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ABSTRACT


This research is a pragmatic study that aims to find out conversational implicature that is generated by non-observance of maxim in TIME Magazine’s interview with Donald Trump. It is also to discover the meaning of the conversational implicature that has been found. The writer uses the theory of Cooperative Principle proposed by Paul Grice for this study. The data are collected by reading the interview transcript. Qualitative method is applied to analyze the collected data.

The result shows that there are fifteen conversational implicatures that is generated by non-observance of maxims. They are the non-observance of the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of manner, and the maxim of relevance. Donald Trump has also done three of the five types of the non-observance of the maxims which are flouting, violating, and opting-out. In this interview, the type of the non-observance that he often does is flouting. Furthermore, Trump tends to flout the maxim of quantity the most. He blatantly makes his contribution in the conversation more informative than what is required. There are nine data which indicate it.

This study concludes that Trump tends to give more information than what is needed for a certain reason. He does not give a brief answer because he wants to make the public understand clearly what he says. It seems that he has been this way since he was still a businessman. He tends to give a long answer when he is asked about something. Moreover, he is now considered as a politician since he runs for the 2016’s presidential election. He needs public to vote for him in the election, so he does not want the public to misunderstand his views and plans for the United States in a wrong way.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

In the communication process, it is expected for both of speaker and listener to use language effectively, so that the communication will proceed smoothly. It will enable common meaning to be produced or understanding to occur (Sullivan 42). However, the communication does not always run smoothly without any hitch, especially in oral communication. For instance, in an interview of a politician, it is mandatory for a politician to be cautious in giving a statement. Politicians do not talk things bluntly because they want to save their face. They realize every word they utter will surely be heard by the public. They know they have to win people’s heart in order to achieve the positions they want in the government. Therefore, they often state things which the meaning cannot be grasped easily.

Grice states it in his article entitled ‘Logic and Conversation’ that a speech can imply propositions that are not part of the speech in which the implicit proposition can be called as a conversational implicature (Grice 45). The term implicature is used by Grice to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as distinct from what the speaker literally says (Brown and Yule 31). In using language in everyday life, people often use conversational implicatures for
a particular purpose (Mey 45). Consequently, it leads to the listener’s confusion and misunderstanding sometimes.

In order for the communication process between the speaker and the listener can run well and smoothly, it is necessary in a conversation to consider following these principles: (1) the principle of clarity, (2) the principle of conciseness, and (3) principle of directness (Rahardi 18). A cooperation is also needed. One of the ways to cooperate each other to avoid misunderstandings in a conversation can be seen in the Cooperative Principles coined by Paul Grice. Grice claims, ‘Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged’. In the Cooperative Principles, there are four maxims. One by one can be described as follows: (1) Maxim of Quantity, (2) Maxim of Quality, (3) the Maxim of Relevance, and (4) Maxim of Manner (Grice 45). If the principles are followed, it can assist the communication process to proceed smoothly because those maxims can prevent misunderstandings between the speaker and the listener.

Nevertheless, the speaker does not rule out the possibility to violate the maxims intentionally to bring up the conversational implicatures because the speaker has a specific purpose to use implicatures in their conversation. One of the occasions in which the frequent use of implicatures can be found is in a political interview. Politicians are very brilliant in twisting words. They often
assert things which mean something quite different from what they literally says. They are very intelligent in using language. They use language as a weapon in a political world.

In this research, an interview between TIME magazine (represented by TIME Editor Nancy Gibbs, Washington Bureau Chief Michael Scherer, and political correspondent Zeke Miller), an American weekly news magazine, and Donald Trump, the nominee of the Republican party for president of the United States in the 2016 election, will be analyzed as the object of the research. In the interview with Donald Trump, TIME, as one of the leading magazine in the United States and even the world, asks the critical issues to test the feasibility of Donald Trump who has a possibility to be the next president of the United States. Since Trump’s answers are likely to be read by millions of loyal readers of TIME magazine, he will surely be careful in answering all the questions. He is aware that the answers will affect the public opinion on him. Therefore, he often violates the cooperative principles by Grice which generate implicatures. He uses implicatures because he tries not to be straight-out in answering the questions. For example, when he is asked about his opinion on whether the Republic is honest or not.

(I) Interviewer : So do you think that they’re not honest?
Donald Trump : They got elected on the basis. So they got in, something happened.
Trump’s answer flouts the maxim of quantity. Trump can simply state ‘I do’ or ‘I don’t’. He does not state it clearly that the Republicans are not honest. He carefully says something has happened to imply the lying that the Republicans do are probably true. This conversation indicates there is non-observance of the maxim in attempting to avoid direct statement which Trump often uses in this interview. This interview is interesting to be analyzed because it has one of the most controversial people to be interviewed. Donald Trump is famous not only because of his candidacy as the next president of the United States, but he is also famous because his controversial statements toward some big issues. For example, he once declares he will ban muslims to come to the United States and he will build a wall to prevent more illegal immigrants from Mexico to come if he succeed becoming the next president of the United States.

Since Donald Trump is well-known for his controversial words, it is assumed that this interview between TIME magazine and Donald Trump would be very interesting to research. The non-observance of the maxims which also generate implicatures in TIME Magazine’s interview with Donald Trump will be analyzed in this research.

B. Focus of the Study

This study is limited to the pragmatic analysis related to the concept of conversational implicature. The object of research that will be examined is TIME Magazine’s interview with Donald Trump.
C. Research Questions

Based on the focus of the study above, the questions of the research are as follow:

1. What kind of conversational implicatures that occur in TIME Magazine’s interview with Donald Trump?
2. How are the conversational implicatures generated by the non-observance of maxims in TIME Magazine’s interview with Donald Trump?
3. What are the meanings of the conversational implicatures in TIME Magazine’s interview with Donald Trump?

D. Objective of the Study

Based on the research questions above, the purpose of this study can be concluded for:

a. To find out the type of conversational implicatures that occur in TIME Magazine’s interview with Donald Trump
b. To analyze the conversational implicatures that are generated by the non-observance of maxims in TIME Magazine’s interview with Donald Trump.
c. To describe the meanings of the conversational implicatures.
E. Significance of the Study

This research is expected to make the readers understand the use of the conversational implicature that is generated by the non-observance of maxim in political discourse. In addition, it is also expected to be beneficial for the students who will use Grice’s theory as well for the research. They can use this as one of the useful references to perform a further study related to pragmatics particularly in the use of conversational implicature.

F. Research Methodology

1. Method of the Research

This research uses qualitative method which is suitable to apply in the linguistic research. The method is conducted by compiling and analyzing the data. This kind of method that explores the meaning of phenomena and its relations with society in a real life context (Subroto 5-6).

2. Technique of Collecting and Analyzing Data

This research uses an interview transcript between TIME magazine and Donald Trump. The data are collected by bibliography technique. It is using written sources to collect the data (Subroto 77). The method used by the writer is a qualitative method using a conversational implicature theory of Paul Grice. Here are the stages in this research:

a. Read the transcript text.
b. Give mark on the utterance that might be contained conversational implicature.

c. Write the data gained into the data card in order to number the dialogue

d. Apply the theory of conversational implicature for the data in this research.

e. Describe the meaning of each implicature in the data that has been discovered.

