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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The word populism has been constantly present in the arena of international politics, but this concept inspires different approaches and definitions. Hugo Chávez, Marine Le Pen, Margaret Thatcher, Andrew Jackson and Adolf Hitler are some of the previous world leaders that have been catalogued as populists. More recently, one special character emerged onto the American political field: Donald J. Trump. Over a year ago, he expressed his desire to become the next President of the United States. His politics were in many ways new to the American public, but they were common to much of the rest of the world. He was an outsider ready to take the old government down, and he appeared to be very similar to a specific candidate that once took the stage in the Old World: Silvio Berlusconi.

The need to explain the red-hat character and his too-direct personality generated thousands of headlines throughout the media that compared the American tycoon to the Italian mogul. They both come from a similar background and both have very similar speech. It is easy to see superficial similarities between them. They are often compared because they are outsiders that made their wealth from real estate and became candidates who ran against the old establishment, the evil elite. In the eyes of the media, they were both populists.

Nevertheless, this study begins with the premise that the comparisons made by the press between these two leaders are superficial assumptions that require scholarly verification. By focusing merely on their discourses, which is one of the
approaches taken to describe populism, this study ventures beyond the superficial in deciding whether the two leaders’ messages are similar or not.

The research is intended to answer this question: What are the characteristics that connect Silvio Berlusconi and Donald Trump’s speeches? The answer will confirm or refute the statement that both candidates are considered populists. Berlusconi’s and Trump’s political profiles can be examined through their speeches.

To deepen this knowledge of the candidates and their speeches, research on each of them found information on their family backgrounds, their businesses and their campaigns. A literature review of populism and populist discourse served to nourish the definition of populism and what a candidate needs to voice to be considered a populist. By using all this information, a more complete analysis can be done on the speeches to understand if what the media formulated about both candidates was just superficial, or it could be proved academically.

This case study intends to contribute to a general formation of the concept of populism by acknowledging that it is not defending the discursive definition with regard to other definitions of populism. Also taken into account is that this research is limited by the number of samples studied. The focus of this study is the comparison between two speeches by each candidate.

Since this research is currently limited, it takes three different methods of discourse analysis that complement each other. Each was coded and studied by its parts, as recommended by Reisigl, then graded holistically based on the Hawkins method and finally analyzed through seven questions, proposed by Gee.
In the end, the theory the media had was confirmed only if and when populism is taken as a discourse, because this is how it was studied, and it also expanded the possibility of accepting populism as a discursive tool or strategy that candidates can take to achieve power.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The “Trumposconi” Phenomenon

If people cannot trust their government to do their job for which it exists—to protect them and to promote their common welfare—all else is lost.

—Barack Obama, 2006

In 1981, President Ronald Reagan, in his first inaugural speech, said, “Government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem.” Could this possibly be true?

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, a government is “the group of people with the authority to govern a country or state; a particular ministry in office”; and it “conducts the policy, actions, and affairs of (a state, organization, or people) with authority,”\(^1\) this with the purpose of protecting its people’s rights. Thus, in theory, governments are a paramount institution for nations because of their purpose of keeping the order of a state while respecting the basic human rights.

Mahatma Gandhi once said, “I suppose leadership at one time meant muscles, but today it means getting along with people.” In today’s world, governments do not always choose to understand and serve their people.

When politicians stop defending the rights of the governed, the relationship between the rulers and the ruled start to deteriorate, and this is when “establishment outsiders” appear. Some outsiders march in carrying the flag of populism. Populists are individuals who profess to know the needs of the people;

for them, politicians are enemies and they need to be gone. Even though “we simply do not have anything like a theory of populism,”2 “the term is regularly used as a synonym of ‘antiestablishment.’”3

Two contemporary examples of establishment outsiders are Silvio Berlusconi and Donald Trump. Since the latter’s arrival to the American political field, he has been frequently compared to the Italian “Cavaliere.” But are they really similar? Can they be both called populists?

Alexander Stille stated in an article published on The Intercept that when both of them entered politics, both presented themselves as the “ultimate anti-politician” and “as the super-successful entrepreneur running against gray ‘professional politicians’ who have never met a payroll and are ruining their respective countries.”4 Yet, neither Trump nor Berlusconi ever proposed a real political program because what they really sell “is themselves.”5

The resemblance between both characters resonated so much in the American media that the press has even started calling it the “Trumposconi” phenomenon, which, according to The New York Times’ Frank Bruni is:

A study in the peril and pitfalls of unchecked testosterone and tumescent avarice. It’s a commentary on wealth in the Western world: how ardently certain blowhards pursue it, how much the rest of us forgive in those who attain it, how thoroughly we equate money and accomplishment. It’s a comedy. It’s a tragedy.6

---

3 Ibid., 1.
5 Ibid.
Donald Trump and Silvio Berlusconi have both been described as “playboys, moguls, businessmen, chauvinists, billionaires and even misogynists.” They are “both loud, vain, cheeky businessmen, amateur politicians, and professional womanizers. Both have a troubled relation with their egos and their hair. Both think God is their publicist, and twist religion to suit their own ends.”

They may be the good, they may be the bad. For some, “The Donald” and “Il Cavaliere” became, according to Severgnini, what Margaret Thatcher called TINA (There Is No Alternative); which was used to defend the market economy in England as the only system that worked. In this scenario, what TINA means is that voters willing to oust the traditional politicians from the government are willing to vote for any other available option, even if it is the devil himself, with the excuse that it is the only alternative remaining to get the nation back to where it should be. This type of politician/businessman/dilettante leader becomes the easiest exit voters can take to avoid staying in the status quo.

Donald Trump provokes, in Italians, a sense of déjà vu, because, like Silvio Berlusconi, he built his fortune on real estate and infiltrated people’s minds through media outlets with his personality.

Both have this forthright “populism, a willingness to engage demagoguery, their wealth, their vulgarity, their ability to tap into the emotions of their supporters;” these features gave Italians the motivation to wave red flags of danger to

---


Americans through media so the latter could avoid the mistakes that Italy may have made addressing, or obviating, the candidacy and political campaigns of Mr. Berlusconi.

“To dismiss Mr. Trump as a joke, as many Italians did with Mr. Berlusconi early on, and many Americans continue to do with Mr. Trump would be a mistake”9. Despite this, Americans did not take the advice. Now, with a President Donald Trump, the Americans might have to deal with a Berlusconi sequel.

Nevertheless, this research looks at both characters as campaigners, not as country leaders, at their behavior during their campaigns, and tries to determine if this sense of déjá vu that Mr. Trump awakened during his campaign is just a coincidence, or if both can be catalogued as populists.

In 1994 Silvio Berlusconi was born as a candidate in Italy. Twenty-one years later came Donald Trump, asking for the only power he did not yet possess -- political power. His character inspired the media, which tried to find a way to explain this unique character who was entering the everyday news of America. Thus, the press started finding answers in Silvio Berlusconi, which according to them was another Donald Trump.

What both of them represent is society’s incapacity to vaccinate against these thugs who succeed with the ability to get away with trampling principles and values on which democracy is grounded.10

Nevertheless, their resemblance might just be superficial. Aside from the similarities Trump and Berlusconi share, like their too-direct personality and their

---

9 Severgini, “What Italy Can Teach America About Donald Trump.”
real-estate background, these Western leaders also differ in many ways. For example, Donald Trump won the candidacy as the Republican Party candidate while Silvio Berlusconi created its own political party (Forza Italia) to take control of the government.

There is also the media factor. Mr. Trump is constantly attacking media for being biased and even though he used to appear “in a television program in which he played himself”\(^\text{11}\) he only portrayed himself as a showman; while Berlusconi “was the show: it was him, always and everywhere, the means, the director, the message and at the same time the messenger”\(^\text{12}\). Hence, even with his skills to attract media attention “Trump still lacks one of the most important tools that explains Berlusconi’s rise to power”\(^\text{13}\): his control of the media.

Silvio came to control six of Italy’s most popular private television channel. He did not need to insult the media; he simply overshadowed those who were against him. Trump does not control American media. He also does not control “nearly the share of the American economy that Berlusconi did”\(^\text{14}\) in Italy. According to Forbes, Berlusconi’s net worth is near $6 billion, while Trump’s is $3.7 billion. Hence, Berlusconi’s punch is far stronger in Italy’s economy than Trump’s is in the United States, “which has the world’s largest economy and a far less insular network of business elites.”\(^\text{15}\)

\(^{12}\) Ibid.
\(^{13}\) Lees, “Why Trump Isn’t Quite an American Berlusconi.”
\(^{14}\) Ibid.
\(^{15}\) Ibid.
In summary, their power over their respective countries is very different. “Il Cavaliere” wins every time he bets. Overall, “The Donald” as President Trump has “much more power than Berlusconi has ever had: he (has) the decision-making power to press the fatal ‘red button;’”\(^{16}\) he is the commander-in-chief of one of the world’s greatest powers. In other words, the world can laugh at Italy for being under the power of Berlusconi, but it will feel awkward to laugh at the United States under Trump’s command.\(^{17}\)

2.1.1 The Outsiders

Politicians can find inspiration in others who have preceded them, usually sharing principles and even career paths. It appears that Trump is a mirror to Berlusconi, at least regarding personality and professional background. Are their ideologies really the same? Are they the same kind of politician? Do their discourses express populism? Or is it just the media being influenced by the character of these two candidates and their personalities? Is it just that they are outsiders in the political field? Unlike Berlusconi in Italy, Trump does not have direct control over the American media; yet, he still dazzles them and takes control of the headlines as much as he can.

2.1.1.a Silvio Berlusconi

Silvio Berlusconi was born in Milan, Italy, on September 29, 1936. He has five children and has had three wives. He is, according to Orsina,\(^{18}\) a “skeptical

\(^{16}\) Meiler, “Paragonare Donald Trump a Silvio Berlusconi è Sbagliato.”
\(^{17}\) Ibid.
\(^{18}\) Giovanni Orsina, Berlusconism and Italy, (Palgrave MacMillan, 2014).
politician in a historical context marked by an excess of politics of faith”. He managed to conquer the love of the Italian electorate, three times becoming Prime Minister of his country. But before he got into politics he had a life, one that made him who he is and that managed to put him in power.

Michael Day, author of “Being Berlusconi: The Rise and Fall from Cosa Nostra to Bunga Bunga”, explained in detail how Silvio was always a dedicated man. He was a student who did not believe in religion very much, even though he went to a Catholic school. Years later, when he decided to attend the Università Degli Studi di Milano, he started working as a singer and host on a Mediterranean cruise ship; “Putting his natural charms to good use, effortlessly entertaining large groups for hours at a time with songs, jokes.”19

After he graduated with honor in 1961, he got a loan to build his first apartments in Via Alciati. This is when his life as a real-estate mogul began, but the property development that really made Berlusconi’s name a household word was Milano 2.

Shortly after, he started having problems explaining where the money for his investments came from. “The vicissitudes of Silvio Berlusconi are indelibly tied to the comings and goings in his Arcore mansion: from the earliest intrigues concerning his association with mobsters, right up until the Rubygate20 sex scandal that would make him an international laughingstock.”21

---

20 A sex scandal in which Berlusconi was involved that had him accused of paying for sex with a minor.
21 Ibid., 16.
In 1976, Italy’s Constitutional Court paved the way for local commercial broadcasting, so Berlusconi bought Television International of Milan (TVI) and merged it with Telemilano to create Telemilano 58. A media monster was born.

By 1984, the “real-estate mogul had built up three ‘national’ TV channels, giving him a virtual monopoly in private TV, which would power his business and political success over the next three decades.”

“Critics of Berlusconi remember the 1980s as the decade in which he stitched up Italy and cemented his status as a billionaire media magnate.” A decade later, Italy had a new leader, different from anybody else and unique in his own way.

2.1.1.b Donald J. Trump

Donald John Trump was born in Queens, New York, on June 14, 1946. He has five children and has had three wives, the present one being Melania Trump. Mr. Trump not only parallels Mr. Berlusconi in the number of children and wives; they both have created a real estate empire for themselves. Trump is the fourth child of New York real-estate tycoon Fred Trump. Despite the family’s wealth, he was expected to work the lowest-tier jobs within his father’s company and was sent off to a military academy at age 13 when he started misbehaving in school.

---

22 Ibid., 24.
23 Ibid., 27.
After working for his father and helping him with his New York’s residential housing projects, he took control of the company in 1971, which he renamed “Trump Organization.”

Unlike Mr. Berlusconi, who had a pleasant relationship with his parents, Trump’s childhood was challenging. His mother was sickly and his father was “demanding and often absent.” Both abandoned him to a military school that was, by a modern definition, brutal. Yet his parents also provided him with ample support, and he would be the first to insist they were loving and generous. With that support, he managed not only to continue and outgrow his father’s legacy, but he also entered many other fields that brought him a huge popularity in the United States and beyond.

No one in the world of business—not Bill Gates, Steve Jobs, or Warren Buffett—has been as famous as Trump for as long. First associated with high-profile real estate development in 1970s Manhattan, his name soon became synonymous with success, defined by wealth and luxury. Placed on skyscrapers, casinos, and commercial airlines, the name TRUMP (usually spelled in gold-colored, capital letters) became a true personal brand that connected one man to a seemingly endless number of offerings.

What got him there, in that place of the world where he is recognized by everyone, might not only have been his business savvy, but also his willingness “to say almost anything to gain attention.” That was the personality that made him pursue a career outside real state, even though throughout his adult life he has never gotten out of the family business.

---

26 Ibid.
27 Ibid., 2.
28 Ibid., 325.
Trump’s views and bully persona made him exceedingly popular with people who believed he represented important ideologies, especially the American promise of success that was represented by great wealth. His image was amplified as he hosted a TV game show—*The Apprentice*—and maintained a constant presence on the social media site Twitter, where millions followed his commentary and many implored him to seek the presidency.\(^{29}\)

Mr. Trump also built a beauty pageant empire. From 1996 until 2015, he was an owner in the Miss Universe, Miss USA, and Miss Teen USA competitions.

Nevertheless, despite his high involvement in many aspects of American lives, when he first tried to join politics in 2000 he was not successful. He ended his political run saying, “the Reform Party is a total mess,” to which the party replied, “Donald Trump came in, promoted his hotels, he promoted his book, he promoted himself at our expense, and I think he understands fully that we’ve ended the possibilities for such abuse of our party.”\(^{30}\)

Scandals as these have always surrounded the mogul, and even though he has not gotten into as much trouble as “Il Cavaliere” has with the law, there are still many questions regarding his finances.

A *New York Times* examination recently “underscored how much of Mr. Trump’s business remains shrouded in mystery. He has declined to disclose his tax returns or allow an independent valuation of his assets.”\(^{31}\)

\(^{29}\) Ibid., 4.  
\(^{30}\) Ibid., 251.  
also reveals that the companies he owns “have at least $650 million of debt” and that “a substantial portion of his wealth is tied up in three passive partnerships that owe an additional $2 billion to a string of lenders.”

His finances are so under the shadows that even Forbes could not verify in the past the net worth he said he had. Forbes struggled with Trump’s numbers because much of his wealth was privately held and not subject to independent audits to confirm the balance between his assets and his liabilities.

Notwithstanding, Donald J. Trump is now the President of the United States of America and how he managed to do that is still a matter of debate in the press.

### 2.2 Populism and the Media

### 2.2.1 What Is Populism?

When the media compares Donald J. Trump to Silvio Berlusconi, they tend to identify certain characteristics of each that are similar, if not the same. One of these is populism.

Even though there is not a rock-solid definition of populism, there are certain approaches that are taken to describe it, and there are specific characteristics that are present every time this term comes to light in the political arena.

Populists, according to Jan-Werner Müller, are not only anti-elitist but also anti-pluralist characters; even though, not “everyone that rejects pluralism is a

---

32 Ibid.
34 Müller, *What is Populism?*, 3.
This notion that populism is opposite to pluralism was also used by Hawkins in his study “Is Chávez Populist? Measuring Populist Discourse in Comparative Perspective” and by Ronald Inglehart and Pippa Norris in their research “Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash.”

Like Hawkins, there are many others, such as Mudde, Canovan and Laclau who try to define or measure populism to reach a better understanding of the concept.

The challenge that has developed throughout the years to achieve a global definition of populism is “at least partially due to the fact that the term has been used to describe political movements, parties, ideologies, and leaders across geographical, historical, and ideological contexts.” This is why sometimes populism is considered a thin ideology, which means it can be combined with other ideologies, such as communism, nationalism or socialism. It goes from right to left in the political spectrum.

In spite of the debate regarding the concept, there are some basic definitions that can be found throughout the literature. According to the Encyclopedia of Democracy, populism is:

A political movement that emphasizes the interests, cultural traits, and spontaneous feeling of the common people, as opposed to those of a privileged elite. For legitimation, populist movements often appeal to the majority will directly—through mass gatherings, referendums, or other forms of popular democracy—without much concern for checks and balances or the rights of minorities.

---

Populists then tend to pit “the pure, innocent, always hardworking people against a corrupt elite who do not really work.” Moreover, these leaders believe that “the people” have one voice, which can only be heard and turned into a reality by them, and that the elite is the “enemy” of the nation’s wellbeing. Thus, and because the leaders are the only ones capable of understanding the people’s desires, “there is no real need for debate, let alone the messy back/and/forth of deliberating in Congress or other national assemblies.” “The populist doesn’t need the polls because he has the people.”

What defines populists, then, is their necessary claim that a part of the population is “the people” and that only they, as populist frontrunners, can truly identify and represent them. The people are considered a “homogeneous or uniform grouping in cultural as well as economic terms.” It is an imagined community, which Mudde compares to the “national” of those that are identified as nationalists.

Those considered the opponents, which populists tend to call “elites,” “are not just people with different priorities and values, they are evil!”

---

37 Müller, *What is Populism?*, 23.
38 Ibid., 31.
40 Müller, *What is Populism?*, 22.
43 Ibid.
Because they truly believe they represent the majority and the real population of the nation, populists tend to be antagonistic “to cultural, linguistic, religious, and racial minorities,” 44 and they can ignite reform or reaction, idealism or scapegoating. 45 Populism comes in left and right variants. 46 It is a chameleonic movement.

2.2.2 Why Populism Rises?

“Populism is consubstantial to the political identity and practice of the nation paradoxically founded by an intellectual elite, inspired by illustration” 47.

This chameleonic movement has been present in international politics for a long time, though it caught the greater attention of the world because of its most recent popularity inside the political spectrum. Nevertheless, it is not new.

The socio-political history of Western civilization is littered with diverse examples of populism, from the policy of some Roman emperors (such as Julius Caesar himself), who avoided the role of the Senate, to the strong popular sentiment generated by Romanticism. Baroque, classicism, and enlightenment, under the aegis of the elite, were regarded as antitheses of the populist sentiment which was inclined to sympathy for Robin Hood 48.

Today, according to Mudde, populism has grown so much that it controls the largest share of the parliamentary state in six countries of Europe: Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Slovakia, and Switzerland. There also are and have been many presidents in Latin America with a populist bent in recent years: Venezuela’s

48 Ibid., 130.
Hugo Chávez, Argentina’s Cristina Fernández, and Bolivia’s Evo Morales. Marine Le Pen, a favorite for the presidency of France, is also a populist; and the famous Brexit\(^\text{49}\) that knocked on the door of the European Union in 2016 was also another sign of current populism.

This “current populist movement is part of a longer history and is rooted in the post-industrial revolution that led to fundamental changes in European societies in the 1960s.”\(^\text{50}\)

Canovan uses the phrase ‘new populism’ to describe this current wave of what is in the news today. These new populist movements “claim to speak for the forgotten mass of ordinary people”\(^\text{51}\). “All versions share a suspicion of and hostility toward elites, mainstream politics, and established institutions.”\(^\text{52}\) Trump, is a great representation of this upsurge.

According to Zakaria, new populism is gaining momentum because economic issues have become less important in the mind of the public. What are really affecting the Western countries are demographics, globalization, the information revolution, and a fiscal burden, and, while the effects of an increased global trade are positive for economics as a whole, “specific sectors get battered, and large swaths of unskilled and semiskilled workers find themselves unemployed or underemployed.”\(^\text{53}\)

\(^{49}\) The 2016 vote that got Britain out of the European Union.


\(^{52}\) Zakaria, “Populism on the March,” 9.

\(^{53}\) Ibid., 12.
The “people who lack opportunities for achievement-based identity tend to become more attracted to identities based on innate characteristics like race.”54 Thus, populism arises generating in the society where there is a “fear of social change; fear of terrorist attacks and other physical threats; and the crisis of identity.”55 These become what social scientists are calling “authoritarian voters”: “people who have a strong desire to maintain order and hierarchies, along with a powerful fear of outsiders”56 which is why “they seek out strongman leaders and support harsh, punitive policies against immigrants and other outsiders – much as Mr. Trump has done.”57 When the fear of physical threats appears, it compels people to desire leaders who will prioritize security above all else. The economy is no longer a priority58 for them, nor are, in some cases, democratic institutions or civil rights.

Populism reflects deep cynicism and resentment of existing authorities, whether big business, big banks, multinational corporations, media pundits, elected politicians and governments officials, intellectual elites and scientific experts and the arrogant and privileged rich.59

Thus, “with the impact of immigration, industrialization, and abandonment of the primacy of agriculture, praxis politics adopts strategies to capture the favor of the masses.”60

---

55 Ibid.
56 Ibid.
57 Ibid.
58 Ibid.
60 Roy, “El Nuevo Populismo en América.”
While resentment and insecurities inside the population continue to take on roles inside each nation’s problems, populism will continue to threaten democracy. What is unknown is how long it can last ruling a nation.

Currently, as mentioned above, there is an increasing wave of populism. In spite of it, the developing countries that started experiencing it years ago now see a decline within the movement, while first-world countries, like the United States of America and France, are just being hit by populism. “Populism is largely absent in Asia, is actually in retreat in Latin America. In Europe, not only has there been a steady and strong rise in populism almost everywhere, but it has deeper roots than one might imagine.”

“Europe and North America include countries with widely varying economic, social, and political conditions. But they face a common challenge—economic stasis—drop-off in growth. This has a fundamental and negative impact on economic growth.”

As long as the country keeps receiving a negative impact on its economy, generating the stagnation of some sectors of the population, a need to find a culprit for these problems will arise within the people. For populists, the government and the outsiders are the first on the list to blame, and those affected believe them.

Zakaria asserts that there are places in which politicians have failed to address citizens’ concerns, and it translates into a populist rise. On the other hand, countries that have managed immigration and integration, and managed an engaged leadership, have not seen a rise in populist anger.
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Furthermore, “the decadence of the organized parties and the atomization provoked by the social networks in the field of the activism and the political participation limit the possibility of an answer of the established institutions. Populism always had idealistic elements and confused its origin with nationalist ideas”\(^{64}\).

2.2.3 The People’s Whisperers

The German experience can be summarized as follows: If problems of the citizens are enduringly hidden in politics, if a political idiom creeps in that no longer means anything to the people, then the time has come for the actor to take the stage. But not just any actors, actors who are prepared to step down from their personal stage and turn the real life of a nation into a stage. The audience is at first astonished, uneasy about the chutzpah, then charmed and fascinated. Then comes the final step, the transformation of the intoxicated audience into an intoxicated nation.\(^ {65}\)

According to the media, Donald J. Trump and Silvio Berlusconi are populists. Hence, their campaigns are considered part of a populist movement that went on in their respective countries. They are actors that knew when to take the stage. They both were born as politicians in different moments of their lives, in different countries, and in different contexts; but when talking about them, some seem to find them very similar.

Silvio Berlusconi and Mr. Trump were non-politicians who capitalized on their ability to attract extensive press coverage of their outsize personalities and business success (Mr. Trump through his celebrity, Mr. Berlusconi through his media empire). Both also sought to appeal to voters who were disillusioned


with mainstream parties with populist appeals that often seemed to lack a clear ideological basis.66

They both were what their countries seemed to have been missing for each period of time. Both ran campaigns that appear to have populist characteristics. Mr. Trump announced to his country that he had decided, once more, to run for the presidential election, on June 15, 2015. Since the beginning, he postured himself as an out-of-the-ordinary candidate, irrespective of the fact that he was never elected to office.

