a disgrace.

COOPER: Your time is up. Thank you.

158. TRUMP: It's an absolute disgrace.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton, two minutes.

CLINTON: And actually — well, that was very interesting. First of all, China is illegally dumping steel in the United States and Donald Trump is buying it to build his buildings, putting steelworkers and American steel plants out of business. That's something that I fought against as a senator and that I would have a trade prosecutor to make sure that we don't get taken advantage of by China on steel or anything else.

You know, because it sounds like you're in the business or you're aware of people in the business — you know that we are now for the first time ever energy-independent. We are not dependent upon the Middle East. But the Middle East still controls a lot of the prices. So the price of oil has been way down. And that has had a damaging effect on a lot of the oil companies, right? We are, however, producing a lot of natural gas, which serves as a bridge to more renewable fuels. And I think that's an important transition.

We've got to remain energy-independent. It gives us much more power and freedom than to be worried about what goes on in the Middle East. We have enough worries over there without having to worry about that.

So I have a comprehensive energy policy, but it really does include fighting climate change, because I think that is a serious problem. And I support moving toward more clean, renewable energy as quickly as we can, because I think we can be the 21st century clean energy superpower and create millions of new jobs and businesses.

But I also want to be sure that we don't leave people behind. That's why I'm the only candidate from the very beginning of this campaign who had a plan to help us revitalize coal country, because those coal miners and their fathers and their grandfathers, they dug that coal out. A lot of them lost their lives. They were injured, but they turned the lights on and they powered their factories. I don't want to walk away from them. So we've got to do something for them.

COOPER: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: But the price of coal is down worldwide. So we have to look at this comprehensively.

COOPER: Your time is up.

CLINTON: And that's exactly what I have proposed. I hope you will go to HillaryClinton.com and look at my entire policy.

COOPER: Time is up. We have time for one more...

RADDATZ: We have...

COOPER: One more audience question.

RADDATZ: We've sneaked in one more question, and it comes from Karl Becker.

QUESTION: Good evening. My question to both of you is, regardless of the current rhetoric, would either of you name one positive thing that you respect in one another?

(APPLAUSE)

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump, would you like to go first?

CLINTON: Well, I certainly will, because I think that's a very fair and important question. Look, I respect his children. His children are incredibly able and devoted, and I think that says a lot about Donald. I don't agree with nearly anything else he says or does, but I do respect that. And I think that is something that as a mother and a grandmother is very important to me.

So I believe that this election has become in part so — so conflict-oriented, so intense because there's a lot at stake. This is not an ordinary time, and this is not an ordinary election. We are going to be choosing a president who will set policy for not just four or eight years, but because of some of the important decisions we have to make here at home and around the world, from the Supreme Court to energy and so much else, and so there is a lot at stake. It's one of the most consequential elections that we've had.

And that's why I've tried to put forth specific policies and plans, trying to get it off of the personal and put it on to what it is I want to do as president. And that's why I hope people will check on that for themselves so that they can see that, yes, I've spent 30 years, actually maybe a little more, working to help kids and families. And I want to take all that experience to the White House and do that every single day.

RADDATZ: Mr. Trump?

159. TRUMP: Well, I consider her statement about my children to be a very nice compliment. I don't know if it was meant to be a compliment, but it is a great — I'm very proud of my children. And they've done a wonderful job, and they've been wonderful, wonderful kids. So I consider that a compliment. I will say this about Hillary. She doesn't quit. She doesn't give up. I respect that. I tell it like it is. She's a fighter. I disagree with much of what she's fighting for. I do disagree with her judgment in many cases. But she does fight hard, and she doesn't quit, and she doesn't give up. And I consider that to be a very good trait.

RADDATZ: Thanks to both of you.

COOPER: We want to thank both the candidates. We want to thank the university here. This concludes the town hall meeting. Our thanks to the candidates, the commission, Washington University, and to everybody who watched.

RADDATZ: Please tune in on October 19th for the final presidential debate that will take place at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Good night, everyone.

5. Third presidential debate, October 19th 2016

WALLACE: Good evening from the Thomas and Mack Center at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I'm Chris Wallace of Fox News, and I welcome you to the third and final of the 2016 presidential debates between Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Donald J. Trump.

WALLACE: This debate is sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates. The commission has designed the format: Six roughly 15-minute segments with two-minute answers to the first question, then open discussion for the rest of each segment. Both campaigns have agreed to those rules.

For the record, I decided the topics and the questions in each topic. None of those questions has been shared with the commission or the two candidates. The audience here in the hall has promised to remain silent. No cheers, boos, or other interruptions so we and you can focus on what the candidates have to say.

WALLACE: No noise, except right now, as we welcome the Democratic nominee for president, Secretary Clinton, and the Republican nominee for president, Mr. Trump.

(APPLAUSE)

Secretary Clinton, Mr. Trump, welcome. Let's get right to it. The first topic is the Supreme Court.

You both talked briefly about the court in the last debate, but I want to drill down on this, because the next president will almost certainly have at least one appointment and likely or possibly two or three appointments.

WALLACE: Which means that you will, in effect, determine the balance of the court for what could be the next quarter century.

First of all, where do you want to see the court take the country? And secondly, what's your view on how the Constitution should be interpreted? Do the founders' words mean what they say or is it a living document to be applied flexibly according to changing circumstances? In this segment, Secretary Clinton, you go first. You have two minutes.

CLINTON: Thank you very much, Chris. And thanks to UNLV for hosting us.

You know, I think when we talk about the Supreme Court, it really raises the central issue in this election, namely, what kind of country are we going to be? What kind of opportunities will we provide for our citizens? What kind of rights will Americans have?

And I feel strongly that the Supreme Court needs to stand on the side of the American people, not on the side of the powerful corporations and the wealthy. For me, that means that we need a Supreme Court that will stand up on behalf of women's rights, on behalf of the rights of the LGBT community, that will stand up and say no to Citizens United, a decision that has undermined the election system in our country because of the way it permits dark, unaccountable money to come into our electoral system.

I have major disagreements with my opponent about these issues and others that will be before the Supreme Court. But I feel that at this point in our country's history, it is important that we not reverse marriage equality, that we not reverse Roe v. Wade, that we stand up against Citizens United, we stand up for the rights of people in the workplace, that we stand up and basically say: The Supreme Court should represent all of us.

That's how I see the court, and the kind of people that I would be looking to nominate to the court would be in the great tradition of standing up to the powerful, standing up on behalf of our rights as Americans.

And I look forward to having that opportunity. I would hope that the Senate would do its job and confirm the nominee that President Obama has sent to them. That's the way the Constitution fundamentally should operate. The president nominates, and then the Senate advises and consents, or not, but they go forward with the process.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, thank you.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, same question. Where do you want to see the court take the country? And how do you believe the Constitution should be interpreted?

1. TRUMP: Well, first of all, it's great to be with you, and thank you, everybody. The Supreme Court: It's what it's all about. Our country is so, so — it's just so imperative that we have the right justices.

2. Something happened recently where Justice Ginsburg made some very, very inappropriate statements toward me and toward a tremendous number of people, many, many millions of people that I represent. And she was forced to apologize. And apologize she did. But these were statements that should never, ever have been made.

3. We need a Supreme Court that in my opinion is going to uphold the Second Amendment, and all amendments, but the Second Amendment, which is under absolute siege. I believe if my opponent should win this race, which I truly don't think will happen, we will have a Second Amendment which will be a very, very small replica of what it is right now. But I feel that it's absolutely important that we uphold, because of the fact that it is under such trauma.

4. I feel that the justices that I am going to appoint — and I've named 20 of them — the justices that I'm going to appoint will be pro-life. They will have a conservative bent. They will be protecting the Second Amendment. They are great scholars in all cases, and they're people of tremendous respect. They will interpret the Constitution the way the founders wanted it interpreted. And I believe that's very, very important.

5. I don't think we should have justices appointed that decide what they want to hear. It's all about the Constitution of — of — and so important, the Constitution the way it was meant to be. And those are the people that I will appoint.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, thank you.

WALLACE: We now have about 10 minutes for an open discussion. I want to focus on two issues that, in fact, by the justices that you name could end up changing the existing law of the land. First is one that you mentioned, Mr. Trump, and that is guns.

Secretary Clinton, you said last year, let me quote, "The Supreme Court is wrong on the Second Amendment." And now, in fact, in the 2008 Heller case, the court ruled that there is a constitutional right to bear arms, but a right that is reasonably limited. Those were the words of the Judge Antonin Scalia who wrote the decision. What's wrong with that?

CLINTON: Well, first of all, I support the Second Amendment. I lived in Arkansas for 18 wonderful years. I represented upstate New York. I understand and respect the tradition of gun ownership. It goes back to the founding of our country.

But I also believe that there can be and must be reasonable regulation. Because I support the Second Amendment doesn't mean that I want people who shouldn't have guns to be able to threaten you, kill you or members of your family.

And so when I think about what we need to do, we have 33,000 people a year who die from guns. I think we need comprehensive background checks, need to close the online loophole, close the gun show loophole. There's other matters that I think are sensible that are the kind of reforms that would make a difference that are not in any way conflicting with the Second Amendment.

You mentioned the Heller decision. And what I was saying that you referenced, Chris, was that I disagreed with the way the court applied the Second Amendment in that case, because what the District of Columbia was trying to do was to protect toddlers from guns and so they wanted people with guns to safely store them. And the court didn't accept that reasonable regulation, but they've accepted many others. So I see no conflict between saving people's lives and defending the Second Amendment.

WALLACE: Let me bring Mr. Trump in here. The bipartisan Open Debate Coalition got millions of votes on questions to ask here, and this was, in fact, one of the top questions that they got. How will you ensure the Second Amendment is protected? You just heard Secretary Clinton's answer. Does she persuade you that, while you may disagree on regulation, that, in fact, she supports a Second Amendment right to bear arms? TRUMP: Well, the D.C. vs. Heller decision was very strongly — and she was extremely angry about it. I watched. I mean, she was very, very angry when upheld. And Justice Scalia was so involved. And it was a well-crafted decision. But Hillary was extremely upset, extremely angry. And people that believe in the Second Amendment and believe in it very strongly were very upset with what she had to say.

WALLACE: Well, let me bring in Secretary Clinton. Were you extremely upset?

CLINTON: Well, I was upset because, unfortunately, dozens of toddlers injure themselves, even kill people with guns, because, unfortunately, not everyone who has loaded guns in their homes takes appropriate precautions. But there's no doubt that I respect the Second Amendment, that I also believe there's an individual right to bear arms. That is not in conflict with sensible, commonsense regulation.

And, you know, look, I understand that Donald's been strongly supported by the NRA. The gun lobby's on his side. They're running millions of dollars of ads against me. And I regret that, because what I would like to see is for people to come together and say: Of course we're going to protect and defend the Second Amendment. But we're going to do it in a way that tries to save some of these 33,000 lives that we lose every year.

WALLACE: Let me bring Mr. Trump back into this, because, in fact, you oppose any limits on assault weapons, any limits on high- capacity magazines. You support a national right to carry law. Why, sir?

6. TRUMP: Well, let me just tell you before we go any further. In Chicago, which has the toughest gun laws in the United States, probably you could say by far, they have more gun violence than any other city. So we have the toughest laws, and you have tremendous gun violence.

7. I am a very strong supporter of the Second Amendment. And I am — I don't know if Hillary was saying it in a sarcastic manner, but I'm very proud to have the endorsement of the NRA. And it's the earliest endorsement they've ever given to anybody who ran for president. So I'm very honored by all of that.

8. We are going to appoint justices — this is the best way to help the Second Amendment. We are going to appoint justices that will feel very strongly about the Second Amendment, that will not do damage to the Second Amendment.

WALLACE: Well, let's pick up on another issue which divides you and the justices that whoever ends up winning this election appoints could have a dramatic effect there, and that's the issue of abortion.

9. TRUMP: Right.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, you're pro-life. But I want to ask you specifically: Do you want the court, including the justices that you will name, to overturn Roe v. Wade, which includes — in fact, states — a woman's right to abortion?

10. TRUMP: Well, if that would happen, because I am pro-life, and I will be appointing pro-life judges, I would think that that will go back to the individual states.

WALLACE: But I'm asking you specifically. Would you like to...

11. TRUMP: If they overturned it, it will go back to the states.

WALLACE: But what I'm asking you, sir, is, do you want to see the court overturn — you just said you want to see the court protect the Second Amendment. Do you want to see the court overturn Roe v. Wade?

12. TRUMP: Well, if we put another two or perhaps three justice on, that's really what's going to be — that will happen. And that'll happen automatically, in my opinion, because I am putting pro-life justices on the court. I will say this: It will go back to the states, and the states will then make a determination.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I strongly support Roe v. Wade, which guarantees a constitutional right to a woman to make the most intimate, most difficult, in many cases, decisions about her health care that one can imagine. And in this case, it's not only about Roe v. Wade. It is about what's happening right now in America.

So many states are putting very stringent regulations on women that block them from exercising that choice to the extent that they are defunding Planned Parenthood, which, of course, provides all kinds of cancer screenings and other benefits for women in our country.