3. Instrument of the Research

This research uses data card as the instrument of the research to classify and identify the data which is gained from interview transcript. This card is also used to collect the sources by taking some notes such as from books, newspaper, and websites (Subroto 42-3). Then, the data which contains the conversational implicatures that are generated by the non-observance of maxims are analyzed.

4. Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis of this research is TIME Magazine’s interview with Donald Trump which is published in August 20th, 2015. Many dialogues in the interview indicate conversational implicature as a result of non-observance of the cooperative principles by Grice.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Previous Research

There are some previous studies related to this research. The first study is conducted by Irma Rizkiani Hanifah entitled *Non-Observance of Maxim in Facebook Conversation*. The purpose of the study is to investigate types of maxims which are not observed by male and female Facebook users and how male and female users fail to observe maxims in their conversation. The writer uses a qualitative method by identifying, classifying, calculating, and interpreting based on Grice’s theory of conversational maxims (1975). The result of this study indicates that male users commonly failed to observe the maxim of relation with a percentage of 53.13%, while female users commonly failed to observe the maxim of quantity with a percentage of 44%. It turns out the reason why they fail to observe the maxim is because both speakers tend to make a joke, to stay close with friends, or just to contribute the conversation.

The second study is conducted by Sheila Nanda, Didi Sukyadi, and Sudarsono M.I., entitled *Conversational Implicature of the Presenters in Take Me Out Indonesia*. This study is aimed to study conversational implicatures that are used by the presenters in a matchmaking show on Indosiar, Take Me Out Indonesia. The writer uses a qualitative method to identify, classify, calculate and
analyze the data based on conversational implicature theory proposed by Grice (1975). The results of this study indicate that the presenters tend to be more frequent in using general conversational implicatures with a percentage of 59.8% than the emergence of particularized conversational implicature which is 40.2%. The study concludes that various types of implicatures are used to make the interactions run smoothly.

Both of the previous studies use the same theory with this research to be applied in the collected data which is Grice’s theory of cooperative principle. The use of the non-observance of maxims and implicatures in this research is the same as the previous studies as well. It is deliberately used to achieve a particular purpose. Whether it is to make the interactions flows smoothly, to stay close with the listener, or to save the speaker’s face. The purpose depends on the event. However, the previous studies use a percentage by calculating the data to get the results and compare which one that is used the most while the aim of this research is not to compare which non-observance maxim or implicature that is used the most. On the contrary, this research’s goal is to indicate implicatures that are generated by the non-observance of the maxims.

This research also does not use a conversation in a reality show or social media as the previous studies, this research uses an interview of a well-known politician who is likely to be the next president of the United States as the object instead. It makes this research as a political discourse because it focuses on
political forums. In the political discourse, it turns out the main purpose of the use of the non-observance maxims and implicatures is not to stay close with the listener or to make the interactions run smoothly as the previous studies. Therefore, this research will answer the politician’s motive in using the non-observance maxims and implicatures. The writer also applies a qualitative method as the previous studies by collecting and studying the data.

B. Discourse Analysis

The analysis of discourse is the analysis of language in use. It is committed to an investigation of what that language is used for (Brown and Yule 1). It examines patterns of language across texts and considers the relationship between language and the social and the cultural contexts in which it is used. It also considers the ways that the use of language presents different views of the world and different understandings. It examines how the use of language is influenced by the relationships between participants as well as the effects the use of language has upon social identities and relations (Paltridge 2).

Moreover, it turns out that it has the same approach with pragmatics. Peccei and Yule describe that both pragmatics and discourse analysis study the meaning of words in context, analyzing the part of meaning that can be explained by knowledge of the physical and social world and the socio-psychological factors influencing communication, as well as the knowledge of the time and place in which the words are uttered or written. Cook states that the second
feature that pragmatics and discourse analysis have in common is that they both look at the use of language and pieces of spoken and written discourse, concentrating on how stretches of language become meaningful and unified for their users. They are both also concerned with the speakers’ short-term purposes in speaking and long-term goals in interacting verbally (Cutting 2).

C. Pragmatics and Cooperative Principles

Levinson concludes pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language (Levinson 9). It is the way speakers and writers accomplish goals as social actors who do not just need to get things done, but must attend to their interpersonal relationships with other participants at the same time (Leech 8). One of the ways to accomplish goals as social actors in a particular conversation is by following the cooperative principle.

The cooperative principle is one of the fields that is studied in pragmatics. It is coined by Paul Grice in his paper “Logic and Conversation” (Grice 45). Grice describes the cooperative principle as a set of rules in an ordinary conversation. It is formulated as follows: make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (Barber and Stainton 100).

The speaker and the listener have to cooperate each other to avoid misunderstanding between them. In a particular conversation, people certainly
expects their utterance can be understood by the listener. Therefore, in order to achieve it, it is necessary in a conversation to consider following these principles: (1) the principle of clarity, (2) the principle of conciseness, and (3) principle of directness. Grice has fully set forth the principles in the cooperative principle which entirely covers the four maxims (Grice 45).

1. The Maxim of Quantity

In this maxim, there are some principles that has to be followed according to Grice, which are:

(i) *make your contribution as informative as is required*

(ii) *do not make your contribution more informative than is required*

Maxim of quantity is related to the amount of information that is expected from any conversational exchange. It occurs when people are talking to someone that they assume it is obliged to give them enough detail to enable the listener understanding the speaker. If the speaker does not attempt to give enough information, he or she can be seen as a person who does not want to cooperate. At the same time, however, the speaker must avoid giving too much information and he must create a restriction in an ongoing conversation (Finch 157). Thus, the speaker is expected to provide sufficient information, relatively adequate, and informative as possible. If such information is beyond the information that is needed by the listener or otherwise, less than is required by the listener, it can be said violating the maxim of quantity in Grice’s cooperative principle (Rahardi 53)
A: Who’s eaten the biscuits?

B: I’ve had some.

If B’s answer is true that he or she only eats some of the biscuits, B’s reply is appropriately cooperative because he or she replies A’s question with the information that is needed. The B’s answer does not violate the maxim of quantity (Finch 158).

2. The Maxim Of Quality

In this maxim, there are some principles that has to be followed according to Grice, which are;

(i) do not say what you believe to be false
(ii) do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Maxim of quality is a maxim which considers that lying is an obvious violation of the cooperative principle (Finch 159). The speaker is expected to deliver something tangible and also in accordance to the fact. The fact must be supported and based on clear evidence (Rahardi 55). If we say something that does not correspond to the facts, it can violate the maxim of quality (Chapman 77).

A: Where does C live?

B: Somewhere in the South of France.

B’s answer implicates that he or she does not know exactly where C lives. France is a big country. He or she only knows that C lives in South of France, but
he or she does not know the exact location. Therefore, he or she cannot be more specific. If he or she tries harder to give the exact location, it will lead to violation of a maxim quality if his or her answer is not totally correct. B’s answer follows the maxim of quality because the answer is in accordance to the fact that he or she knows.

3. The Maxim of Relevance

In this maxim, there are some principles that has to be followed according to Grice, which are:

(i) make your contribution relevant.

In the maxim of relevance, it is stated that in order to create a good cooperation between the speaker and the listener, each should be able to provide a relevant contribution of something that is spoken (Rahardi 56). People in a conversation who change the topic abruptly are normally considered rude or uncooperative. Thus it would violate one of the principles in the cooperative principle. In this case, it will violate the maxim of relevance (Finch 158).