"It does not matter what he says, or what his ideas are,' Mr. Sykes67 said. 'It's about the persona. He is the strong man. And he's apparently figured out a way to bond with millions of Americans"68, a characteristic that can be considered populist in nature. He has always thought, though, that all publicity is good publicity69, which is why he talks without a filter, is not well acquainted with diplomacy, and promised during his campaign several things that could pose a violation of the basic human rights.

Trump is a man of the people, in the respect that he can say what they want to hear and get away with it. Over the years, he has opposed gay marriage and also stood in favor of gays serving in the military. He has been sympathetic to abortion

67 A radio host.
rights and against them. He says “global warming” is not real and he is on the way to build a wall that will physically separate Mexico from the United States.

“It is not uncommon to say nonsense in an election campaign, but it is nonsense that people believes in them. People who are supposed to be educated and informed, with a solid democratic tradition”.

His way of public speaking and the content of his speeches have been the center of much criticism, not only because many say it is “nonsense,” like Nobel Prize Laureate Mario Vargas Llosa believes, but also because there are many of his statements that have been fact-checked by the press, like The New York Times, and proven wrong, or because he has made promises that are unbelievable to many.

Nevertheless, “at various points during the campaign, Trump has put forward the idea that if you don’t know him personally, you have no business challenging or criticizing his proposals as a candidate.”

In the end, his proposals and his speeches made him president, even after his “unconventional kick-off speech.” An address that sent him on a “rapid ascent to the top of the Republican field.”
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“Mr. Trump’s harsh language has, in turn, attracted widespread support from whites with hostile views toward immigrants and minority groups.”\textsuperscript{75} This group of supporters that he awakened were always there, and they are not the majority of the country—proven by the fact that Hillary Clinton won the popular vote in the 2016 Presidential race— but, “in a nation of 300 million people, a following as small as 20 percent is such an enormous market that he doesn’t need anyone else.”\textsuperscript{76} He preferred “to cultivate a proportionally small but intensely loyal following of repeat customer (or viewers) than to win the approval of everyone else.”\textsuperscript{77}

“The best explanation of Trump’s surprising success is that the constituency he has mobilized has existed for decades but the right champion never came along.”\textsuperscript{78}

Under the banner ‘Make America Great Again’, Trump has run a controversial campaign built on promises to strengthen the American economy, build a wall on the border of Mexico and the US, and to temporarily ban immigration of Muslims ‘until our country’s representatives can figure out what is going on.’\textsuperscript{79}

All of these promises were made under the pretext that they are what all Americans want and need, which is making many believe he has populist ideologies that incline him to believe he is representing “the American people” as a whole, when he could only be attributing the beliefs of a sector of the society, rather than to the whole nation.
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According to Cas Mudde, “Trump himself doesn’t hold a populist radical right ideology, but his political campaign clearly caters to populist radical right attitudes, and his supporter base is almost identical to the core electorate of populist radical right parties in (Western) Europe.”\textsuperscript{80} And while he never developed a real ideology-based campaign, his current popularity does seem to be based on a combination of features that defines Europe’s contemporary populist radical right: nativism, authoritarianism, and populism\textsuperscript{81}. What there is no doubt about is that Mr. Trump is an anti-establishment politician. “He has called all (other) politicians incompetent and corrupt, including virtually all of his competitors in the GOP primary.”\textsuperscript{82}

But populism entails not just an anti-elite position, which is common to most political challengers, but also a pro-people position and a call for ‘common sense’ politics. A real populist is the \textit{vox populi} (voice of the people) because he or she is one of the people.\textsuperscript{83}

This doubtful populism of Mr. Trump is not only exposed by Mudde, but also by Katrina Heuvel, who argues that the President’s populism, “is a deceptive marketing ploy. When it comes to actual policy, Trump (proposed) mostly the same regressive ideas that other Republican candidates have been peddling for decades.”\textsuperscript{84}
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Regardless of the man (Trump) and the ideology (Trumpism), “the supporter of Trump (the Trumpist) is almost identical to the populist radical right voter in (Western) Europe.”

First studies show that Trump is particularly popular among young, lower educated, white males. This is exactly the same group that constitutes the core of the electorate of populist radical right parties in Western Europe. The gender gap is particularly striking. Just as European populist radical right parties have a much larger gender gap.

His win then represents the view of a small portion of the population, or of those which are so abnegated to support any other party than the Republican, or of those that believed Donald Trump was the only way out of their problems, their TINA.

“By repeated measures, the majority of Americans don’t like Donald Trump. In 2011, experts at the firm that issues the celebrity Q Score ratings said that for every one person who liked Trump, more than four did not. More recently, in 2014, 61 percent of New Yorkers responding to a Wall Street Journal/Maris College poll said they had an unfavorable view of him.”

In spite of this, some of them voted for him and made him the 45th leader of the country. It also helped that he decided to launch his career as a politician during this specific period of time, a time in which there are many so-called populist politicians that are currently accusing immigrants and Muslims of rising crime and violence in their respective nations. Even if this perception does not hold any truth within it.
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For example, most Americans have believed that crime is increasing, even though crime rates have fallen dramatically during the past two decades. Yet, the massive immigration that wars and insecurity are bringing to several European countries and the United States over the last years, joined with the fact that economic problems have affected many, has given an impulse to these kinds of leaders.

“The Brexit and Trump's triumph are an unmistakable symptom of decadence, that slow death in which countries that lose faith in themselves sink, renounce rationality and begin to believe in witchcraft, as the most cruel and stupid of all, nationalism.”

These symptoms shown by the American public in the past year were also present in Italy more than a decade ago. When Silvio Berlusconi launched his political career in 1994 the situation in Italy was under similar circumstances as those in which the United States currently finds itself. This opened the gates for “Il Cavaliere” to step into the political arena. A so-called populist had come into the picture.

He was, according to Michael Day, the first Italian politician to speak the language of ordinary people, and who also happened to be from outside the political establishment.

The greatest paradox of Italy in the 1970s and 1980s was that one of the world's beautiful, prosperous and socially stable countries, which had been riding high, thanks to the economic miracle of the preceding decades, should find itself gripped not just by endemic corruption but also by a strange paranoia and under siege from political violence, as shadowy right-wing forces blew up banks

---

90 Ibid.
91 Vargas Llosa, “La Decadencia de Occidente.”
92 Day, Being Berlusconi: The Rise and Fall from Cosa Nostra to Bunga Bunga, 50.
and railways stations in Milan and Bologna, and the far-left Red Brigades’ tried to kneecap or shoot dead anyone who didn’t agree with them.\(^{93}\)

All that instability that brought corruption and paranoia to the Italians, and the fear that the Red Brigades (Brigate Rosse) generated joined with the strikes, protests, and bloodshed that were the order of the day, recreate a similar context in which the Americans live today, a context in which some of the citizens are tired of nothing getting done and fearing for their security.

In the United States, the economic crisis of 2008 and the terrorist attacks over the past years developed in the population an urge to blame the government and find someone that protects them from all the outside forces that threaten the country’s stability.

The savior in Italy’s case was Silvio Berlusconi. He was the man that had brought them entertainment for years, the entrepreneur that was responsible for presenting American soap operas to the Italian market, and “he was certainly the first transatlantic Italian prime ministerial candidate”\(^{94}\).

His election in 1994 is “the best antecedent of anti-politics, anti-system and the influence of television. Berlusconi turned viewers into voters. He created public opinion. And he did it by vindicating his iconoclastic profile, his business audacity, and his populist instinct, just as it happens now with Donald Trump in the United States.”\(^{95}\) “Italians were sold on Berlusconi’s populist message when they were

\(^{93}\) Ibid.
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hungry while the government budget constraint was being hidden from them.”

And, since Italians are realists, instead of choosing what might have been right, they took what was useful. “In order to defeat the left, many Italians would have voted for the devil.”

Berlusconi was a unique historical figure, and his ‘entering the political stage’ was a moment of profound historical change: since the unification of Italy, no political or government leader capable of winning elections and commanding a parliamentary majority had ever dared to say so openly and explicitly that Italians were fine as they were. The positive, reassuring messages that Berlusconi sent out to the Italians about the Italians, continually accentuating the positive and minimizing the negative while at the same time criticizing the broadcasting of negative images of Italy, were not just a product of political communication, nor, once he was in power, did he use them just to defend the achievements of his governments and avoid criticism.

Berlusconi’s campaign started after he decided to launch his career on behalf of his own political party, “Forza Italia.” He was able to do that because, unlike Mr. Trump, who was entering the American field in which legislative and electoral institutions heavily favor a two-party system, Berlusconi was stepping into Italian politics, and instead of fighting old parties he saw a better opportunity in creating one that worked according to his needs. He always portrayed himself as a man “who had built up a powerful television empire by breaking the monopoly of Italy's state-owned broadcaster, RAI. He told them that he represented a clean break with Italy's corrupt past.”
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The leader emerged and created a movement, presented a new way of doing politics, presented to Italians a new and different politician. He started what the press used to call “Berlusconism.” “Berlusconism is an emulsion of populism and liberalism”\(^{100}\) (or at least a certain kind of liberalism).\(^ {101}\) It is described by Orsina as an octopus with three tentacles. The head of the octopus is the myth of the “good” civil society, and the three tentacles are the “friendly, minimal state”; hypopolitics;\(^ {102}\) and the identification of the new virtuous elite.\(^ {103}\)

Berlusconism is defined by the politics of skepticism. It convinces people that politicians can be like everyone else and politics do not need to be taken that seriously. This was a “breath of fresh air” for Italians, so they took to Silvio Berlusconi, who, aside from being an outsider, represented for them “the ideal of the successful businessman, the very wealthy, very active and very ‘modern embodiment of the American model of success based on a ‘work hard, play hard’ lifestyle.”\(^ {104}\)

An emotional identification with their leader creates a symbolic bridge for voters – a connection between his charisma and their need and hopes – bypassing the corrupt intermediating éliters, the professional profiteers of the political world that Berlusconi despises.\(^ {105}\)
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\(^{102}\) According to Orsina, a less intrusive way of doing politics. The intent of doing things, a desire for revival, and counterattack by areas of society that had suffered from political oppression.
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The best way for Berlusconi to express his charisma to the voters and appear to them as a common man was by the frequent use of jokes and his musical performances. He managed to generate a political campaign that captivated the hearts of Italians by becoming almost an entertainment show.

Berlusconi employed a marketing and business machine that could help him create his political party and eventually lead him to an election victory. Chiapponi, Cremonesi, and Legnante described Berlusconi’s 1994 campaign as massive and well organized regarding timing, style and contents.

Michael Day, asserts that even though he was light on policies he won the public with his heavy imagery and his ability to sell almost anything, which is why “selling himself to the masses ought to be child’s play.” He sold his brand of anti-politics and the Italians bought it.

That a corrupt, self-serving tycoon, with little or no record of interest in politics or public service, could buy his way to the prime ministership of one of the world’s biggest democracies, was—and is—shocking. But this phenomenon—without equal in modern history—bears testimony not only to the mogul’s wealth and TV power but also to the brilliance of his campaign, his mendacity and the peculiar social circumstances in which Italy found itself in the early 1990s.

A huge part of his short campaign were his speeches. They had, according to Day, many marketing-approved words such as “freedom” and “hope”. “The general thrust was that Berlusconi was stepping into the breach to save Italy from the communists.”
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His message was easily digested by the Italian public, not only because of his art of expression but because of his huge media power. “In Italy, political advertisements are not allowed in the final month of an electoral campaign. But that left the mogul with four weeks to blitz Italian television, practically half of which he owned.”

His other crucial advantage was the ban on political spots maintained by Rai state TV that limited the options of his opponents. Berlusconi’s center-left political opponents didn’t know how to react to the promotional onslaught of Forza Italia ads and the blatant pro-Berlusconi bias of the Berlusconi-owned networks.

Well aware that he could probably not get a majority in parliament by himself, Berlusconi also formed alliances with other parties, which in the end led to the emergence of a quasi-bipolar party system in Italy, as found in the United States.

2.2.4 The Media for the Populists

For both Trump and Berlusconi, the media were key factors for winning the race. For the latter, it was his omnipresence on Italian media; for “The Donald,” it was his tweets and the admiration the American media have with entertainment, and how easy it is to fall in love with everything that generates controversy. “Some of the successful cases of populism in recent years have come from leaders who literally own or control parts of the mass media. Thaksin Shinawatra and Silvio Berlusconi are the most instructive examples.”
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Hence, it is important to highlight how important the media are for populist, not only because of the main role they play in getting the populists elected, but also how they have a love/hate relationship with the press. Moffitt describes the media as one of the central “stages” on which contemporary populism plays out upon.

Populist actors tend to be savvy when it comes to the manipulation of the media channels. They use the media’s thirst for “salacious and entertaining headlines and soundbites that populist actors provide,” thus they give them what they want. Populists are opportunistic.

On one hand, populists tend to target the media as a tool of the ‘elite’ that is used to discredit the marginalize ‘common sense’ opinions and mislead ‘the people’. On the other hand, populists are often very opportunistic about their media opportunities, willing to align themselves with tabloid and ‘low’ forms of media to reach ‘the people,’ blurring the line between politics and entertainment in the process.

The Internet is also making it easier for the news to spread and for the populist message to get to more places, an advantage that Berlusconi did not have in his time. On the other hand, Trump did, and he took advantage of it. Berlusconi had, and still has, great power over the Italian media, while Trump has nearly none. Nevertheless, social media and the Internet helped him achieve almost the same results as Berlusconi did through television.

“Flows of information are now networked globally, meaning that time and space barriers are overcome in terms of distribution of information and communication; content is cheap, portable and easily reproduced,” which is
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why, “even as newsrooms are smaller than ever, they’re producing far more journalism—at least in the realm of presidential campaign coverage. And that’s largely because of how technology has upended the journalism industry as it once operated.”  

Nevertheless, while the media is a steppingstone in the rise of a populist leader because of the value it has for the people, populists tend to criticize it at every opportunity.

“The irony of Donald Trump’s relationship with the press is that, while he has spent his entire campaign complaining bitterly about it, he has also sopped up more media attention than arguably any Presidential candidate in history.” And while the media might not be to blame for creating Trump, it definitely helped him get the White House.

Through every available portal, Trump expressed his feelings and concerns. He was able, according to Schamis, to reveal the breakdown of the Republican Party, a party that for decades was embracing extremism (social, cultural, religious, and fiscal).

Trump was simply more entertaining and generating more passion. In a news environment moving from a world of subscriptions and long-term appointments-to-view to the vagaries of clicks, friends’ recommendations and Facebook news streams, that makes him a winner.

---
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Berlusconi had control; Trump had social media, and the belief that “bad news is good news.” It does not matter if they are talking bad about him as long as they are talking. Moreover, his supporters were so convinced that he was the answer to all their problems that they “dismissed irrefutable journalism about his grotesque character and various scams.”  

In part, the endurance of Donald Trump is due to “the stream of his own provocations.” He is surrounded by so many scandals and so much outrage that is hard to focus on only one of them.

Moreover, his campaign not only focused on generating news with his straightforward personality, but also on his social media, especially his Twitter. “Analyze Trump’s speeches and there are references to dozens of stories that are dismissed by most mainstream media but have enthusiastic support in the growing world of alternative news sources.”

“The vicious polarization of America’s news media: More voters than ever are getting their news from the walled gardens of Facebook and other social media sites, where like-minded views often reinforce one another. And on mainstream channels like Fox News, conspiracy theories that were once limited to the fringes of the internet are getting an airing. As a result, public trust in the media has collapsed.”

Because of this, it was easy for Donald Trump to diminish news that did not help him as “fake news” and to make his “people” believe what he said. He managed and controlled his opposition in the media with the new forms of news
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reproduction, which is why, in spite of having opposition, while Berlusconi did not, he still dominated the American media.

Trump had to deal with news portals talking bad about him and counteracting his statements. This is a problem that Silvio Berlusconi did not have in Italy.

“What makes the Italian media peculiar is that the richest person in the country, Silvio Berlusconi, directly or indirectly controls approximately 90 percent of Italian national TV, two national newspapers, some of the larger-circulation national news magazines, the copyrights on a quarter of all Italian books, the main distribution networks for most of Italy’s magazines and movies, and around 60 percent of all TV advertising sales.”

This circumstance translated into almost zero criticism for him in the media outlets. The only significant criticism came from “a handful of print outlets and a few isolated voices within RAI.” His control is such that still, in 2016, he is not the Prime Minister, but the Italian media are still in a great percentage his, which gives him the power to set the agenda in political campaigns and manipulate public opinion.

“The blatant and unprecedented conflict of interest between Berlusconi’s media holdings and his government position has remained unresolved since the early 1990s. Italy’s highest tribunal, the Constitutional Court, has ruled multiple times that such media concentration is illegal. Yet its decisions have not been enforced.”

The fact that his almost-monopoly has not been decreed illegal and remains yet unresolved does not mean that the situation has been favorable for the country.
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Italy has come to have one of the lowest levels of press freedom in Europe because Berlusconi and his “organizations exert extraordinary leverage on the production of knowledge and information in Italy.”

According to Ragnedda and Muschert, he managed to lower the press freedom by generating favorable news while censoring inconvenient news and creating a cultural background for legitimating the status quo. In Italy, TV has the clear effect as a tool of political information that influences political decisions.

This technique worked perfectly for the entrepreneur that had the media power and just needed to use it to get himself elected. TV is the most important source of information for Italians.

Thus, with his power, “Berlusconi has transformed the political life of a major nation into a kind of reality TV show in which he is star, producer, and network owner.” He “understood that contemporary politics is a permanent campaign.”

Berlusconi was able to fill a gap, a power vacuum, that the Christian Democratic coalition left when it disappeared from the Italian political field. The end of the Cold War and the fall of the Berlin Wall collapsed the ideologies of the people and “Il Cavaliere” went to the rescue. With his extraordinary ability and his understanding of the capability of his media empire, he managed to use them as political assets “in an age in which celebrity mattered more than ideology.”

To explain Berlusconi’s political popularity only by his influence in the media, however, would be simplistic. The second reason is that a number of people
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And it was only with his charisma with which he conquered the masses of “a nation that cheers for a political party as blindly and intensively as it cheers for a favorite football team.”\footnote{Ibid.}
CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Since populism has a debatable concept in which social scientists cannot agree, different points of view have developed from which it can be studied. Hawkins classifies the different current definitions into structural, economic, political-institutional, and discursive.

The first definition associates populism with social stages of development; the economic approach identifies it with policy outputs; the political “sees populism as a phenomenon rooted in the basic struggle over control of government, policy, and core values of the community,” and the last one, populism as a discourse, will be utilized for this research.

The purpose of focusing on the interpretation of populism as a discourse style is that “analyses of populist discourse highlight a series of common, rough elements of linguistic form and content that distinguish populism from other political discourses.”

‘Considering populism as a discursive style lends itself to its operationalization as a gradational property of specific instances of political expression’ (Bos et al. 2013) rather than an essential attribute of political parties or political leaders that can be captured by a simple populist/non-populist dichotomy.

This view, according to Moffitt, lets the political actor be more or less populist at different times, depending on how and when they use populist discourse, whereas the ideological or strategic point of view gives populism a more drastic
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definition of being or not being populist. This kind of process turns the discourse into a rhetoric that constructs politics as the struggle between the people and the elite.

Now, since populism is having a domino effect in the world, “populist discourse has become mainstream in the politics of western democracies.”\(^\text{136}\) Countries like France and the United States have been hearing lately discourses that the media are cataloging as populist. Italy also heard them back in the 1990’s.

Donald Trump and Silvio Berlusconi might have similar backgrounds and stories, but the real purpose of this research is to understand their speeches and if they really tried to extend a populist discourse to their people. In order to do so, this study analyzes a sample of their speeches through a qualitative discourse analysis. This “involves asking questions about language, at a given time and place”\(^\text{137}\) and takes into “consideration, if only as background, to the whole picture.”\(^\text{138}\)

The analysis of discourses has a precedent not only in the political field but also in others, like sociology. Its study has not only been developed in a qualitative manner but also with quantitative methods. Hawkins mentions specifically the work of Armony and Armony, who used a computer-based technique to measure populist discourse in a large number of speeches by two Argentine presidents, Jagers and Walgrave, performed a human-coded content analysis of television programs by six Belgian parties. Hawkins’ own work generates a way of measuring
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the level of populism by doing a holistic grading, which asks readers to interpret whole texts rather than count content at the level of words or sentences, to study 200 speeches from 40 different chief executives.

Overall, discursive analysis breaks the text “into pertinent units of information for their subsequent coding and categorization.” It is not a single method, but, rather, it “covers a broad range of communicative phenomena, and different approaches are integrated with distinct lines of social theory and philosophy.” “The methodology of discourse analysis is continuous with the phenomena it seeks to analyze. The methodology of discourse analysis is thus deeply ethnographic.”

Generally, discourse is defined as text above the level of sentences. Discourse analysts tend to focus on how particular phenomena are represented. For example, Van Dijk (1991) studied manifestations of racism in the press: how minorities appear, how ethnic conflicts are described, and how stereotypes permeate given accounts. Other discourse analysts have examined how television news programs and other TV shows in the United States manifest particular ideological vision of the U.S. economy (Wonsek, 1992).

Overall, discourse analysis can present itself in a wide range of forms. It can study Small or Large-N cases that are related to a text from which the analysts are trying to understand the meaning.
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3.1 Applied Methodology

Research Question: What are the characteristics that connect Silvio Berlusconi’s and Donald Trump’s speeches?

As mentioned, there are many foci and ways of doing discourse analysis, which means there are different approaches to this methodology. Nevertheless, those applying discourse analyses reach for similar goals.

According to Barbara Johnstone, these analyses can be used to answer many kinds of questions. It all starts with asking a variety of questions that could be answered through a wide range of methodologies. Discourse analysis sheds light on how speakers indicate their intentions and how hearers interpret them. They are helpful in the study of personal identity and social identification, resulting in the description of texts and how they work in order to uncover the multiple reasons why texts are the way they are and no other way.

Therefore, the discourse analysis was chosen to understand the texts that are represented in two of the speeches given by each Berlusconi and Trump during their respective campaigns. Since it is a methodology that allows creativity, this study will take three different authors previous studies to create a new analysis for the speeches. The use of different analyses will improve the understanding of each text, later to compare and analyze them to determine if both candidates used populism to attract followers.

The discourse analysis was chosen over other studies of populism because “anyone who wants to understand human beings has to understand discourse, so
the potential uses of discourse analysis are almost innumerable. The discourse analysis is considered the best alternative for this study not only to understand the candidates but also the tools they used to captivate the people.

Discourses “usually means actual instances of communicative action in the medium of language, although some define the term more broadly as meaningful symbolic behavior”. With these analyses this research will also answer if Trump and Berlusconi are really similar politicians, if their discourses are really an expression of populism, and if the similarity they share is just that they are both political outsiders.

In order to do the discourse analysis, the samples have to be prepared and selected. This study took two speeches per candidate, selecting the big first speech each of them gave and their announcement speeches given at the beginning of their campaigns. For Berlusconi, the first big speech was given on January 26, 1994, a few months before he was elected, while Trump’s was his inauguration speech, which the media catalogued as “populist”. In reference to Silvio Berlusconi’s speeches, which were taken from the book “L’ Italia che ho in mente” by Silvio Berlusconi, they were read and translated by an Italian speaker before the analysis was made.

After carefully reviewing each speech, they were coded by paragraphs following the recommendations of Reisigl to examine the data and sort it. Each
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145 See Wodak and Krzyzanowski’s Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences.
paragraph was analyzed to detect the presence or absence of populist elements, based on the research done in the literature review.

The following step is to read the speech as a whole, to take notes and to assign a grade based on Hawkins’ rubric, which allows populist discourse’s elements to be compared with pluralist’s. It is a 3-point scale of 0 (nonpopulist or pluralist), 1 (mixed), or 2 (populist). A grade is given to each speech according the populist weight it has inside of it, or the lack of. This method will not only fulfill the purpose of understanding each speech and capture its populist essence (if present), but also to compare both candidate’s speeches to each other and with an ideology like pluralism.