Donald has said he's in favor of defunding Planned Parenthood. He even supported shutting the government down to defund Planned Parenthood. I will defend Planned Parenthood. I will defend Roe v. Wade, and I will defend women's rights to make their own health care decisions.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton... CLINTON: And we have come too far to have that turned back now. And, indeed, he said women should be punished, that there should be some form of punishment for women who obtain abortions. And I could just not be more opposed to that kind of thinking.

WALLACE: I'm going to give you a chance to respond, but I want to ask you, Secretary Clinton, I want to explore how far you believe the right to abortion goes. You have been quoted as saying that the fetus has no constitutional rights. You also voted against a ban on late-term, partial-birth abortions. Why?

CLINTON: Because Roe v. Wade very clearly sets out that there can be regulations on abortion so long as the life and the health of the mother are taken into account. And when I voted as a senator, I did not think that that was the case.

The kinds of cases that fall at the end of pregnancy are often the most heartbreaking, painful decisions for families to make. I have met with women who toward the end of their pregnancy get the worst news one could get, that their health is in jeopardy if they continue to carry to term or that something terrible has happened or just been discovered about the pregnancy. I do not think the United States government should be stepping in and making those most personal of decisions. So you can regulate if you are doing so with the life and the health of the mother taken into account.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, your reaction? And particularly on this issue of late-term, partial-birth abortions.

14. TRUMP: Well, I think it's terrible. If you go with what Hillary is saying, in the ninth month, you can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb of the mother just prior to the birth of the baby.

15. Now, you can say that that's OK and Hillary can say that that's OK. But it's not OK with me, because based on what she's saying, and based on where she's going, and where she's been, you can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb in the ninth month on the final day. And that's not acceptable.

CLINTON: Well, that is not what happens in these cases. And using that kind of scare rhetoric is just terribly unfortunate. You should meet with some of the women that I have met with, women I have known over the course of my life. This is one of the worst possible choices that any woman and her family has to make. And I do not believe the government should be making it.

You know, I've had the great honor of traveling across the world on behalf of our country. I've been to countries where governments either forced women to have abortions, like they used to do in China, or forced women to bear children, like they used to do in Romania. And I can tell you: The government has no business in the decisions that women make with their families in accordance with their faith, with medical advice. And I will stand up for that right.

WALLACE: All right. But just briefly, I want to move on to another segment...

16. TRUMP: And, honestly, nobody has business doing what I just said, doing that, as late as one or two or three or four days prior to birth. Nobody has that.

WALLACE: All right. Let's move on to the subject of immigration. And there is almost no issue that separates the two of you more than the issue of immigration. Actually, there are a lot of issues that separate the two of you. Mr. Trump, you want to build a wall. Secretary Clinton, you have offered no specific plan for how you want to secure our southern border. Mr. Trump, you are calling for major deportations. Secretary Clinton, you say that within your first 100 days as president you're going to offer a package that includes a pathway to citizenship. The question, really, is, why are you right and your opponent wrong?

Mr. Trump, you go first in this segment. You have two minutes.

17. TRUMP: Well, first of all, she wants to give amnesty, which is a disaster and very unfair to all of the people that are waiting on line for many, many years. We need strong borders.

18. In the audience tonight, we have four mothers of — I mean, these are unbelievable people that I've gotten to know over a period of years whose children have been killed, brutally killed by people that came into the country illegally. You have thousands of mothers and fathers and relatives all over the country. They're coming in illegally. Drugs are pouring in through the border. We have no country if we have no border. Hillary wants to give amnesty. She wants to have open borders. The border — as you know, the Border Patrol agents, 16,500-plus ICE last week, endorsed me. First time they've ever endorsed a candidate. It means their job is tougher. But they know what's going on. They know it better than anybody. They want strong borders. They feel we have to have strong borders.

19. I was up in New Hampshire the other day. The biggest complaint they have — it's with all of the problems going on in the world, many of the problems caused by Hillary Clinton and by Barack Obama. All of the problems — the single biggest problem is heroin that pours across our southern border. It's just pouring and destroying their youth. It's poisoning the blood of their youth and plenty of other people. We have to have strong borders. We have to keep the drugs out of our country. We are — right now, we're getting the drugs, they're getting the cash. We need strong borders. We need absolute — we cannot give amnesty.

20. Now, I want to build the wall. We need the wall. And the Border Patrol, ICE, they all want the wall. We stop the drugs. We shore up the border. One of my first acts will be to get all of the drug lords, all of the bad ones — we have some bad, bad people in this country that have to go out. We're going to get them out; we're going to secure the border. And once the border is secured, at a later date, we'll make a determination as to the rest. But we have some bad hombres here, and we're going to get them out.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, thank you. Same question to you, Secretary Clinton. Basically, why are you right and Mr. Trump is wrong?

CLINTON: Well, as he was talking, I was thinking about a young girl I met here in Las Vegas, Carla, who is very worried that her parents might be deported, because she was born in this country but they were not. They work hard, they do everything they can to give her a good life.

And you're right. I don't want to rip families apart. I don't want to be sending parents away from children. I don't want to see the deportation force that Donald has talked about in action in our country.

We have 11 million undocumented people. They have 4 million American citizen children, 15 million people. He said as recently as a few weeks ago in Phoenix that every undocumented person would be subject to deportation. Now, here's what that means. It means you would have to have a massive law enforcement presence, where law enforcement officers would be going school to school, home to home, business to business, rounding up people who are undocumented. And we would then have to put them on trains, on buses to get them out of our country. I think that is an idea that is not in keeping with who we are as a nation. I think it's an idea that would rip our country apart.

I have been for border security for years. I voted for border security in the United States Senate. And my comprehensive immigration reform plan of course includes border security. But I want to put our resources where I think they're most needed: Getting rid of any violent person. Anybody who should be deported, we should deport them.

When it comes to the wall that Donald talks about building, he went to Mexico, he had a meeting with the Mexican president. Didn't even raise it. He choked and then got into a Twitter war because the Mexican president said we're not paying for that wall.

So I think we are both a nation of immigrants and we are a nation of laws and that we can act accordingly. And that's why I'm introducing comprehensive immigration reform within the first 100 days with the path to citizenship.

WALLACE: Thank you, Secretary Clinton. I want to follow up...

21. TRUMP: Chris, I think it's...

WALLACE: OK.

22. TRUMP: I think I should respond to that. First of all, I had a very good meeting with the president of Mexico. Very nice man. We will be doing very much better with Mexico on trade deals. Believe me. The NAFTA deal signed by her husband is one of the worst deals ever made of any kind, signed by anybody. It's a disaster. Hillary Clinton wanted the wall. Hillary Clinton fought for the wall in 2006 or thereabouts. Now, she never gets anything done, so naturally the wall wasn't built. But Hillary Clinton wanted the wall.

WALLACE: Well, let me — wait, wait, sir, let me...

23. TRUMP: We are a country of laws. We either have — and by the way...

WALLACE: Now, wait. I'd like to hear from...

24. TRUMP: Well — well, but she said one thing.

WALLACE: I'd like to hear — I'd like to hear from Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: I voted for border security, and there are...

25. TRUMP: And the wall.

CLINTON: There are some limited places where that was appropriate. There also is necessarily going to be new technology and how best to deploy that.

But it is clear, when you look at what Donald has been proposing, he started his campaign bashing immigrants, calling Mexican immigrants rapists and criminals and drug dealers, that he has a very different view about what we should do to deal with immigrants.

Now, what I am also arguing is that bringing undocumented immigrants out from the shadows, putting them into the formal economy will be good, because then employers can't exploit them and undercut Americans' wages.

And Donald knows a lot about this. He used undocumented labor to build the Trump Tower. He underpaid undocumented workers, and when they complained, he basically said what a lot of employers do: "You complain, I'll get you deported."

I want to get everybody out of the shadows, get the economy working, and not let employers like Donald exploit undocumented workers, which hurts them, but also hurts American workers.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump?

26. TRUMP: President Obama has moved millions of people out. Nobody knows about it, nobody talks about it. But under Obama, millions of people have been moved out of this country. They've been deported. She doesn't want to say that, but that's what's happened, and that's what happened big league.

27. As far as moving these people out and moving — we either have a country or we don't. We're a country of laws. We either have a border or we don't.

28. Now, you can come back in and you can become a citizen. But it's very unfair. We have millions of people that did it the right way. They're on line. They're waiting. We're going to speed up the process, big league, because it's very inefficient. But they're on line and they're waiting to become citizens.

29. Very unfair that somebody runs across the border, becomes a citizen, under her plan, you have open borders. You would have a disaster on trade, and you will have a disaster with your open borders.

WALLACE: I want to...

30. TRUMP: But what she doesn't say is that President Obama has deported millions and millions of people just the way it is.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, I want to...

CLINTON: We will not have open borders. That is...

WALLACE: Well, let me — Secretary...

CLINTON: That is a rank mischaracterization.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: We will have secure borders, but we'll also have reform. And this used to be a bipartisan issue. Ronald Reagan was the last president...

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, excuse me. Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: ... to sign immigration reform, and George W. Bush supported it, as well.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, I want to clear up your position on this issue, because in a speech you gave to a Brazilian bank, for which you were paid \$225,000, we've learned from the WikiLeaks, that you said this, and I want to quote. "My dream is a hemispheric common market with open trade and open borders." So that's the question...

31. TRUMP: Thank you.

WALLACE: That's the question. Please quiet, everybody. Is that your dream, open borders? CLINTON: Well, if you went on to read the rest of the sentence, I was talking about energy. You know, we trade more energy with our neighbors than we trade with the rest of the world combined. And I do want us to have an electric grid, an energy system that crosses borders. I think that would be a great benefit to us.

But you are very clearly quoting from WikiLeaks. And what's really important about WikiLeaks is that the Russian government has engaged in espionage against Americans. They have hacked American websites, American accounts of private people, of institutions. Then they have given that information to WikiLeaks for the purpose of putting it on the Internet.

This has come from the highest levels of the Russian government, clearly, from Putin himself, in an effort, as 17 of our intelligence agencies have confirmed, to influence our election.

CLINTON: So I actually think the most important question of this evening, Chris, is, finally, will Donald Trump admit and condemn that the Russians are doing this and make it clear that he will not have the help of Putin in in this election, that he rejects Russian espionage against Americans, which he actually encouraged in the past? Those are the questions we need answered. We've never had anything like this happen in any of our elections before.

WALLACE: Well?

32. TRUMP: That was a great pivot off the fact that she wants open borders, OK? How did we get on to Putin?

WALLACE: Hold on — hold on, wait. Hold on, folks. Because we — this is going to end up getting out of control. Let's try to keep it quiet so — for the candidates and for the American people.

33. TRUMP: So just to finish on the borders...

WALLACE: Yes?

34. TRUMP: She wants open borders. People are going to pour into our country. People are going to come in from Syria. She wants 550 percent more people than Barack Obama, and he has thousands and thousands of people. They have no idea where they come from.

35. And you see, we are going to stop radical Islamic terrorism in this country. She won't even mention the words, and neither will President Obama. So I just want to tell you, she wants open borders.

36. Now we can talk about Putin. I don't know Putin. He said nice things about me. If we got along well, that would be good. If Russia and the United States got along well and went after ISIS, that would be good.

37. He has no respect for her. He has no respect for our president. And I'll tell you what: We're in very serious trouble, because we have a country with tremendous numbers of nuclear warheads — 1,800, by the way — where they expanded and we didn't, 1,800 nuclear warheads. And she's playing chicken. Look, Putin...

WALLACE: Wait, but...

38. TRUMP: ... from everything I see, has no respect for this person.

CLINTON: Well, that's because he'd rather have a puppet as president of the United States.

39. TRUMP: No puppet. No puppet.

CLINTON: And it's pretty clear...

40. TRUMP: You're the puppet!

CLINTON: It's pretty clear you won't admit...

41. TRUMP: No, you're the puppet.

CLINTON: ... that the Russians have engaged in cyberattacks against the United States of America, that you encouraged espionage against our people, that you are willing to spout the Putin line, sign up for his wish list, break up NATO, do whatever he wants to do, and that you continue to get help from him, because he has a very clear favorite in this race.

So I think that this is such an unprecedented situation. We've never had a foreign government trying to interfere in our election. We have 17 — 17 intelligence agencies, civilian and military, who have all concluded that these espionage attacks, these cyberattacks, come from the highest levels of the Kremlin and they are designed to influence our election. I find that deeply disturbing.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: And I think it's time you take a stand...

42. TRUMP: She has no idea whether it's Russia, China, or anybody else.

CLINTON: I am not quoting myself.

43. TRUMP: She has no idea.

CLINTON: I am quoting 17...

44. TRUMP: Hillary, you have no idea.

CLINTON: ... 17 intelligence — do you doubt 17 military and civilian...

45. TRUMP: And our country has no idea.

CLINTON: ... agencies.

46. TRUMP: Yeah, I doubt it. I doubt it.

CLINTON: Well, he'd rather believe Vladimir Putin than the military and civilian intelligence professionals who are sworn to protect us. I find that just absolutely...

(CROSSTALK)

47. TRUMP: She doesn't like Putin because Putin has outsmarted her at every step of the way.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump...