A: Where’s my chocolate?
B: The children were in your room this morning.

It is clear to see that B’s reply is explicitly relevant to the question, so it does not violate the maxim of relevance. The answer implicates that there is a probability that the children who were in A’s room eat the chocolate.

4. The Maxim of Manner

In this maxim, there are some principles that has to be followed according
to Grice, which are;

(i) *avoid obscurity*

(ii) *avoid ambiguity*

(iii) *be brief*

(iv) *be orderly*

Maxim of manner requires participants to speak directly, clearly, and not hazy (Rahardi 57). This maxim also obliges us to organise our utterances in an orderly manner to provide information in a way which can be received by the listener (Finch 159). The purpose of the maxim of manner is to avoid ambiguities in a conversation. Speakers should avoid vague expressions, avoid ambiguous words, and speak briefly (Thomas 64).

A: Where are the car keys?

B: They’re on the table in the hall.

In the case above B’s reply is clearly not ambiguous. He or she replies in accordance with what A needs to know. Therefore, it follows the maxim of manner and it certainly does not violate it.

**D. The Non-Observance of the Maxim**

Grice realized that there are many possibilities when people fail to observe the maxims. There are some motives why people may be unsuccessful to observe
the maxim, for instance, they do not always speak clearly and they also state a lie sometimes (Thomas 64). There are five ways of failing to observe a maxim.

1. Flouting a Maxim

Flouting a maxim is the intentional and blatant non-observance of a maxim at the level of what is said. Grice claims this blatancy is overt, that is, it is designed to be noticed by the speaker’s interlocutors and is therefore designed to generate a conversational implicature (Bousfield 23).

1.A. Flouting a Maxim of Quantity

A flout of the maxim of quantity occurs when a speaker blatantly gives more or less information than the situation requires (Thomas 69). The speaker intentionally gives an answer that is not sufficient in a conversation to implicate something. In other words, the speaker gives incomplete words when she or he is speaking (Leech 40). Here is an example of a conversation in which there is a flouting of maxim of quantity (Thomas 66):

A: How are we getting there?
B: Well, we’re getting there in Dave’s car

B blatantly gives less information than A needs, A expects B to explain how they are all getting there, but B only lets her know how she and her friends have a lift arranged without explaining A’s lift, thereby generating the implicature
that, A will not be travelling with them because B says exclusive ‘we’re’, which only covers B and her friends, not all the people on the spot which includes A.

1.B. Flouting a Maxim of Quality

Flouts, which exploit the maxim of quality, occur when the speaker says something which is blatantly untrue or for which he or she lacks adequate evidence (Thomas 67). It may be claimed that the speaker is stating a lie. The speaker misrepresents his information in order to make the listener understand the intended meaning of the utterance (Levinson 110). Here is an example of a conversation in which there is a flouting of maxim of quality (Thomas 68).

A: What do you do?
B: I’m a teacher
A: Where do you teach?
B: Outer Mongolia
A: Sorry I asked!

Outer Mongolia is seen as somewhere impossibly remote, the answer that B states is to implicate to A that his attention to B is unwelcome. That is why A apologizes to B after B replied his second question.

1.C. Flouting a Maxim of Relation

The maxim of relation is exploited by making a response or observation
which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand (Thomas 70). In this case the participant will change the topic by means of irrelevance topic of the partner of the conversation (Levinson 111).

*I finished working on my face. I grabbed my bag and a coat. I told my mother I was going out . . . She asked me where I was going. I repeated myself. ‘Out.’*

The speaker’s answer to her mother is not relevant to the exact meaning of the question. The speaker already tells her mother that she is going out, then her mother asks where she is going and she replies the exact answer she told her mother before. What her mother exactly wants to know is the specific place she is going, but it is obvious that she does not her mother to know.

1.D. Flouting a Maxim of Manner

A flout of the maxim of manner occurs when a speaker is extremely long-winded and convoluted in response. Here is an example of a conversation in which there is a flouting of maxim of manner (Thomas 71).

Interviewer : Did the United States Government play any part in Duvalier's Departure? Did they, for example, actively encourage him to leave?

Official : I would not try to steer you away from that conclusion. T

The official could simply reply the question by saying ‘no’ or ‘yes’.

The answer is seen as an ambiguous answer because the official does not
clearly make his answer as an agreement or a disagreement to the interviewer.

2. Violating a maxim

Violating a maxim is the unostentatious or covert non-observance of a maxim. Grice asserts that the speaker in violating a maxim will be liable to mislead (Bousfield 23). According to Thomas, a speaker can be said to ‘violate’ a maxim when they know that the hearer will not know the truth and will only understand the surface meaning of the words (Cutting 40).

2.A. Violating a Maxim of Quantity

The following example is a violation of a maxim quantity (Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi 123).

John : Where have you been? I searched everywhere for you during the past three months!
Mike : I wasn’t around. So, what’s the big deal?

Mike’s answer is insufficient and less informative. Mike does not want John to know where he was, so he just confirms John’s question which asks his nonexistence for the past three months is true, but he does not tell John where exactly he was. Hence, Mike’s answer leads to a violation of a maxim of quantity.

2.B. Violating a Maxim of Quality

The following example is a violation of a maxim quality (Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi 122-123).
The son has been playing all day long.

Mother : Did you study all day long?
Son : I’ve been studying till now!

The son violates the maxim of quantity because he does not tell the truth to his mother by conveying a lie. It is probably because he is afraid of the unpleasant consequences he will get such as punishment or to be forced to study for the rest of the day.

2.C. Violating a Maxim of Relation

The following example is a violation of a maxim relation (Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi 123).

Teacher : Why didn’t you do your homework?
Student : May I go and get some water? I’m so thirsty.

The student’s answer to the teacher’s question is not relevant. The teacher expects the student to explain the reason why he or she does not do the homework, the student replies it back with another question instead of an explanation of his or her laziness. The student’s answer clearly indicates a violation of a maxim relation. One reason for the answer can be the fact that the student is trying to evade the interrogation posed by the teacher.

2.D. Violating a Maxim of Manner

The following example is a violation of a maxim relation (Khosravizadeh
Sarah : Did you enjoy the party last night?
Anna : There was plenty of oriental food on the table, lots of flowers all over the place, people hanging around chatting with each other . . .

Sarah asks a simple question, but Anna replies with a long unnecessary answer. She does not answer it clearly which causes the answer she expresses is likely to have two interpretations: 1. Anna has such a good time in the party and she is obviously too excited and have no idea where to begin. 2. Anna has such a terrible time and she does not know how to complain about it. In this case, Anna’s answer is ambiguous, therefore it violates a maxim of manner.

3. Infringing a maxim

Infringing maxim occurs when a speaker who, with no intention of generating an implicature and with no intention of deceiving, fails to observe a maxim (Thomas 74). This is kind of non-observance that often occurs to a young child or a foreign learner. When they have no a perfect knowledge of a language they are speaking. Therefore, they unintentionally fails to observe the maxim. Thomas argues transgressions of this nature are generated through a speaker’s imperfect linguistic performance rather than a desire to generate conversational implicature, to be uncooperative, or to mislead (Bousfield 24).
Infringing also occurs when the speaker is physically or cognitively impaired. The speaker may be nervous or drunk or unable to develop a logical argument in conformity with the maxims (Flowerdew 100). Here is an example of a person who infringes a maxim (Mooney 910).