Finally, to complement the previous methods, James Paul Gee recommends using seven tasks (or seven questions)\textsuperscript{146} that are useful to identify the cues and clues that are inside any text. According to the author, “Whenever we speak or write, we often (and often simultaneously) construct or build seven things or seven areas of ‘reality’.”\textsuperscript{147} In order to understand them, a discourse analyst can ask seven different questions about any piece of language-in-use. In this study, we will analyze both speeches of each candidate together because of their similarities.

It is paramount to highlight that the context in which of these speeches were given is always taken into consideration when analyzing them because context is “an extremely important notion in discourse analysis.”\textsuperscript{148}

\textsuperscript{146} See Appendix. Tasks that detect the significance, practices, identities, relationships, politics, connections, sign systems and knowledge within the text.
\textsuperscript{147} Gee, \textit{An Introduction to Discourse Analysis}, 32.
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., 36.
In doing discourse analysis, we gain information about a context in which a piece of language has been used and use this information to form hypotheses about what that piece of language means and is doing. In turn, we closely study the piece of language and ask ourselves what we can learn about the context in which the language was used, and about how that context was construed (interpreted) and used by the speaker or writer and listener(s) or reader(s).\textsuperscript{149}

\textsuperscript{149} Ibid.
CHAPTER 4. RESEARCH FINDINGS

After careful evaluation of each of the four speeches—two by Berlusconi and two by Trump—this study confirms the theory that the media had about both candidates. Nevertheless, there are some side notes to be made.

First of all, what this research concludes is that their speeches are considered populist discourses, not that they as individuals could be called populists.

Each speech was studied individually, both within its parts and as a whole, and together they showed very similar characteristics as well as few differences. They can differ because, for example, Berlusconi has a smoother speech than Trump. All four of them have populist elements, with nothing pluralist in them. All four can be catalogued as populist discourses because they all have within them the “us versus them” element, an evil represented in the minority, which is always hurting the people, and the fact that the only ones capable of saving the United States and Italy are Trump and Berlusconi, respectively. There are no grays, a great systematic change is required, and, most of all, each of the speeches tends to include exaggerated facts.

When giving their discourses, both Trump and Berlusconi focus on themselves and try to sell their experience as the best asset a ruler can have. The fact that they are “normal” people, common citizens not part of the establishment, and they are willing to leave everything behind for the country is for them in itself a reason to choose them as leaders of the government. They also focus on what is hurting the people and make it the center of attention on their speeches. They both talk
about how the government has taken advantage of the people and how they can become the people’s whisperers since they understand what is hurting them. They, with their knowledge and experience, can fix it. They usually exaggerate facts, they go to the extremes to make them more dramatic, and every issue for them could have huge consequences. Berlusconi tends to be more specific in what the problems are than Donald Trump. They give their discourses as though they were talking to a friend, not the usual way in which a political speech is given. For them, it is always the government versus the people. Trump tends to be more exaggerated because, unlike Berlusconi, who only has the government as the enemy, Trump blames several other outside forces, as well.

It is paramount to underline that what this study focused on is the populism in their discourses, not whether they as politicians are or are not populist, which also leads this study to assert that maybe, in some cases like in this one, populist discourse is used only as a tool to get the attention of those that are out of tune with the government.

Discourse is then used “to persuade, to cause others to act, to change the world”\textsuperscript{150}. This idea that it can be a strategy that people, in this case, politicians, use to get to the people no matter what their principles are “is a result of the fact that various traditions of rhetoric and poetics have for centuries had an enormous influence on how people were educated in writing, reading, and public speaking.”\textsuperscript{151}

\textsuperscript{150} Johnstone, Discourse Analysis, 265.
\textsuperscript{151} Ibid.
The development of discourse analysis is historically linked to the study of the strategic aspects of discourse. In the context of the first European democracy, in classical Greece, those people who had the rights of citizens (at that time actually a fairly small subset of the population) needed to be able to make their own cases in courts of law, and the systematic study of speech-making and persuasion arose originally as the underpinning of practical education in oratory.  

By taking this approach, it means that Trump and Berlusconi do not share the same ideology but only generate a similar speech to approach their voters. This is reinforced by the fact that Trump has a more drastic speech than Berlusconi. He demonizes the enemy with more vehemence and does not recognize some of the citizens of his nation as citizens at all. Moreover, Berlusconi also constantly stresses how much he wants unity within the nation. Both candidates also were born as politicians in different contexts, which might make their points of view very different; while they have fear as a common denominator. Trump’s populism was born in a context of hate for the outsiders and for the foreigner, while Berlusconi’s was not.

Moisés Naím explains how populism works and how it can only be a tool in the box of the candidates. To begin with, he writes that all “populists” delegitimize and criminalize the opposition, allege international conspiracy, and discredit journalists and experts. This is another way in which Silvio Berlusconi proves to have had mild populist discourses, which might have been only at the beginning, because he later discredited all journalists who went against him, but at least as a
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candidate he did not go against them, maybe because he knew the power inside
the media he had. Donald Trump does not have the same influence Berlusconi
has over the media, which is why since the beginning Trump catalogued some
media outlets as inept.

Therefore, populism is not considered an ideology. It is a strategy for gaining
and retaining power. It has always existed, but in recent times it has reappeared
with force, powered by the Internet and by the frustrations of societies
overwhelmed by change, economic precariousness, and a threatening
insecurity before the future.\textsuperscript{154} With their speeches, candidates like “Il Cavaliere” and “The Donald” divide and
conquer. They appear “as the defenders of the noble people -the populus-
mistreated and run over.”\textsuperscript{155} These types of candidates can be catalogued as
fascist, nationalist or part of a plutocracy—all names which Donald Trump has been
called, which proves that they are not really populist but that their speeches are.
They may have different approaches when it comes to actions, to proposals, to
principles, because they believe in different things. They only use the populist
speech as part of their campaign strategy, and when they get into power they
“continue to polarize and prepare the people for nothing less than what is conjured
up as a king of apocalyptic confrontation”\textsuperscript{156}. This theory could also explain why,

\textsuperscript{154} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{155} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{156} Müller, \textit{What is Populism?}, 42.
after Donald Trump got into power, the media started calling him “a sham populist.”

Populism is not an easy concept to define, nor to understand. It is still debatable whether a citizen of the world or a candidate could be called “populist,” but what is definitely accurate is that populism is gaining popularity amongst politicians, especially when they are campaigning to gain power. It is the perfect tool in the strategy manual to awaken those that are unheard.

CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION

An analysis was conducted of four speeches, two by Silvio Berlusconi and two by Donald Trump, to determine whether or not these speeches reflected populism. In order to understand what populism meant, this study includes a literature review of previous definitions done by experts, with the main focus on populist discourse. Although there are many approaches in which populism can be studied, the one chosen for this study helped to explain why, in spite of being different persons, in different countries and contexts, these two leaders sound very similar.

From this analysis, it became apparent that populism, as Moisés Naím asserts, ends up being a strategy used by some to conquer power, which is why many media outlets defined Berlusconi and Trump as populists, even though after carefully studying their speeches it is possible that they are not completely the same, but it is just that they include populist elements within their texts and end up sounding similar.

By understanding previous works, like Hawkins did to measure populism in discourses, this research recognizes the importance discourse has in the minds and opinions of the people. It is not the only way to study populism, but it should gain more importance because of the relevance it could have in a political campaign and the future of a country. Moreover, because populism is gaining importance in politics as a consequence of recent revolutions that are being born around the world and the fear many have that it can pose a threat to democracy.
Thus, it is important to have studies like this one to contribute to the understanding of what populism can be.

We cannot say however that the definition derived from this analysis is a good enough definition of populism, because this study was limited to two candidates that happened to have similar business profiles and similar speeches. Therefore, it is paramount to keep conducting research about populism, defining how best it can be measured or understood through candidates that present the basic elements of it. Future studies could compare populism with ideologies, like nationalism or fascism, to identify ways in which they coincide, and which candidates present the characteristics in which those definitions coincide. Perhaps further studies will prompt a look at new candidates that are emerging in the international politics arena and why they are. This area of populist discourse is still a little bit undiscovered, but it will help to gain a better understanding of real-life cases that could in the end help with the formation of the concept. This study is a grain of sand towards that formation.
Appendix A. Speeches

I)
Silvio Berlusconi’s Announcement Speech

26 gennaio 1994
Source: Silvio Berlusconi, L’Italia che ho in mente.

L’Italia e il Paese che amo. Qui ho le mie radici, le mie speranze, i miei orizzonti. Qui ho imparato, da mio padre e dalla vita, il mio mestiere di imprenditore. Qui ho appreso la passione per la liberta.
Ho scelto di scendere in campo e di occuparmi della cosa pubblica perché non voglio vivere in un Paese illiberale, governato da forze immature e da uomini legati a doppio filo a un passato politicamente ed economicamente fallimentare.
Per poter compiere questa nuova scelta di vita, ho rassegnato oggi stesso le mie dimissioni da ogni carica sociale nel gruppo che ho fondato. Rinuncio dunque al mio ruolo di editore e di imprenditore per mettere la mia esperienza e tutto il mio impegno a disposizione di una battaglia in cui credo con assoluta convinzione con la più grande fermezza.
So quel che non voglio e, insieme con i molti italiani che mi hanno dato la loro fiducia in tutti questo anni, so anhe quel che voglio. E ho anche la ragionevole speranza di riuscire e realizzarlo, in sincera e leale alleanza con tutte le forze liberali e democratiche che sentono il dovere civile di offrire al Paese una alternativa credibile al governo delle sinistre e dei comunisti.
La vecchia classe politica italiana e stata travolta dai fatti e superata dai tempi. L'autoaffondamento dei vecchi governanti, schiacciati dal peso del debito pubblico e dal sistema di finanziamento illegale dei partiti, lascia il Paese impreparato e incerto nel momento difficile del rinnovamento e del passaggio a una nuova Repubblica. Mai come in questo momento l'Italia, che giustamente diffida di profeti e salvatori, ha bisogno di persone con la testa sulle spalle e di esperienza consolidata, creative e innovative, capaci di darle una mano, di far funzionare lo Stato.
Il movimento referendario ha condotto alla scelta popolare di un nuovo Sistema di elezione del Parlamento. Ma affinché il nuovo sistema funzioni, e indispensabile che al cartello delle sinistre si opponga un Polo delle Liberta che sia capace di attrarre a se il meglio di un Paese pulito, ragionevole, moderno. Di questo Polo delle Liberta dovranno far parte tutte le forze che si richiamano ai principi fondamentali delle democrazie occidentali, a partire da quel mondo cattolico che ha generosamente contribuito all’ultimo cinquantennio della nostra storia unitaria.

L’importante è saper proporre anche ai cittadini italiani gli stessi obiettivi e gli stessi valori che hanno fin qui consentito lo sviluppo delle libertà in tutte le grandi democrazie occidentali. Quegli obiettivi e quei valori che invece non hanno mai trovato piena cittadinanza in nessuno dei Paesi governati dai vecchi apparati communisti, per quanto riverniciati e riciclati. Ne si vede come a questa regola elementare potrebbe fare eccezione proprio l’Italia. Gli orfani e i nostalgici del comunismo, infatti, non sono soltanto impreparati al governo del Paese. Portano con sé anche un retaggio ideologico che stride e fa a pugni con le esigenze di una amministrazione pubblica che voglia esse liberale in politica e liberista in economia.

Le nostre sinistre pretendono di essere cambiate. Dicono di essere diventate liberaldemocratiche. Ma non e vero. I loro uomini sono sempre gli stessi, la loro mentalità, la loro cultura, i loro più profondi convincimenti, i loro comportamenti sono rimasti gli stessi. Non credono nel mercato, non credono nell’iniziativa privata, non credono nel profitto, non credono nell’individuo. Non credono che il mondo possa migliorare attraverso l’apporto libero di tante persone tutte diverse l’una dall’altra. Non sono cambiati. Ascoltateli parlare, guardare i loro telegiornali pagati dallo Stato, leggete la loro stampa. Non credono più in niente. Vorrebbero trasformare il Paese in una piazza urlante, che grida, che inveisce, che condanna. Per questo siamo costretti a contrapporci a loro. Perché noi crediamo nell’individuo, nella famiglia, nell’impresa, nella competizione, nello sviluppo, nell’efficienza, nel mercato libero e nella solidarietà, figlia della giustizia e della libertà.
Se ho deciso di scendere in campo con un nuovo movimento, e se ora chiedo di scender in campo anche a voi, a tutti voi—ora, subito, prima che sia troppo tardi—è perché sogno—a occhi bene aperti—una società libera, di donne e di uomini, dove non ci sia la paura, dove al posto dell’invidia sociale e dell’odio di classe stiano la generosità, la dedizione, la solidarietà, l’amore per il lavoro, la tolleranza e il rispetto per la vita.

Il movimento politico che vi propongo si chiama, non a caso, Forza Italia. Ciò che vogliamo farne è una libera organizzazione di elettrici e di elettori di tipo totalmente nuovo, non l’ennesimo partito o l’ennesima fazione che nascono per dividere, ma una forza che nasce invece con l’obiettivo opposto: quello di unire, per dare finalmente all’Italia una maggioranza e un governo all’altezza delle esigenze più profondamente sentite dalla gente comune.

Ciò che vogliamo offrire agli italiani è una forza politica fatta di uomini totalmente nuovi. Ciò che vogliamo offrire alla nazione è un programma di governo fatto solo di impegni concreti e comprensibili. Noi vogliamo rinnovare la società italiana, noi vogliamo dare sostegno e fiducia a chi crea occupazione e benessere, noi vogliamo accettare e vincere le grandi sfide produttive e tecnologiche dell’Europa e del mondo moderno. Noi vogliamo offrire spazio a chiunque ha voglia di fare e di costruire il proprio futuro, al Nord come al Sud. Vogliamo un governo e una maggioranza parlamentare che sappiano dare adeguata dignità al nucleo originario di ogni società, alla famiglia, che sappiano rispettare ogni fede e che suscitino ragionevoli speranze per chi è più debole, per chi cerca lavoro, per chi ha bisogno di cure, per chi, dopo una vita operosa, ha diritto a vivere in serenità.

Un governo e una maggioranza che portino più attenzione e rispetto all’ambiente, che sappiano opporsi con la massima determinazione alla criminalità, alla corruzione, alla droga. Che sappiano garantire ai cittadini più sicurezza, più ordine e più efficienza.

La storia d’Italia è a una svolta. Da imprenditore, da cittadino e ora da cittadino che scende in campo, senza nessuna timidezza ma con la determinazione e la serenità che la vita mi ha insegnato, vi dico che è possibile farla finita con una politica di chiacchiere incomprensibili, di stupide baruffe e di politcanti senza
mestiere. Vi dico che è possibile realizzare insieme un grande sogno: quello di un'Italia più giusta, più generosa verso chi ha bisogno, più prospera e serena, più moderna ed efficiente, protagonista in Europa e nel mondo

Vi dico che possiamo, vi dico che dobbiamo costruire insieme, pero noi e per i nostri figli, un nuovo miracolo italiano.

TRANSLATION
For my country
January 26, 1994

Italy is the country that I love. Here I have my roots, my hopes, my horizons. Here I learned from my father and from life, my profession as an entrepreneur. Here I learned the passion for freedom.

I chose to take the field and to take care of public affairs because I do not want to live in an illiberal country, governed by immature forces and by men intertwined in a politically and economically bankrupt past.

In order to fulfill this new way of life, today I resign from all social charge from the group I founded. So I give up my role as a publisher and entrepreneur to put my experience and all my effort available to a battle in which I believe with absolute conviction with the greatest firmness.

I know what I don’t want, together with the many Italians who have given me their trust in all this years, and I know what I want. And I have a reasonable hope of success to make it happen, in sincere and loyal alliance with all liberal and democratic forces who feel a civic duty to offer the country a credible alternative to the government of the Left and the Communists.

The old Italian political class was overwhelmed by the facts and exceeded by time. The scuttling of the old rulers, crushed by the weight of public debt and the illegal financing of political parties, leaving the country unprepared and uncertain in the difficult time of renewal and the transition to a new Republic. Never before at this time Italy, which is rightly suspicious of prophets and saviors, needs people with a
good head on his shoulders and solid experience, creative and innovative, able to help her out, to run the state.

The referendum movement has led to the popular choice of a new system of election of the Parliament. But in order for the new system to work, it is essential that the sign of the Left opposes Polo delle Libertà which is able to attract the best of a clean country, reasonable, modern. This Polo delle Libertà will join all the forces that will draw upon the fundamental principles of the Western democracies, from the Catholic world who generously contributed to the last fifty years of our history unit. The important thing is knowing how to propose to Italian citizens the same objectives and the same values that have so far allowed the development of freedom in all the major Western democracies. Those goals and values that have not ever found full citizenship in any of the countries ruled by old communist's apparatuses, repainted and recycled. It is seen that in this elementary rule Italy might make an exception. Orphans and those nostalgic for communism, in fact, are unprepared for the government of the country. They bring with them also an ideological legacy that stride and is at odds with the needs of a public administration with liberal politics and liberal economics.

Our Left purport to be changed. They say they became liberal democratic. But it's not true. Their men are always the same, their mentality, their culture, their deepest convictions, their behaviors have remained the same. They do not believe in the market, do not believe in private initiative, do not believe in profit, they do not believe in the individual. They do not believe that the world can improve through the free contribution of so many people all different from one another. They have not changed. Listen to them talk, watch their newscasts paid by the state, read their press. No longer believe in anything. They would like to turn the country into a screaming square, shouting, who rants condemning. For this we are forced to oppose them. Because we believe in the individual, the family, enterprise, competition, development, efficiency, and solidarity in the free market, the daughter of justice and freedom.

If I decided to take the field with a new movement, and if I now ask you to come down the pitch to you, to all of you-now, immediately, before it is too late-it is
because I dream with eyes wide open with a free society, women and men, where there is fear, where instead of social envy and hatred of class there is generosity, dedication, solidarity, love of work, tolerance and respect for life.

The political movement that I propose is called, not surprisingly, Forza Italia. What we want to do is a free organization of totally new electrical voters, not just another party or yet another faction who are born to share, but a force that came into being with the opposite goal: to unite, to finally give Italy a majority and a government at the height of the deepest needs felt by ordinary people.

What we want to offer Italians it’s made by a totally new political force of men. What we want to offer the nation is a government program that only offers concrete and understandable commitments. We want to renew the Italian company, we want to give support and confidence to those who create jobs and wealth, we want to accept and to win the big production and technological challenges facing Europe and the modern world. We want to offer space to anyone who wants to do and to build their future, the North and the South. We want a government and a parliamentary majority that know how to give proper dignity to the original core of any society, the family, who know how to respect every faith and that arouse reasonable hopes for those who are weaker, for job seekers, for those who need care, for those who, after a hard-working life, have the right to live in peace.

A government and a majority that will bring more attention and respect to the environment, who can oppose with the utmost determination to crime, corruption, drugs. Who know how to ensure more security to citizens, more order and more efficiency.

The history of Italy is at a turning point. As a businessman, as a citizen and as a citizen who now takes the field, without any timidity but with the determination and serenity that life has taught me, I tell you that you put end to incomprehensible talk politics and sluggish politicians. I tell you that you can achieve together a big dream: of a fairer Italy, more generous towards those in need, the most prosperous and peaceful, more modern and efficient, the protagonist in Europe and in the world.
I tell you that can and we must build together, for us and for our children, a new Italian miracle.

(II) Silvio Berlusconi’s First Speech as a Candidate

6 Febbraio 1994
Source: Silvio Berlusconi, L’Italia che ho in mente.

Come si fa a non commuoversi in questo momento…
È un momento solenne, un momento intenso… Forse il nostro Paese ha bisogno davvero della luce della speranza e della fiducia.
Mentre venivo qui, ho pensato che c’era un matto che stava andando a incontrarsi con altri matti… Non credo, non credo… io credo che in questa Italia ci resteremo, ma abbiamo deciso di restarci come uomini liberi!
Ebbene, pensando a questa follia che sembra aver contagiato tutti noi, e tanti altri insieme a noi, io pensavo che si era verificato ancora una volta quel che avevo scritto in una prefazione a un bellissimo libro, l’Elogio della follia di Erasmo da Rotterdam. In quella prefazione dicevo: “È vera la tesi che viene fuori da queste pagine: le decisioni più importanti, le decisioni più sagge, le decisioni più giuste, la vera saggezza, non è quella che scaturisce dal ragionamento, non è quella che scaturisce dal cervello, ma è quella che scaturisce da una lungimirante, visionaria follia”.

C’è un pericolo per il Paese

Io credo che questa decisione noi, tutti noi, l’abbiamo assunta certo guardando ai pericoli che si venivano profilando–li avete ricordati qui questa mattina–, ma la ragione forse ci avrebbe invitato a continuare a preoccuparci del nostro particolare, della nostra famiglia, delle nostre aziende, del nostro mestiere, delle nostre professioni. Abbiamo deciso invece di dare una risposta diversa, perché abbiamo sentito che si profilava un pericolo: una nuova legge elettorale, dei politici...
incapaci di mettersi d’accordo, la possibilità che il nostro Paese fosse governato da una minoranza, da una minoranza che conosciamo bene, che ci avrebbe inflitto un futuro soffocante e illiberale. Abbiamo sentito venire fuori dal Paese, da tutto il Paese, dal Nord, dal Sud, dalle persone di tutte le categorie, di tutte le età, una domanda, un desiderio, una voglia di cambiamento, non soltanto un cambiamento di uomini, ma anche un cambiamento del mondo di fare politica. Basta con la politica delle baruffe, delle parole, delle chiacchiere, dei vetti incrociati, dei vecchi rancori, delle trattative sotto il tavolo: abbiamo sentito la voglia di una politica diversa, di una politica pulita. Abbiamo sentito salire da tutte le parti la voglia di un nuovo soggetto politico, abbiamo sentito venire dal Paese la domanda di risposte concrete ai problemi concreti del Paese.

È per questo che oggi noi siamo qui, con la volontà di cominciare da qui un lungo cammino, un cammino—lo ripeto—di speranza e di fiducia nel nostro futuro. Siete qui, quindi, voi che avete creato in tutto il Paese questo gran numero di club che hanno riavvicinato gli italiani alla pólis, alle cose che ci riguardano tutti, voi che avete deciso di abbandonare i vostri interessi e di mettere davanti ai vostri interessi l’interesse generale del Paese. Poi sono qui anch’io, io che ho sentito una specie di responsabilità che non poteva essere elusa e ho detto, forse esagerando, che mi sentivo nella condizione di chi, dovendo partire per un bel viaggio, per una bella vacanza, si è poi trovato improvvisamente davanti qualcuno bisognoso d’aiuto: ecco, nonostante la vacanza, il viaggio, non sarebbe stato possibile girare la testa dall’altra parte, perché questo ha un nome preciso: omissione di soccorso. È per questo—perché noi ci sentiamo tutti responsabilmente chiamati a uscire dal nostro egoismo per fare quanto possiamo per il nostro Paese—che noi siamo qui, che abbiamo risposto a questa specie di chiamate alle armi!

L’Italia che vogliamo: i nostri principi

Allora ci corre l’obbligo—essendo noi qui e volendo procedere a interessarci dell’amministrazione di questo Paese—di dichiarare con chiarezza i principi e i valori che ci ispirano; ci corre l’obbligo di dire qual è il nostro modello di società, e
quindi quale Italia vogliamo; ci corre l’obbligo di dire che cosa riteniamo si debba fare per cambiare il nostro Paese.

I principi in cui noi crediamo non sono principi astrusi, non sono ideologie complicate; no, sono i valori fondamentali di tutte le grandi democrazie occidentali. Noi crediamo nella libertà, in tutte le sue forme, molteplici e vitali; libertà di pensiero e di opinione, libertà di espressione, libertà di culto, di tutti i culti, libertà di associazione; crediamo nella libertà di impressa, nella libertà di mercato, regolata da norme certe, chiare e uguali per tutti.