48. TRUMP: Excuse me. Putin has outsmarted her in Syria.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump...

(CROSSTALK)

49. TRUMP: He's outsmarted her every step of the way.

WALLACE: I do get to ask some questions.

50. TRUMP: Yes, that's fine.

WALLACE: And I would like to ask you this direct question. The top national security officials of this country do believe that Russia has been behind these hacks. Even if you don't know for sure whether they are, do you condemn any interference by Russia in the American election?

51. TRUMP: By Russia or anybody else.

WALLACE: You condemn their interference?

52. TRUMP: Of course I condemn. Of course I — I don't know Putin. I have no idea.

WALLACE: I'm not asking — I'm asking do you condemn?

53. TRUMP: I never met Putin. This is not my best friend. But if the United States got along with Russia, wouldn't be so bad.

54. Let me tell you, Putin has outsmarted her and Obama at every single step of the way. Whether it's Syria, you name it. Missiles. Take a look at the "start up" that they signed. The Russians have said, according to many, many

reports, I can't believe they allowed us to do this. They create warheads, and we can't. The Russians can't believe it. She has been outsmarted by Putin.

55. And all you have to do is look at the Middle East. They've taken over. We've spent \$6 trillion. They've taken over the Middle East. She has been outsmarted and outplayed worse than anybody I've ever seen in any government whatsoever.

WALLACE: We're a long way away from immigration, but I'm going to let you finish this topic. You got about 45 seconds.

56. TRUMP: And she always will be.

CLINTON: I — I find it ironic that he's raising nuclear weapons. This is a person who has been very cavalier, even casual about the use of nuclear weapons. He's...

57. TRUMP: Wrong. CLINTON: ... advocated more countries getting them, Japan, Korea, even Saudi Arabia. He said, well, if we have them, why don't we use them, which I think is terrifying.

But here's the deal. The bottom line on nuclear weapons is that when the president gives the order, it must be followed. There's about four minutes between the order being given and the people responsible for launching nuclear weapons to do so. And that's why 10 people who have had that awesome responsibility have come out and, in an unprecedented way, said they would not trust Donald Trump with the nuclear codes or to have his finger on the nuclear button.

58. TRUMP: I have 200 generals...

WALLACE: Very quickly.

59. TRUMP: ... and admirals, 21 endorsing me, 21 congressional Medal of Honor recipients. As far as Japan and other countries, we are being ripped off by everybody in the — we're defending other countries. We are spending a fortune doing it. They have the bargain of the century.

60. All I said is, we have to renegotiate these agreements, because our country cannot afford to defend Saudi Arabia, Japan, Germany, South Korea, and many other places. We cannot continue to afford — she took that as saying nuclear weapons.

WALLACE: OK.

61. TRUMP: Look, she's been proven to be a liar on so many different ways. This is just another lie.

CLINTON: Well, I'm just quoting you when you were asked...

62. TRUMP: There's no quote. You're not going to find a quote from me.

CLINTON: ... about a potential nuclear — nuclear competition in Asia, you said, you know, go ahead, enjoy yourselves, folks. That kind...

63. TRUMP: And defend yourselves.

CLINTON: ... of language — well...

64. TRUMP: And defend yourselves. I didn't say nuclear. And defend yourself.

CLINTON: The United States has kept the peace — the United States has kept the peace through our alliances. Donald wants to tear up our alliances. I think it makes the world safer and, frankly, it makes the United States safer. I would work with our allies in Asia, in Europe, in the Middle East, and elsewhere. That's the only way we're going to be able to keep the peace.

WALLACE: We're going to — no, we are going to move on to the next topic, which is the economy. And I hope we handle that as well as we did immigration. You also have very different ideas about how to get the economy growing faster. Secretary Clinton, in your plan, government plays a big role. You see more government spending, more entitlements, more tax credits, more tax penalties. Mr. Trump, you want to get government out with lower taxes and less regulation.

65. TRUMP: Yes.

WALLACE: We're going to drill down into this a little bit more. But in this overview, please explain to me why you believe that your plan will create more jobs and growth for this country and your opponent's plan will not. In this round, you go first, Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: Well, I think when the middle class thrives, America thrives. And so my plan is based on growing the economy, giving middle-class families many more opportunities. I want us to have the biggest jobs program since World War II, jobs in infrastructure and advanced manufacturing. I think we can compete with high-wage countries, and I believe we should. New jobs and clean energy, not only to fight climate change, which is a serious problem, but to create new opportunities and new businesses.

I want us to do more to help small business. That's where two-thirds of the new jobs are going to come from. I want us to raise the national minimum wage, because people who live in poverty should not — who work full-time should not still be in poverty. And I sure do want to make sure women get equal pay for the work we do.

I feel strongly that we have to have an education system that starts with preschool and goes through college. That's why I want more technical education in high schools and in community colleges, real apprenticeships to prepare young people for the jobs of the future. I want to make college debt-free and for families making less than

\$125,000, you will not get a tuition bill from a public college or university if the plan that I worked on with Bernie Sanders is enacted.

And we're going to work hard to make sure that it is, because we are going to go where the money is. Most of the gains in the last years since the Great Recession have gone to the very top. So we are going to have the wealthy pay their fair share. We're going to have corporations make a contribution greater than they are now to our country. That is a plan that has been analyzed by independent experts which said that it could produce 10 million new jobs. By contrast, Donald's plan has been analyzed to conclude it might lose 3.5 million jobs. Why? Because his whole plan is to cut taxes, to give the biggest tax breaks ever to the wealthy and to corporations, adding \$20 trillion to our debt, and causing the kind of dislocation that we have seen before, because it truly will be trickle-down economics on steroids.

So the plan I have I think will actually produce greater opportunities. The plan he has will cost us jobs and possibly lead to another Great Recession.

WALLACE: Secretary, thank you. Mr. Trump, why will your plan create more jobs and growth than Secretary Clinton's?

66. TRUMP: Well, first of all, before I start on my plan, her plan is going to raise taxes and even double your taxes. Her tax plan is a disaster. And she can say all she wants about college tuition. And I'm a big proponent. We're going to do a lot of things for college tuition. But the rest of the public's going to be paying for it. We will have a massive, massive tax increase under Hillary Clinton's plan.

67. TRUMP: But I'd like to start off where we left, because when I said Japan and Germany, and I'm — not to single them out, but South Korea, these are very rich, powerful countries. Saudi Arabia, nothing but money. We protect Saudi Arabia. Why aren't they paying?

68. She immediately — when she heard this, I questioned it, and I questioned NATO. Why aren't the NATO questioned — why aren't they paying? Because they weren't paying.

69. Since I did this — this was a year ago — all of a sudden, they're paying. And I've been given a lot — a lot of credit for it. All of a sudden, they're starting to pay up. They have to pay up. We're protecting people, they have to pay up. And I'm a big fan of NATO. But they have to pay up.

70. She comes out and said, we love our allies, we think our allies are great. Well, it's awfully hard to get them to pay up when you have somebody saying we think how great they are.

71. We have to tell Japan in a very nice way, we have to tell Germany, all of these countries, South Korea, we have to say, you have to help us out. We have, during his regime, during President Obama's regime, we've doubled our national debt. We're up to \$20 trillion.

72. So my plan — we're going to renegotiate trade deals. We're going to have a lot of free trade. We're going to have free trade, more free trade than we have right now. But we have horrible deals. Our jobs are being taken out by the deal that her husband signed, NAFTA, one of the worst deals ever. Our jobs are being sucked out of our economy.

73. You look at all of the places that I just left, you go to Pennsylvania, you go to Ohio, you go to Florida, you go to any of them. You go upstate New York. Our jobs have fled to Mexico and other places. We're bringing our jobs back.

74. I am going to renegotiate NAFTA. And if I can't make a great deal — then we're going to terminate NAFTA and we're going to create new deals. We're going to have trade, but we're going — we're going to terminate it, we're going to make a great trade deal.

75. And if we can't, we're going to do it — we're going to go a separate way, because it has been a disaster. We are going to cut taxes massively. We're going to cut business taxes massively. They're going to start hiring people. We're going to bring the \$2.5 trillion...

WALLACE: Time, Mr. Trump.

76. TRUMP: ... that's offshore back into the country. We are going to start the engine rolling again, because...

WALLACE: Mr. Trump?

77. TRUMP: ... right now, our country is dying at 1 percent GDP.

CLINTON: Well, let me translate that, if I can, Chris, because...

78. TRUMP: You can't.

CLINTON: ... the fact is, he's going to advocate for the largest tax cuts we've ever seen, three times more than the tax cuts under the Bush administration. I have said repeatedly throughout this campaign: I will not raise taxes on anyone making \$250,000 or less.

I also will not add a penny to the debt. I have costed out what I'm going to do. He will, through his massive tax cuts, add \$20 trillion to the debt.

Well, he mentioned the debt. We know how to get control of the debt. When my husband was president, we went from a \$300 billion deficit to a \$200 billion surplus and we were actually on the path to eliminating the national debt. When President Obama came into office, he inherited the worst economic disaster since the Great Depression. He has cut the deficit by two-thirds.

So, yes, one of the ways you go after the debt, one of the ways you create jobs is by investing in people. So I do have investments, investments in new jobs, investments in education, skill training, and the opportunities for people to get ahead and stay ahead. That's the kind of approach that will work.

WALLACE: Secretary...

CLINTON: Cutting taxes on the wealthy, we've tried that. It has not worked the way that it has been promised.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, I want to pursue your plan, because in many ways it is similar to the Obama stimulus plan in 2009, which has led to the slowest GDP growth since 1949.

79. **TRUMP: Correct.**

WALLACE: Thank you, sir.

You told me in July when we spoke that the problem is that President Obama didn't get to do enough in what he was trying to do with his stimulus. So is your plan basically more — even more of the Obama stimulus?

CLINTON: Well, it's a combination, Chris. And let me say that when you inherit the level of economic catastrophe that President Obama inherited, it was a real touch-and-go situation. I was in the Senate before I became secretary of state. I've never seen people as physically distraught as the Bush administration team was because of what was happening to the economy.

I personally believe that the steps that President Obama took saved the economy. He doesn't get the credit he deserves for taking some very hard positions. But it was a terrible recession.

So now we've dug ourselves out of it, we're standing, but we're not yet running. So what I am proposing is that we invest from the middle out and the ground up, not the top down. That is not going to work.

That's why what I have put forward doesn't add a penny to the debt, but it is the kind of approach that will enable more people to take those new jobs, higher-paying jobs. We're beginning to see some increase in incomes, and we certainly have had a long string of increasing jobs. We've got to do more to get the whole economy moving, and that's what I believe I will be able to do.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, even conservative economists who have looked at your plan say that the numbers don't add up, that your idea, and you've talked about 25 million jobs created, 4 percent...

80. **TRUMP: Over a 10-year period.**

WALLACE: ... growth is unrealistic. And they say — you talk a lot about growing the energy industry. They say with oil prices as low as they are right now, that's unrealistic, as well. Your response, sir?

81. **TRUMP: So I just left some high representatives of India. They're growing at 8 percent. China is growing at 7 percent. And that for them is a catastrophically low number.**

82. **We are growing — our last report came out — and it's right around the 1 percent level. And I think it's going down. Last week, as you know, the end of last week, they came out with an anemic jobs report. A terrible jobs report. In fact I said, is that the last jobs report before the election? Because if it is, I should win easily, it was so bad. The report was so bad.**

83. **Look, our country is stagnant. We've lost our jobs. We've lost our businesses. We're not making things anymore, relatively speaking. Our product is pouring in from China, pouring in from Vietnam, pouring in from all over the world.**

84. **I've visited so many communities. This has been such an incredible education for me, Chris. I've gotten to know so many — I've developed so many friends over the last year. And they cry when they see what's happened. I pass factories that were thriving 20, 25 years ago, and because of the bill that her husband signed and she blessed 100 percent, it is just horrible what's happened to these people in these communities.**

85. **Now, she can say that her husband did well, but, boy, did they suffer as NAFTA kicked in, because it didn't really kick in very much, but it kicked in after they left. Boy, did they suffer. That was one of the worst things that's ever been signed by our country.**

86. **Now she wants to sign Trans-Pacific Partnership. And she wants it. She lied when she said she didn't call it the gold standard in one of the debates. She totally lied. She did call it the gold standard. And they actually fact checked, and they said I was right. I was so honored.**

WALLACE: I want you to give you a chance to briefly speak to that, and then I want to pivot to one-sixth of the economy...

87. **TRUMP: And that will be as bad as NAFTA. WALLACE: ... which is Obamacare. But go ahead, briefly.**

CLINTON: Well, first, let me say, number one, when I saw the final agreement for TPP, I said I was against it. It didn't meet my test. I've had the same test. Does it create jobs, raise incomes, and further our national security? I'm against it now. I'll be against it after the election. I'll be against it when I'm president.

There's only one of us on this stage who's actually shipped jobs to Mexico, because that's Donald. He's shipped jobs to 12 countries, including Mexico.

But he mentioned China. And, you know, one of the biggest problems we have with China is the illegal dumping of steel and aluminum into our markets. I have fought against that as a senator. I've stood up against it as secretary of state.