English speaker : Would you like ham or salad for your sandwich?
Non-English speaker : Yes.

This example shows that the non-English speaker does not intentionally generate the implicature, but he or she simply does not understand the utterance that is being asked.

4. Opting Out a Maxim

Opting out a maxim occurs when the speaker indicates unwillingness to cooperate in a conversation in which the maxim requires. This often occurs in public life when the speaker has some legal or ethical reasons, therefore they cannot reply as normally expected. For instance, a priest, counsellor or even an investigate journalist refusing to relay information given in confidence, or a police officer refusing to release the name of an accident victim until the victim’s relatives have been informed (Thomas 75).

*The Conservative M.P., Teddy Taylor, had been asked a question about talks he had had with Colonel Gadaffi.*
‘Well, honestly, I can’t tell you a thing, because what was said to me was told me in confidence’.

This indicates that the politicians, Teddy Taylor, opts out a maxim when he prevents from answering. He seems to be unwilling to cooperate because he is probably required not to tell it for the sake of secret information or something else.

5. Suspending a Maxim

Suspending a maxim occurs when the speaker finds something that is not supposed to say. There are certain events in which there is no expectation on the part of any participant that they will be fulfilled. The suspensions of the maxims may be related to a particular culture or events. For instance, mentioning someone’s name after his or her death in a particular circumstance is considered as a taboo act. In this case the non-observance of the maxim of quantity generates no implicatures because all the participants know that it is suspended (Thomas 76-77).

_The speaker in this example is the daughter of a murdered man. She is talking to Officer Jjim Chee of the Navajo Tribal Police._

‘Last time you were with that FBI man – asking about the one who got killed,’ she said, respecting the Navajo taboo of not speaking the name of the dead. ‘You find out who killed that man?’
This example indicates that the daughter of a murdered man avoids the name of the dead and replaces it with ‘the one who got killed’.

E. Implicature

Implicature is the implications of an utterance that go beyond of what strictly implied by the content of the utterance. It refers to an utterance which is not expressed explicitly (Blackburn 238). The term implicature goes back to the philosopher Paul Grice, as laid down in his paper ‘Logic and Conversation’. He claims that what is implicated and what is said by speakers are distinct. However, both are part of the meaning of a sentence spoken (Mey 365). Here is an example of a conversation in which there are implicatures (Cummings 10).

A: Do you want to come round to my place tonight?
B: John’s mother is visiting this evening.

B’s answer is indirectly rejecting A’s bid to come to a party. In the case above, B is not directly rejecting A’s bid by saying ‘no’. B tries to resist the bid by tucking his point in another sentence that may be understood by A that B cannot accept the offer because John’s mother would come to visit. Therefore, B cannot join the party because there will be a guest that he or she has to encounter. Sometimes, when we want to answer a question or offer, the person does not explicitly give a reply on the question or the offer.
Grice claims that there are two kinds of implicature, which are conventional implicature and conversational implicature (Grice 44).

1. Conventional Implicature

In contrast of a conversational implicature, that will be discussed later, conventional implicature is not based on the cooperative principle or the maxims (Yule 45). It is an implicature that does not depend on a conversational fate and does not depend on a particular context of language use (Mey 45). Here is an example of a conventional implicature (Ziegeler 143):

*He is an englishman, therefore he is brave*

In which the conventional implicature, associated with *therefore*, is the meaning ‘it follows that’. In this case, the adverb ‘therefore’ that carries the conventional implicature. Conventional implicatures are often associated with highly grammaticalised items. Another example of grammaticalised item that carries conventional implicature is the definite article. Such as in *the window was open*, where *the window* conventionally implies there was only one in the room.

2. Conversational Implicature

According to Grice, conversational implicature is a proposition in a speech which is not part of the speech itself (Rahardi 43). It is a component of a speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in a speaker’s utterance without being part of what is said (Horn 3). What a speaker intends to
communicate is characteristically far richer than what she directly expresses. It is derived via Grice’s cooperative principle and its attendant maxims of conversation (Cummings 206). The basic assumption in conversation is the participants are adhering to the cooperative principle and the maxim. Consider the following example. Dexter may appear to be violating the requirements of the quantity maxim.

Charlene : I hope you brought the bread and the cheese.
Dexter : Ah, I brought the bread.

After hearing Dexter’s response, Charlene has to assume that Dexter is cooperating and not totally unaware of the quantity maxim, but he does not mention the cheese. Even though he does not mention it, we can understand that he only brings the bread. The proposition of Dexter’s utterance is he does not bring the cheese. The proposition is known as part of the meaning of a sentence or clause (Radden and Dirven 56), so it is clear when Dexter says he only brings the bread, it also means he does not bring the cheese. If he has brought the cheese, he would say so, because he would be adhering to the quantity maxim. He must intend that she infer that what is not mentioned is not brought. In this case, Dexter has conveyed more than he says via a conversational implicature (Yule 40).

Conversational implicature concerns the way we comprehend an utterance in conversation in accordance with what we expect to hear. Thus, if we
ask a question, a response which on the face of it does not make ‘sense’ can very well be an adequate answer.

For instance, if a person asks:

\[
\text{What time is it?}
\]

It makes perfectly good sense to answer:

\[
\text{The bus just went by,}
\]

In a particular context of conversation. This context should include the fact that there is only one bus a day, that it passes at 7.45 a.m. each morning, and furthermore, that the interlocutor is aware of this and takes the answer in the spirit in which it was given, as a hopefully relevant answer (Mey 46-47).

2.A. Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized implicature occurs when the hearer is not required to assume a particular context or scenario: the information is generally assumed, universally or culture-wide (Verschueren and Jan-Ola Östman 106). When no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning (Yule 41). It is also stated that generalized implicatures are similar to the usual or common meaning (Engelhardt 5). Here is an example of a generalized implicature (Yule 41).

\[
\text{I was sitting in a garden one day. A child looked over the fence.}
\]

The implicature above indicates that the garden or the child is not owned by the speaker for the reason that there is an article 'a' which indicates that the noun
that is followed does not belong to the speaker. If the speaker was capable of being more specific, then he or she would have said ‘my garden’ or ‘my child’.

2.B. Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized implicature occurs when contextual information has a role in the process of the conversation (Sbisà and Turner 115). Particularized implicature requires special knowledge of any particular context, so that its meaning can be understood by the listener (Yule 42). Particularized implicature was not about the utterance, but the speakers. Here is an example of a particularized implicature (Sbisà and Turner 115):

A: Would you like a slice of cake?
B: I'm on a diet.

In the sentence above, B’s reply will be understood by the participants in the conversation only. Therefore, in order to understand the actual meaning of the implicature, an appropriate knowledge or information is needed. Particularized implicature can also be canceled by the speakers by providing further details such as the following example.

B: I'm on a diet, but I'll have one.

By saying *but I'll have one*, it appears that particularized implicature has been canceled.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH FINDINGS

A. Data Description

Data collecting technique used in this research is bibliography study. It is using written sources to gain the data. The data is from an interview transcript between Donald Trump and TIME magazine which is represented by Nancy Gibbs, Michael Scherer, and Zeke Millerand. They interview Trump on August 18\textsuperscript{th}, 2015. The transcript is downloaded from official website \url{http://time.com/4003734/donald-trump-interview-transcript/}.