Ma la libertà non è graziosamente “concessa” dallo Stato, perché è ad esso anteriore, viene prima dello Stato. E lo Stato deve riconoscerla e difenderla–in tutte le sue forma–proprio per essere uno Stato legittimo, libero e democratico e non un tiranno arbitrario.

Crediamo che lo Stato debba essere al servizio dei cittadini, e non i cittadini al servizio dello Stato. Crediamo che lo Stato debba esse il servitore del cittadino e non il cittadino il servitore dello Stato. Il cittadino deve essere sovrano.

Per questo–concretamente–crediamo nell’individuo e riteniamo che ciascuno debba avere il diritto di realizzare se stesso, di aspirare al benessere e alla felicità, di costruire con le proprie mani il proprio futuro, di poter educare i figli liberamente.

Per questo crediamo nella famiglia, nucleo fondamentale della nostra società.

E crediamo anche nell’impresa, a cui è demandato il grande valore sociale della creazione di lavoro, di benessere e di ricchezza.

Noi crediamo nei valori della nostra cultura nazionale che tutto il mondo ammira e ci invidia.

Crediamo nei valori della nostra tradizione cristiana, nei valori irrinunciabili della vita, del bene comune, nel valore irrinunciabile della libertà di educazione e di apprendimento, della pace, della solidarietà, della giustizia, della tolleranza, verso tutti, a cominciare dagli avversari.

E crediamo soprattutto nel rispetto e nell’amore verso chi è più debole, primi fra tutti i malati, i bambini, gli anziani, gli emarginati.

Desideriamo vivere in un Paese moderno dove siano valori sentiti e condivisi la generosità, l’altruismo, la dedizione, la passione per il lavoro, e al tempo stesso–
da liberisti–crediamo negli effetti positivi per tutti della competizione, della concorrenza e del progresso che non può esserci se non c’è libertà.

Ispirandoci a questi valori, noi vogliamo dare il nostro contributo al nostro Paese, noi vogliamo che il nostro Paese possa essere migliore, possa essere diverso da quello del recente passato e anche da questo, il Paese di questo confuso presente. Noi vogliamo un’Italia di donne e di uomini liberi, che non conoscano la paura, che non conoscano l’invidia sociale e l’odio di classe e che tutti insieme possano costruire un futuro diverso.

Noi vogliamo quindi un’Italia diversa, unita in un’unità indissolubile, che non tollera neppure che questa unità sia messa in discussione perché questo sentimento dell’unità appartiene alla nostra cultura, alla nostra coscienza, alla nostra storia, ai nostri ricordi, perché tutto questo appartiene a noi stessi!

Noi vogliamo un’Italia che abbia qualcosa in meno dell’Italia che conosciamo, ma che abbia anche qualche cosa in più–anzi, molte cose in più.

Il nostro modello di società

Innanzi tutto noi vogliamo un’Italia con meno disoccupazione e con più lavoro; a coloro che non hanno lavoro, ai disoccupati, a coloro che sono in cassa integrazione, a coloro che sono in aziende che non vanno bene e perciò guardano con preoccupazione al loro futuro, noi, se riusciremo nell’impresa che ci siamo proposti, noi oggi possiamo garantire che queste preoccupazione finiranno, possiamo garantire che noi sappiamo come rilanciare l’economia dell’Italia”

Non c’è nessuno in Italia che possa fare questa promessa, che possa fare questa affermazione con più credibilità e con più autorevolezza di chi la sta facendo in questo momento!

Noi vogliamo un’Italia [dal pubblico: abbiamo già vinto, Silvio!]… Che Dio ti ascolti, e, già che si siamo, che ti ascoltino anche tutti i Santi, compreso il nostro santo Patrono.

Noi vogliamo un’Italia che consideri con più rispetto e con più amore i deboli e gli anziani. La prosperità di cui godiamo è anche dovuta ai sacrifici, all’amore per il
lavoro che loro hanno praticato per tutta la vita. Continuando come ora, il nostro sistema economico non potrebbe garantire l’integrità della pensione a questi benemeriti che invece, dopo una vita di lavoro, hanno pieno diritto a una stagione di serenità e di certezze.

Ma il Paese avrà bisogno di ben altro per migliorare: noi vogliamo anche un’Italia più ordinata e più sicura, un’Italia che sappia lottare con determinazione e con efficacia contro la criminalità comune e contro la criminalità organizzata. Nel nostro Paese rimangono impuniti il 96 per cento dei furti e il 74 per cento degli omicidi! Questo significa che lo Stato non adempie a uno dei suoi fondamenti doveri: quello di garantire la sicurezza dei cittadini, la loro integrità fisica e patrimoniale.

Noi vogliamo anche un’Italia che sappia combattere la droga, ma che offra a chi ne è caduto vittima ogni aiuto possibile affinché possa reinserirsi nella famiglia, nella società e nel lavoro.

Noi vogliamo, naturalmente, un’Italia con meno corruzione, vogliamo anche un’Italia più attenta alla salute dei cittadini, che li difenda dall’inquinamento, che presi maggiore attenzione alla natura, all’ambiente, a tutte le opere d’arte che chi ci ha preceduto ci ha consegnato e che noi abbiamo il dovere di consegnare a chi verrà dopo di noi, almeno nelle stesse condizioni nelle quali le abbiamo ricevute.

Noi vogliamo un’Italia con meno tasse e meno burocrazia, un’Italia che dia più spazio a chi assume il rischio d’impresa, a chi si assume il compito di produrre lavoro e benessere: noi vogliamo un’Italia, insomma, che dia più spazio al privato e meno allo Stato: un’Italia con più privato e meno Stato.

Che cosa è successo in questi ultimi anni perché oggi si possa essere così preoccupati nel guardare al nostro presente e al nostro futuro? È successo che lo Stato, anziché occuparsi dei suoi doveri fondamentali, ha voluto espandersi, ha voluto estendere la sua presenza anche nei settori del privato, anche nei settori dell’economia. Se oggi noi godiamo di una situazione di benessere, ciò è dovuto al fatto che milioni e milioni di italiani continuano a compiere il loro dovere tutti i giorni, tutte le mattine uscendo dalle loro case, andando nelle scuole, nelle fabbriche, negli uffici, ed è proprio a loro che dobbiamo il nostro benessere e anche la libertà che si ha fin qui assistito. Lo dobbiamo alla laboriosità delle nostre
maestranze, dei nostri contadini, all’ingegno dei nostri imprenditori—soprattutto di quelli che hanno costruito e che gestiscono imprese piccolissime, piccole e medie—al genio e al talento dei nostri artigiani, dei nostri artisti, dei nostri commercianti, di tutti coloro che assumono su di sé il rischio di un lavoro autonomo. E l’hanno saputo fare nonostante la macchina politico-burocratica sia “perfetta” per proibire e per creare difficoltà a chi lavora”

Che cosa è successo? È successo che a poco a poco le tasse sono aumentate perché sono aumentate le spese pubbliche; è successo che negli ultimi anni la spesa pubblica è passata dal 43 per cento del prodotto nazionale, di tutto ciò che noi produciamo, a quasi il 58 per cento del 1992, con un aumento di tredici punti percentuali; è successo che negli ultimi tre anni per ogni milione di reddito un più che siamo stati capaci di produrre, la mano pubblica si è presa settecentocinquemila lire e solo duecentocinquemila lire sono rimaste nella disponibilità dei singoli, delle famiglie e delle imprese. Così come il 60 per cento del risparmio delle famiglie è stato assorbito dallo Stato per coprire i suoi disavanzi. Questi dati ci fanno ritenere che no possiamo non contenere questo accrescimento della spesa pubblica, questo conseguente accrescimento delle imposte che mette in discussione i posti di lavoro esistenti, e che non dà la possibilità di crearne di nuovi. Credo che il meccanismo vi sia chiaro: tutto ciò che va nella direzione della spesa pubblica viene sottratto all’investimento nelle aziende private: il 90 per cento dei risparmi delle famiglie italiane è oggi consegnato allo Stato attraverso i titoli del debito pubblico, soltanto il 10 per cento è indirizzato alle imprese per consentire alle imprese essere di produrre e di espandersi.

Questa è una situazione che davvero non può durare. Ci lamentiamo degli interessi alti, ma credo che a nessuno sfugga come anche questo sia un fenomeno causato dalla voracità del nostro Stato, che per continuare a espandere la spesa si rivolge alle famiglie dei risparmiatori, offre a loro una garanzia totale circa la restituzione del capitale, offre a loro interessi che sono numerosi punti più alti dell’inflazione: il risparmio li si rivolge. La stessa offerta non può essere sostenuta dalle imprese che quindi si trovano a operare senza quei mezzi che sono necessari per finanziare il loro sviluppo.
Per questo io ritengo che non possiamo più accettare questa Italia così politicizzata, statizzata, corrotta, quest’Italia iperregolata: quante sono le leggi, i regolamenti, le circolari che rendono difficile, se non impossibile, l’attività di chi lavora? Non possiamo più accettare, insomma, questa Italia che è stata ed è così male governata e così male amministrata.

Uomini nuovi alla guida dal Paese

Allora che cosa di deve fare? Io credo che si debbano approntare delle cure, che si debbano approntare dei programmi che dicano con precisione che cosa si deve fare per risolvere ogni problema. Credo che si debba anche portare alla guida del Paese uomini diversi da quelli che fino ad ora l’hanno diretto e amministrato. Io credo che mai come oggi l’Italia abbia bisogno di uomini con la testa sulle spalle, e quando dico uomini intendo dire, naturalmente, donne e uomini. Uomini che non sappiano soltanto fare bei discorsi, fare bella figura alle tavole rotonde o in televisione, tenere comizi, rispondere alle battute, ma che sappiano invece e soprattutto operare; uomini che sappiano dire bene e chiaro ciò che vogliono fare, ma che sappiano soprattutto trasformare in azione le loro parole e che abbiano i risultati del loro lavoro a testimoniare questa loro capacità. Uomini che vengano dalla trincea della vita e del lavoro, uomini di speranza, di fiducia, di ottimismo, animati da una gran voglia di fare!

Il nostro programma

Poi ci vuole un programma, come dicevamo, un programma semplice, chiaro, preciso, che riesca a dare subito fiducia al Paese, a togliere le paure che oggi sono coi diffuse, perché è la fiducia, soprattutto, la prima cosa che serve per ripartire. Abbiamo bisogno di fiducia. Devono aver fiducia le famiglie per convincersi a risparmiare senza timore, devono aver fiducia le imprese per determinarsi a rischiare, a investire, a svilupparsi. Abbiamo preparato questo programma e credo di non sbagliarmi se dico che mai nessuna forza politica in Italia ha mai presentato
un programma così completo, così articolato, così dettagliato, un programma di oltre quaranta punti a cui abbiamo lavorato con gli esperti che ci sono apparsi i migliori di ogni settore, un programma che ora è pronto e che consegnieremo ai nostri candidati affinché ciascuno di loro possa dare il suo contributo nelle materie di specifica competenza. Un programma che diventerà quindi definitivo dopo questo lavoro, e che noi presenteremo a tutti gli elettori italiani nel mese precedente la data delle le data delle elezioni. Questo programma avrà alcuni punti centrali: il primo sarà proprio quello di rilanciare lo sviluppo, che è una faccia della medaglia che ha come altra faccia l’esigenza di mettere e dieta lo Stato.

Ho già fatto una proposta che ha suscitato tanto scalpore e che ha mostrato come gli uomini delle sinistre, che si dichiarano oggi liberaldemocratici, siano tuttora ancorati al dirigismo e allo statalismo di sempre: il programma di introdurre un tetto al prelievo fiscale da parte dello Stato. Negli ultimi dodici anni il prelievo da parte dello Stato sul prodotto è stato aumentato di tredici punti: non mi pare sia irragionevole pensare che in un periodo altrettanto lungo si possa diminuirlo di un punto all’anno. Credo sia un traguardo che si può raggiungere e anzi superare nei fatti; questo significherebbe cominciare ad amministrare lo Stato come si amministrano le famiglie e le imprese. In nessuna famiglia e in nessuna impresa il buon padre di famiglia, il bravo imprenditore spende senza essere certo di quanto incasserà, di quanti soldi potrà disporre. Io credo che lo Stato debba fare altrettanto. Credo che all’impegno sul tetto massimo del prelievo fiscale–che, come principio generale, non deve essere mai tale da impedire il finanziamento dello sviluppo economico–debbà essere aggiunto il rispetto vero, che oggi non c’è, dell’articolo della Costituzione che dice che ogni spesa deve avere una propria precisa copertura finanziaria. Ecco, io credo che questo sia un impiego assoluto, necessario, che noi, se avremo responsabilità di governo, dovremo assumere, e assumeremo, nei confronti di tutto il Paese.

Credo poi, naturalmente, che dovremo rilanciare lo sviluppo, che dovremo dare un amano alla creazione di nuovi posti di lavoro e al mantenimento di quelli esistenti perché, se vogliamo rilanciare l’economia, è urgente intervenire con decisione. Si deve intervenire modificando le tassazioni che gravano sulle imprese. In un Paese
che ha bisogno di espandersi bisogna incentivare gli investimenti e quindi proporremo di non sottoporre ad alcuna tassa i profitti di impresa che gli imprenditori si impegneranno a utilizzare per sviluppare le proprie attività e creare nuovi posti di lavoro.

In un Paese che ha il problema del lavoro, si è tassato e si tassa ferocemente proprio il lavoro: proporremo una detassazione del lavoro, soprattutto di quello dei giovani, una detassazione per il lavoro offerto a chi è disoccupato e a chi è in cassa di integrazione e una detassazione del lavoro quelle zone che soffrono di alti livelli di disoccupazione.

Sono misure che già altri Stato hanno adottato con successo per un periodo determinato. Proporremo di introdurre l’apprendistato e contratti di formazione che fungano da mediazione tra il momento di formazione e il momento dell’inizio effettivo dell’attività lavorativa.

Poi, naturalmente, dovremo impregnarcì a riorganizzare l’amministrazione fiscale con principi che crediamo non possano essere messi in discussione; con l’abolizione di questo numero straordinario di tasse, riportandole dalle cento e passa che sono q un numero decente, a quelle principale che determinano oltre il 90 per cento degli introiti dello Stato: diciamo a dieci, a quindici tasse principali, in modo da poter concentrare gli sforzi degli uomini dell’amministrazione fiscale sui grandi e principale tributi, in modo da poterli concentrare nella lotta all’evasione.

Proporremo anche la riduzione delle aliquote fiscali perché quelle di oggi, introdotte molto tempo fa per colpire di più i cittadini più ricchi, oggi fanno pressione anche su cittadini che certo sono nel benessere, ma che non possono assolutamente definirsi ricchi; opereremo quindi in questa direzione convinti, come siamo, che aliquote più giuste siano un incentivo al lavoro, all’investimento, al rischio d’impresa, e siano soprattutto un grande disincentivo all’evasione.

Si dovrà mettere mano alla riorganizzazione della nostra burocrazia e della nostra amministrazione; questa mattina abbiamo ricordato come molto spesso la corruzione sia figlia di un’amministrazione mal retribuita, senza motivazione, pletorica, confusa, caotica, inefficiente; un’amministrazione che troppo spesso si
dimentica che non sono i cittadini al servizio dello Stato, ma che è lo Stato al servizio dei cittadini.

Dovremo mettere mano–e che mano!– ai servizi principali, quali la sanità, gli ospedali, la scuola, la previdenza; il nostro programma indicherà con precisione le misure da adottare, ma certo ci sarà da fare un gran lavoro; il concetto fondamentale è quello di lasciare allo Stato tutto ciò che non e può essere attribuito alla intrapresa dei privati e di dare invece ai privati tutto ciò che, in un regime di competizione e di concorrenza, possa costare meno e possa essere migliorato come qualità.

Il concetto ispiratore deve essere quello di dare la possibilità a ogni cittadino di scegliere in quale scuola istruirsi, in quale clinica o ospedale curarsi, con quale istituto assicurarsi. Con questo naturalmente, facendo un’opera ancora migliore di sostegno nei confronti delle categorie più deboli a cui potranno essere assegnati degli aiuti precisi, come il buono scuola e il buono salute, che possano consentire a ciascuno di scegliere la scuola che vorrà, di scegliere l’assicurazione che vorrà, di scegliere anche l’assicurazione sanitaria che vorrà, fi non essere più un cittadino a metà. I cittadino dimezzato che deve attendere mesi per fare dei semplici esami clini, che deve fare code per qualunque servizio che chiede allo Stato, che molto spesso dagli uomini dello Stato riceve risposte infastidite, quando non addirittura incivili e arroganti.

Dovremo mettere mano anche a questa grande e complessa congerie di leggi, di leggine, di regolamenti, di decreti, di interpretazione che hanno avviluppato in una morsa terribile la vita nostra di tutti i giorni e la vita di chi si impegna per produrre. Credo che da tutte queste leggi noi dovremo trarre per ogni materia dei testi unici, chiari, semplici, comprensibili, sino ad arrivare alla formazione di nuovi codici, di testi unici, soprattutto per certe materie e in primo luogo per la materia fiscale. Questi saranno per la prima volta programmi che deriveranno dall’esperienza di tutti, dall’esperienza di chi ha lavorato nei vari settori, saranno per la prima volta programmi che tutti potranno conoscere, che tutti potranno migliorare, che tutti potranno giudicare.
Le forze politiche a cui ci rivolgiamo per realizzare questi programmi

Ed è proprio con questi programmi che noi ci rivolgeremo alle altre forze politiche dell'area liberaldemocratica, per chiedere il loro consenso e la loro collaborazione– senza veto alcuno, senza ingiuramenti–, la loro collaborazione sui punti di questi programmi, oltre naturalmente al consenso sui principi e sui valori che li ispirano, per avere con loro una collaborazione leale e fattiva.

Abbiamo già discusso di questi programmi con i protagonisti del Centro Cristiano Democratico e con quelli dell'Unione di Centro e abbiamo ricevuto la loro convinta adesione; ne discuteremo questa settimana con i rappresentati della Lega con cui speriamo di poter collaborare riconoscendo il ruolo importante che la Lega ha avuto nella recente storia del nostro Paese, e riconoscendo l’impulso che oggi manifesta per passare dalla protesta alla costruzione.

Ma non chiuderemo la porta a chi ha dichiarato ad alta voce la propria fede nei nostri stessi principi, ha presentato documenti ineccepibili sotto il profilo politico ed economico, documenti di vero liberalismo e di convinto liberismo, a chi non si presenta come portatore di idee xenofobe, di idee razziste, ma come qualcuno che considera inequivocabilmente finita e superata una certa fase storica. Qualcuno che vuole lasciare, sepolto nel passato, un periodo che non può avere più ritorno. Cercheremo questa collaborazione così come la stragrande maggioranza degli italiani vuole, perché questo nuovo sistema elettorale, il sistema elettorale maggioritario, è stato voluto attraverso un voto dall’80 per cento degli italiani, e fa specie, fa stupore che chi ha contribuito a questa legge, oggi tradisca lo spirito di questa legge, la volontà di questa legge, che indica strada precisa: quella della chiarezza. Nel Paese ci deve essere una parte che governa e una che sta all’opposizione e per arrivare a questo occorre aggiungere voto a voto, occorre sommare consenso a consenso, così come una squadra, quella della sinistra, ha già fatto e così come deve fare la squadra liberaldemocratica se non vuole consegnarsi alla sconfitta.

Un nuovo miracolo italiano
Con la fiducia in questi valori, con questa idea chiara sull'Italia che vogliamo, con questi uomini, con questi programmi, noi cercheremo di far fare all'Italia un altro miracolo. Dopo un periodo assai peggiore del presente, dopo la guerra, l'Italia ha saputo stupire il mondo con quello che si chiamò allora il “miracolo italiano”. Bene, io dico che anche oggi noi possiamo far fare un salto in avanti al nostro Paese e alla nostra economia e costruire davvero un periodo nuovo di sviluppo e di benessere.

Credo che tutti insieme dobbiamo accingersci a questa grande impresa, a questa grande, ineluttabile avventura, credendoci, credendoci fino in fondo, avendo fiducia, avendo fede nella nostra capacità di conseguire un grande risultato.

E ora vi invito a cantare tutti insieme.

Non ci dobbiamo vergognare di cantare, di restare giovani, la giovinezza non è un dato anagrafico, è uno stato dell’anima, è una condizione dello spirito, e quindi facciamolo di buon grado, di alzarcì, di unirci, e cantare insieme il nostro inno che ha parole semplici ma vere, il nostro inno che dice “Forza Italia, è tempo di credere…”, è tempo di osare, è tempo di accendere dentro il nostro cuore un grande fuoco, quello della passione per la libertà.

Con una grande passione noi potremo raggiungere i traguardi più ambiziosi, potremo costruire un’Italia più giusta, un’Italia più generosa e sollecita verso chi soffre e chi ha bisogno, un’Italia più moderna ed efficiente, un’Italia più prospera e serena, un’Italia più ordinata e sicura, un’Italia che sappia imporsi all’ammirazione degli altri, non soltanto per il suo grande passato ma per un suo nuovo, magico presente.

Quindi “Forza Italia”, “Forza Italia” come dicono le parole della nostra canzone, Forza Italia per fare, Forza Italia per crescere, Forza Italia per essere liberi, Forza Italia per costruire, tutti insieme, un grande, un nuovo, uno straordinario miracolo italiano!
TRANSLATION

February 6, 1994

How can you not be moved at this time...It is a solemn moment, an intense moment... Perhaps our country really needs the light of hope and trust. While I was coming here, I thought I was a crazy person about to meet up with other crazy people... I do not think so, I do not think so... I believe that in this Italy we will remain, but we decided to stay there as free men!

Well, thinking about the madness that seems to have infected all of us, and many others along with us, I thought that it had occurred once again what I wrote in the preface of a beautiful book, “In Praise of Folly” by Erasmus of Rotterdam. The preface said: "It is true the idea that comes out of these pages: the most important decisions, the wisest decisions, the right decisions, the true wisdom is not that which comes from the reasoning, it is not that which comes from the brain, but it is the one that springs from a forward-looking, visionary madness."

I believe that this decision we, all of us, have taken looking at the dangers that were looming-you remembered them here this morning- but the reason might have invited us to continue to worry about us, our family, our companies, our job, our professions. We decided instead to give a different answer, because we heard that a danger was looming: a new electoral law, the politicians unable to agree, the possibility that our country was ruled by a minority, a minority that we know well would inflict an illiberal and stifling future. We heard it from out of the country, from all over the country, from the North, from the South, from the people of all classes, of all ages, a question, a wish, a desire for change, not just a change of men, but also a change in the world of politics. Enough with the bickering of politics, of words, of talk, of vetoes, of old grudges, the negotiations under the table: we have heard the desire for a different policy, for clean politics. We heard climb on all sides the desire for a new political entity, we heard it coming from the country the demand for concrete answers to the concrete problems of the country.
This is why today we are here, with the desire to start here a long journey, a journey, I repeat, of hope and confidence in our future. You are here, then, you who created all over the country this large number of clubs that have brought us closer to the Italians polis, to the things that concern us all, you who have decided to abandon your interests and put your interests after the 'general interest of the country. And so have I, I've heard that kind of responsibility that could not be overcome and I said, perhaps exaggerating, that I felt in the condition of those who, having to go on a nice trip, for a nice vacation, suddenly found himself in front of someone in need of help, so despite the holiday, the journey, it would have not been possible to turn his head away, because this has a specific name: wrongful death. That's why-because we all feel responsibility calling us to abandon our selfishness to do what we can for our country-that we are here, we have responded to this sort of call to weapons!

So we are obliged-since we are here and willing to continue to take an interest for the administration of this country-to state clearly the principles and the values that inspire us; we are obliged to say what is our model of society, and what Italy do we want; we are obliged to say what we think should be done to change our country.