Donald has bought Chinese steel and aluminum. In fact, the Trump Hotel right here in Las Vegas was made with Chinese steel. So he goes around with crocodile tears about how terrible it is, but he has given jobs to Chinese steelworkers, not American steelworkers.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump?

CLINTON: That's the kind of approach that is just not going to work.

88. TRUMP: Well, let me just say — let me just say.

CLINTON: We're going to pull the country together. We're going to have trade agreements that we enforce. That's why I'm going to have a trade prosecutor for the first time in history. And we're going to enforce those agreements, and we're going to look for businesses to help us by buying American products.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton? Go ahead, Mr. Trump.

89. TRUMP: Let me ask a simple question. She's been doing this for 30 years. Why the hell didn't you do it over the last 15, 20 years?

CLINTON: No, I voted.

90. TRUMP: You were very much involved — excuse me. My turn. You were very much involved in every aspect of this country. Very much. And you do have experience. I say the one thing you have over me is experience, but it's bad experience, because what you've done has turned out badly.

91. For 30 years, you've been in a position to help, and if you say that I use steel or I use something else, I — make it impossible for me to do that. I wouldn't mind.

92. The problem is, you talk, but you don't get anything done, Hillary. You don't. Just like when you ran the State Department, \$6 billion was missing. How do you miss \$6 billion? You ran the State Department, \$6 billion was either stolen. They don't know. It's gone, \$6 billion. If you become president, this country is going to be in some mess. Believe me.

CLINTON: Well, first of all, what he just said about the State Department is not only untrue, it's been debunked numerous times.

CLINTON: But I think it's really an important issue. He raised the 30 years of experience, so let me just talk briefly about that. You know, back in the 1970s, I worked for the Children's Defense Fund. And I was taking on discrimination against African-American kids in schools. He was getting sued by the Justice Department for racial discrimination in his apartment buildings.

In the 1980s, I was working to reform the schools in Arkansas. He was borrowing \$14 million from his father to start his businesses. In the 1990s, I went to Beijing and I said women's rights are human rights. He insulted a former Miss Universe, Alicia Machado, called her an eating machine.

93. TRUMP: Give me a break.

CLINTON: And on the day when I was in the Situation Room, monitoring the raid that brought Osama bin Laden to justice, he was hosting the "Celebrity Apprentice." So I'm happy to compare my 30 years of experience, what I've done for this country, trying to help in every way I could, especially kids and families get ahead and stay ahead, with your 30 years, and I'll let the American people make that decision.

94. TRUMP: Well, I think I did a much better job. I built a massive company, a great company, some of the greatest assets anywhere in the world, worth many, many billions of dollars. I started with a \$1 million loan. I agree with that. It's a \$1 million loan. But I built a phenomenal company.

95. And if we could run our country the way I've run my company, we would have a country that you would be so proud of. You would even be proud of it.

96. And frankly, when you look at her real record, take a look at Syria. Take a look at the migration. Take a look at Libya. Take a look at Iraq. She gave us ISIS, because her and Obama created this huge vacuum, and a small group came out of that huge vacuum because when — we should never have been in Iraq, but once we were there, we should have never got out the way they wanted to get out. She gave us ISIS as sure as you are sitting there. And what happened is now ISIS is in 32 countries. And now I listen how she's going to get rid of ISIS. She's going to get rid of nobody.

WALLACE: All right. We are going to get to foreign hot spots in a few moments, but the next segment is fitness to be president of the United States. Mr. Trump, at the last debate, you said your talk about grabbing women was just that, talk, and that you'd never actually done it. And since then, as we all know, nine women have come forward and have said that you either groped them or kissed them without their consent.

Why would so many different women from so many different circumstances over so many different years, why would they all in this last couple of weeks make up — you deny this — why would they all make up these stories? Since this is a question for both of you, Secretary Clinton, Mr. Trump says what your husband did and that you defended was even worse. Mr. Trump, you go first.

97. TRUMP: Well, first of all, those stories have been largely debunked. Those people — I don't know those people. I have a feeling how they came. I believe it was her campaign that did it.

98. Just like if you look at what came out today on the clips where I was wondering what happened with my rally in Chicago and other rallies where we had such violence? She's the one and Obama that caused the violence. They hired people — they paid them \$1,500, and they're on tape saying be violent, cause fights, do bad things.

99. I would say the only way — because those stories are all totally false, I have to say that. And I didn't even apologize to my wife, who's sitting right here, because I didn't do anything. I didn't know any of these — I didn't see these women.

100. These women — the woman on the plane, the — I think they want either fame or her campaign did it. And I think it's her campaign. Because what I saw what they did, which is a criminal act, by the way, where they're telling people to go out and start fist-fights and start violence.

100. And I'll tell you what, in particular in Chicago, people were hurt and people could have been killed in that riot. And that was now all on tape, started by her. I believe, Chris, that she got these people to step forward. If it wasn't, they get their 10 minutes of fame. But they were all totally — it was all fiction. It was lies, and it was fiction.

CLINTON: Well...

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: At the last debate, we heard Donald talking about what he did to women. And after that, a number of women have come forward saying that's exactly what he did to them. Now, what was his response? Well, he held a number of big rallies where he said that he could not possibly have done those things to those women because they were not attractive enough for them to be assaulted.

101. TRUMP: I did not say that. I did not say that.

CLINTON: In fact, he went on to say... WALLACE: Her two minutes — sir, her two minutes. Her two minutes.

102. TRUMP: I did not say that.

WALLACE: It's her two minutes.

CLINTON: He went on to say, "Look at her. I don't think so." About another woman, he said, "That wouldn't be my first choice." He attacked the woman reporter writing the story, called her "disgusting," as he has called a number of women during this campaign.

Donald thinks belittling women makes him bigger. He goes after their dignity, their self-worth, and I don't think there is a woman anywhere who doesn't know what that feels like. So we now know what Donald thinks and what he says and how he acts toward women. That's who Donald is.

I think it's really up to all of us to demonstrate who we are and who our country is, and to stand up and be very clear about what we expect from our next president, how we want to bring our country together, where we don't want to have the kind of pitting of people one against the other, where instead we celebrate our diversity, we lift people up, and we make our country even greater.

America is great, because America is good. And it really is up to all of us to make that true, now and in the future, and particularly for our children and our grandchildren.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump...

103. TRUMP: Nobody has more respect for women than I do. Nobody.

(LAUGHTER)

Nobody has more respect...

WALLACE: Please, everybody.

104. TRUMP: And frankly, those stories have been largely debunked. And I really want to just talk about something slightly different.

105. She mentions this, which is all fiction, all fictionalized, probably or possibly started by her and her very sleazy campaign. But I will tell you what isn't fictionalized are her e-mails, where she destroyed 33,000 e-mails criminally, criminally, after getting a subpoena from the United States Congress.

106. What happened to the FBI, I don't know. We have a great general, four-star general, today you read it in all of the papers, going to potentially serve five years in jail for lying to the FBI. One lie. She's lied hundreds of times to the people, to Congress, and to the FBI. He's going to probably go to jail. This is a four-star general. And she gets away with it, and she can run for the presidency of the United States? That's really what you should be talking about, not fiction, where somebody wants fame or where they come out of her crooked campaign.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, every time Donald is pushed on something which is obviously uncomfortable, like what these women are saying, he immediately goes to denying responsibility. And it's not just about women. He never apologizes or says he's sorry for anything.

So we know what he has said and what he's done to women. But he also went after a disabled reporter, mocked and mimicked him on national television.

107. TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: He went after Mr. and Mrs. Khan, the parents of a young man who died serving our country, a Gold Star family, because of their religion. He went after John McCain, a prisoner of war, said he prefers "people who aren't captured." He went after a federal judge, born in Indiana, but who Donald said couldn't be trusted to try the fraud and racketeering case against Trump University because his parents were Mexican.

So it's not one thing. This is a pattern, a pattern of divisiveness, of a very dark and in many ways dangerous vision of our country, where he incites violence, where he applauds people who are pushing and pulling and punching at his rallies. That is not who America is.

And I hope that as we move in the last weeks of this campaign, more and more people will understand what's at stake in this election. It really does come down to what kind of country we are going to have.

108. TRUMP: So sad when she talks about violence at my rallies, and she caused the violence. It's on tape.

WALLACE: During the last...

109. TRUMP: The other things are false, but honestly, I'd love to talk about getting rid of ISIS, and I'd love to talk about other things...

WALLACE: OK.

110. TRUMP: ... but those other charges, as she knows, are false.

WALLACE: In this bucket about fitness to be president, there's been a lot of developments over the last 10 days since the last debate. I'd like to ask you about them. These are questions that the American people have.

Secretary Clinton, during your 2009 Senate confirmation hearing, you promised to avoid even the appearance of a conflict of interest with your dealing with the Clinton Foundation while you were secretary of state, but e-mails show that donors got special access to you. Those seeking grants for Haiti relief were considered separately from non-donors, and some of those donors got contracts, government contracts, taxpayer money.

Can you really say that you kept your pledge to that Senate committee? And why isn't what happened and what went on between you and the Clinton Foundation, why isn't it what Mr. Trump calls pay to play?

CLINTON: Well, everything I did as secretary of state was in furtherance of our country's interests and our values. The State Department has said that. I think that's been proven.

But I am happy, in fact I'm thrilled to talk about the Clinton Foundation, because it is a world-renowned charity and I am so proud of the work that it does. You know, I could talk for the rest of the debate — I know I don't have the time to do that.

But just briefly, the Clinton Foundation made it possible for 11 million people around the world with HIV-AIDS to afford treatment, and that's about half all the people in the world who are getting treatment. In partnership with the American Health Association...

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton...

CLINTON: ... we have made environments in schools healthier for kids, including healthier lunches...

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, respectfully, this is — this is an open discussion.

CLINTON: Well, it is an open discussion. And you...

WALLACE: And the specific question went to pay for play. Do you want to talk about that?

CLINTON: Well, but there is no — but there is no evidence — but there is...

(CROSSTALK)

111. TRUMP: I think that it's been very well...

WALLACE: Let's ask Mr. Trump.

CLINTON: There is a lot of evidence about the very good work...

112. TRUMP: It's been very well studied.

CLINTON: ... and the high rankings...

(CROSSTALK)

WALLACE: Please let me Mr. Trump speak.

113. TRUMP: ... and it's a criminal enterprise, and so many people know it.

WALLACE: Please let Mr. Trump speak.

(CROSSTALK)

114. TRUMP: It's a criminal enterprise. Saudi Arabia giving \$25 million, Qatar, all of these countries. You talk about women and women's rights? So these are people that push gays off business — off buildings. These are people that kill women and treat women horribly. And yet you take their money.

115. So I'd like to ask you right now, why don't you give back the money that you've taken from certain countries that treat certain groups of people so horribly? Why don't you give back the money? I think it would be a great gesture.

116. Because she takes a tremendous amount of money. And you take a look at the people of Haiti. I was at a little Haiti the other day in Florida. And I want to tell you, they hate the Clintons, because what's happened in Haiti with the Clinton Foundation is a disgrace. And you know it, and they know it, and everybody knows it.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, very quickly, we at the Clinton Foundation spend 90 percent — 90 percent of all the money that is donated on behalf of programs of people around the world and in our own country. I'm very proud of that. We have the highest rating from the watchdogs that follow foundations. And I'd be happy to compare what we do with the Trump Foundation, which took money from other people and bought a six-foot portrait of Donald. I mean, who does that? It just was astonishing.

But when it comes to Haiti, Haiti is the poorest country in our hemisphere. The earthquake and the hurricanes, it has devastated Haiti. Bill and I have been involved in trying to help Haiti for many years. The Clinton Foundation raised \$30 million to help Haiti after the catastrophic earthquake and all of the terrible problems the people there had.

We have done things to help small businesses, agriculture, and so much else. And we're going to keep working to help Haiti...

WALLACE: All right.

CLINTON: ... because it's an important part of the American experience.

117. TRUMP: They don't want you to help them anymore.

(CROSSTALK)

118. TRUMP: I'd like to mention one thing. Trump Foundation, small foundation. People contribute, I contribute. The money goes 100 percent — 100 percent goes to different charities, including a lot of military. I don't get anything. I don't buy boats. I don't buy planes. What happens — the money goes to them.

WALLACE: Wasn't some of the money used to settle your lawsuits, sir?

119. TRUMP: No, it was — we put up the American flag. And that's it. They put up the American flag. We fought for the right in Palm Beach to put up the American flag.

WALLACE: Right. But there was a penalty that was imposed by Palm Beach County, and the money came from your foundation...

120. TRUMP: There was. There was. And, by the way...

WALLACE: ... instead of Mar-a-Lago or yourself, sir.

121. TRUMP: ... the money — the money went to Fisher House, where they build houses — the money that you're talking about went to Fisher House, where they build houses for veterans and disabled vets.

WALLACE: I want to get into one...

CLINTON: But, of course, there's no way we can know whether any of that is true, because he hasn't released his tax returns. He is the first candidate ever to run for president in the last 40-plus years who has not released his tax returns, so everything he says about charity or anything else, we can't prove it. You can look at our tax returns. We've got them all out there.