After getting the data, the data is written into data cards, e.g on page 1, data 1: flouting maxim of quantity, page 2, data 2: flouting maxim of manner, and so on. In using the technique, the total data obtained on data cards which are the data of particularized conversational implicature that is generated by non-observance of maxim are 15 data.

In total, there are 11 data indicate flouting a maxim, 2 data indicate violating a maxim, and 2 data indicate opting-out a maxim. The maxims that are unobserved are maxim of quantity which has a total of 9 data, maxim of quality which has a total of 3 data, maxim of relevance which has a total of 1 data, and maxim of manner which has a total of 2 data.
The results of this research are conversational implicatures which are generated by the non-observance of maxims, each type of the non-observance of maxim is represented by one example as described on the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversational Implicature</th>
<th>Non-observance of Maxims</th>
<th>Indications</th>
<th>Corpuses</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Particularized Conversational Implicature</td>
<td>1. Flouting a Maxim Quantity</td>
<td>1.1 Blatantly indicates the non-observance of the maxims 1.2 Intentionally generate an implicature</td>
<td>1. Interviewer : But the next step, if I understand your plan correctly, is that even the hardworking good people who are here without papers — Donald Trump : They’re illegally here. They will leave, and they’ll come back on an expedited basis if they…</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Particularized Conversational Implicature</td>
<td>2. Flouting a Maxim Manner</td>
<td>2.1 Blatantly indicates the non-observance of the maxims 2.2 Intentionally</td>
<td>2. Interviewer : But do you forcibly remove them? I mean if they choose not to</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Particularized Conversational Implicature | 3. Flouting a Maxim Relevance | generate an implicature
| 3.3 Blatantly indicates the non-observance of the maxims | 3.4 Intentionally generate an implicature |
| 4. Particularized Conversational Implicature | 4. Violating a Maxim Quality | go, if they say, “No, I’m not going to go.”
| 4.1 Covertly indicates the non-observance of the maxims | 4.2 Intentionally generate a misleading implicature |

Donald Trump : It’ll all work out. It’s called management.

Interviewer : You’re not the average American in a way, you’ve never been – but you connect with them. How do you explain that?

Donald Trump : Actually, the funny thing is, I do worse with the wealthy people.

Interviewer : Several of your rivals say that your experience in business doesn’t translate. Chris Christie said, “This is not negotiating a real estate

Donald Trump : It’ll all work out. It’s called management.
deal. This is international diplomacy.” What do you say to that?

Donald Trump: Well, I have the right temperament.

Interviewer: Are there any of the current candidates who you would not consider as a vice presidential candidate?

Donald Trump: Well I don’t want to say because –

Interviewer: What happened with “The Apprentice”?

Donald Trump: [NBC/Comcast Executives] came up to see me. And even after twelve years and fourteen seasons…
B. Data Analysis

Datum 1

Trump rarely gives a short answer in any interview. It has been this way since he was still a businessman. He tends to talk a lot. Therefore, it is not surprising to discover that Trump is known as a presidential candidate of the United States of America who often gives controversial statements. One of the controversial statements that he gives is that he promises to deport all the illegal immigrants if he is elected as the next president. He wants to establish new immigration controls to boost wages and to ensure that open jobs are offered to American workers first (Trump Pence: Make America Great Again 2016). One of the ways to control it is by sending all the illegal immigrants back to their country. TIME, as one of the trusted magazines in the United States, surely does not forget to confirm the validity of his statement which many people claim as a controversial one.

Interviewer: But the next step, if I understand your plan correctly, is that even the hardworking good people who are here without papers —

Donald Trump: They're illegally here. They will leave, and they’ll come back on an expedited basis if they...And they will leave.

In this conversation, Trump’s answer indicates a particularized conversational implicature because the interviewer needs to understand the
context of the conversation in order to understand what Trump means by his utterance. The particularized conversational implicature that he indicates is generated by his non-observance of the maxim. Trump’s answer blatantly flouts the maxim of quantity. His answer is flouting a maxim because he intends to make sure that the interviewer notices what he really means. He also gives too much information than what is needed which flout the maxim of quantity. The interviewer asks whether Trump still wants to deport the illegal immigrants who are also good workers in the United States. He can answer by only saying ‘yes, it is’ to confirm or ‘no, it is not’ to deny the plan that he has told. Instead, he says that the illegal immigrants will leave.

Therefore, by flouting the maxim of quantity, his answer generates a conversational implicature. He claims that those people are still illegal which implies he has no other choice but to deport them. He does not care whether they are hardworking good people or not as long as they are still illegal, he will make sure those people will be deported one way or another.

Datum 2

It is really obvious that Trump does not tolerate the illegal immigrants at all. Trump’s answer gives an impression that he will do anything to make the illegal immigrants go back to their country. He makes it as if it is easy to create a system to deport all of them. A 2015 study by the American Action Forum (AAF) estimates it would take about 20 years to find and deport that many
people (*BBC News*). Therefore, the interviewer asks this question as the response of the previous answer.

**Interviewer**: But do you forcibly remove them? I mean if they choose not to go, if they say, “No, I’m not going to go.”

**Donald Trump**: It’ll all work out. It’s called management. Politicians can’t manage. All they can do is talk. It’s called management. And we’ll do an expedited system. Because I agree with you, there are some very, very good people here who they are here illegally. But they are illegal. We have to strengthen our border. We have to have people come in legally. And we will work out an expedited system where the really good people can come back legally.

Trump indicates a particularized conversational implicature in this case. In order to understand Trump’s utterance completely, the interviewer has to understand the context of the conversation. Trump’s particularized conversational implicature is generated by his non-observance of the maxim. Trump flouts the maxim of manner. He intentionally tries to make the interviewer understands that he will deport the illegal immigrants although he has to forcibly remove them. However, his answer is not really clear to understand. Two of the four rules to follow the maxim of manner are avoiding obscurity and being brief. Trump is asked whether he does want to remove the illegal citizens forcibly or not. He is being complicated to clarify it. He can simply answer, ’yes,
I do’ or ‘no, I do not’ to follow the principle. Instead, he says that ‘it will all work out’. He says the illegal citizens do not help his plan to strengthen United States’ border.

Hence, by flouting the maxim of manner, he generates a conversational implicature. From all the things he says above, he implies that he still wants to remove the illegal citizens even though the citizens insist not to go, but one thing that has to be marked is that he has a plan to create a system to take the good people back legally.

Datum 3

Trump is also known as a candidate who often gives bad comments about other politicians. For instance, he often criticizes his rival in the presidential election, Hillary Clinton, and the current president of the United States, Barack Obama. Therefore in this interview, the interviewer is intrigued to ask him a question about the former presidents of the United States.

**Interviewer**: You’ve written more on leadership than any of the other candidates. George W. Bush or Bill Clinton, who is a better leader?

**Donald Trump**: I wasn’t a huge fan of Bush, as you know...I thought he was lost. I thought he was not a great president...He certainly wasn’t a good president. He got us into Iraq which by itself was a disaster. He also caused toward the end of his thing a financial problem by allowing
exploding mortgages and other things that I predicted.