The principles in which we believe are not abstruse principles, ideologies are not complicated; no, they are the core values of all the great Western democracies. We believe in freedom, in all its forms, multiple and vital; freedom of thought and opinion, freedom of expression, freedom of worship of all religions, freedom of association; we believe in freedom of press, in a free market, regulated by certain rules, clear and equal for all.

But freedom is not graciously "granted" by the state, because it is anterior to it, it comes before the state. And the state must recognize and defend it in all its forms-just to be a legitimate state, free and democratic and not an arbitrary tyrant.

We believe that the state should be at the service of citizens, and not citizens at the service of the state. We believe that the state should be the servant of the citizen and not the citizen the servant of the state. The citizen must be sovereign.
For this, actually, we believe in the individual and we believe that everyone should have the right to fulfill himself, to aspire to the welfare and happiness, to build with their own hands their own future, to be able to educate their children freely. This is why we believe in the family, the basic unit of our society. And we also believe in the labor, which is entrusted with the great social value of job creation, welfare and wealth. We believe in the values of our national culture that the whole world admires and envies. We believe in the values of our Christian tradition, in the inalienable values of life, the common good, in the fundamental value of freedom of education and learning, peace, solidarity, justice, tolerance, towards all, starting with the opponents. And above all we believe in respect and love towards those who are weaker, above all the sick, children, the elderly, the marginalized. We want to live in a modern country where values are felt and shared generosity, altruism, dedication, passion for the job, and at the same time by-liberals believe in the positive effects for all of the competition, the competition and progress that may not be there if there is no freedom. Inspired by these values, we want to make our contribution to our country, we want our country to be better, to be different from that of the recent past and also from this, the country of this confusing present. We want an Italy of women and free men, who do not know fear, who do not know the social envy and class hatred, and that together they can build a different future. We want an Italy so different, united in an indissoluble unity, which does not even tolerate that this unity is called into question because this feeling of unity belongs to our culture, to our conscience, to our history, to our memories, because all this belongs to ourselves! We want an Italy that has nothing less than the Italy that we know, but also has something more-indeed, many things more. First of all, we want an Italy with less unemployment and more work; to those who have no work, the unemployed, those who are laid off, to those who are in companies that are not good and therefore look with concern for their future, we,
we will succeed if we have set ourselves, we today we can ensure that these concerns will end, we can ensure that we know how to revive Italy's economy. There is no one in Italy who can make that promise, that can make this claim with more credibility and with more authority of whom is doing it right now!

We want an Italy [by the public: we have already won, Silvio] ... May God hear you, and, now that you mentioned it may all the Saints also listen to you, including our patron saint.

We do want Italy to consider with more respect and more love the weak and elderly. The prosperity we enjoy is also due to their sacrifices, the love for the work that they have practiced for a lifetime. Continuing as now, our economic system could not guarantee the integrity of the board to these deserving. Instead, after a lifetime of work, they are fully entitled to a season of serenity and certainty.

But the country will need more than that to improve: we also want an Italy tidier and safer, an Italy that knows how to fight with determination and effectiveness against common crime and organized crime. In our country, 96 percent of burglaries and 74 percent of the murders go unpunished! This means that the state does not fulfill one of the cornerstones duties: to ensure the safety of citizens, their physical and patrimonial integrity.

We also want an Italy that knows how to fight drugs, and provides to those who fell victim of them every possible help so that they can reintegrate into the family, society and work.

We do, of course, want an Italy with less corruption, we also want an Italy more attentive to the health of citizens, to defend them from pollution, which takes more attention to nature, the environment, in all the works of art that our predecessors gave us and that we have a duty to deliver to those who come after us, at least in the same condition in which we have received them.

We want an Italy with lower taxes and less bureaucracy, an Italy that gives more space to those who assume the business risk, who takes on the task of producing jobs and prosperity: we want an Italy, in short, that gives more space to private and less to the State: an Italy with more private and less state.
What has happened in recent years that today you can be so concerned in looking at our present and our future? What happened is that the state, instead of dealing with its fundamental duties, wanted to expand, wanted to extend its presence in the private sectors, including in the areas of the economy. If today we enjoy a welfare state, this is due to the fact that millions and millions of Italians continue to do their duty every day, every morning coming out of their houses, going in schools, factories, offices, and it is to them that we owe our well-being and also the freedom that has so far been witnessed. We owe it to the hard work of our workers, our farmers, the ingenuity of our entrepreneurs—especially those who built and who run very small businesses, small and medium-to the genius and talent of our artisans, our artists, our traders, of all those who take upon themselves the risk of a self-employment. And they have been able to do so despite the political-bureaucratic machine which is "perfect" to prohibit and to create difficulties for those who work.

What happened? What happened is that gradually the fees are increased because public expenditure has increased; it happened that in recent years public spending increased from 43 percent of the national product, of everything that we produce, to nearly 58 percent in 1992, an increase of thirteen percentage points; it happened that in the last three years for every one million more that we were able to produce income, the public sector has taken seven hundred and fifty thousand pounds and only two hundred fifty thousand pounds remained in the availability of individuals, families and businesses. As well as 60 percent of household savings has been absorbed by the state to cover its deficits. These data lead us to believe that we cannot contain this increase in public spending, this resulting in increase of taxes that challenges the existing jobs, and that does not give the possibility to create new ones. I think that the mechanism will be clear: everything that goes in the direction of public spending is subtracted from investment in private companies: 90 percent of the savings of Italian families is now delivered to the State through the public debt, only 10 percent is targeted to businesses to enable enterprises to produce and expand.
This is a situation that really cannot last. We complain of the heavy interest, but I think anyone can realize this is a phenomenon caused by the greed of our state, that to continue to expand the spending they aimed at family’s savings, offering them a full guarantee regarding the return of capital. It offers to their interests which are numerous higher inflation points: savings there turns. The same offer cannot be sustained by the companies so that they operate without those means that are needed to finance their development.

Therefore, my judgment is that we can no longer accept this Italy so politicized, nationalized, corrupt, this regulated Italy: how many laws, regulations, circulars that make it difficult, if not impossible, the activities of those who work? We can no longer accept, in short, this Italy who was and is so badly governed and administered.

Then what should you do? I believe that we should prepare the care, they need to prepare the programs that say exactly what should be done to solve every problem. I think we should also lead the country away from those who until now have managed and administered. I believe that never before has Italy need men with a head on his shoulders, and when I say men I mean, of course, women and men. Men who can not only make speeches, do well in the round tables or on television, hold rallies, meet the characters, but rather men that know how to operate; men who can say good and clear what they want to do, but mostly men whom would turn their words into action and have the results of their work to testify this capacity. Men who come from the trenches of life and work, men of hope, trust, optimism, animated by a great desire to do!

Then it takes a program, as we said, a simple, clear, precise program, that can immediately give confidence to the country, to take away the fears that are now read as popular, because it is trust, above all, the first thing you need to share. We need confidence. They must have confidence to convince families to save money without fear, they have to trust companies to determine to risk, to invest, to develop. We have prepared this program and I am not wrong if I say that never no political force in Italy has never presented such a comprehensive program, so articulate, so detailed, a more than forty points program that we have worked with
the experts which are the best of each sector, a program that is now ready and we will deliver to our candidates so that each of them can make its contribution in the specific competence. A program that will then become final following this work, and that we will present to all Italians voters in the month preceding the date of the election date. This program will have a few key points: the first will be to boost the development, which is one side of the coin.

I have already made a proposal that has caused such a stir and that showed how the men of the Left, who claim today that are Liberal Democrats, are still anchored to the interventionism and statist of all time: the plan to introduce a cap on the tax levy by the State. Over the past twelve years the levy to be part of the product state was increased by thirteen points: I do not think it is unreasonable to think that an equally long period can decrease it by one point per year. I think it is a goal that you can reach and even exceed in the facts; This would begin to administer the state as you administer family and business. In no family and no business, the good father, the good entrepreneur spends without being sure what will cash, how much money to be made. I believe that the state should do the same. I think the commitment on the ceiling of the tax-levy, as a general principle, must not be such as to prevent the financing of economic development. It should be added to the respect the true in the article of the Constitution which says that any expenditure must have its own specific funding. Here, I believe that this is an absolute impregnated necessity, that we, if we have the responsibility of government, we must assume, and assume, in respect of the whole country.

I think then of course we will have to boost the development, we will have to give love to the creation of new jobs and retaining existing ones because, if we want to boost the economy, it is urgent to act decisively. It must take action by changing the taxation imposed on businesses. In a country that needs to expand we need to encourage investment and thus propose not to subject to any tax the business profits that entrepreneurs will commit to use to develop their businesses and create new jobs.

In a country in which work is a problem, it was and is taxed fiercely: we propose a de-taxation of labor, especially to young people, a tax exemption for the job offered
to those who are unemployed and those who are in “Cassa di Integrazione”, and a labor tax relief to those areas suffering from high levels of unemployment.

These are measures that other states already have successfully adopted for a specified period. We propose to introduce apprenticeship and training contracts to act as mediator between the time of training and the time the work actually starts.

Then, of course, we will have to reorganize the tax administration imbued with the principles that we believe cannot be challenged; with the abolition of this extraordinary number of taxes, bringing them back from the hundred-odd to a decent number, principally those producing more than 90 percent of state revenues: say ten, fifteen major taxes, so we can concentrate the efforts of the men of the tax on large and main taxes, so we can concentrate on the fight against tax evasion.

Also we propose the reduction of tax rates because those of today, introduced long ago to hit the wealthiest citizens, today it puts pressure on citizens who are certainly in a good economic situation, but that cannot possibly be called rich; then we will work in this direction convinced, as we are, that fairer rates are an incentive to work, to invest, to business risk, and are especially a big disincentive for evasion.

We will have to put a firm hand to the reorganization of our bureaucracy and our administration; this morning we remembered that very often corruption is the daughter of an administration poorly paid, without motivation, bloated, confused, chaotic, inefficient; an administration that too often forgets that the citizens are not at the service of the state, but that is the state at the service of citizens.

We must be tough, and how tough! - To the main services, such as health, hospitals, schools, social security; our program will indicate the precise steps to take, but certainly there will exist to do a great job; The basic idea is to let the state do all that cannot be attributed to private enterprise and instead give to individuals all that, in a system of competition, it costs less and can be improved in quality.

The underlying concept must be to give the opportunity to every citizen to choose where to go to school, in which clinic or hospital to take care, with what institution they want to get insurance. With this, we will support vulnerable groups who may be assigned to the specific aid, like the good school and good health, it will allow
to choose the school they want, to choose insurance you want, to also choose the health insurance that will, so you will no longer be a citizen in half. To those citizens that must wait months to do simple clinic exams, that have to do queues for any service that involves the State, which very often receive from those that work for the State annoyed answers, or even uncivilized and arrogant. We will also have to put a firm hand to this great and complex patchwork of laws, sneaky regulations, decrees, and interpretations that have enmeshed in a terrible vise of our everyday lives and the lives of those who work to produce. I believe that we will have to take these laws by subject to form a consolidation of a clear, simple, understandable formation of new codes, unique texts, especially for certain subjects and primarily for tax matters. These will be for the first time programs which will be derived from the experience of all, from the experience of whom have worked in various fields, and will be, for the first time, programs that everybody will know, for everyone to improve, that everybody will judge. And it is with these programs that we will turn to other AER liberal political forces, to ask their consent and their cooperation-without any veto, without pretense-, their collaboration on the points of these programs, in addition to the consent on the principles and values that inspire them, to have with them a sincere and cooperation. We have already discussed these programs with the protagonists of the Christian Democratic Centre and with those of Union Center and we received their steadfast commitment; we will discuss this week with representatives of the League with which we hope to work together recognizing the important role that the League has had in the recent history of our country, and recognizing the impulse that manifests itself today to move from protest to construction. But we will not close the door to those who loudly declared their faith in our own principles, whom presented documents faulted both politically and economically, of true liberalism documents and convinced liberals, who does not present itself as a carrier of xenophobic ideas, racist ideas, but as someone who considers
unequivocally over and above a certain historical period. Someone who wants to leave, buried in the past, a period that cannot be returned.
We'll try this cooperation as well as the vast majority of Italians want, because this new electoral system has been wanted by a vote of 80 percent of Italians. Does that surprise those who have contributed to this Law that today it can betray the spirit of this law, the will of this law, indicating precise path: that of clarity. In the country there must be a party that governs and one that is in opposition, to get this you need to add votes to vote, you have to add a consent agreement, as well as a team, like that of the left that has already done so as a must the liberal team has to do as well if it does not want to surrender defeat.
With confidence in these values, with this clear idea about the Italy we want, with these people, with these programs, we will seek to make Italy another miracle. After a much worse period of this, after the war, Italy was able to astonish the world with what was called then the "Italian miracle".
Well, I say that even today we can take a leap forward in our country and our economy and really build a new period of development and prosperity.
I believe that together we must attempt this great undertaking, this great, inescapable adventure, believing, believe in it, trusting, having faith in our ability to achieve a great result.
And now I invite you to sing along.

We must not be ashamed of creels, to stay young, youth is not a piece of personal data, is a state, is a condition of the spirit, and then let's do it willingly, to get up, to unite, and to sing together our hymn that has simple but true words, our anthem that says "Forza Italy, it's time to believe ...", it is time to dare, it's time to light within our heart a great fire, the passion for freedom.
With a passion we can achieve more ambitious goals, we can build a more just Italy, an Italy more generous and caring towards those who suffer and those in need, an Italy more modern and efficient, an Italy more prosperous and peaceful, an Italy more orderly and safe, an Italy that knows how to impose itself to the admiration of others, not only for its great past but for its new, magical present.
So "Forza Italy", "Forza Italy" as they say the words of our song, Forza Italy to do, Forza Italy to grow, Forza Italy to be free, Forza Italy to build, together, a great, new, an extraordinary Italian miracle!

(III) Donald Trump’s Announcement Speech

June 16, 2015
Source: Time Magazine

Wow. Whoa. That is some group of people. Thousands. So nice, thank you very much. That's really nice. Thank you. It's great to be at Trump Tower. It's great to be in a wonderful city, New York. And it's an honor to have everybody here. This is beyond anybody's expectations. There's been no crowd like this. And, I can tell, some of the candidates, they went in. They didn't know the air-conditioner didn't work. They sweated like dogs. They didn't know the room was too big, because they didn't have anybody there. How are they going to beat ISIS? I don't think it's gonna happen. Our country is in serious trouble. We don't have victories anymore. We used to have victories, but we don't have them. When was the last time anybody saw us beating, let's say, China in a trade deal? They kill us. I beat China all the time. All the time. When did we beat Japan at anything? They send their cars over by the millions, and what do we do? When was the last time you saw a Chevrolet in Tokyo? It doesn't exist, folks. They beat us all the time. When do we beat Mexico at the border? They're laughing at us, at our stupidity. And now they are beating us economically. They are not our friend, believe me. But they're killing us economically. The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems. Thank you. It's true, and these are the best and the finest. When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not
sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last week, I read 2,300 Humvees—these are big vehicles—were left behind for the enemy. 2,000? You would say maybe two, maybe four? 2,300 sophisticated vehicles, they ran, and the enemy took them.
Last quarter, it was just announced our gross domestic product— a sign of strength, right? But not for us. It was below zero. Whoever heard of this? It's never below zero.

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

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

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

But the real number, the real number is anywhere from 18 to 19 and maybe even 21 percent, and nobody talks about it, because it's a statistic that's full of nonsense. Our enemies are getting stronger and stronger by the way, and we as a country are getting weaker. Even our nuclear arsenal doesn't work.

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

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

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

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

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

Well, you need somebody, because politicians are all talk, no action. Nothing's gonna get done. They will not bring us— believe me— to the promised land. They will not.
As an example, I've been on the circuit making speeches, and I hear my fellow Republicans. And they're wonderful people. I like them. They all want me to support them. They don't know how to bring it about. They come up to my office. I'm meeting with three of them in the next week. And they don't know— "Are you running? Are you not running? Could we have your support? What do we do? How do we do it?".

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And we also need a cheerleader.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Take a look at the deal he's making with Iran. He makes that deal, Israel maybe won't exist very long. It's a disaster, and we have to protect Israel. But...
So we need people— I'm a free trader. But the problem with free trade is you need really talented people to negotiate for you. If you don't have talented people, if you don't have great leadership, if you don't have people that know business, not just a political hack that got the job because he made a contribution to a campaign, which is the way all jobs, just about, are gotten, free trade terrible. Free trade can be wonderful if you have smart people, but we have people that are stupid. We have people that aren't smart. And we have people that are controlled by special interests. And it's just not going to work.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I said, "They send it back?"

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

Now, they do charge you tariff on trucks, when we send trucks and other things over there.
Ask Boeing. They wanted Boeing's secrets. They wanted their patents and all their secrets before they agreed to buy planes from Boeing.

Hey, I'm not saying they're stupid. I like China. I sell apartments for—I just sold an apartment for $15 million to somebody from China. Am I supposed to dislike them?

I own a big chunk of the Bank of America Building at 1290 Avenue of the Americas, that I got from China in a war. Very valuable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So I would say, "Congratulations. That's the good news. Let me give you the bad news. Every car and every truck and every part manufactured in this plant that comes across the border, we're going to charge you a 35-percent tax, and that tax is going to be paid simultaneously with the transaction, and that's it.

Now, here's what is going to happen. If it's not me in the position, it's one of these politicians that we're running against, you know, the 400 people that we're
(inaudible). And here's what's going to happen. They're not so stupid. They know it's not a good thing, and they may even be upset by it. But then they're going to get a call from the donors or probably from the lobbyist for Ford and say, "You can't do that to Ford, because Ford takes care of me and I take care of you, and you can't do that to Ford."
And guess what? No problem. They're going to build in Mexico. They're going to take away thousands of jobs. It's very bad for us.
So under President Trump, here's what would happen:
The head of Ford will call me back, I would say within an hour after I told them the bad news. But it could be he'd want to be cool, and he'll wait until the next day. You know, they want to be a little cool.
And he'll say, "Please, please, please." He'll beg for a little while, and I'll say, "No interest." Then he'll call all sorts of political people, and I'll say, "Sorry, fellas. No interest," because I don't need anybody's money. It's nice. I don't need anybody's money.
I'm using my own money. I'm not using the lobbyists. I'm not using donors. I don't care. I'm really rich. I (inaudible).
And by the way, I'm not even saying that's the kind of mindset, that's the kind of thinking you need for this country.
So— because we got to make the country rich.
It sounds crass. Somebody said, "Oh, that's crass." It's not crass.
We got $18 trillion in debt. We got nothing but problems.
We got a military that needs equipment all over the place. We got nuclear weapons that are obsolete.
We've got nothing. We've got Social Security that's going to be destroyed if somebody like me doesn't bring money into the country. All these other people want to cut the hell out of it. I'm not going to cut it at all; I'm going to bring money in, and we're going to save it.
But here's what's going to happen:
After I'm called by 30 friends of mine who contributed to different campaigns, after I'm called by all of the special interests and by the— the donors and by the
lobbyists—and they have zero chance at convincing me, zero—I'll get a call the next day from the head of Ford. He'll say, "Please reconsider," I'll say no. He'll say, "Mr. President, we've decided to move the plant back to the United States, and we're not going to build it in Mexico." That's it. They have no choice. They have no choice.

There are hundreds of things like that. I'll give you another example. Saudi Arabia, they make $1 billion a day. $1 billion a day. I love the Saudis. Many are in this building. They make a billion dollars a day. Whenever they have problems, we send over the ships. We say "we're gonna protect." What are we doing? They've got nothing but money.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Then I looked at Rubio. He was unable to answer the question, is Iraq a good thing or bad thing? He didn't know. He couldn't answer the question.
How are these people gonna lead us? How are we gonna go back and make it great again? We can't. They don't have a clue. They can't lead us. They can't. They can't even answer simple questions. It was terrible.

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

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

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

Somebody said -- thank you, darlin'.

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

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

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

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

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

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

But, I said, "This is going to be an election that's based on competence, because people are tired of these nice people. And they're tired of being ripped off by everybody in the world. And they're tired of spending more money on education than any nation in the world per capita, than any nation in the world, and we are
26th in the world, 25 countries are better than us in education. And some of them are like third world countries. But we're becoming a third world country, because of our infrastructure, our airports, our roads, everything. So one of the things I did, and I said, you know what I'll do. I'll do it. Because a lot of people said, "He'll never run. Number one, he won't want to give up his lifestyle."
They're right about that, but I'm doing it.
Number two, I'm a private company, so nobody knows what I'm worth. And the one thing is that when you run, you have to announce and certify to all sorts of governmental authorities your net worth.
So I said, "That's OK." I'm proud of my net worth. I've done an amazing job.
I started off— thank you— I started off in a small office with my father in Brooklyn and Queens, and my father said -- and I love my father. I learned so much. He was a great negotiator. I learned so much just sitting at his feet playing with blocks listening to him negotiate with subcontractors. But I learned a lot.
But he used to say, "Donald, don't go into Manhattan. That's the big leagues. We don't know anything about that. Don't do it."
I said, "I gotta go into Manhattan. I gotta build those big buildings. I gotta do it, Dad. I've gotta do it."
And after four or five years in Brooklyn, I ventured into Manhattan and did a lot of great deals— the Grand Hyatt Hotel. I was responsible for the convention center on the west side. I did a lot of great deals, and I did them early and young. And now I'm building all over the world, and I love what I'm doing.
But they all said, a lot of the pundits on television, "Well, Donald will never run, and one of the main reasons is he's private and he's probably not as successful as everybody thinks."
So I said to myself, you know, nobody's ever going to know unless I run, because I'm really proud of my success. I really am.
I've employed— I've employed tens of thousands of people over my lifetime. That means medical. That means education. That means everything.
So a large accounting firm and my accountants have been working for months, because it's big and complex, and they've put together a statement, a financial
statement, just a summary. But everything will be filed eventually with the
government, and we don't [use] extensions or anything. We'll be filing it right on
time. We don't need anything.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now I'm not doing that...

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

I'm doing that to say that that's the kind of thinking our country needs. We need
that thinking. We have the opposite thinking.
We have losers. We have losers. We have people that don't have it. We have people that are morally corrupt. We have people that are selling this country down the drain.

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

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

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

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

Mark my words.

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

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

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

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

Fully support and back up the Second Amendment.
Now, it's very interesting. Today I heard it. Through stupidity, in a very, very hard core prison, interestingly named Clinton, two vicious murderers, two vicious people escaped, and nobody knows where they are. And a woman was on television this morning, and she said, "You know, Mr. Trump," and she was telling other people, and I actually called her, and she said, "You know, Mr. Trump, I always was against guns. I didn't want guns. And now since this happened"— it's up in the prison area— "my husband and I are finally in agreement, because he wanted the guns. We now have a gun on every table. We're ready to start shooting." I said, "Very interesting."
So protect the Second Amendment.
End— end Common Core. Common Core should— it is a disaster. Bush is totally in favor of Common Core. I don't see how he can possibly get the nomination. He's weak on immigration. He's in favor of Common Core. How the hell can you vote for this guy? You just can't do it. We have to end education has to be local. Rebuild the country's infrastructure.
Nobody can do that like me. Believe me. It will be done on time, on budget, way below cost, way below what anyone ever thought.
I look at the roads being built all over the country, and I say I can build those things for one-third. What they do is unbelievable, how bad.
You know, we're building on Pennsylvania Avenue, the Old Post Office, we're converting it into one of the world's great hotels. It's gonna be the best hotel in Washington, D.C. We got it from the General Services Administration in Washington. The Obama administration. We got it. It was the most highly sought after— or one of them, but I think the most highly sought after project in the history of General Services. We got it. People were shocked, Trump got it.
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.
So we have to rebuild our infrastructure, our bridges, our roadways, our airports. You come into La Guardia Airport, it's like we're in a third world country. You look at the patches and the 40-year-old floor. They throw down asphalt, and they throw. You look at these airports, we are like a third world country. And I come in from China and I come in from Qatar and I come in from different places, and they have the most incredible airports in the world. You come to back to this country and you have LAX, disaster. You have all of these disastrous airports. We have to rebuild our infrastructure.