But what is really troubling is that we learned in the last debate he has not paid a penny in federal income tax. And we were talking about immigrants a few minutes ago, Chris. You know, half of all immigrants — undocumented immigrants in our country — actually pay federal income tax. So we have undocumented immigrants in America who are paying more federal income tax than a billionaire. I find that just astonishing.

WALLACE: I want...

122. TRUMP: So let me just tell you very quickly, we're entitled because of the laws that people like her passed to take massive amounts of depreciation on other charges, and we do it. And all of her donors — just about all of them — I know Buffett took hundreds of millions of dollars, Soros, George Soros, took hundreds of millions of dollars...

WALLACE: We...

123. TRUMP: Let me just explain.

WALLACE: But, no, we heard this...

124. TRUMP: Most of her donors have done the same thing as I do.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, we — OK.

125. TRUMP: You know what she should have done?

WALLACE: Folks, we heard this...

126. TRUMP: And you know, Hillary, what you should have done, you should have changed the law when you were a United States senator...

WALLACE: Folks, we heard this...

127. TRUMP: ... because your donors and your special interests are doing the same thing as I do, except even more so.

CLINTON: Well, you know...

128. TRUMP: You should have changed the law. But you won't change the law, because you take in so much money. I mean, I sat in my apartment today on a very beautiful hotel down the street known as Trump...

CLINTON: Made with Chinese steel.

130. TRUMP: But I will tell you, I sat there...

131. (LAUGHTER)

132.... I sat there watching ad after ad after ad, false ad. All paid for by your friends on Wall Street that gave so much money because they know you're going to protect them. And, frankly, you should have changed the laws.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump...

133. TRUMP: If you don't like what I did, you should have changed the laws.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, I want to ask you about one last question in this topic. You have been warning at rallies recently that this election is rigged and that Hillary Clinton is in the process of trying to steal it from you.

Your running mate, Governor Pence, pledged on Sunday that he and you — his words — “will absolutely accept the result of this election.” Today your daughter, Ivanka, said the same thing. I want to ask you here on the stage tonight: Do you make the same commitment that you will absolutely — sir, that you will absolutely accept the result of this election?

134. TRUMP: I will look at it at the time. I’m not looking at anything now. I’ll look at it at the time.

135. What I’ve seen — what I’ve seen is so bad. First of all, the media is so dishonest and so corrupt, and the pile-on is so amazing. The New York Times actually wrote an article about it, but they don’t even care. It’s so dishonest. And they’ve poisoned the mind of the voters.

136. But unfortunately for them, I think the voters are seeing through it. I think they’re going to see through it. We’ll find out on November 8th. But I think they’re going to see through it.

WALLACE: But, sir, there’s...

137. TRUMP: If you look — excuse me, Chris — if you look at your voter rolls, you will see millions of people that are registered to vote — millions, this isn’t coming from me — this is coming from Pew Report and other places — millions of people that are registered to vote that shouldn’t be registered to vote.

138. So let me just give you one other thing. So I talk about the corrupt media. I talk about the millions of people — tell you one other thing. She shouldn’t be allowed to run. It’s crooked — she’s — she’s guilty of a very, very serious crime. She should not be allowed to run.

139. And just in that respect, I say it’s rigged, because she should never...

WALLACE: But...

140. TRUMP: Chris, she should never have been allowed to run for the presidency based on what she did with e-mails and so many other things.

WALLACE: But, sir, there is a tradition in this country — in fact, one of the prides of this country — is the peaceful transition of power and that no matter how hard-fought a campaign is, that at the end of the campaign that the loser concedes to the winner. Not saying that you’re necessarily going to be the loser or the winner, but that the loser concedes to the winner and that the country comes together in part for the good of the country. Are you saying you’re not prepared now to commit to that principle?

141. TRUMP: What I’m saying is that I will tell you at the time. I’ll keep you in suspense. OK?

CLINTON: Well, Chris, let me respond to that, because that’s horrifying. You know, every time Donald thinks things are not going in his direction, he claims whatever it is, is rigged against him.

The FBI conducted a year-long investigation into my e-mails. They concluded there was no case; he said the FBI was rigged. He lost the Iowa caucus. He lost the Wisconsin primary. He said the Republican primary was rigged against him. Then Trump University gets sued for fraud and racketeering; he claims the court system and the federal judge is rigged against him. There was even a time when he didn’t get an Emmy for his TV program three years in a row and he started tweeting that the Emmys were rigged against him.

142. TRUMP: Should have gotten it.

(LAUGHTER)

CLINTON: This is — this is a mindset. This is how Donald thinks. And it’s funny, but it’s also really troubling.

WALLACE: OK.

CLINTON: So that is not the way our democracy works. We’ve been around for 240 years. We’ve had free and fair elections. We’ve accepted the outcomes when we may not have liked them. And that is what must be expected of anyone standing on a debate stage during a general election. You know, President Obama said the other day when you’re whining before the game is even finished...

(APPLAUSE)

WALLACE: Hold on. Hold on, folks. Hold on, folks.

CLINTON: ... it just shows you’re not up to doing the job. And let’s — you know, let’s be clear about what he is saying and what that means. He is denigrating — he’s talking down our democracy. And I, for one, am appalled that somebody who is the nominee of one of our two major parties would take that kind of position.

143. TRUMP: I think what the FBI did and what the Department of Justice did, including meeting with her husband, the attorney general, in the back of an airplane on the tarmac in Arizona, I think it’s disgraceful. I think it’s a disgrace.

WALLACE: All right.

144. TRUMP: I think we’ve never had a situation so bad in this country.

(APPLAUSE)

WALLACE: Hold on, folks. This doesn’t do any good for anyone. Let’s please continue the debate, and let’s move on to the subject of foreign hot spots.

The Iraqi offensive to take back Mosul has begun. If they are successful in pushing ISIS out of that city and out of all of Iraq, the question then becomes, what happens the day after? And that’s something that whichever of you ends up — whoever of you ends up as president is going to have to confront.

Will you put U.S. troops into that vacuum to make sure that ISIS doesn’t come back or isn’t replaced by something even worse? Secretary Clinton, you go first in this segment. You have two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, I am encouraged that there is an effort led by the Iraqi army, supported by Kurdish forces, and also given the help and advice from the number of special forces and other Americans on the ground. But I will not support putting American soldiers into Iraq as an occupying force. I don't think that is in our interest, and I don't think that would be smart to do. In fact, Chris, I think that would be a big red flag waving for ISIS to reconstitute itself.

The goal here is to take back Mosul. It's going to be a hard fight. I've got no illusions about that. And then continue to press into Syria to begin to take back and move on Raqqa, which is the ISIS headquarters.

I am hopeful that the hard work that American military advisers have done will pay off and that we will see a real — a really successful military operation. But we know we've got lots of work to do. Syria will remain a hotbed of terrorism as long as the civil war, aided and abetted by the Iranians and the Russians, continue.

So I have said, look, we need to keep our eye on ISIS. That's why I want to have an intelligence surge that protects us here at home, why we have to go after them from the air, on the ground, online, why we have to make sure here at home we don't let terrorists buy weapons. If you're too dangerous to fly, you're too dangerous to buy a gun.

And I'm going to continue to push for a no-fly zone and safe havens within Syria not only to help protect the Syrians and prevent the constant outflow of refugees, but to, frankly, gain some leverage on both the Syrian government and the Russians so that perhaps we can have the kind of serious negotiation necessary to bring the conflict to an end and go forward on a political track.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, same question. If we are able to push ISIS out of Mosul and out of Iraq, will — would you be willing to put U.S. troops in there to prevent their return or something else?

145. TRUMP: Let me tell you, Mosul is so sad. We had Mosul. But when she left, when she took everybody out, we lost Mosul. Now we're fighting again to get Mosul. The problem with Mosul and what they wanted to do is they wanted to get the leaders of ISIS who they felt were in Mosul.

146. About three months ago, I started reading that they want to get the leaders and they're going to attack Mosul. Whatever happened to the element of surprise, OK? We announce we're going after Mosul. I have been reading about going after Mosul now for about — how long is it, Hillary, three months? These people have all left. They've all left.

147. The element of surprise. Douglas MacArthur, George Patton spinning in their graves when they see the stupidity of our country. So we're now fighting for Mosul, that we had. All she had to do was stay there, and now we're going in to get it.

148. But you know who the big winner in Mosul is going to be after we eventually get it? And the only reason they did it is because she's running for the office of president and they want to look tough. They want to look good. He violated the red line in the sand, and he made so many mistakes, made all the mistakes. That's why we have the great migration. But she wanted to look good for the election. So they're going in.

149. But who's going to get Mosul, really? We'll take Mosul eventually. But the way — if you look at what's happening, much tougher than they thought. Much, much tougher. Much more dangerous. Going to be more deaths than they thought.

150. But the leaders that we wanted to get are all gone because they're smart. They say, what do we need this for? So Mosul is going to be a wonderful thing. And Iran should write us a letter of thank you, just like the really stupid — the stupidest deal of all time, a deal that's going to give Iran absolutely nuclear weapons. Iran should write us yet another letter saying thank you very much, because Iran, as I said many years ago, Iran is taking over Iraq, something they've wanted to do forever, but we've made it so easy for them.

151. So we're now going to take Mosul. And do you know who's going to be the beneficiary? Iran. Oh, yeah, they're making — I mean, they are outsmarting — look, you're not there, you might be involved in that decision. But you were there when you took everybody out of Mosul and out of Iraq. You shouldn't have been in Iraq, but you did vote for it. You shouldn't have been in Iraq, but once you were in Iraq, you should have never left the way.

WALLACE: Sir, your two minutes are up.

152. TRUMP: The point is, the big winner is going to be Iran.

CLINTON: Well, you know, once again, Donald is implying that he didn't support the invasion of Iraq. I said it was a mistake. I've said that years ago. He has consistently denied what is...

153. TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: ... a very clear fact that...

154. TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: ... before the invasion, he supported it. And, you know, I just want everybody to go Google it. Google "Donald Trump Iraq." And you will see the dozens of sources which verify that he was for the invasion of Iraq.

155. TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: And you can actually hear the audio of him saying that. Now, why does that matter? Well, it matters because he has not told the truth about that position. I guess he believes it makes him look better now to contrast with me because I did vote for it.

But what's really important here is to understand all the interplay. Mosul is a Sunni city. Mosul is on the border of Syria. And, yes, we do need to go after Baghdadi, and — just like we went after bin Laden, while you were doing “Celebrity Apprentice,” and we brought him to justice. We need to go after the leadership.

But we need to get rid of them, get rid of their fighters. There are an estimated several thousand fighters in Mosul. They've been digging underground. They've been prepared to defend. It's going to be tough fighting. But I think we can take back Mosul, and then we can move on into Syria and take back Raqqa.

This is what we have to do. I'm just amazed that he seems to think that the Iraqi government and our allies and everybody else launched the attack on Mosul to help me in this election, but that's how Donald thinks. You know, he always is looking for some conspiracy.

156. TRUMP: Chris, we don't gain anything.

CLINTON: He has all the conspiracy theories...

(CROSSTALK)

157. TRUMP: Iran is taking over Iraq.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, it's...

(CROSSTALK)

158. TRUMP: Iran is taking over Iraq. We don't gain anything.

CLINTON: This conspiracy theory, which he's been spewing out for quite some time.

159. TRUMP: If they did it by surprise...

(CROSSTALK)

WALLACE: Wait, wait, wait, Secretary Clinton, it's an open discussion.

CLINTON: He says...

(CROSSTALK)

160. TRUMP: We could have gained if they did it by surprise.

WALLACE: Secretary, please let Mr. Trump speak.

CLINTON: ... unfit, and he proves it every time he talks.

161. TRUMP: No, you are the one that's unfit. You know, WikiLeaks just actually came out — John Podesta said some horrible things about you, and, boy, was he right. He said some beauties. And you know, Bernie Sanders, he said you have bad judgment. You do.

162. And if you think that going into Mosul after we let the world know we're going in, and all of the people that we really wanted — the leaders — they're all gone. If you think that was good, then you do. Now, John Podesta said you have terrible instincts. Bernie Sanders said you have bad judgment. I agree with both.

CLINTON: Well, you should ask Bernie Sanders who he's supporting for president. And he has said...

163. TRUMP: Which is a big mistake.

CLINTON: ... as he has campaigned for me around the country, you are the most dangerous person to run for president in the modern history of America. I think he's right.

WALLACE: Let's turn to Aleppo. Mr. Trump, in the last debate, you were both asked about the situation in the Syrian city of Aleppo. And I want to follow up on that, because you said several things in that debate which were not true, sir. You said that Aleppo has basically fallen. In fact, there — in fact, there are... TRUMP: It's a catastrophe. I mean...

WALLACE: It's a catastrophe, but there...

164. TRUMP: ... it's a mess.

WALLACE: There are a quarter of...

165. TRUMP: Have you seen it? Have you seen it?

WALLACE: Sir...

166. TRUMP: Have you seen what's happening to Aleppo?

WALLACE: Sir, if I may finish my question...

167. TRUMP: OK, so it hasn't fallen. Take a look at it.

WALLACE: Well, there are a quarter of a million people still living there and being slaughtered.