In the dialogue above, Trump creates a particularized conversational implicature. It is because in order to get what Trump means by his utterance, the interviewer has to have a special knowledge based on the context of the conversation. Also, the particularized conversational implicature that he utters is generated by his non-observance of the maxim. Trump flouts the maxim of quantity. It is because he blatantly gives more information than what is required. The interviewer just asks who the better leader is between the two former presidents of the United States. To follow the principle, he can answer it by mentioning one name only to indicate the better one, whether it is George W. Bush or Bill Clinton, so that his answer will be as informative as what is required. However, he instead explains about his dislike of George W. Bush.

By stating that he is not a huge fan of Bush, a conversational implicature is created. Trump implies that the one whom he assumes the better leader is Bill Clinton. He is probably not a fan of Bill Clinton as well, but he still thinks that Bill Clinton is better compared to George W. Bush. It is because his answer only explains the reasons why he dislikes Bush.

Datum 4

Besides criticizing the other politicians, he also likes to pride himself.
He knows by only talking about other people’s badness, it will not get people’s votes. He must tell people the reason why he deserves to be the next president as well. He has to persuade people to choose him. Therefore, when he is asked about his good connection with average people, he explains that his connection to average people is better than his connection to the wealthy ones. It is to convince the people who read this interview to have a good impression about him although his answer flouts one of the maxims.

**Interviewer**: You’re not the average American in a way, you’ve never been – but you connect with them. How do you explain that?

**Donald Trump**: Actually, the funny thing is, I do worse with the wealthy people. Okay, it’s funny in my opinion. Now, they’ll all support me if I want them to, but I don’t want them. If they want to send something, I don’t care….I have a dot com. I had a woman send me $7 the other day. Another guy sent me $12. There was a long beautiful letter. I love that, because it’s like they’re investing. That’s called a great thing.

In this dialogue, a particularized conversational implicature is created by Trump’s answer. The interviewer has to understand context of the conversation in order to grasp the real meaning by Trump’s utterance. His particularized conversational implicature is also generated by his non-observance of the maxim. His answer flouts the maxim of relevance. He flouts it because he blatantly gives an irrelevant answer. As it is already known, Trump is born into a wealthy
family. His father, Frederick Trump, was a builder and real estate developer. His father is also the founder of Elizabeth Trump & Son Co (Bio). The interviewer asks why Trump can connect with average people although he has never been in their position. However, he explains about his connection with wealthy people instead. It is because he wants to make an impression to the public that he is a down to earth person. Although he is wealthy, his relationship with the wealthy people is not as good as his relationship with the average ones.

His answer is not relevant to the question that is being asked. His answer about him being worse with the wealthy people is a conversational implicature which implies that it is easier to connect with the average people than the wealthy ones.

Datum 5

There are many ways to make the wealthy and the poor believe that he is capable of becoming the next president of the United States. One of the ways is creating a new policy that is aimed to benefit the citizens. One of the new policies that he wants to create is repealing the Dodd Frank.

**Interviewer**: Do you want to repeal Dodd Frank and similar financial regulation reforms passed by President Obama?

**Donald Trump**: Well Dodd Frank is probably not a very good thing. There are aspects of it you could leave. But generally speaking Dodd Frank stifles business. It just totally stifles business.
Trump indicates a particularized conversational implicature by his utterance as the interviewer must know the context of the conversation in order to understand what Trump means by his utterance. The particularized conversational implicature that appears is generated by Trump’s non-observance of the maxim. Trump flouts the maxim of quantity. It is clear that his answer is blatantly designed to make the interviewer aware of what he means. He also gives too much information than what is required. The interviewer only wants to know whether Trump wants to repeal Dodd Frank, an act to promote the financial stability of the United States, or not. To follow the principle, he can simply answer it by saying ‘yes, I do’ if he wants to repeal it, or ‘no, I do not’ if he wants the opposite. In fact, he explains that Dodd Frank is not good because it stifles business. He probably says that because Dodd Frank is considered restricting financial institutions and threatening small businesses (Peirce).

By giving too much information, his answer leads to a conversational implicature which implies that he wants to repeal Dodd Frank because it is not good for business, so he will not continue the act.

Datum 6

In another occasion, the interviewer asks Trump again about his view on the other politicians. When the Republicans promise to repeal Obamacare, a health
care reform law signed in 2010 by President Barack Obama (Obamacare Facts) and they have not done it till now, Trump thinks they could not do it.

**Interviewer**: So do you think that they’re not honest?

**Donald Trump**: *They got elected on the basis. So they got in, something happened.*

In this conversation, Trump indicates a particularized conversational implicature by his utterance. It is because, to figure out the conveyed meaning of Trump’s answer, a special knowledge of the context in the conversation is needed by the interviewer. The particularized conversational implicature that Trump indicates is generated by his non-observance of the maxim. Trump flouts the maxim of quantity by openly giving too much information than what is required. The interviewer wants to know whether Trump assumes that the Republicans, people who are under the Republican Party, one of the two major political parties in the United States, are considered dishonest according to what they have done. They promise to repeal Obamacare, but after they get elected, they do not do it. Trump can simply state ‘yes, I do’ to explain that he does think they are dishonest or ‘no, I do not’ to explain the contrary. However, he instead claims that the Republicans have been elected, they get into the parliament, and something happens.

His answer generates a conversational implicature because he says something has happened to imply the lying that the Republicans do is true, the Republicans
are being dishonest. After they have got elected, they do not do the things as they have promised.

Datum 7

which is beneficial for his wealth to keep growing. Afterwards, the interviewer asks him about a Cayman account. It is an account of an offshore bank in Cayman Islands that people mostly use to accumulate wealth, or pay less tax (eCheck.org: Banking Advice Made Easy).

Interviewer: You don’t have any Cayman accounts?
Donald Trump: No I don’t. I could have
Interviewer: Have you ever, because you’d benefit a lot I’m sure.
Donald Trump: I could have and I said – I’ve been thinking about doing this – that really hurt Romney in my book, when he set up these stupid accounts. In the end, when you do the Cayman accounts you don’t gain that much.

In this case, a particularized conversational implicature appears in Trump’s utterance. In order to understand the meaning of Trump’s answer, the interviewer needs to know the context of the conversation. The particularized conversational implicature that Trump indicates is generated by his non-observance of the maxim. Trump flouts the maxim of quantity. It happens when a speaker blatantly gives too much information than what is needed which Trump does. His answer must be only ‘yes, I have’ or ‘no, I have not’ to follow the
principle. However, besides telling that he does not have a Cayman account, he also adds that he could have it if he wants. His answer gives too much information because the interviewer does not ask for his possibility to have a Cayman account. The interviewer only asks whether he has it or not.

Therefore, his flouting of the maxim of quantity generates a conversational implicature. He states that he could have a Cayman account which implies that he does not have a Cayman account not because he cannot have it, it is just because he does not want to.

**Datum 8**

Trump is a presidential candidate from the Republican Party, so the interviewer tries to ask one more question about the Republicans to get more details about Trump’s view on them.

**Interviewer**

: Are they the real phonies though?