Save Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security without cuts. Have to do it. Get rid of the fraud. Get rid of the waste and abuse, but save it. People have been paying it for years. And now many of these candidates want to cut it. You save it by making the United States, by making us rich again, by taking back all of the money that's being lost.

Renegotiate our foreign trade deals.

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

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

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

Sadly, the American dream is dead.

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

Thank you. Thank you very much.
(IV) Donald Trump’s Inauguration Speech

January 20, 2017
Source: The White House

Chief Justice Roberts, President Carter, President Clinton, President Bush, President Obama, fellow Americans, and people of the world: thank you.
We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country and to restore its promise for all of our people.
Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for years to come. We will face challenges. We will confront hardships. But we will get the job done. Every four years, we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power, and we are grateful to President Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama for their gracious aid throughout this transition. They have been magnificent.
Today’s ceremony, however, has very special meaning. Because today we are not merely transferring power from one Administration to another, or from one party to another – but we are transferring power from Washington, D.C. and giving it back to you, the American People.
For too long, a small group in our nation’s Capital has reaped the rewards of government while the people have borne the cost.
Washington flourished – but the people did not share in its wealth.
Politicians prospered – but the jobs left, and the factories closed.
The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country.
Their victories have not been your victories; their triumphs have not been your triumphs; and while they celebrated in our nation’s Capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land.
That all changes – starting right here, and right now, because this moment is your moment: it belongs to you.
It belongs to everyone gathered here today and everyone watching all across America.
This is your day. This is your celebration.
And this, the United States of America, is your country.
What truly matters is not which party controls our government, but whether our government is controlled by the people.
January 20th 2017, will be remembered as the day the people became the rulers of this nation again.
The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer.
Everyone is listening to you now.
You came by the tens of millions to become part of a historic movement the likes of which the world has never seen before.
At the center of this movement is a crucial conviction: that a nation exists to serve its citizens.
Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves.
These are the just and reasonable demands of a righteous public.
But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities; rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation; an education system, flush with cash, but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of knowledge; and the crime and gangs and drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential.
This American carnage stops right here and stops right now.
We are one nation – and their pain is our pain. Their dreams are our dreams; and their success will be our success. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny.
The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans.
For many decades, we’ve enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry;
Subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military;
We’ve defended other nation’s borders while refusing to defend our own;
And spent trillions of dollars overseas while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay.
We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country has disappeared over the horizon.
One by one, the factories shuttered and left our shores, with not even a thought about the millions upon millions of American workers left behind.
The wealth of our middle class has been ripped from their homes and then redistributed across the entire world.
But that is the past. And now we are looking only to the future.
We assembled here today are issuing a new decree to be heard in every city, in every foreign capital, and in every hall of power.
From this day forward, a new vision will govern our land.
From this moment on, it's going to be America First.
Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families.
We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength.
I will fight for you with every breath in my body – and I will never, ever let you down.
America will start winning again, winning like never before.
We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth. And we will bring back our dreams.
We will build new roads, and highways, and bridges, and airports, and tunnels, and railways all across our wonderful nation.
We will get our people off of welfare and back to work – rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor.
We will follow two simple rules: Buy American and Hire American.
We will seek friendship and goodwill with the nations of the world – but we do so with the understanding that it is the right of all nations to put their own interests first.
We do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone, but rather to let it shine as an example for everyone to follow.
We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones – and unite the civilized world against Radical Islamic Terrorism, which we will eradicate completely from the face of the Earth.
At the bedrock of our politics will be a total allegiance to the United States of America, and through our loyalty to our country, we will rediscover our loyalty to each other.
When you open your heart to patriotism, there is no room for prejudice.
The Bible tells us, “how good and pleasant it is when God's people live together in unity.”
We must speak our minds openly, debate our disagreements honestly, but always pursue solidarity.
When America is united, America is totally unstoppable.
There should be no fear – we are protected, and we will always be protected.
We will be protected by the great men and women of our military and law enforcement and, most importantly, we are protected by God.
Finally, we must think big and dream even bigger.
In America, we understand that a nation is only living as long as it is striving.
We will no longer accept politicians who are all talk and no action – constantly complaining but never doing anything about it.
The time for empty talk is over.
Now arrives the hour of action.
Do not let anyone tell you it cannot be done. No challenge can match the heart and fight and spirit of America.
We will not fail. Our country will thrive and prosper again.
We stand at the birth of a new millennium, ready to unlock the mysteries of space, to free the Earth from the miseries of disease, and to harness the energies, industries and technologies of tomorrow.
A new national pride will stir our souls, lift our sights, and heal our divisions.
It is time to remember that old wisdom our soldiers will never forget: that whether we are black or brown or white, we all bleed the same red blood of patriots, we all enjoy the same glorious freedoms, and we all salute the same great American Flag.

And whether a child is born in the urban sprawl of Detroit or the windswept plains of Nebraska, they look up at the same night sky, they fill their heart with the same dreams, and they are infused with the breath of life by the same almighty Creator. So to all Americans, in every city near and far, small and large, from mountain to mountain, and from ocean to ocean, hear these words:

You will never be ignored again.

Your voice, your hopes, and your dreams, will define our American destiny. And your courage and goodness and love will forever guide us along the way.

Together, We Will Make America Strong Again.

We Will Make America Wealthy Again.

We Will Make America Proud Again.

We Will Make America Safe Again.

And, Yes, Together, We Will Make America Great Again. Thank you, God Bless You, And God Bless America.
## Appendix B. Paragraph Analyses by Reisigl

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Italy’s Prime Ministerial Candidate, Silvio Berlusconi’s announcement speech</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text</strong></td>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy is the country that I love. Here I have my roots, my hopes, my horizons. Here I learned from my father and from life, my profession as an entrepreneur. Here I learned the passion for freedom.</td>
<td>Silvio Berlusconi starts his speech stating how Italian he and his roots are.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I chose to take the field and to take care of public affairs because I do not want to live in an illiberal country, governed by immature forces and by men intertwined in a politically and economically bankrupt past.</td>
<td>He is going against the bad government that currently holds the reins of the country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to fulfill this new way of life, today I resign from all social charge from the group I founded. So I give up my role as a publisher and entrepreneur to put my experience and all my effort available to a battle in which I believe with absolute conviction with the greatest firmness.</td>
<td>Berlusconi’s effort is what Italy needs, which is why he is deciding to forgo his private life to make it public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I know what I don’t want, together with the many Italians who have given me their trust in all this years, and I know what I want. And I have a reasonable hope of success to make it happen, in sincere and loyal alliance with all liberal and democratic forces who feel a civic duty to offer the country a credible alternative to the government of the Left and the Communists.

He has the trust of the Italians. He knows what they want and what they don’t. He understands the country’s needs.

The old Italian political class was overwhelmed by the facts and exceeded by time. The scuttling of the old rulers, crushed by the weight of public debt and the illegal financing of political parties, leaving the country unprepared and uncertain in the difficult time of renewal and the transition to a new Republic. Never before at this time Italy, which is rightly suspicious of prophets and saviors, needs people with a good head on his shoulders and solid experience, creative and innovative, able to help her out, to run the state.

The establishment is not working. The old and traditional politicians are not working. He is the one, the only one capable of resolving the country’s problems.
The referendum movement has led to the popular choice of a new system of election of the Parliament. But in order for the new system to work, it is essential that the sign of the Left opposes Polo delle Libertà which is able to attract the best of a clean country, reasonable, modern. This Polo delle Libertà will join all the forces that will draw upon the fundamental principles of the Western democracies, from the Catholic world who generously contributed to the last fifty years of our history unit. The important thing is knowing how to propose to Italian citizens the same objectives and the same values that have so far allowed the development of freedom in all the major Western democracies. Those goals and values that have not ever found full citizenship in any of the countries ruled by old communist’s apparatuses, repainted and recycled. It is seen that in this elementary rule Italy might make an exception. Orphans and those nostalgic for communism, in fact, are unprepared for the government of the country. They bring with them also an ideological legacy that stride and is at odds with the needs of a public

He announces that he is getting together with other forces, with those that believe in Democracy and Catholicism. Italy will have the same values as the Western Democracies. Those that still support communism are the enemy because they will bring Italy down.
administration with liberal politics and liberal economics.
Our Left purport to be changed. They say they became liberal democratic. But it's not true. Their men are always the same, their mentality, their culture, their deepest convictions, their behaviors have remained the same. They do not believe in the market, do not believe in private initiative, do not believe in profit, they do not believe in the individual. They do not believe that the world can improve through the free contribution of so many people all different from one another. They have not changed. Listen to them talk, watch their newscasts paid by the state, read their press. No longer believe in anything. They would like to turn the country into a screaming square, shouting, who rants condemning. For this we are forced to oppose them. Because we believe in the individual, the family, enterprise, competition, development, efficiency, and solidarity in the free market, the daughter of justice and freedom.

Those that have been in power are not what they say they are. They do not represent democratic principles. What they want is to continue hurting Italy, which is why Berlusconi is seeking power, to prevent Italy from failure. Berlusconi thinks experts with different backgrounds can contribute to the development of the country.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If I decided to take the field with a new movement, and if I now ask you to come down the pitch to you, to all of you-now, immediately, before it is too late-it is because I dream with eyes wide open with a free society, women and men, where there is fear, where instead of social envy and hatred of class there is generosity, dedication, solidarity, love of work, tolerance and respect for life.</th>
<th>He wants people to support him so he can liberate the society, one that is full of respect.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The political movement that I propose is called, not surprisingly, Forza Italia. What we want to do is a free organization of totally new electrical voters, not just another party or yet another faction who are born to share, but a force that came into being with the opposite goal: to unite, to finally give Italy a majority and a government at the height of the deepest needs felt by ordinary people.</td>
<td>The new movement with which he is entering politics will be out of the ordinary, nothing like the traditional parties in Italy. He wants to unite the country, and let it be led by an ordinary man.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we want to offer Italians it’s made by a totally new political force of men. What we want to offer the nation is a government program that only offers concrete and understandable commitments. We want to renew the Italian company, we want to give support and confidence to those who create jobs and wealth, we want to accept and to win the big production and technological challenges facing Europe and the modern world. We want to offer space to anyone who wants to do and to build their future, the North and the South. We want a government and a parliamentary majority that know how to give proper dignity to the original core of any society, the family, who know how to respect every faith and that arouse reasonable hopes for those who are weaker, for job seekers, for those who need care, for those who, after a hard-working life, have the right to live in peace.

He is offering a government that gives freedom to its people in all fields. He embraces the new. He respects minorities. He wants to help those in need.
A government and a majority that will bring more attention and respect to the environment, who can oppose with the utmost determination to crime, corruption, drugs. Who know how to ensure more security to citizens, more order and more efficiency. He wants to conserve the environment. Fight the problem Italy had with corruption, which generated distrust amongst the Italians. He want to give security to its people, because people were in fear.

The history of Italy is at a turning point. As a businessman, as a citizen and as a citizen who now takes the field, without any timidity but with the determination and serenity that life has taught me, I tell you that you put end to incomprehensible talk politics and sluggish politicians. I tell you that you can achieve together a big dream: of a fairer Italy, more generous towards those in need, the most prosperous and peaceful, more modern and efficient, the protagonist in Europe and in the world. This is the moment, Italy could get very bad if he does not come with his expertise to save it. The old politicians do not make sense, do not work for the wellbeing of the country. On the other hand, Berlusconi can form a prosperous Italy, one that can be on top of the world.

I tell you that can and we must build together, for us and for our children, a new Italian miracle. He, with the help of the people, can achieve a better Italy.
Italy’s Prime Ministerial Candidate, Silvio Berlusconi’s first speech
February 6, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How can you not be moved at this time...It is a solemn moment, an intense moment... Perhaps our country really needs the light of hope and trust. While I was coming here, I thought I was a crazy person about to meet up with other crazy people... I do not think so, I do not think so... I believe that in this Italy we will remain, but we decided to stay there as free men!</td>
<td>Silvio Berlusconi can transform Italy into a better place. He will get into politics even though it can be a hard ride to take.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well, thinking about the madness that seems to have infected all of us, and many others along with us, I thought that it had occurred once again what I wrote in the preface of a beautiful book, “In Praise of Folly” by Erasmus of Rotterdam. The preface said: &quot;It is true the idea that comes out of these pages: the most important decisions, the wisest decisions, the right decisions, the true wisdom is not that which comes from the reasoning, it is not that which comes from the brain, but it is the one that springs from a forward-looking, visionary madness.&quot;</td>
<td>He is aware what he is doing is hard, and it comes with a lot of work but he is willing to do it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I believe that this decision we, all of us, have taken looking at the dangers that were looming-you remembered them here this morning- but the reason might have invited us to continue to worry about us, our family, our companies, our job, our professions. We decided instead to give a different answer, because we heard that a danger was looming: a new electoral law, the politicians unable to agree, the possibility that our country was ruled by a minority, a minority that we know well would inflict an illiberal and stifling future. We heard it from out of the country, from all over the country, from the North, from the South, from the people of all classes, of all ages, a question, a wish, a desire for change, not just a change of men, but also a change in the world of politics. Enough with the bickering of politics, of words, of talk, of vetoes, of old grudges, the negotiations under the table: we have heard the desire for a different policy, for clean politics. We heard climb on all sides the desire for a new political entity, we heard it coming from the country the demand for concrete answers to the concrete problems of the country.

Berlusconi is part of the people. People that are tired of old politicians that do not get things done. Silvio has come to save them, to hear them, to take the old establishment down.
This is why today we are here, with the desire to start here a long journey, a journey, I repeat, of hope and confidence in our future. You are here, then, you who created all over the country this large number of clubs that have brought us closer to the Italians polis, to the things that concern us all, you who have decided to abandon your interests and put your interests after the 'general interest of the country. And so have I, I've heard that kind of responsibility that could not be overcome and I said, perhaps exaggerating, that I felt in the condition of those who, having to go on a nice trip, for a nice vacation, suddenly found himself in front of someone in need of help, so despite the holiday, the journey, it would have not been possible to turn his head away, because this has a specific name: wrongful death. That's why—because we all feel responsibility calling us to abandon our selfishness to do what we can for our country—that we are here, we have responded to this sort of call to weapons!

He is willing to leave everything for his country, and since he is part of the people then all of them are willing to do it also. The country comes first.
So we are obliged—since we are here and willing to continue to take an interest for the administration of this country—to state clearly the principles and the values that inspire us; we are obliged to say what is our model of society, and what Italy do we want; we are obliged to say what we think should be done to change our country.

The principles in which we believe are not abstruse principles, ideologies are not complicated; no, they are the core values of all the great Western democracies. We believe in freedom, in all its forms, multiple and vital; freedom of thought and opinion, freedom of expression, freedom of worship of all religions, freedom of association; we believe in freedom of press, in a free market, regulated by certain rules, clear and equal for all.

But freedom is not graciously "granted" by the state, because it is anterior to it, it comes before the state. And the state must recognize and defend it in all its forms—just to be a legitimate state, free and democratic and not an arbitrary tyrant.

Every member of the people is going to have a basic human right: freedom.

The old politicians took power and used it for themselves, not for the people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We believe that the state should be at the service of citizens, and not citizens at the service of the state. We believe that the state should be the servant of the citizen and not the citizen the servant of the state. The citizen must be sovereign.</th>
<th>The government should work for the people, not the other way around.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For this, actually, we believe in the individual and we believe that everyone should have the right to fulfill himself, to aspire to the welfare and happiness, to build with their own hands their own future, to be able to educate their children freely. This is why we believe in the family, the basic unit of our society. And we also believe in the labor, which is entrusted with the great social value of job creation, welfare and wealth.</td>
<td>Every citizen is entitled to a future. Every Italian is equal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We believe in the values of our national culture that the whole world admires and envies.

We believe in the values of our Christian tradition, in the inalienable values of life, the common good, in the fundamental value of freedom of education and learning, peace, solidarity, justice, tolerance, towards all, starting with the opponents.

And above all we believe in respect and love towards those who are weaker, above all the sick, children, the elderly, the marginalized.

We want to live in a modern country where values are felt and shared generosity, altruism, dedication, passion for the job, and at the same time-by-liberals believe in the positive effects for all of the competition, the competition and progress that may not be there if there is no freedom.

Inspired by these values, we want to make our contribution to our country, we want our country to be better, to be different from that of the recent past and also from this, the country of this confusing present.

In Berlusconi’s Italy everybody will fit, in spite of their religion, culture and beliefs. Minorities are to be respected.

With freedom comes competition, which should be tolerable and respected.

Berlusconi wants to work for a better Italy.
We want an Italy of women and free men, who do not know fear, who do not know the social envy and class hatred, and that together they can build a different future.

We want an Italy so different, united in an indissoluble unity, which does not even tolerate that this unity is called into question because this feeling of unity belongs to our culture, to our conscience, to our history, to our memories, because all this belongs to ourselves!

We want an Italy that has nothing less than the Italy that we know, but also has something more—indeed, many things more.

First of all, we want an Italy with less unemployment and more work; to those who have no work, the unemployed, those who are laid off, to those who are in companies that are not good and therefore look with concern for their future, we, we will succeed if we have set ourselves, we today we can ensure that these concerns will end, we can ensure that we know how to revive Italy’s economy.

Unity amongst Italians is paramount.

Italy’s economy will improve; jobs will be created because he knows how to do it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is no one in Italy who can make that promise, that can make this claim with more credibility and with more authority of whom is doing it right now!</th>
<th>He does not explain how he will revive and improve Italy’s economy, but his real estate background gives confidence to his voters.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We want an Italy [by the public: we have already won, Silvio!] ... May God hear you, and, now that you mentioned it may all the Saints also listen to you, including our patron saint. We do want Italy to consider with more respect and more love the weak and elderly. The prosperity we enjoy is also due to their sacrifices, the love for the work that they have practiced for a lifetime. Continuing as now, our economic system could not guarantee the integrity of the board to these deserving. Instead, after a lifetime of work, they are fully entitled to a season of serenity and certainty.</td>
<td>He wants everyone, even those that have worked their entire life and now need a rest, to have a good and prosperous life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But the country will need more than that to improve: we also want an Italy tidier and safer, an Italy that knows how to fight with determination and effectiveness against common crime and organized crime. In our country, 96 percent of burglaries and 74 percent of the murders go unpunished! This means that the state does not fulfill one of the cornerstones duties: to ensure the safety of citizens, their physical and patrimonial integrity.</td>
<td>Economy is not the only aspect that needs improvement. Security is also a sensitive topic. The government has done almost nothing to protect their citizens, he will change that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We also want an Italy that knows how to fight drugs, and provides to those who fell victim of them every possible help so that they can reintegrate into the family, society and work.</td>
<td>He wants to help those in need. Especially those that are fighting with drug addiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do, of course, want an Italy with less corruption, we also want an Italy more attentive to the health of citizens, to defend them from pollution, which takes more attention to nature, the environment, in all the works of art that our predecessors gave us and that we have a duty to deliver to those who come after us, at least in the same condition in which we have received them.</td>
<td>Italy, at that moment, was suffering of a deeply rooted corruption. Silvio Berlusconi received votes from citizens by promising them to eliminate the corruption. He wants also to give more attention to other aspects, like the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We want an Italy with lower taxes and less bureaucracy, an Italy that gives more space to those who assume the business risk, who takes on the task of producing jobs and prosperity: we want an Italy, in short, that gives more space to private and less to the State: an Italy with more private and less state.</td>
<td>Berlusconi will support entrepreneurship. He will give to the people an Italy that is more of them and less of the government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What has happened in recent years that today you can be so concerned in looking at our present and our future? What happened is that the state, instead of dealing with its fundamental duties, wanted to expand, wanted to extend its presence in the private sectors, including in the areas of the economy. If today we enjoy a welfare state, this is due to the fact that millions and millions of Italians continue to do their duty every day, every morning coming out of their houses, going in schools, factories, offices, and it is to them that we owe our well-being and also the freedom that has so far been witnessed. We owe it to the hard work of our workers, our farmers, the ingenuity of our entrepreneurs-especially those who built and who run very small businesses, small and medium-to the genius and talent of our artisans, our artists, our traders, of all those who take upon themselves the risk of a self-employment. And they have been able to do so despite the political-bureaucratic machine which is "perfect" to prohibit and to create difficulties for those who work.

If the country is working it's not because of the elite, the government, or the old politicians. It is because of those who take risks to keep the economy working.
| What happened? What happened is that gradually the fees are increased because public expenditure has increased; it happened that in recent years public spending increased from 43 percent of the national product, of everything that we produce, to nearly 58 percent in 1992, an increase of thirteen percentage points; it happened that in the last three years for every one million more that we were able to produce income, the public sector has taken seven hundred and fifty thousand pounds and only two hundred fifty thousand pounds remained in the availability of individuals, families and businesses. As well as 60 percent of household savings has been absorbed by the state to cover its deficits. These data lead us to believe that we cannot contain this increase in public spending, this resulting in increase of taxes that challenges the existing jobs, and that does not give the possibility to create new ones. I think that the mechanism will be clear: everything that goes in the direction of public spending is subtracted from investment in private companies: 90 percent of the savings of Italian families is now delivered to the State through the |
| The government has mishandled the country’s money, now it is the people that are suffering the consequences. |
public debt, only 10 percent is targeted to businesses to enable enterprises to produce and expand.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This is a situation that really cannot last. We complain of the heavy interest, but I think anyone can realize this is a phenomenon caused by the greed of our state, that to continue to expand the spending they aimed at family's savings, offering them a full guarantee regarding the return of capital. It offers to their interests which are numerous higher inflation points: savings there turns. The same offer cannot be sustained by the companies so that they operate without those means that are needed to finance their development.</th>
<th>Again, every economic problem the people may have is because of the state, the government.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therefore, my judgment is that we can no longer accept this Italy so politicized, nationalized, corrupt, this regulated Italy: how many laws, regulations, circulars that make it difficult, if not impossible, the activities of those who work? We can no longer accept, in short, this Italy who was and is so badly governed and administered.</td>
<td>Those inside the elite are ruining Italy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Then what should you do? I believe that we should prepare the care, they need to prepare the programs that say exactly what should be done to solve every problem. I think we should also lead the country away from those who until now have managed and administered. I believe that never before has Italy need men with a head on his shoulders, and when I say men I mean, of course, women and men. Men who can not only make speeches, do well in the round tables or on television, hold rallies, meet the characters, but rather men that know how to operate; men who can say good and clear what they want to do, but mostly men whom would turn their words into action and have the results of their work to testify this capacity. Men who come from the trenches of life and work, men of hope, trust, optimism, animated by a great desire to do!