168. TRUMP: That's right. And they are being slaughtered...

WALLACE: Yes.

169. TRUMP: ... because of bad decisions.

WALLACE: If I may just finish here, and you also said that — that Syria and Russia are busy fighting ISIS. In fact, they have been the ones who've been bombing and shelling eastern Aleppo, and they just announced a humanitarian pause, in effect, admitting that they have been bombing and shelling Aleppo. Would you like to clear that up, sir?

170. TRUMP: Well, Aleppo is a disaster. It's a humanitarian nightmare. But it has fallen from the — from any standpoint. I mean, what do you need, a signed document? Take a look at Aleppo. It is so sad when you see what's happened.

171. And a lot of this is because of Hillary Clinton, because what's happened is, by fighting Assad, who turned out to be a lot tougher than she thought, and now she's going to say, oh, he loves Assad, she's — he's just much

tougher and much smarter than her and Obama. And everyone thought he was gone two years ago, three years ago. He — he aligned with Russia.

172 He now also aligned with Iran, who we made very powerful. We gave them \$150 billion back. We give them \$1.7 billion in cash. I mean, cash. Bundles of cash as big as this stage. We gave them \$1.7 billion.

173 Now they have — he has aligned with Russia and with Iran. They don't want ISIS, but they have other things, because we're backing — we're backing rebels. We don't know who the rebels are. We're giving them lots of money, lots of everything. We don't know who the rebels are. And when and if — and it's not going to happen, because you have Russia and you have Iran now. But if they ever did overthrow Assad, you might end up with — as bad as Assad is, and he's a bad guy, but you may very well end up with worse than Assad.

174 If she did nothing, we'd be in much better shape. And this is what's caused the great migration, where she's taking in tens of thousands of Syrian refugees, who probably in many cases — not probably, who are definitely...

WALLACE: Let me...

175 TRUMP: ... in many cases, ISIS-aligned, and we now have them in our country, and wait until you see — this is going to be the great Trojan horse. And wait until you see what happens in the coming years. Lots of luck, Hillary. Thanks a lot for doing a great job.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, you have talked about — and in the last debate and again today — that you would impose a no-fly zone to try to protect the people of Aleppo and to stop the killing there. President Obama has refused to do that because he fears it's going to draw us closer or deeper into the conflict.

And General Joseph Dunford, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, says you impose a no-fly zone, chances are you're going to get into a war — his words — with Syria and Russia. So the question I have is, if you impose a no-fly zone — first of all, how do you respond to their concerns? Secondly, if you impose a no-fly zone and a Russian plane violates that, does President Clinton shoot that plane down?

CLINTON: Well, Chris, first of all, I think a no-fly zone could save lives and could hasten the end of the conflict. I'm well aware of the really legitimate concerns that you have expressed from both the president and the general. This would not be done just on the first day. This would take a lot of negotiation. And it would also take making it clear to the Russians and the Syrians that our purpose here was to provide safe zones on the ground.

We've had millions of people leave Syria and those millions of people inside Syria who have been dislocated. So I think we could strike a deal and make it very clear to the Russians and the Syrians that this was something that we believe was in the best interests of the people on the ground in Syria, it would help us with our fight against ISIS.

But I want to respond to what Donald said about refugees. He's made these claims repeatedly. I am not going to let anyone into this country who is not vetted, who we do not have confidence in. But I am not going to slam the door on women and children. That picture of that little 4-year-old boy in Aleppo, with the blood coming down his face while he sat in an ambulance, is haunting. And so we are going to do very careful, thorough vetting. That does not solve our internal challenges with ISIS and our need to stop radicalization, to work with American Muslim communities who are on the front lines to identify and prevent attacks. In fact, the killer of the dozens of people at the nightclub in Orlando, the Pulse nightclub, was born in Queens, the same place Donald was born. So let's be clear about what the threat is and how we are best going to be able to meet it.

And, yes, some of that threat emanates from over in Syria and Iraq, and we've got to keep fighting, and I will defeat ISIS, and some of it is we have to up our game and be much smarter here at home.

WALLACE: Folks, I want to get into our final segment.

176 TRUMP: But I just have to...

WALLACE: Real quick.

177 TRUMP: It's so ridiculous what she — she will defeat ISIS. We should have never let ISIS happen in the first place. And right now, they're in 32 countries.

WALLACE: OK.

178 TRUMP: We should have — wait one second. They had a cease-fire three weeks ago. A cease-fire, the United States, Russia, and Syria. And during the cease-fire, Russia took over vast swatches of land, and then they said we don't want the cease-fire anymore.

We are so outplayed on missiles, on cease-fires. They are outplayed. Now, she wasn't there. I assume she had nothing to do with it. But our country is so outplayed by Putin and Assad, and by the way — and by Iran. Nobody can believe how stupid our leadership is.

WALLACE: Mr. Trump, Secretary Clinton — no, we need to move on to our final segment, and that is the national debt, which has not been discussed until tonight.

Our national debt, as a share of the economy, our GDP, is now 77 percent. That's the highest since just after World War II. But the nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget says, Secretary Clinton, under your plan, debt would rise to 86 percent of GDP over the next 10 years. Mr. Trump, under your plan, they say it would rise to 105 percent of GDP over the next 10 years. The question is, why are both of you ignoring this problem? Mr. Trump, you go first.

179. TRUMP: Well, I say they're wrong, because I'm going to create tremendous jobs. And we're bringing GDP from, really, 1 percent, which is what it is now, and if she got in, it will be less than zero. But we're bringing it from 1 percent up to 4 percent. And I actually think we can go higher than 4 percent. I think you can go to 5 percent or 6 percent. And if we do, you don't have to bother asking your question, because we have a tremendous machine. We will have created a tremendous economic machine once again. To do that, we're taking back jobs. We're not going to let our companies be raided by other countries where we lose all our jobs, we don't make our product anymore. It's very sad. But I'm going to create a — the kind of a country that we were from the standpoint of industry. We used to be there. We've given it up. We've become very, very sloppy.

180. We've had people that are political hacks making the biggest deals in the world, bigger than companies. You take these big companies, these trade deals are far bigger than these companies, and yet we don't use our great leaders, many of whom back me and many of whom back Hillary, I must say. But we don't use those people. Those are the people — these are the greatest negotiators in the world. We have the greatest businesspeople in the world. We have to use them to negotiate our trade deals.

181. We use political hacks. We use people that get the position because they gave — they made a campaign contribution and they're dealing with China and people that are very much smarter than they are. So we have to use our great people.

182. But that being said, we will create an economic machine the likes of which we haven't seen in many decades. And people, Chris, will again go back to work and they'll make a lot of money. And we'll have companies that will grow and expand and start from new.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, first, when I hear Donald talk like that and know that his slogan is "Make America Great Again," I wonder when he thought America was great. And before he rushes and says, "You know, before you and President Obama were there," I think it's important to recognize that he has been criticizing our government for decades. You know, back in 1987, he took out a \$100,000 ad in the New York Times, during the time when President Reagan was president, and basically said exactly what he just said now, that we were the laughingstock of the world. He was criticizing President Reagan. This is the way Donald thinks about himself, puts himself into, you know, the middle and says, "You know, I alone can fix it," as he said on the convention stage.

But if you look at the debt, which is the issue you asked about, Chris, I pay for everything I'm proposing. I do not add a penny to the national debt. I take that very seriously, because I do think it's one of the issues we've got to come to grips with.

So when I talk about how we're going to pay for education, how we're going to invest in infrastructure, how we're going to get the cost of prescription drugs down, and a lot of the other issues that people talk to me about all the time, I've made it very clear we are going where the money is. We are going to ask the wealthy and corporations to pay their fair share.

And there is no evidence whatsoever that that will slow down or diminish our growth. In fact, I think just the opposite. We'll have what economists call middle-out growth. We've got to get back to rebuilding the middle class, the families of America. That's where growth will come from. That's why I want to invest in you. I want to invest in your family.

And I think that's the smartest way to grow the economy, to make the economy fairer. And we just have a big disagreement about this. It may be because of our experiences. You know, he started off with his dad as a millionaire...

182. TRUMP: Yeah, yeah, we've heard — we've heard this before, Hillary.

CLINTON: I started off with — my dad was a small-business man.

183. TRUMP: We've heard this before.

CLINTON: And I think it — you know, it's a difference that affects how we see the world and what we want to do with the economy.

WALLACE: Time.

184. TRUMP: Thank you, Hillary. Could I just respond?

WALLACE: Well, no, sir, because we're running out of time...

185. TRUMP: Because I did disagree with Ronald Reagan very strongly on trade. I disagreed with him. We should have been much tougher on trade even then. I've been waiting for years. Nobody does it right.

WALLACE: OK.

186. TRUMP: And frankly, now we're going to do it right.

WALLACE: All right. The one last area I want to get into with you in this debate is the fact that the biggest driver of our debt is entitlements, which is 60 percent of all federal spending. Now, the Committee for federal — a Responsible Federal Budget has looked at both of your plans and they say neither of you has a serious plan that is going to solve the fact that Medicare's going to run out of money in the 2020s, Social Security is going to run out of money in the 2030s, and at that time, recipients are going to take huge cuts in their benefits.

So, in effect, the final question I want to ask you in this regard is — and let me start with you, Mr. Trump, would President Trump make a deal to save Medicare and Social Security that included both tax increases and benefit cuts, in effect, a grand bargain on entitlements?

187. **TRUMP: I'm cutting taxes. We're going to grow the economy. It's going to grow at a record rate of growth.**

WALLACE: That's not going to help in the entitlements.

188. **TRUMP: No, it's going to totally help you. And one thing we have to do: Repeal and replace the disaster known as Obamacare. It's destroying our country. It's destroying our businesses, our small business and our big businesses. We have to repeal and replace Obamacare.**

189. **You take a look at the kind of numbers that that will cost us in the year '17, it is a disaster. If we don't repeal and replace — now, it's probably going to die of its own weight. But Obamacare has to go. It's — the premiums are going up 60 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent. Next year they're going to go up over 100 percent.**

190. **And I'm really glad that the premiums have started — at least the people see what's happening, because she wants to keep Obamacare and she wants to make it even worse, and it can't get any worse. Bad health care at the most expensive price. We have to repeal and replace Obamacare.**

WALLACE: And, Secretary Clinton, same question, because at this point, Social Security and Medicare are going to run out, the trust funds are going to run out of money. Will you as president entertain — will you consider a grand bargain, a deal that includes both tax increases and benefit cuts to try to save both programs?

CLINTON: Well, Chris, I am on record as saying that we need to put more money into the Social Security Trust Fund. That's part of my commitment to raise taxes on the wealthy. My Social Security payroll contribution will go up, as will Donald's, assuming he can't figure out how to get out of it. But what we want to do is to replenish the Social Security Trust Fund...

191. **TRUMP: Such a nasty woman.**

CLINTON: ... by making sure that we have sufficient resources, and that will come from either raising the cap and/or finding other ways to get more money into it. I will not cut benefits. I want to enhance benefits for low-income workers and for women who have been disadvantaged by the current Social Security system.

But what Donald is proposing with these massive tax cuts will result in a \$20 trillion additional national debt. That will have dire consequences for Social Security and Medicare.

And I'll say something about the Affordable Care Act, which he wants to repeal. The Affordable Care Act extended the solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund. So if repeals it, our Medicare problem gets worse. What we need to do is go after...

192. **TRUMP: Your husband disagrees with you.**

CLINTON: ... the long-term health care drivers. We've got to get costs down, increase value, emphasize wellness. I have a plan for doing that. And I think that we will be able to get entitlement spending under control by with more resources and harder decisions.

WALLACE: This is — this is the final time, probably to both of your delight, that you're going to be on a stage together in this campaign. I would like to end it on a positive note. You had not agreed to closing statements, but it seems to me in a funny way that might make it more interesting because you haven't prepared closing statements. So I'd like you each to take — and we're going to put a clock up, a minute, as the final question in the final debate, to tell the American people why they should elect you to be the next president. This is another new mini-segment. Secretary Clinton, it's your turn to go first.

CLINTON: Well, I would like to say to everyone watching tonight that I'm reaching out to all Americans — Democrats, Republicans, and independents — because we need everybody to help make our country what it should be, to grow the economy, to make it fairer, to make it work for everyone. We need your talents, your skills, your commitments, your energy, your ambition.

You know, I've been privileged to see the presidency up close. And I know the awesome responsibility of protecting our country and the incredible opportunity of working to try to make life better for all of you. I have made the cause of children and families really my life's work.

That's what my mission will be in the presidency. I will stand up for families against powerful interests, against corporations. I will do everything that I can to make sure that you have good jobs, with rising incomes, that your kids have good educations from preschool through college. I hope you will give me a chance to serve as your president.

WALLACE: Secretary Clinton, thank you.

Mr. Trump?

193. **TRUMP: She's raising the money from the people she wants to control. Doesn't work that way.**

But when I started this campaign, I started it very strongly. It's called "Make America Great Again." We're going to make America great. We have a depleted military. It has to be helped, has to be fixed. We have the greatest people on Earth in our military. We don't take care of our veterans. We take care of illegal immigrants, people that come into the country illegally, better than we take care of our vets. That can't happen.