**Donald Trump**

: Look, I was just as disappointed in the Republicans as I am the Democrats. I mean at least the Democrats you know where they’re coming from. The Republicans – and many of them got elected on the basis of we’re going to get rid of Obamacare. It’s almost like when they get to Washington, I will not let this happen to me. They’re so enamored with the magnificence that they sort of say, “Oh, we can’t do this. We can’t do that.” They become different. Does that make sense?
In this conversation, Trump’s answer indicates a particularized conversational implicature because the interviewer needs to understand the context of the conversation in order to understand what Trump means by his utterance. The particularized conversational implicature that he indicates is generated by his non-observance of the maxim. Trump flouts the maxim of quantity. He blatantly gives too much explanation. He can simply declare that the republicans are the real phonies or not by saying ‘yes, they are’ or ‘no, they are not’. Those kinds of answer would follow the cooperative principle, but he instead clarifies about the disappointment he gets from the Republicans as they are not aware of where they come from and they also become different. Trump knows he has stated some controversial statements. That is why he becomes more careful with the things he says. Everything he says could be a headline in a mass media and it could be misinterpreted. He knows that he cannot say ‘yes, the Republicans are real phonies’ blatantly.

His long statement about the Republicans is a conversational implicature which implies he does assume that the Republicans are phonies because it does not make sense to him that they cannot do anything while at the same time they are so enamored with the magnificence they get from their position.

Datum 9

Furthermore, the interviewer affirms one of Trump’s statement in the past to get the full explanation about it.
Interviewer: You’ve said that you can’t tear up an Iran deal on Day One.

Donald Trump: I’m a deal maker, when a person makes a deal … But I’ve taken on some really bad deals and made the other side suffer.

Trump indicates a particularized conversational implicature in this case. In order to understand Trump’s utterance completely, the interviewer has to understand the context of the conversation. Trump’s particularized conversational implicature is generated by his non-observance of the maxim. Trump flouts the maxim of quantity by overtly giving an excessive information than what is required. The interviewer tries to make sure that Trump has said that he cannot tear up an Iran deal on day one. Instead, he explains that he often makes a deal, but he has made some really bad deals which make the other people whom he makes a deal suffering. To follow the principle, his answer must be an agreement of what the interviewer has stated such as ‘yes, I have said that’ or ‘no, I have not said that’.

From the answer that he gives, it leads to a conversational implicature. He implies that he does say that statement because he cannot tear up an Iran deal in a short time. He needs more time because he does not want to make the other side suffers ever again like what he has done in the past.
Datum 10

Besides being a businessman and a candidate for the presidential election, Trump is also a father of five children from a total of his three marriages. In another occasion, the interviewer has a chance to ask about his daughters.

**Interviewer**: What do your daughters give you a hard time about?

**Donald Trump**: I’ve been very lucky, they’re both smart and both went to the Wharton School. Tiffany goes to Penn and Ivanka went to the Wharton School, both very good students. Tiffany’s got all A’s, Ivanka the same, very good students. Ivanka was interesting because I’m very strong on women’s health issues. And I couldn’t believe what Bush said last week about he wouldn’t fund, essentially wouldn’t fund women’s health issues. And I hit him hard.

In the dialogue above, Trump creates a particularized conversational implicature. It is because in order to get what Trump means by his utterance, the interviewer has to have a special knowledge based on the context of the conversation. Also, the particularized conversational implicature that he utters is generated by his non-observance of the maxim. Trump flouts the maxim of quantity. He frankly gives too much information than what is needed. The interviewer asks whether his daughters trouble him a lot or not. If his daughters do not do such things, he can just simply answer "no, they do not give me a hard
time’ to make his contribution as informative as what is required. However, he instead prides his daughters. He clarifies that both of his daughters, Ivanka Trump and Tiffany Trump, are smart, going to a great school, and getting all A’s. He also flouts the maxim of relevant by blatantly replying an irrelevant answer. He explains about Bush’s statement about women’s health issues which is not relevant at all to the topic that is being discussed, which are his daughters.

From the flouting of the maxim of quantity that he makes, the conversational implicature is also generated. His long answer about whether his daughters giving him a hard time implies that his daughters do not give him a hard time. On the contrary, Trump feels he is very lucky to have such smart daughters.

Datum 11

Trump is famous for his outspoken words. He is not afraid for speaking his mind in public. Some people think it is rude, but some people also think it is good to have a presidential candidate who can be a role model for authenticity. The interviewer later also asks Trump about this related matter.

Interviewer: Do you think there’s any chance watching what has happened with you, that here will be a wave of authenticity?

Donald Trump: *I think that’s what they need. There’s so little authenticity in many of the people that I’m watching. And that includes the other side. Hillary. I mean it certainly includes Hillary...*
In this dialogue, a particularized conversational implicature is created by Trump’s answer. The interviewer has to understand context of the conversation in order to grasp the real meaning by Trump’s utterance. His particularized conversational implicature is also generated by his non-observance of the maxim. Trump flouts the maxim of quantity by overtly providing too much information than what is needed. It is a yes or no question. If Trump wants to follow the rules of the maxim of quantity by making his contribution in the conversation as informative as what is required, he can simply say ‘yes, I do’ or ‘no, I do not’. However, he explains that the authenticity is what people need instead. Trump makes clear that many politicians these days have little authenticity. He once says that politics is such a disgrace and good people do not go into government (The Huffington Post). He does think that he is an authentic candidate that people need.

The things he explains leads to a conversational implicature which implies that he agrees with the question that he thinks a wave of authenticity will be there because of him. It is because people need it, since the present politicians cannot give that kind of wave.

Datum 12

Donald Trump considers himself as a businessman, not a politician. He thinks all politicians can do is talking and there is no action from them (Bump). That probably clarifies why he always gives bad comments toward other
politicians. Trump is a businessman who is also the president of The Trump Organizations. He has built office towers, hotels, casinos, golf courses, and other branded facilities worldwide (Bio). Therefore, when he announces that he is going to run for the presidential election, there are pros and cons toward his candidacy. Some people who are on the contra side think being a president of a big country is not the same as being a CEO of an organization. Hence, this situation leads the interviewer to ask this question.

**Interviewer**: Several of your rivals say that your experience in business doesn’t translate. Chris Christie said, “This is not negotiating a real estate deal. This is international diplomacy.” What do you say to that?

**Donald Trump**: Well, I have the right temperament. I have the right leadership. I’ve built an incredible company. I went to a great school. I came out I built an incredible company. I wrote the number one selling business book of all time Trump: The Art of the Deal. I had tremendous success in show business–star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame. “The Apprentice” was one of the most successful shows. And as you know NBC renewed it, I just said I’m not doing it. They’re not exactly thrilled with me at all. But I’ve had a great career, and I know how to get along with people. I know how to deal with people.

Trump indicates a particularized conversational implicature by his utterance as the interviewer must know the context of the conversation in order to
understand what Trump means by his utterance. The particularized conversational implicature that appears is generated by Trump’s non-observance of the maxim. Trump’s response to his rival’s statements which is conveyed by the interviewer is violating the maxim of quality. He covertly states some things which are not true. First, he claims that he writes a book titled *Trump: The Art of the Deal*. The truth is he does not write it. He uses a ghostwriter to write his own autobiography (Mayer). Second, he says that his autobiography is number one selling business book of all time. In fact, it is not. Since 2001, his book has been sold over 177,000 copies only. There are some business books which have been sold more than his. For instance, Steve Jobs’ biography has been sold over 1,740,000 copies (Qiu).