The government needs a change. It needs to say goodbye to old politicians, which according to him do not do, and welcome those that speak with actions. The country needs men like Silvio Berlusconi to save it.
Then it takes a program, as we said, a simple, clear, precise program, that can immediately give confidence to the country, to take away the fears that are now read as popular, because it is trust, above all, the first thing you need to share. We need confidence. They must have confidence to convince families to save money without fear, they have to trust companies to determine to risk, to invest, to develop. We have prepared this program and I am not wrong if I say that never no political force in Italy has never presented such a comprehensive program, so articulate, so detailed, a more than forty points program that we have worked with the experts which are the best of each sector, a program that is now ready and we will deliver to our candidates so that each of them can make its contribution in the specific competence. A program that will then become final following this work, and that we will present to all Italians voters in the month preceding the date of the election date. This program will have a few key points: the first will be to boost the development, which is one side of the coin.

| Silvio believes Italy needs a program that explains, easily, what is going to be done in every sector to improve the current situation. | Then it takes a program, as we said, a simple, clear, precise program, that can immediately give confidence to the country, to take away the fears that are now read as popular, because it is trust, above all, the first thing you need to share. We need confidence. They must have confidence to convince families to save money without fear, they have to trust companies to determine to risk, to invest, to develop. We have prepared this program and I am not wrong if I say that never no political force in Italy has never presented such a comprehensive program, so articulate, so detailed, a more than forty points program that we have worked with the experts which are the best of each sector, a program that is now ready and we will deliver to our candidates so that each of them can make its contribution in the specific competence. A program that will then become final following this work, and that we will present to all Italians voters in the month preceding the date of the election date. This program will have a few key points: the first will be to boost the development, which is one side of the coin. |
I have already made a proposal that has caused such a stir and that showed how the men of the Left, who claim today that are Liberal Democrats, are still anchored to the interventionism and statist of all time: the plan to introduce a cap on the tax levy by the State. Over the past twelve years the levy to be part of the product state was increased by thirteen points: I do not think it is unreasonable to think that an equally long period can decrease it by one point per year. I think it is a goal that you can reach and even exceed in the facts; This would begin to administer the state as you administer family and business. In no family and no business, the good father, the good entrepreneur spends without being sure what will cash, how much money to be made. I believe that the state should do the same. I think the commitment on the ceiling of the tax-levy, as a general principle, must not be such as to prevent the financing of economic development. It should be added to the respect the true in the article of the Constitution which says that any expenditure must have its own specific funding. Here, I believe that this is an absolute impregnated necessity, that we, if we have the

He firmly believes the government should work as a family does.
responsibility of government, we must assume, and assume, in respect of the whole country.
I think then of course we will have to boost the development, we will have to give love to the creation of new jobs and retaining existing ones because, if we want to boost the economy, it is urgent to act decisively. It must take action by changing the taxation imposed on businesses. In a country that needs to expand we need to encourage investment and thus propose not to subject to any tax the business profits that entrepreneurs will commit to use to develop their businesses and create new jobs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If the economy needs businesses, taxes will need to be cut.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In a country in which work is a problem, citizens were, and are, taxed fiercely: we propose a de-taxation of labor, especially to young people, a tax exemption for the job offered to those who are unemployed and those who are in the “Cassa di Integrazione”, and a labor tax relief to those areas suffering from high levels of unemployment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For him, taxes are a big issue, which is why he is going to reduce them to help all the workers of Italy that have suffered because of the government.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
These are measures that other states already have successfully adopted for a specified period. We propose to introduce apprenticeship and training contracts to act as mediator between the time of training and the time the work actually starts. Then, of course, we will have to reorganize the tax administration imbued with the principles that we believe cannot be challenged; with the abolition of this extraordinary number of taxes, bringing them back from the hundred-odd to a decent number, principally those producing more than 90 percent of state revenues: say ten, fifteen major taxes, so we can concentrate the efforts of the men of the tax on large and main taxes, so we can concentrate on the fight against tax evasion.

He proposes a plan that will help workers and fight corruption by stopping tax evasion.
Also we propose the reduction of tax rates because those of today, introduced long ago to hit the wealthiest citizens, today it puts pressure on citizens who are certainly in a good economic situation, but that cannot possibly be called rich; then we will work in this direction convinced, as we are, that fairer rates are an incentive to work, to invest, to business risk, and are especially a big disincentive for evasion.

By reducing taxes, Berlusconi believes he will give the economy a boost.

We will have to put a firm hand to the reorganization of our bureaucracy and our administration; this morning we remembered that very often corruption is the daughter of an administration poorly paid, without motivation, bloated, confused, chaotic, inefficient; an administration that too often forgets that the citizens are not at the service of the state, but that is the state at the service of citizens.

He criticizes the way previous governments handled themselves, only benefiting them and not the citizens.
We must be tough, and how tough! - To the main services, such as health, hospitals, schools, social security; our program will indicate the precise steps to take, but certainly there will exist to do a great job; The basic idea is to let the state do all that cannot be attributed to private enterprise and instead give to individuals all that, in a system of competition, it costs less and can be improved in quality.

The underlying concept must be to give the opportunity to every citizen to choose where to go to school, in which clinic or hospital to take care, with what institution they want to get insurance. With this, we will support vulnerable groups who may be assigned to the specific aid, like the good school and good health, it will allow to choose the school they want, to choose insurance you want, to also choose the health insurance that will, so you will no longer be a citizen in half. To those citizens that must wait months to do simple clinic exams, that have to do queues for any service that involves the State, which very often receive from those that work for the State annoyed answers, or even uncivilized and arrogant.

What he proposes is a reformation of the state, of the government; so everything will start to work again for the service of Italians.

He wants to improve the entities so much that anybody will be able to choose where to study or take care. With this, the life inside Italy will improve.
We will also have to put a firm hand to this great and complex patchwork of laws, sneaky regulations, decrees, and interpretations that have enmeshed in a terrible vise of our everyday lives and the lives of those who work to produce. I believe that we will have to take these laws by subject to form a consolidation of a clear, simple, understandable formation of new codes, unique texts, especially for certain subjects and primarily for tax matters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>These will be for the first time programs which will be derived from the experience of all, from the experience of whom have worked in various fields, and will be, for the first time, programs that everybody will know, for everyone to improve, that everybody will judge.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The reformation he intends to give to his citizens will utilize the language of the people, not the jargon of the elite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is the one that understands the people, which is why his programs will work for the people, they will be what the people need.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And it is with these programs that we will turn to other AER liberal political forces, to ask their consent and their cooperation-without any veto, without pretense-, their collaboration on the points of these programs, in addition to the consent on the principles and values that inspire them, to have with them a sincere and cooperation.

We have already discussed these programs with the protagonists of the Christian Democratic Centre and with those of Union Center and we received their steadfast commitment; we will discuss this week with representatives of the League with which we hope to work together recognizing the important role that the League has had in the recent history of our country, and recognizing the impulse that manifests itself today to move from protest to construction.

He not only wants to be one and the same with the people, but to get the support of other political forces inside the country. Political forces that will fight the old elite, the old establishment. He did this because he knew that if he did not organize a coalition he would most likely loose.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>But we will not close the door to those who loudly declared their faith in our own principles, whom presented documents faulted both politically and economically, of true liberalism documents and convinced liberals, who does not present itself as a carrier of xenophobic ideas, racist ideas, but as someone who considers unequivocally over and above a certain historical period. Someone who wants to leave, buried in the past, a period that cannot be returned.</th>
<th>He wants to welcome to his side of the story anyone that shares principles with him, his campaign and Italians.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We'll try this cooperation as well as the vast majority of Italians want, because this new electoral system has been wanted by a vote of 80 percent of Italians. Does that surprise those who have contributed to this Law that today it can betray the spirit of this law, the will of this law, indicating precise path: that of clarity. In the country there must be a party that governs and one that is in opposition, to get this you need to add votes to vote, you have to add a consent agreement, as well as a team, like that of the left that has already done so as a must, the liberal team has to do as well if it does not want to surrender defeat.</td>
<td>He needs this coalition as much as Italians need a reformation of the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With confidence in these values, with this clear idea about the Italy we want, with these people, with these programs, we will seek to make Italy another miracle. After a much worse period of this, after the war, Italy was able to astonish the world with what was called then the &quot;Italian miracle.&quot;</td>
<td>Since Italy has been hurting… Berlusconi feels the need to make everything better, to improve the situation and give Italians another &quot;Italian miracle&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well, I say that even today we can take a leap forward in our country and our economy and really build a new period of development and prosperity. I believe that together we must attempt this great undertaking, this great, inescapable adventure, believing, believe in it, trusting, having faith in our ability to achieve a great result. And now I invite you to sing along.</td>
<td>This is a job of all, to give birth to a new and improved Italy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We must not be ashamed of creels, to stay young, youth is not a piece of personal data, is a state, is a condition of the spirit, and then let's do it willingly, to get up, to unite, and to sing together our hymn that has simple but true words, our anthem that says &quot;Forza Italy, it's time to believe ...&quot;, it is time to dare, it's time to light within our heart a great fire, the passion for freedom.</td>
<td>Unity amongst Italy is what will help him get everything done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a passion we can achieve more ambitious goals, we can build a more just Italy, an Italy more generous and caring towards those who suffer and those in need, an Italy more modern and efficient, an Italy more prosperous and peaceful, an Italy more orderly and safe, an Italy that knows how to impose itself to the admiration of others, not only for its great past but for its new, magical present.</td>
<td>Italy will be great, a country that others will look up to, a country in which peace and prosperity reign, in which all citizens fit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So &quot;Forza Italy&quot;, &quot;Forza Italy&quot; as they say the words of our song, Forza Italy to do, Forza Italy to grow, Forza Italy to be free, Forza Italy to build, together, a great, new, an extraordinary Italian miracle!</td>
<td>Closure. Remembering all that Italy is strong.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
United States’ Presidential Candidate, Donald J. Trump’s announcement speech
June 16, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wow. Whoa. That is some group of people. Thousands.</td>
<td>The population of the U.S.A. is around 318 million people. If there were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So nice, thank you very much. That's really nice. Thank you. It's</td>
<td>thousands then not everybody was there. Unless, he assumes everybody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great to be at Trump Tower. It's great to be in a wonderful city,</td>
<td>is all “the people”, all of those who are in the right side of history,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York. And it's an honor to have everybody here. This is beyond</td>
<td>all of those whom he wishes to represent, the enemy of the elite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anybody's expectations. There's been no crowd like this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And, I can tell, some of the candidates, they went in. They didn't</td>
<td>Attacks the opposition inside his own party. Exposes the bigger enemy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know the air-conditioner didn't work. They sweated like dogs.</td>
<td>of the nation and the incapability of every other politician of stopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They didn't know the room was too big, because they didn't have</td>
<td>the threats posed by that enemy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anybody there. How are they going to beat ISIS? I don't think it's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gonna happen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When he mentions “our country”, “our” signifies those who are against the elite. The nation’s current status is bad because of the ruling elite. He portrays himself as the man that will know how to get the country to a better place, because he knows how to do it, because he has done it before in his businesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacking outside forces. Making other nations the scapegoats.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing another enemy of the “people”. Blaming the U.S neighbor for the current problems of the country. Mexico subverted the system to their own system to its own interests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems. Thank you. It's true, and these are the best and the finest. When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people.

| Generalization and stereotyping of the enemy.                      |
| Blaming outside forces for targeting the United States and making it hurt. |
| Highlighting the wrongful execution of the decisions of those in power, the evil, the elite. |
| Exaggeration of the situation.                                    |
| Everything is black and white.                                    |

But I speak to border guards and they tell us what we're getting. And it only makes common sense. It only makes common sense. They're sending us not the right people. It's coming from more than Mexico. It's coming from all over South and Latin America, and it's coming probably—probably—from the Middle East. But we don't know. Because we have no protection and we have no competence, we don't know what's happening. And it's got to stop and it's got to stop fast.

| He knows because the people speak to him, he is “the people’s whisperer”. |
| He understands what “the people” need.                                      |
| He also assumes that the international community is purposely sending their people to the United States to hurt the country socially and economically, people that are always doing bad things. |
| He, again, points the finger to other countries or regions: Latin America, the Middle East. |
| Blames the current elite for the lack of protection and competence in the country's affairs. |
Islamic terrorism is eating up large portions of the Middle East. They've become rich. I'm in competition with them. Compares one of the main threats to the United States to him in terms of richness. This is because the current political elite do not known how to stop them.

They just built a hotel in Syria. Can you believe this? They built a hotel. When I have to build a hotel, I pay interest. They don't have to pay interest, because they took the oil that, when we left Iraq, I said we should've taken. Example of what the terrorist group is doing to get reach. Blaming the last presidents for it. Judging his opposition and the last leaders of the country’s decision towards foreign affairs.

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. Explanation of how he already knew, years ago, what to do. The elites made a wrong decision, now Iran has more power and the Middle East is destabilized. He exposes Iran as another enemy of the United States.
<p>| 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. | What the country lost because of those bad decisions taken. Revealing his love for the military and those who protect the country from outside forces. |
| 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. | They lost the power they had over the Middle East. |
| 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. | Examples of the loses the U.S. has had because of the power vacuum they left at the Middle East. |
| Last quarter, it was just announced our gross domestic product— a sign of strength, right? But not for us. It was below zero. Whoever heard of this? It's never below zero. Our labor participation rate was the worst since 1978. But think of it, GDP below zero, horrible labor participation rate. | Foregrounding the decline in the American economy. The blame should go to the establishment. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>And our real unemployment is anywhere from 18 to 20 percent. Don't believe the 5.6. Don't believe it. That's right. A lot of people up there can't get jobs. They can't get jobs, because there are no jobs, because China has our jobs and Mexico has our jobs. They all have jobs.</th>
<th>Pointing to outside forces for the lack of jobs inside the national territory.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The enemies of “the people” are hurting the nation. The country is worse every day and he is the savior that comes to rescue it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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, &quot;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.&quot;</td>
<td>Points out how the United States is appearing weaker to the international community because the elites are not taking care of the nuclear arsenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a disaster called the big lie: Obamacare. Obamacare.</td>
<td>Directly pointing towards his predecessor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Criticizes an initiative done by the current leader at the moment. Cataloguing it as useless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>He exposes huge amounts of wasted money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>An example of what he is doing better than the current elites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Separates himself from the politicians. Accusing them of getting nothing done; they are the elite and he is with “the people”. Assuring “the people” they need someone to save them from that evil elite.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As an example, I've been on the circuit making speeches, and I hear my fellow Republicans. And they're wonderful people. I like them. They all want me to support them. They don't know how to bring it about. They come up to my office. I'm meeting with three of them in the next week. And they don't know—"Are you running? Are you not running? Could we have your support? What do we do? How do we do it?".

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

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

Posing himself as the only person that knows how to handle the country’s problem. Talking about other Republican candidates, who also happen to be politicians, in an effort to boast about himself.

He is the only one that exposes the real threats to the country. Traditional politicians are not doing anything about it, they do not acknowledge the problems nor the enemy.

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

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

He talks about the current President and how he could go and have hobbies while the country is having problems. He brings again to the conversation his richness. Explaining how Obamacare is hurting the country like anything before. How the country is going to worsen.
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.

Proposing a solution that would make the country better, again. He knows how to solve the problem that the Washington elite brought upon the nation.

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.

Criticizes politicians, the evil, the elite. How easily politicians fell into corruption and are manipulated by the elite, hurting the country.

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.

The country needs a savior, someone that will stop the current elite. Someone that, as of now, only does what “the people” wants. What is better for the country.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 &quot;The Art of the Deal.&quot;</th>
<th>Pointing the finger at himself as the great next leader, the one the country needs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>What is going to get better in the country with this “new leader” in power, without the elite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And we also need a cheerleader.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know, when President Obama was elected, I said, &quot;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.&quot;</td>
<td>Exposing President Obama’s lack of ability to cheer the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He was vibrant. He was young. I really thought that he would be a great cheerleader. He's not a leader. That's true. You're right about that.</td>
<td>Critique of the current elite. The President that does not know how to lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The president, the evil, who was only negative for the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need somebody that can take the brand of the United States and make it great again. It's not great again.</td>
<td>The country needs someone capable, someone new.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need— we need somebody— we need somebody that literally will take this country and make it great again. We can do that.</td>
<td>He is capable of exploiting the potential of the country. Save it from what the elite has done so far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And, I will tell you, I love my life. I have a wonderful family. They're saying, &quot;Dad, you're going to do something that's going to be so tough.&quot;</td>
<td>Acknowledging he is making a sacrifice for the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Again, highlighting how he is fit to improve the country's situation despite of being an outsider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So ladies and gentlemen...I am officially running... for president of the United States, and we are going to make our country great again.</td>
<td>Announces his official candidacy and his promise to make the country great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The country has the potential, it just needs someone capable of using it at its fullest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Outlines the future to his people. From the day he is elected and forward, everything will improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be the greatest jobs president that God ever created. I tell you that.</td>
<td>He will focus on getting everyone a job, he will be the best at it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'll bring back our jobs from <strong>China</strong>, from <strong>Mexico</strong>, from <strong>Japan</strong>, from so many places. I'll bring back our jobs, and I'll bring back our money.</td>
<td>He will take from the enemy what belongs to the U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>In detail, how his country is being used by the outside forces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How stupid are our leaders? How stupid are these politicians to allow this to happen? How stupid are they?</td>
<td>Use of language that directly attacks the elite.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Begins talking about trade, and why is against it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Number one, the people negotiating don't have a clue. Our president doesn't have a clue. He's a bad negotiator. He's the one that did Bergdahl. We get Bergdahl, they get five killer terrorists that everybody wanted over there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attacking President Obama and how he failed in diplomacy and negotiation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of Obama’s bad negotiation skills. The United States loses every time; the enemy wins.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Another example of an enemy using the United States for their own benefits.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th>Another critique of the elite and the corruption inside its lines. How the country needs a great leadership to do trade, and it has not been done.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>How trade can work if the right people its behind it. Using specific language that attacks those in the elite responsible for free trade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explains how China takes advantage of people inside the United States, even himself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

The United States is not able to compete with China. The United States is a victim of outside forces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

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

I said, "They send it back?"

"Yeah. So I finally got it over there and they charged me a big tariff. They're not supposed to be doing that. I told them."
<p>| Now, they do charge you tariff on trucks, when we send trucks and other things over there. Ask Boeing. They wanted Boeing's secrets. They wanted their patents and all their secrets before they agreed to buy planes from Boeing. | Examples of how China is taking advantage of the United States. |
| 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. | Despite criticizing China, he states that he likes the country. |
| 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, &quot;Oh, you don't like China?&quot; | China is the enemy, but he as an entrepreneur has worked with them. Tells everyday stories to the people to make them understand the current situation. Works with the enemy. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th>The real problem then is the elite inside the United States, which cannot compete with China's.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>China is taking advantage of the United States poor management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The potential is there but the elites do not know how to handle it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The advantage China has over the U.S. has grown so much the Chinese are even growing in the military department, which is part of the security of a nation. He diminishes the capability of the United States to protect its citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They're building up their military to a point that is very scary. You have a problem with ISIS. You have a bigger problem with China. And, in my opinion, the new China, believe it or not, in terms of trade, is Mexico.</td>
<td>Emphasizes security problems. Threats coming not only from ISIS, but from China in terms of national security. In terms of trade, there is Mexico. Another outside force menacing the United States' wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So this man tells me about the manufacturing. I say, &quot;That's a terrible story. I hate to hear it.&quot; But I have another one, Ford. So Mexico takes a company, a car company that was going to build in Tennessee, rips it out. Everybody thought the deal was dead. Reported it in the Wall Street Journal recently. Everybody thought it was a done deal. It's going in and that's going to be it, going into Tennessee. Great state, great people.</td>
<td>Goes back to the example related to China and adds another one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>For him, Ford choose Mexico over the United States to do business. That is unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>An investment done in Mexico that hurts the United States. Ford is a good company. Mexico is to blame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So I announced that I'm running for president. I would... ... one of the early things I would do, probably before I even got in— and I wouldn't even use— you know, I have— I know the smartest negotiators in the world. I know the good ones. I know the bad ones. I know the overrated ones.</td>
<td>He is the candidate, the perfect person to do negotiations that would improve the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 buffaled. But they're not good.</td>
<td>Attack to the media.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But I know the negotiators in the world, and I put them one for each country. Believe me, folks. We will do very, very well, very, very well.

With him in power the country will not only improve, but it will better than ever.

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."

He has power. He knows does who have.

And you say to yourself, "How does that help us," right? "How does that help us? Where is that good"? It's not. So I would say, "Congratulations. That's the good news. Let me give you the bad news. Every car and every truck and every part manufactured in this plant that comes across the border, we're going to charge you a 35-percent tax, and that tax is going to be paid simultaneously with the transaction, and that's it.

He proposes a solution to the problem of companies preferring Mexico over the United States.
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."

Again, exposes the weakness of the current politicians and how are they manipulated by the elite.

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

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

With his power he will be able to keep the companies inside the United States.
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.

Because he is already rich, he will not fall into the manipulation of anybody. He will do only what is better for the country.

I'm using my own money. I'm not using the lobbyists. I'm not using donors. I don't care. I'm really rich. I (inaudible). And by the way, I'm not even saying that's the kind of mindset, that's the kind of thinking you need for this country.

He is rich and he does not need anybody else's influence or money.
So— because we got to make the country rich.
It sounds crass. Somebody said, "Oh, that's crass." It's not crass.
We got $18 trillion in debt. We got nothing but problems.
We got a military that needs equipment all over the place. We got nuclear weapons that are obsolete.
We've got nothing. We've got Social Security that's going to be destroyed if somebody like me doesn't bring money into the country. All these other people want to cut the hell out of it. I'm not going to cut it at all; I'm going to bring money in, and we're going to save it.

Again, exposes the problems the country has. Related to the economy and the people’s security.

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

Goes back to the Ford example. Asserts he will not let himself be manipulated by anyone.
He'll say, "Mr. President, we've decided to move the plant back to the United States, and we're not going to build it in Mexico." That's it. They have no choice. They have no choice. There are hundreds of things like that. I'll give you another example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 &quot;we're gonna protect.&quot; What are we doing? They've got nothing but money.</th>
<th>The United States is always helping the Saudis. Another nation that takes advantage of the U.S.A. Criticizes Obama and his diplomacy skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the right person asked them, they'd pay a fortune. They wouldn't be there except for us. And believe me, you look at the border with Yemen. You remember Obama a year ago, Yemen was a great victory. Two weeks later, the place was blown up. Everybody got out— and they kept our equipment.</td>
<td>Another example.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They always keep our equipment. We ought to send used equipment, right? They always keep our equipment. We ought to send some real junk, because, frankly, it would be— we ought to send our surplus. We're always losing this gorgeous brand-new stuff. But look at that border with Saudi Arabia. Do you really think that these people are interested in Yemen? Saudi Arabia without us is gone. They're gone.

And I'm the one that made all of the right predictions about Iraq. You know, all of these politicians that I'm running against now— it's so nice to say I'm running as opposed to if I run, if I run. I'm running. He is right, he always knew what had to be done with the enemy.

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?"

Attacks again all politicians that have worked for the establishment. Politicians that have not known how to handle international matters. Questioning Mr. Bush’s intelligence.

Then I looked at Rubio. He was unable to answer the question, is Iraq a good

Indicts another one of his party’s candidates.
thing or bad thing? He didn't know. He couldn't answer the question.

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

The elite is not working. The politicians do not know how to deal with the enemies. They are not fit to lead.

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.

Compares another country's leaders to the United States' leaders and how the latter are always outrun by the rest of international community.

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.

The country has the potential to be better. It is at its worst and he is going to be able to get it to what it can be.
So Ford will come back. They'll all come back. And I will say this, this is going to be an election, in my opinion, that's based on competence. Somebody said -- thank you, darlin'.

Goes back to the Ford example. As this company will, all of them will come back. He has the answer to the problems.

Somebody said to me the other day, a reporter, a very nice reporter, "But, Mr. Trump, you're not a nice person." That's true. But actually I am. I think I am a nice person. People that know me, like me. Does my family like me? I think so, right. Look at my family. I'm proud of my family.

What the media is saying to diminish him it is not true. He is the capable of being Washington's leader.

By the way, speaking of my family, Melania, Barron, Kai, Donnie, Don, Vanessa, Tiffany, Ivanka did a great job. Did she do a great job? Great. Jared, Laura and Eric, I'm very proud of my family. They're a great family.

Appreciates his family. Gives "the people" a way of getting to know him, to appear as an everyday man, an ordinary man.

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

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

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

He highlights the current problems of the United States and poses the country’s situation as one of terrible crisis, maybe exaggerating. He assures he will do everything he says to make it better.

Number two, I'm a private company, so nobody knows what I'm worth. And the one thing is that when you run, you have to announce and certify to all sorts of governmental authorities your net worth.
So I said, "That's OK." I'm proud of my net worth. I've done an amazing job.

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

But he used to say, "Donald, don't go into Manhattan. That's the big leagues. We don't know anything about that. Don't do it."
I said, "I gotta go into Manhattan. I gotta build those big buildings. I gotta do it, Dad. I've gotta do it."

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portrays himself as an everyday man by telling a story of his relationship with his father, which was not easy, but from which he learned a lot.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Story continues... in reference to his real estate businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He explains his businesses throughout the years, which reflects on him as a success in what he does, giving confidence to the electorate that he will do well as a President.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But they all said, a lot of the pundits on television, "Well, Donald will never run, and one of the main reasons is he's private and he's probably not as successful as everybody thinks."