194. Our policemen and women are disrespected. We need law and order, but we need justice, too. Our inner cities are a disaster. You get shot walking to the store. They have no education. They have no jobs. I will do more for African-Americans and Latinos than she can ever do in 10 lifetimes.

195. All she's done is talk to the African-Americans and to the Latinos, but they get the vote, and then they come back, they say, we'll see you in four years. We are going to make America strong again, and we are going to make America great again, and it has to start now. We cannot take four more years of Barack Obama, and that's what you get when you get her.

WALLACE: Thank you both.

(APPLAUSE)

Secretary Clinton — hold on just a moment, folks. Secretary Clinton, Mr. Trump, I want to thank you both for participating in all three of these debates.

That brings to an end this year's debates sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates. We want to thank the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and its students for having us. Now the decision is up to you.

While millions have already voted, Election Day, November 8th, is just 20 days away. One thing everyone here can agree on: We hope you will go vote. It is one of the honors and obligations of living in this great country. Thank you, and good night.

6. Selected tweets between June 15th 2015 and November 8th 2016

Islam

1. Hillary Clinton raked in money from regimes that horribly oppress women and gays & refuses to speak out against Radical Islam.,08-01-2016 22:52:00
2. Our way of life is under threat by Radical Islam and Hillary Clinton cannot even bring herself to say the words.,07-29-2016 03:50:59
3. Hillary's refusal to mention Radical Islam as she pushes a 550% increase in refugees is more proof that she is unfit to lead the country.,07-29-2016 03:47:56
4. I highly recommend the just out book - THE FIELD OF FIGHT - by General Michael Flynn. How to defeat radical Islam.,07-23-2016 03:49:04
5. With Hillary and Obama the terrorist attacks will only get worse. Politically correct fools won't even call it what it is - RADICAL ISLAM!,07-04-2016 15:34:15
6. How can Crooked Hillary say she cares about women when she is silent on radical Islam which horribly oppresses women?,05-22-2016 19:37:05
7. More radical Islam attacks today - it never ends! Strengthen the borders we must be vigilant and smart. No more being politically correct.,01-16-2016 02:47:22
8. Hillary won't call out radical Islam! She will be soundly defeated.,12-07-2015 00:55:56

Terrorism

9. If elected POTUS - I will stop RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISM in this country! In order to do this we need to... <https://t.co/45VyK6z18m>,10-20-2016 15:52:38
10. This story is not about Mr. Khan who is all over the place doing interviews but rather RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISM and the U.S. Get smart!,08-01-2016 11:27:43
11. Hillary's wars in the Middle East have unleashed destruction terrorism and ISIS across the world.,07-29-2016 03:57:06
12. We must do everything possible to keep this horrible terrorism outside the United States.,06-28-2016 21:10:57
13. We must suspend immigration from regions linked with terrorism until a proven vetting method is in place.,06-26-2016 02:37:14
14. TERRORISM IMMIGRATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY SPEECH- TRANSCRIPT: <https://t.co/WD1LGFKx3M> <https://t.co/T7yHSdCeU8>,06-13-2016 19:26:07
15. Is President Obama going to finally mention the words radical Islamic terrorism? If he doesn't he should immediately resign in disgrace!,06-12-2016 17:58:00
16. Appreciate the congrats for being right on radical Islamic terrorism I don't want congrats I want toughness & vigilance. We must be smart!,06-12-2016 16:43:17
17. Really bad shooting in Orlando. Police investigating possible terrorism. Many people dead and wounded.,06-12-2016 12:07:22
18. See when I said NATO was obsolete because of no terrorism protection they made the change without giving me credit.<https://t.co/sRCF1H3rjg>,06-06-2016 21:36:49
19. Thank you @LtStevenLRogers. We will respond to terrorism with strength in 2017!<https://t.co/Mk4YuuRf4s>,05-19-2016 19:36:58
20. Ted Cruz is incensed that I want to refocus NATO on terrorism as well as current mission but also want others to PAY FAIR SHARE a must!,03-28-2016 22:18:21
21. Hillary Clinton has been working on solving the terrorism problem for years. TIME FOR A CHANGE I WILL SOLVE - AND FAST!,03-24-2016 14:46:29
22. N.A.T.O. is obsolete and must be changed to additionally focus on terrorism as well as some of the things it is currently focused on!,03-24-2016 11:47:26
23. Watch this clip from earlier this year. Time & time again I have been right about terrorism. It's time to get tough! <https://t.co/8mnY3GFRzw>,03-22-2016 16:16:10
24. I have proven to be far more correct about terrorism than anybody- and it's not even close. Hopefully AZ and UT will be voting for me today!,03-22-2016 15:32:36
25. There is no question who will handle the threat of terrorism best as #POTUS. #Trump2016 <https://t.co/frS7alctbB> <https://t.co/0P4qSnAltB>,12-18-2015 01:17:53
26. Our country is facing a major threat from radical Islamic terrorism. We better get very smart and very tough FAST before it is too late!,12-09-2015 02:56:41
27. BIG NIGHT ON TWITTER TONIGHT. I WILL BE LIVE TWEETING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S SPEECH AT 7:50 P.M. (EASTERN). MUST TALK RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISM!,12-07-2015 00:27:17
28. I didn't suggest a database-a reporter did. We must defeat Islamic terrorism & have surveillance including a watch list to protect America,11-20-2015 18:51:41

29. When will President Obama issue the words RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISM? He can't say it and unless he will the problem will not be solved!,11-15-2015 14:18:42

30. Why won't President Obama use the term Islamic Terrorism? Isn't it now after all of this time and so much death about time!,11-15-2015 03:30:52

Terrorist

31. The terrorist who killed so many people in Germany said just before crime "by God's will we will slaughter you pigs I swear we will.....,12-23-2016 21:17:42

32. Once again someone we were told is ok turns out to be a terrorist who wants to destroy our country & its people- how did he get thru system?,09-19-2016 16:41:15

33. Yet another terrorist attack today in Israel -- a father shot at by a Palestinian terrorist was killed while:<https://t.co/Cv1HzKVbiT>,07-01-2016 15:51:46

34. Horrible killing of a 13 year old American girl at her home in Israel by a Palestinian terrorist. We must get tough. <https://t.co/zauQ6kb9Hj>,07-01-2016 13:32:19

35. Yet another terrorist attack this time in Turkey. Will the world ever realize what is going on? So sad.,06-28-2016 21:08:51

36. I will be meeting with the NRA who has endorsed me about not allowing people on the terrorist watch list or the no fly list to buy gun s.,06-15-2016 13:50:31

37. A message of condolences and support regarding the terrorist attacks in Tel Aviv: <https://t.co/iuIXLEANei>,06-09-2016 19:26:49

38. Looks like yet another terrorist attack. Airplane departed from Paris. When will we get tough smart and vigilant? Great hate and sickness!,05-19-2016 10:27:48

39. Boycott all Apple products until such time as Apple gives cellphone info to authorities regarding radical Islamic terrorist couple from Cal,02-19-2016 21:38:07

40. Wonder if Obama will ever say RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORIST?,12-06-2015 00:42:36

Terror

41. Today there were terror attacks in Turkey Switzerland and Germany - and it is only getting worse. The civilized world must change thinking!,12-19-2016 23:21:11

42. The Palestinian terror attack today reminds the world of the grievous perils facing Israeli citizens....continued:<https://t.co/d2UpX5FitC>,10-09-2016 22:26:27

43. President Obama refuses to answer question about Iran terror funding. I won't dodge questions as your President. <https://t.co/jsAMGO3s4P>,08-05-2016 02:19:22

44. Captain Khan killed 12 years ago was a hero but this is about RADICAL ISLAMIC TERROR and the weakness of our "leaders" to eradicate it!,07-31-2016 12:57:21

45. In my speech on protecting America I spoke about a temporary ban which includes suspending immigration from nations tied to Islamic terror.,06-13-2016 21:10:26

46. I will be going to New Hampshire today home of my first primary victory to discuss terror and the horrible events of yesterday. 2:30 P.M.,06-13-2016 15:03:29

47. I have been hitting Obama and Crooked Hillary hard on not using the term Radical Islamic Terror. Hillary just broke-said she would now use!,06-13-2016 14:59:25

48. The American people are sick and tired of not being able to lead normal lives and to constantly be on the lookout for terror and terrorists!,05-22-2016 20:44:48

49. I will be the best by far in fighting terror. I'm the only one that was right from the beginning & now Lyin' Ted & others are copying me.,03-23-2016 19:54:59

50. Just watched Hillary deliver a prepackaged speech on terror. She's been in office fighting terror for 20 years- and look where we are!,03-23-2016 19:53:39

51. Obama and all others have been so weak and so politically correct that terror groups are forming and getting stronger! Shame.,03-22-2016 19:17:41

52. Far more killed than anticipated in radical Islamic terror attack yesterday. Get tough and smart U.S. or we won't have a country anymore!,01-17-2016 20:57:35

53. Man shot inside Paris police station. Just announced that terror threat is at highest level. Germany is a total mess-big crime. GET SMART!,01-07-2016 13:24:31

54. By the way Hillary & the MSM forgot to mention that Hillary is in the Al-Shabaab terror video. <https://t.co/gRannsRXJr>,01-03-2016 23:19:45

55. A new terror warning was issued for European cities. At what point do we say we have had enough and get really tough and smart. Weak leaders!,12-26-2015 22:27:17

56. The horrible shooting that took place in San Bernardino was an absolute act of terror that many people knew about. Why didn't they report?,12-04-2015 20:35:17

War on Terror

No tweets on this topic.

Middle East

57. Crooked Hillary Clinton Tops Middle East Forum's 'Islamist Money List' <https://t.co/JC25rNtx6G>,10-22-2016 17:54:11
58. LIVE FACT-CHECK: Trump's RIGHT. The Clinton Foundation has taken MILLIONS from the Middle East. #DrainTheSwamp <https://t.co/Kgcaf5tdTM>,10-20-2016 02:06:52
59. Jeb why did your brother attack and destabilize the Middle East by attacking Iraq when there were no weapons of mass destruction? Bad info?,10-18-2015 13:29:03
60. Obama's nuclear deal with the Iranians will lead to a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. It has to be stopped.,07-28-2015 19:00:35

ISIS

61. President Obama said that he thinks he would have won against me. He should say that but I say NO WAY! - jobs leaving ISIS OCare etc.,12-26-2016 21:36:28
62. ISIS is taking credit for the terrible stabbing attack at Ohio State University by a Somali refugee who should not have been in our country.,11-30-2016 11:20:01
63. Wow just came out on secret tape that Crooked Hillary wants to take in as many Syrians as possible. We cannot let this happen - ISIS!,10-24-2016 12:00:02
64. ISIS has infiltrated countries all over Europe by posing as refugees and @HillaryClinton will allow it to happen h... <https://t.co/MmeW2qsTQh>,10-20-2016 02:31:45
65. I WILL DEFEAT ISIS. THEY HAVE BEEN AROUND TOO LONG! What has our leadership been doing?#DrainTheSwamp <https://t.co/tU0iW3Gi9v>,10-20-2016 02:27:31
66. After Crooked @HillaryClinton allowed ISIS to rise she now claims she'll defeat them? LAUGHABLE! Here's my plan: <https://t.co/FzRMOBnQVn>,10-20-2016 02:26:24
67. Our thoughts are with the forces fighting ISIS in Iraq. We must never back down against this extreme radical Islami... <https://t.co/oEoFIA8Rym>,10-17-2016 17:50:57
68. A country that Crooked Hillary says has funded ISIS also gave Wild Bill \$1 million for his birthday? SO CORRUPT! <https://t.co/00s5tgsXrM>,10-16-2016 13:15:03
69. @mike_pence and I will defeat #ISIS.<https://t.co/oCIIDwtpV> #VPDebate,10-05-2016 01:54:08
70. Why isn't Hillary 50 points ahead? Maybe it's the email scandal policies that spread ISIS or calling millions of... <https://t.co/yKz9vCz8O1>,09-30-2016 18:24:21
71. @HillaryClinton - Obama #ISIS Strategy Has Allowed It To Expand To Become A Global Threat #DebateNight <https://t.co/f7PctDE31L>,09-27-2016 02:36:11
72. Crooked Hillary has been fighting ISIS or whatever she has been doing for years. Now she has new ideas. It is time for change.,09-20-2016 12:02:35
73. ISIS gained tremendous strength during Hillary Clinton's term as Secretary of State. When will the dishonest media report the facts!,08-12-2016 13:01:06
74. Ratings challenged @CNN reports so seriously that I call President Obama (and Clinton) "the founder" of ISIS & MVP. THEY DON'T GET SARCASM?,08-12-2016 10:26:20
- 75.. Obama's disastrous judgment gave us ISIS rise of Iran and the worst economic numbers since the Great Depression!,08-05-2016 02:19:08
76. Hillary whose decisions have led to the deaths of many accepted \$ from a business linked to ISIS. Silence at CNN. <https://t.co/gJYSSXtpaz>,08-01-2016 22:46:28
77. General John Allen who I never met but spoke against me last night failed badly in his fight against ISIS. His record = BAD #NeverHillary,07-29-2016 13:53:31
78. Hopefully the violent and vicious killing by ISIS of a beloved French priest is causing people to start thinking rationally. Get tough!,07-27-2016 10:01:39
79. You have no idea what my strategy on ISIS is and neither does ISIS (a good thing). Please get your facts straight - thanks. @megynkelly,07-27-2016 01:51:45
80. Dems don't want to talk ISIS b/c Hillary's foreign interventions unleashed ISIS & her refugee plans make it easier for them to come here.,07-26-2016 19:48:08
81. Why aren't the Democrats speaking about ISIS bad trade deals broken borders police and law and order. The Republican Convention was great,07-26-2016 12:38:27
82. Watched Crooked Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine on 60 Minutes. No way they are going to fix America's problems. ISIS & all others laughing!,07-24-2016 23:59:10
83. Just saw Crooked Hillary and Tim Kaine together. ISIS and our other enemies are drooling. They don't look presidential to me!,07-23-2016 20:43:33

84. We are TRYING to fight ISIS and now our own people are killing our police. Our country is divided and out of control. The world is watching,07-17-2016 18:26:51

85. Crooked Hillary will NEVER be able to handle the complexities and danger of ISIS - it will just go on forever. We need change!,07-04-2016 12:00:11

86. The third mass attack (slaughter) in days by ISIS. 200 dead in Baghdad worst in many years. We do not have leadership that can stop this!,07-04-2016 11:54:40

87. In Bangladesh hostages were immediately killed by ISIS terrorists if they were unable to cite a verse from the Koran. 20 were killed!,07-04-2016 11:35:16

88. ISIS exploded on Hillary Clinton's watch- she's done nothing about it and never will. Not capable!,06-29-2016 18:21:38

89. ISIS threatens us today because of the decisions Hillary Clinton has made along with President Obama." -- Donald J. Trump,06-23-2016 13:20:29

90. Hillary says this election is about judgment. She's right. Her judgement has killed thousands unleashed ISIS and wrecked the economy.,06-21-2016 16:36:40

91. Crooked Hillary Clintons foreign interventions unleashed ISIS in Syria Iraq and Libya. She is reckless and dangerous!,05-21-2016 17:02:41

92. Crooked Hillary Clinton looks presidential? I don't think so! Four more years of Obama and our country will never come back. ISIS LAUGHS!,05-20-2016 10:08:49

93. Look where the world is today a total mess and ISIS is still running around wild. I can fix it fast Hillary has no chance!,05-20-2016 09:58:47

94. Crooked Hillary has zero imagination and even less stamina. ISIS China Russia and all would love for her to be president. 4 more years!,05-20-2016 09:47:09

95. If Crooked Hillary Clinton can't close the deal on Crazy Bernie how is she going to take on China Russia ISIS and all of the others?,05-14-2016 01:03:02

96. Crooked Hillary just can't close the deal with Bernie. It will be the same way with ISIS and China on trade and Mexico at the border. Bad!,05-08-2016 20:15:20

97. Just announced that as many as 5000 ISIS fighters have infiltrated Europe. Also many in U.S. I TOLD YOU SO! I alone can fix this problem!,03-24-2016 15:52:11

98. These politicians like Cruz and Graham who have watched ISIS and many other problems develop for years do nothing to make things better!,03-24-2016 14:14:14

99. .@LindseyGrahamSC and Lyin' Ted Cruz are two politicians who are very much alike - ALL TALK AND NO ACTION! Both talk about ISIS do nothing!,03-24-2016 14:07:07

100. USSS did an excellent job stopping the maniac running to the stage. He has ties to ISIS. Should be in jail! <https://t.co/tkzbHg7wyD?ssr=true>,03-12-2016 23:41:57

101. ISIS is making big threats today - no respect for U.S.A. or our "leader" - If I win it will be a very different story with very fast results,02-09-2016 21:40:19

102. Just watched Jeb's ad where he desperately needed mommy to help him. Jeb --- mom can't help you with ISIS the Chinese or with Putin.,01-23-2016 01:02:38

103. Al-Shabbab not ISIS just made a video on me - they all will as front-runner & if I speak out against them which I must. Hillary lied!,01-03-2016 14:12:02

104. Hillary Clinton lied last week when she said ISIS made a D.T. video. The video that ISIS made was about her husband being a degenerate.,01-03-2016 13:59:20

105. .@HallieJackson Why didn't you report Hillary lying about the ISIS video. Bad reporting. Perhaps @NBC will do better next year-but doubt it!,12-25-2015 01:56:08

106. Do you think that Hillary Clinton will apologize to me for the lie she told about "the video" of me being used by ISIS. There is no video.,12-21-2015 18:51:21

107. It's the Democrats' total weakness & incompetence that gave rise to ISIS -- not a tape of Donald Trump that was an admitted Hillary lie!,12-21-2015 17:38:03

108. Hillary said with respect to ISIS "we are finally where we need to be." Do we want 4 more years of incompetent leadership? MAGA!,12-21-2015 12:34:40

109. Hillary said at debate ISIS is "going to people showing videos in order to recruit more radical jihadist." She made up story-want apology!,12-21-2015 11:47:58

110. Hillary Clinton spokesperson admitted that there was no ISIS video of me. Therefore Hillary LIED at the debate last night. SAD!,12-20-2015 23:37:15

111. Hillary Clinton lied when she said that "ISIS is using video of Donald Trump as a recruiting tool." This was fact checked by @FoxNews: FALSE,12-20-2015 09:05:41

112. .@MelindaDC Don't misrepresent in order to make a point. I was always tough on ISIS--as you'll find out after I get elected.,12-18-2015 18:02:12

113. As I have been saying. Only the beginning: "ISIS Suspects Arrested in Turkey 150 European Passports Seized." <https://t.co/55NWoy7OHG>,12-18-2015 16:45:10

114. #ISIS is making \$400M/year on oil. I have been saying it for years. We need to bomb the oil!
<https://t.co/vObIAhIWw> <https://t.co/teKBaKdXzK>,12-18-2015 04:09:33

115. Reports say #ISIS now has a passport machine to have its believers infiltrate our country. I told you so.
<https://t.co/LRPDW10zwl>,12-12-2015 19:16:36

116. In Britain more Muslims join ISIS than join the British army.<https://t.co/LQVNz7b2Eb>,12-11-2015 01:21:27

117. The main stream media wants to surrender constitutional rights -- I believe #ISIS needs to surrender!,12-07-2015 23:39:56

118. Wish Obama would say ISIS like almost everyone else rather than ISIL.,12-07-2015 01:27:05

119. Under our President ISIS is gaining great strength- <https://t.co/28VsmV8xng>,11-20-2015 16:08:18

120. The media must denigrate ISIS at all levels or youth will continue to be drawn to it. These are low level degenerates NOT masterminds!,11-20-2015 13:00:30

121. The media must immediately stop calling ISIS leaders "MASTERMINDS." Call them instead thugs and losers. Young people must not go into ISIS!,11-20-2015 12:50:14

122. Eight Syrians were just caught on the southern border trying to get into the U.S. ISIS maybe? I told you so. WE NEED A BIG & BEAUTIFUL WALL!,11-19-2015 13:11:49

123. Melania and I just had interview with the legendary @BarbaraJWalters. Watch #abc2020 this Friday. Tonight we talk ISIS @WNTonight,11-17-2015 21:16:55

124. Refugees from Syria are now pouring into our great country. Who knows who they are - some could be ISIS. Is our president insane?,11-17-2015 13:54:30

125. Discussing #SyrianRefugees with @EricBolling on @FoxNews back on 10/3/2015. #ISIS <https://t.co/rUX57o2BzM>,11-16-2015 22:47:20

126. Remember I was the one who said attack the oil (ISIS source of wealth) a long time ago. Everyone scoffed now they're attacking the oil.,11-16-2015 12:43:30

127. President Obama just told President Putin how important the Russian air strikes against ISIS have been. I TOLD YOU SO!,11-16-2015 01:03:21

128. @realDonaldTrump on ISIS&OIL FIELDS! Saying it for years! @AndersonCooper you should acknowledge this! #Trump2016 <https://t.co/ocoB9WIP7R>,11-15-2015 20:33:46

129. They laughed at me when I said to bomb the ISIS controlled oil fields. Now they are not laughing and doing what I said. #Trump2016,11-13-2015 21:36:29

130. Black Lives Matter protesters totally disrupt Hillary Clinton event. She looked lost. This is not what we need with ISIS CHINA RUSSIA etc.,10-31-2015 11:27:02

Radical Islam

131. With Hillary and Obama the terrorist attacks will only get worse. Politically correct fools won't even call it what it is - RADICAL ISLAM!,07-04-2016 15:34:15

Radical Islamic Terrorism

Only tweets that are already included in this analysis.

Radical Islamic terrorist

Only tweets that are already included in this analysis.

Radical Islamic terrorists

132. Thank you Geneva Ohio. If I am elected President I am going to keep RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISTS OUT of our countr... <https://t.co/a7t5QN2iqW>,10-28-2016 01:47:08

133. Hillary has called for 550% more Syrian immigrants but won't even mention "radical Islamic terrorists." #Debate... <https://t.co/Rf48XkZWbu>,10-20-2016 01:34:49

134. Thank you Colorado Springs. If I'm elected President I am going to keep Radical Islamic Terrorists out of our count... <https://t.co/N74UK73RLK>,10-18-2016 19:53:23

135. Well Obama refused to say (he just can't say it) that we are at WAR with RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISTS.,12-07-2015 01:45:34

136. We better get tough with RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISTS and get tough now or the life and safety of our wonderful country will be in jeopardy!,11-22-2015 15:59:40

Muslim

137. It is amazing how often I am right only to be criticized by the media. Illegal immigration take the oil build the wall Muslims NATO!,03-24-2016 14:38:13

138. Incompetent Hillary despite the horrible attack in Brussels today wants borders to be weak and open-and let the Muslims flow in. No way!,03-23-2016 02:59:29

139. Hillary Clinton said that it is O.K. to ban Muslims from Israel by building a WALL but not O.K. to do so in the U.S. We must be vigilant!,01-02-2016 13:23:00

140. “@SenSanders: I have a message for Donald Trump: No we’re not going to hate Latinos we’re not going to hate Muslims.” I fully agree!,12-31-2015 10:28:33

141. “Why Franklin Graham says Donald Trump is right about stopping Muslim immigration” <https://t.co/iVPJcDQLeO>,12-10-2015 19:27:16

142. Thank you to respected columnist Katie Hopkins of Daily <https://t.co/LgtY0qdv9U> for her powerful writing on the U.K.’s Muslim problems.,12-10-2015 13:00:55

143. The United Kingdom is trying hard to disguise their massive Muslim problem. Everybody is wise to what is happening very sad! Be honest.,12-10-2015 12:49:41

144. “ Haim Saban: Hillary Clinton’s Top Hollywood Donor Demands Racial Profiling of Muslims” <https://t.co/d99X4O9ysG>,12-09-2015 20:33:53

145. Statement on Preventing Muslim Immigration: <https://t.co/HCWU16z6SR> <https://t.co/d1dhaIs0S7>,12-07-2015 22:32:07

146. “Credible Source on 9-11 Muslim Celebrations: FBI” <https://t.co/UICDNcftJS>,12-07-2015 16:43:48

147. Obama said in his speech that Muslims are our sports heroes. What sport is he talking about and who? Is Obama profiling?,12-07-2015 05:50:31

148. “@thumpmomma: I likewise saw militant Muslims burning our flag and burning George Bush photos and figures right after 9/11! Not#here!”,12-02-2015 22:36:13

149. “@wzpd8z: Mr. Trump Chuck Todd is a moron all kinds of youtube videos showing muslims celebrating 911. I would show it on your ads.”,11-30-2015 13:14:18

150. Credible Source on 9-11 Muslim Celebrations: FBI<https://t.co/UICDNcftJS> via @WKRK,11-26-2015 01:03:10

151. I LIVE IN NEW JERSEY & @realDonaldTrump IS RIGHT: MUSLIMS DID CELEBRATE ON 9/11 HERE! WE SAW IT! <https://t.co/1SksZU9qlj>,11-26-2015 00:22:00

152. “@WayneDupreeShow: “It’s clear that Donald Trump was NOT even talking about a Muslim Database!” <https://t.co/3tLDZj2WGV>”,11-21-2015 23:17:50

153. “@mimi_saulino: @seanhannity @FoxNews Syrian Muslims escorted into U.S. through Mexico. Now arriving to Oklahoma and Kansas! Congress?”,10-13-2015 03:30:39

154. “@Dis_labeledVet: @realDonaldTrump here is a Clinton insider who admitted Hillary started the whole Obama’s a Muslim <https://t.co/UqkW16u3Kz>,09-21-2015 12:37:45

155. “@TheBrodyFile: On the Muslim issue: It might help @BarackObama if he actually supported Christians religious liberty rights.,09-21-2015 12:32:47

156. “@TheBrodyFile: On the Muslim issue: It might help @BarackObama if he didn’t take five years to visit Israel”,09-21-2015 12:32:07