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

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

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

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

Nobody thought he would risk his private life to run for President. But he said he did, even though there were some things he did not reveal to the public.

He has generated jobs, and the fact that he is explaining it to the public means he thinks he could do the same for the country.

In reference to his finances, he again assures he will make his private life, public.

The information that the press is handling is not correct.
So they put together this. And before I say it, I have to say this. I made it the old-fashioned way. It's real estate. You know, it's real estate. It's labor, and it's unions good and some bad and lots of people that aren't in unions, and it's all over the place and building all over the world. And I have assets— big accounting firm, one of the most highly respected— 9 billion 240 million dollars.

And I have liabilities of about $500 million. That's long-term debt, very low interest rates. In fact, one of the big banks came to me and said, "Donald, you don't have enough borrowings. Could we loan you $4 billion"? I said, "I don't need it. I don't want it. And I've been there. I don't want it."

He talks about the amounts of money he has earned, what he has done in his successful businesses. He does not need to borrow money, because he manages his finances well (which will translate into the country's).
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th>Again, he lists all the properties he has. He wants the people to remember what they already know; he is a successful entrepreneur.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So the total is $8,737,540,00. Now I'm not doing that... I'm not doing that to brag, because you know what? I don't have to brag. I don't have to, believe it or not. I'm doing that to say that that's the kind of thinking our country needs. We need that thinking. We have the opposite thinking.</td>
<td>He is encouraging everybody to be like him, because everyone (according to him) can make it as far as he has.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Everyone can have what he has except those who can't. There are a few, not part of the people, that are bringing the country down.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So I put together this statement, and the only reason I'm telling you about it today is because we really do have to get going, because if we have another three or four years— you know, we're at $8 trillion now. We're soon going to be at $20 trillion.

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

So, just to sum up, I would do various things very quickly. I would repeal and replace the big lie, Obamacare. I would build a great wall, and nobody builds walls better than me, believe me, and I'll build them very inexpensively, I will build a great, great wall on our southern border. And I will have Mexico pay for that wall. Mark my words. Nobody would be tougher on ISIS than Donald Trump. Nobody.

He is the only one that can, at this time, save the country. Now is the time.

Soon, according to him, the country is going to be as bad as Greece. The country could be almost irredeemable.

What he is going to do: eliminate what Obama did, build a wall to separate the United States from Mexico, one of their biggest enemies, and eradicate ISIS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th>With a good military they can defeat anybody, he will come up with the best time to do so.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Points the finger to Iran, as another enemy. He also marks the current politicians as incompetent, making them the enemy as well, the elite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will immediately terminate President Obama's illegal executive order on immigration, immediately. Fully support and back up the Second Amendment.</td>
<td>For him, everything President Obama did was a waste of time and money.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now, it's very interesting. Today I heard it. Through stupidity, in a very, very hard core prison, interestingly named Clinton, two vicious murderers, two vicious people escaped, and nobody knows where they are. And a woman was on television this morning, and she said, "You know, Mr. Trump," and she was telling other people, and I actually called her, and she said, "You know, Mr. Trump, I always was against guns. I didn't want guns. And now since this happened"—it's up in the prison area—"my husband and I are finally in agreement, because he wanted the guns. We now have a gun on every table. We're ready to start shooting." I said, "Very interesting."

So protect the Second Amendment.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nobody can do that like me. Believe me. It will be done on time, on budget, way below cost, way below what anyone ever thought. I look at the roads being built all over the country, and I say I can build those things for one-third. What they do is unbelievable, how bad.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donald Trump as a President, according to him, will improve the situation, the economy and his job will be a job well done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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.

Another success for him and his real estate business.

The country needs his real estate expertise; he will rebuild infrastructures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th>Compares the United States with other countries, and how they've developed. The United States needs better infrastructure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Save Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security without cuts. Have to do it. Get rid of the fraud. Get rid of the waste and abuse, but save it. People have been paying it for years. And now many of these candidates want to cut it. You save it by making the United States, by making us rich again, by taking back all of the money that's being lost. Renegotiate our foreign trade deals.</td>
<td>He believes people are not getting what they deserve in the health department. The Foreign Trade deals are bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>He will reduce the debt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be careful of a bubble because what you've seen in the past might be small potatoes compared to what happens. So be very, very careful. And strengthen our military and take care of our vets. So, so important. Sadly, the American dream is dead.</td>
<td>What could come could be worse than everything the U.S. has experienced in the past. He again speaks of the military and how it needs to be strengthened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But if I get elected president I will bring it back bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and we will make America great again. Thank you. Thank you very much.</td>
<td>He is the candidate, the only one capable, the only one that will make the country what it was, that will make it better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(IV) United States’ President, Donald J. Trump’s inauguration speech
January 20, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Justice Roberts, President Carter, President Clinton, President Bush, President Obama, fellow Americans, and people of the world: thank you.</td>
<td>Regards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country and to restore its promise for all of our people. Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for years to come. We will face challenges. We will confront hardships. But we will get the job done.</td>
<td>He portrays himself as part of the people, as a member of the team. He will work for everyone, with everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every four years, we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power, and we are grateful to President Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama for their gracious aid throughout this transition. They have been magnificent.</td>
<td>He thanks the exiting President and his First Lady.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Today’s ceremony, however, has very special meaning. Because today we are not merely transferring power from one Administration to another, or from one party to another – but we are transferring power from Washington, D.C. and giving it back to you, the American People. He wants to make sure the people understand the inauguration day is about them. He tells them the power is being transfer from the elite to the people. Because he understands the people, he will do what they want and need.

For too long, a small group in our nation’s Capital has reaped the rewards of government while the people have borne the cost. The people has been hurting, according to him, while the elite wins.

Washington flourished – but the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered – but the jobs left, and the factories closed. The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country. The elite has been the enemy. The only one winning from the current situation. It is an us versus them speech.

Their victories have not been your victories; their triumphs have not been your triumphs; and while they celebrated in our nation’s Capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land. He separates himself from the traditional government and politicians. He tells the people that the establishment has been using them.
That all changes – starting right here, and right now, because this moment is your moment: it belongs to you. It belongs to everyone gathered here today and everyone watching all across America. This is your day. This is your celebration. And this, the United States of America, is your country.

With his words he assures people that they have the power (through him), that now they will be fine (because of him). He is the savior; he is with “the people”.

What truly matters is not which party controls our government, but whether our government is controlled by the people. January 20th 2017, will be remembered as the day the people became the rulers of this nation again. The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer. Everyone is listening to you now.

Again, it is “the people” that has the power. But, the majority of the nation voted for Hillary Clinton. Still, he believes that with him it is them that will rule. Those in the shadow are now being listened by him. He understands what is wrong.
You came by the tens of millions to become part of a historic movement the likes of which the world has never seen before. At the center of this movement is a crucial conviction: that a nation exists to serve its citizens. Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves. These are the just and reasonable demands of a righteous public.

But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities; rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation; an education system, flush with cash, but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of knowledge; and the crime and gangs and drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential. This American carnage stops right here and stops right now.

He explains he believes that it is the people that has to rule the country. That with him in power the government will be serving its citizens, not the other way. He understands what the people wants.

There are many that have been suffering because of the economy, and he noticed them. According to him, there is insecurity, an education system with holes. He is going to make it better, to erase all the bad aspects of American's lives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We are one nation – and their pain is our pain. Their dreams are our dreams; and their success will be our success. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny. The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans.</th>
<th>He wants to empathize with the people, assuring them he understands them and telling them that whatever they need and feel he does as well.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For many decades, we’ve enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry; Subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military;</td>
<td>Other countries are taking advantage of the United States. Every outside force is making the situation inside the US' borders worsen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We've defended other nation’s borders while refusing to defend our own; And spent trillions of dollars overseas while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay. We’ve made other countries rich while the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country has disappeared over the horizon.</td>
<td>The elite, the previous governments, the establishment has chosen to put outsiders before the United States.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One by one, the factories shuttered and left our shores, with not even a thought about the millions upon millions of American workers left behind. The wealth of our middle class has been ripped from their homes and then redistributed across the entire world. But that is the past. And now we are looking only to the future.

We assembled here today are issuing a new decree to be heard in every city, in every foreign capital, and in every hall of power. From this day forward, a new vision will govern our land. From this moment on, it’s going to be America First.

Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families. We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength.

The country is in a situation where the people are being affected by the bad decisions the government has taken. He will focus on them, on the people.

Now, policy making is changing. Because of him America will be first, because according to him other governments were more occupied with the outsiders’ problems.

He wants to create a bubble in which the United States will protect itself, will improve its situation and stop worrying about outside forces.
I will fight for you with every breath in my body – and I will never, ever let you down. America will start winning again, winning like never before. We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth. And we will bring back our dreams. We will build new roads, and highways, and bridges, and airports, and tunnels, and railways all across our wonderful nation.

We will get our people off of welfare and back to work – rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor. We will follow two simple rules: Buy American and Hire American. We will seek friendship and goodwill with the nations of the world – but we do so with the understanding that it is the right of all nations to put their own interests first. We do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone, but rather to let it shine as an example for everyone to follow.

Donald Trump is part of the people; he will defend them. He is their speaker, their leader. He understands them. He will improve their situation. He will make his country a better place. His nation is first which will make all his policies work around that.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones – and unite the civilized world against Radical Islamic Terrorism, which we will eradicate completely from the face of the Earth. At the bedrock of our politics will be a total allegiance to the United States of America, and through our loyalty to our country, we will rediscover our loyalty to each other.</th>
<th>The enemy will suffer; he will seek only the outside forces that will help him protect Americans.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When you open your heart to patriotism, there is no room for prejudice. The Bible tells us, “how good and pleasant it is when God’s people live together in unity.” We must speak our minds openly, debate our disagreements honestly, but always pursue solidarity.</td>
<td>He wants everybody to try to understand those that do not share their principles or ideals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When America is united, America is totally unstoppable. There should be no fear – we are protected, and we will always be protected. We will be protected by the great men and women of our military and law enforcement and, most importantly, we are protected by God. Finally, we must think big and dream even bigger.</td>
<td>The United States should be united, without fear. He will protect the country from everything and every outside force.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In America, we understand that a nation is only living as long as it is striving. We will no longer accept politicians who are all talk and no action – constantly complaining but never doing anything about it. The time for empty talk is over. Now arrives the hour of action.

Do not let anyone tell you it cannot be done. No challenge can match the heart and fight and spirit of America. We will not fail. Our country will thrive and prosper again.

We stand at the birth of a new millennium, ready to unlock the mysteries of space, to free the Earth from the miseries of disease, and to harness the energies, industries and technologies of tomorrow. A new national pride will stir our souls, lift our sights, and heal our divisions.

It is time to remember that old wisdom our soldiers will never forget: that whether we are black or brown or white, we all bleed the same red blood of patriots, we all enjoy the same glorious freedoms, and we all salute the same great American Flag.

It is the elite, the enemy, the establishment versus him. The old politicians were only talks, he is going to perform.

It will be the United States versus the world.

Everything will be better, improved and developed.

He wants unity amongst Americans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>And whether a child is born in the urban sprawl of Detroit or the windswept plains of Nebraska, they look up at the same night sky, they fill their heart with the same dreams, and they are infused with the breath of life by the same almighty Creator.</th>
<th>Everybody, united, will be the same in the eyes of the government; which will be working towards achieving a better U.S.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So to all Americans, in every city near and far, small and large, from mountain to mountain, and from ocean to ocean, hear these words: You will never be ignored again.</td>
<td>Every member of the people, every American will have what they want. They will be heard and Donald Trump will help them to have the life that they want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your voice, your hopes, and your dreams, will define our American destiny. And your courage and goodness and love will forever guide us along the way.</td>
<td>What “the people” want is what will be moving the country, in the hands of President Trump.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Together, We Will Make America Strong Again. We Will Make America Wealthy Again. We Will Make America Proud Again. We Will Make America Safe Again. And, Yes, Together, We Will Make America Great Again. Thank you, God Bless You, And God Bless America.</td>
<td>The old America, the one that was guided by old politicians will be far gone. The United States will be a new country because of its new leader.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C. Hawkins’ Holistic Grading

## Populist Speech Rubric (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of politician: Silvio Berlusconi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of Speech: Announcement Speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Populist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It conveys a Manichaean vision of the world, that is, one that is moral (every issue has a strong moral one category or the other, &quot;right&quot; or &quot;wrong&quot;, &quot;good&quot; or &quot;evil&quot;). The implication— or even the stated idea—is that there can be nothing in between, no fence sitting, no shades of gray. This leads to the use of highly charged, even bellicose language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pluralist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This discourse does not frame issues in moral terms or paint them in black and white. Instead, there is a strong tendency to focus on narrow, particular issues. The discourse will emphasize or at least not eliminate the possibility of natural, justifiable differences of opinion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Populist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The moral significance of the items mentioned in the speech is heightened by ascribing cosmic proportions to them, that is, by claiming that they affect people everywhere (possibly but not necessarily across the world) and across time. Especially in this last regard, frequent references may be made to a reified notion of “history.” At the same time, the speaker will justify the moral significance of his or her ideas by tying them to national and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pluralist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The discourse will probably not refer to any reified notion of history or use any cosmic proportions. References to the spatial and temporal consequences of issues will be limited to the material reality rather than any mystical connections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
religious leaders that are generally revered.

Although Manichaean, the discourse is still democratic, in the sense that the good is embodied in the will of the majority, which is seen as a unified whole, perhaps but not necessarily expressed in references to the “voluntad del pueblo;” however, the speaker ascribes a kind of unchanging essentialism to that will, rather than letting it be whatever 50% of the people want at any particular moment. Thus, this good majority is romanticized, with some notion of the common man (urban or rural) seen as the embodiment of the national ideal. Democracy is simply the calculation of votes. This should be respected and is seen as the foundation of legitimate government, but it is not meant to be an exercise in arriving at a preexisting, knowable “will.” The majority shifts and changes across issues. The common man is not romanticized, and the notion of citizenship is broad and legalistic.
The evil is embodied in a minority whose specific identity will vary according to context. Domestically, in Latin America it is often an economic elite, perhaps the "oligarchy," but it may also be a racial elite; internationally, it may be the United States; or the capitalist, industrialized nations; or international financiers; or simply an ideology such as neoliberalism and capitalism.

Crucially, the evil minority is or was recently in charge and subverted the system to its own interests, against those of the good majority or the people. Thus, systemic change is/was required, often expressed in terms such as “revolution” or “liberation” of the people from their “immiseration” or bondage, even if technically it comes about through elections.

The discourse avoids a conspiratorial tone and does not single out any evil ruling minority. It avoids labeling opponents as evil and may not even mention them in an effort to maintain a positive tone and keep passions low.

The discourse does not argue for systemic change but, as mentioned above, focuses on particular issues. In the words of Laclau, it is a politics of “differences” rather than “hegemony.”
Because of the moral baseness of the threatening minority, nondemocratic means may be openly justified or at least the minority’s continued enjoyment of these will be seen as a generous concession by the people; the speech itself may exaggerate or abuse data to make this point, and the language will show a bellicosity toward the opposition that is incendiary and condescending, lacking the decorum that one shows a worthy opponent.

Formal rights and liberties are openly respected, and the opposition is treated with courtesy and as a legitimate political actor. The discourse will not encourage or justify illegal, violent actions. There will be great respect for institutions and the rule of law. If data is abused, it is either an innocent mistake or an embarrassing breach of democratic standards.

2: A speech in this category is extremely populist and comes very close to the ideal populist discourse. Specifically, the speech expresses all or nearly all of the elements of ideal populist discourse and has few elements that would be considered nonpopulist.

1: A speech in this category includes strong, clearly populist elements but either does not use them consistently or tempers them by including nonpopulist elements. Thus, the discourse may have a romanticized notion of the people and the idea of a
unified popular will but avoid bellicose
language or references to cosmic
proportions or any particular enemy.

0: A speech in this category uses few
if any populist elements.

**Grade and Analysis: 2.** Even though his speech is not bellicose, it has
every characteristic of a populist speech. Hi proposes a new system that
could copy what other catholic countries have done in terms of democracy.
According to him, all previous governments have been the same and
remaining like that will only drive the country into chaos. Thus, he wants to
unify Italy. With him, everything that is wrong will work. Italy will prosper
and it will be an example for the rest of the world.

*From: Hawkins, "Is Chávez Populist?"*
Populist Speech Rubric (II)

Name of politician: Silvio Berlusconi

Title of Speech: First Speech as Candidate

2: A speech in this category is extremely populist and comes very close to the ideal populist discourse. Specifically, the speech expresses all or nearly all of the elements of ideal populist discourse and has few elements that would be considered nonpopulist.

1: A speech in this category includes strong, clearly populist elements but either does not use them consistently or tempers them by including nonpopulist elements. Thus, the discourse may have a romanticized notion of the people and the idea of a unified popular will but avoid bellicose language or references to cosmic proportions or any particular enemy.

0: A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements.
Grade and Analysis: 2. Silvio Berlusconi puts himself as one of the people, thus what he expresses is what all Italians think. He insists that the country has always been ruled by a minority. Now, all those that seek freedom need to leave everything for the country. He seeks change, a new program, reorganization, and less involvement of the state. He wants a coalition, the start of a new period.

His speech is populist, because he does not show any signs of pluralism in it. Silvio Berlusconi is not an extremist, but still wants to pursue populist measures.
Populist Speech Rubric (III)

Name of politician: Donald Trump

Title of Speech: Announcement Speech

2: A speech in this category is extremely populist and comes very close to the ideal populist discourse. Specifically, the speech expresses all or nearly all of the elements of ideal populist discourse and has few elements that would be considered nonpopulist.

1: A speech in this category includes strong, clearly populist elements but either does not use them consistently or tempers them by including nonpopulist elements. Thus, the discourse may have a romanticized notion of the people and the idea of a unified popular will but avoid bellicose language or references to cosmic proportions or any particular enemy.

0: A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements.
Grade and Analysis: 2. Donald Trump has what seems an exaggerated speech. For him, the country is in deep trouble because it has a lot of enemies that are taking advantage of the United States. He uses strong language in his speech to talk about the enemies and the government, which according to him are doing everything wrong. Because of the role played by previous politicians he is the only one capable of saving and restoring the country, with his experience.
Name of politician: Donald Trump

Title of Speech: Inauguration Speech

2: A speech in this category is extremely populist and comes very close to the ideal populist discourse. Specifically, the speech expresses all or nearly all of the elements of ideal populist discourse and has few elements that would be considered nonpopulist.

1: A speech in this category includes strong, clearly populist elements but either does not use them consistently or tempers them by including nonpopulist elements. Thus, the discourse may have a romanticized notion of the people and the idea of a unified popular will but avoid bellicose language or references to cosmic proportions or any particular enemy.

0: A speech in this category uses few if any populist elements.
Grade and Analysis: 2. This was, according to the press, his most populist speech. In this speech, Donald Trump talks about unity, which he did not often do during his campaign. He also talks about how the government has taken advantage of the people. From now on, because of him, the people will be in control again. Even though, he did not get a majority of the votes, he considers himself a representative of the whole nation. Thus, now it is they against the rest of the world. No more politicians that get nothing done.
## Appendix D. Seven Build Tasks by Gee

### Seven Build Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>What things and people in this context are relevant and significant and in what ways? How is the speaker trying to give significance?</td>
<td>How is this piece of language being used to make certain things significant or not and in what ways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices (activities)</td>
<td>What practice is relevant in this context and how are they being enacted?</td>
<td>What practice (activity) is this piece of language being used to enact (i.e. Get others to recognize as going on)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identities</td>
<td>What identities are relevant for the speaker and the listener?</td>
<td>What identity (s) is this piece of language being used to enact (i.e. Get others to recognize as operative)? What identity or identities is this piece of language attributing to others, and how does this help the speaker or writer enact his own identity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>What relationships are relevant and how are they being enacted, used, recruited?</td>
<td>What sort of relationship or relationships is this piece of language seeking to enact with others (present or not)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>What social goods are relevant and how are they being distributed?</td>
<td>What perspective on social goods is this piece of language communicating (i.e. What is being communicated as to what is taken to be 'normal', 'right', 'good', 'correct', 'proper', 'appropriate', 'valuable', 'the way things are', 'the way things ought to be', 'high status or low status' 'like me or not')?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td>Connections and disconnections between things and people</td>
<td>How does this piece of language connect or disconnect things; how does it make one thing relevant or irrelevant to another?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| Sign Systems and knowledge | What are the relevant sign systems (languages) and ways of knowing relevant? How are they being used? | How does this piece of language privilege or disprivilege specific sign systems (Spanish v. English, technical language v. Everyday language, words v. Images) or different ways of knowing and believing or claims to knowledge or belief (science v. humanities, science v. commonsense)? |

Analyses: Answering the Seven Questions

**Silvio Berlusconi’s speeches:** Overall, what Berlusconi does is focus the attention on himself, how he is the only one capable of restoring Italy, by not focusing on specific points for his administration but highlighting all that is wrong and how the country needs a restructuring. For that he will give up everything for his country, to save the people. There is suffering because of the government, so defective Italy has to be shown the door while he opens the door for a new and unified country, full of opportunities and promoting equality.
Everything that the government has done has been hurting the people, using them for their benefit. What is highlighted is only the bad things the government has done, maybe by exaggerating them, to make them the scapegoat for all the evils.

By pointing out every aspect of Italian life that is wrong and blaming the elite, Berlusconi manages to focus the attention of the speech on what hurts and how he is the chosen healer, for example, how the taxes are misused and misapplied only to favor those in power and hurting all of those who work hard.

He manages, then, to separate himself from old and traditional politicians, making himself one of the people, the one who understands the people, the one who is willing to give everything up for his country. He manages to separate the “we” from the “them”, from the evil.

Not only does his being an outsider make him more fit for the government, but the fact that he is an entrepreneur willing to work with others that have the same principles work for the country as they did for him in his businesses.

His program will be what the Italians have been asking for. Society (according to him) will have a better educational system, health care, and taxes. Corruption will be eliminated, laws will be easy to understand, and the weaker will be helped.

Without explaining how he will do it, he claims he will have the best experts in each field to develop the program. He focuses on the disappointment Italians have in the government and accuses government of everything. Moreover, Berlusconi tends to focus on himself and how he is the chosen one to rescue the
country, how every fear can be overcome if he has the power and the old politicians are out.

Donald Trump’s speeches: In both speeches, he makes it clear that the enemies, which for him are almost every outside force, have taken control of the country. Only he himself, because of his experience, is capable of making everything better than how it has been. By telling stories, he makes the people believe that with his relations with the powerful he is the only one capable of doing the job. He not only diminishes the past government, but also his fellow republicans by indicating that they are incapable of running the country, which could be great but is being mismanaged by those on top. He assumes everyone is a follower; therefore, there is no competition. All Americans feel what he feels, thinks what he thinks. Under Trump, everyone will rule, not the elite. It will be the U.S. against the world.

His major focus is how the United States has been a playground for every outsider. He turns all of them into enemies of the people. Moreover, the country is hurting because those inside the government have let it happen, while the rest of the people suffers the consequences.

For him, since the politicians do not know how to manage, the people are no longer defining their future. He wants to awaken in the people a feeling that an outsider is the only one capable of improving the situation. He will hear those who have been unheard until now.

By telling stories, talking simply (even making it feel like a conversation) and reminding the country how he has managed business before, how well connected
he is, he tries to connect with all Americans. He separates himself from the elite, from the old establishment, and takes the corner of those that are hurting. Furthermore, he calls all Americans to be one, to get together and fight the rest of the world if necessary. He arouses the nationalism in his people.

He does not go deep on issues, only how he is going to undo most of the things Obama did because everything that was done previously was done wrong. He wants a greater America; he knows how to achieve it. What is most relevant is the unsteadiness the nation feels and how the economy has been hurt, mostly because of the enemies and the government.
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