His answer also generates conversational implicature because by claiming the number one selling business book of all time, he also implies that it is not right to state that his business career does not translate to the political world. Because of his career in business, it helps him to get along with people. Therefore, he knows how to deal with them.

**Datum 13**

Later, the interviewer reminds him again about his controversial plan to deport all the illegal immigrants. This is an important issue to discuss because there are about 11 million unauthorized immigrants who live in the United States (Sherman). It is not a small number for the government to easily erase *them all*. 
Interviewer: You’re talking about 10% of California’s workforce, maybe 13% …

Donald Trump: Don’t forget in the meantime we have a real unemployment rate that’s probably 21%. It’s not 6. It’s not 5.2 and 5.5. Our real unemployment rate—in fact, I saw a chart the other day, our real unemployment—because you have ninety million people that aren’t working. Ninety-three million to be exact.

In this conversation, Trump indicates a particularized conversational implicature by his utterance. It is because, to figure out the conveyed meaning of Trump’s answer, a special knowledge of the context in the conversation is needed by the interviewer. The particularized conversational implicature that Trump indicates is generated by his non-observance of the maxim. Trump violates the maxim of quality. His answer is violating the maxim because what he states is incorrect. Trump claims that the unemployment rate in the United States is probably 21%. In fact, the unemployment rate in the United States is only 5.1% (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics). It is far from true.

He also says ‘probably’ which generates a conversational implicature. It implies that he is not sure about the accuracy of the unemployment rate that he claims. Maxim of quality requires the participants not to say things that you lack adequate evidence. Trump clearly violates the maxim of quality by claiming that the unemployment in the United States is 21% which is not true at all.
Datum 14

As a presidential candidate, Trump surely cannot stand alone. He later needs a vice president to accompany him. However, Trump is known for his dislike to many politicians. Thus, many people are curious about the person whom he will choose to sit next to him in the white house if he is elected. Then, the interviewer tries one more time to dig deeper about his view on his opponents and the possibility of making them his vice president.

Interviewer: Are there any of the current candidates who you would not consider as a vice presidential candidate?

Donald Trump: Well I don’t want to say because – I will tell you when it’s all over, win, lose or draw, I’ll tell you who I respect, who I don’t respect. I think the thing that I most – that I’m very complimented by is that Rick Perry was doing really well, and then he decided he had to do better and he went after me and he went right down the tubes. Senator Lindsey Graham was doing fine. Nobody got more publicity than this guy. He had zero. He’s the only one that had zero.

In this case, a particularized conversational implicature appears in Trump’s utterance. In order to understand the meaning of Trump’s answer, the interviewer needs to know the context of the conversation. The particularized conversational implicature that Trump indicates is generated by his non-observance of the maxim. Trump is opting out the maxim of quantity by indicating unwillingness
to cooperate in the conversation and giving too much information. He avoids the answer that is needed by the interviewer. He also gives too much information instead. It is because he has some personal reasons not to inform the public about which candidate whom he will not consider to be his vice president before he wins the election. However, he mentions some names that he considers are good people such as Rick Perry and Senator Lindsey Graham.

The opting out of the maxim of quantity generates a conversational implicature which indicates that there are some current candidates that will not be considered by him to be his vice president, only he cannot tell it at the time.

Datum 15

As it is explained before, Trump is known for his successful business in many areas. He once also becomes the executive producer of a reality game show called *The Apprentice* which is aired on NBC. Yet, he does not become a part of the show anymore for the 15th season which leads the interviewer to ask this.

**Interviewer**: What happened with “The Apprentice”?

**Donald Trump**: [NBC/Comcast Executives] came up to see me. And even after twelve years and fourteen seasons it was one of their most successful shows. It was a great success. And they tried to talk me into it and I just wouldn’t do it. And I just wouldn’t do it.
In this conversation, Trump’s answer indicates a particularized conversational implicature because the interviewer needs to understand the context of the conversation in order to understand what Trump means by his utterance. The particularized conversational implicature that he indicates is generated by his non-observance of the maxim. Trump is opting out the maxim of manner. He indicates unwillingness to answer the question. His reply is also not obscure because it does not answer the question which leads to the non-observance of the maxim of manner. The interviewer wants to know why *The Apprentice*, the reality game show that judges the business skills of a group of contestants who is hosted by him, has stopped airing on NBC. Many people argue it is because he has a possibility of a presidential run. He tries not to tell the reason why it stops. He instead explains how the NBC executives come up to see him and how a great success it is. He informs that he just would not do it without explaining the motives.

Trump’s answer leads to a conversational implicature which implies that he does not want the public to discover the real reasons why he decides not to continue the reality show which makes him famous.
A. Conclusion

According to Grice’s cooperative principle theory, speaker and listener should follow a set of rules to avoid misunderstanding between them. If the speaker and the listener do not follow the cooperative principle, the non-observance of the maxims will be generated. It can cause implicature to appear. There are two types of implicature; conventional implicature and conversational implicature. In this research, the writer only focuses on the conversational implicature which depends on a particular context.

Based on the findings, the writer discovers the non-observance of the maxims from Donald Trump’s utterances generate one of the types of the conversational implicature which is a particularized conversational implicature. It is because all the utterances which lead to implicature are in a specific context. In order to understand the meaning of his utterances, the listener has to have a special knowledge of the context.

The writer has found fifteen data from the interview transcript which are the non-observance of the maxims that generate a conversational implicature. Trump has done the non-observance towards all the maxims in the cooperative principle which are the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of
relevance, and the maxim of manner. There are also some types of the non-observance of the maxims that he has done which are flouting, violating, and opting-out. From all the data, the non-observance of the maxims that he has done the most is flouting the maxim of quantity. There are nine data that indicate he flouts the maxim of quantity.

Donald Trump flouts the maxim of quantity the most because he does not want his words to be misinterpreted by people. He is a public figure after all. He is known as a famous businessman before he runs for the presidential election. Afterwards, it seems that the way he talks as a businessman is not much different compared to the way he talks now as a politician. He tends to talk a lot to explain his ideas or views. Notably when he runs for the election, he knows he has to speak carefully. He is aware that many of his statements are controversial. For instance, Trump is accused as a presidential candidate who hates Muslims. He once said that the United States will have absolutely no choice but to close down some US mosques because some bad things are happening there. He also continues to call for a ban on Muslims from entire regions of the world. Not only his hatred towards Muslims, he is also accused for his hatred towards Hispanic Americans, black people, ethnic minorities, and the LGBT community because of his statements. He is now officially a President-elect of the United States, but this interview happens before he is elected. At the time, he still runs for the 2016’s presidential election. He knows people are watching every word that comes out from his mouth. In consequence, he needs to beware of it. In order to avoid
misconception, he tends to give a long explanation although the question only needs a short answer. He wants the readers to understand clearly. He cannot let people who read the interview getting bad impression about him. To become the next United States president, he needs votes from people and he surely knows that.

So in essence, it is right that the cooperative principle which consists of four maxims is applied in a conversation to avoid misunderstanding. However, it turns out that the non-observance of the maxims does not always cause a misunderstanding between the speaker and the listener. Sometimes, the speaker does the non-observance of the maxims which generate conversational implicature in order to make the listener understand distinctly.

B. Suggestion

The writer suggests the students to research more about the application of the cooperative principle theory in another verbal interaction such as debate or press conference for instance. The types of the non-observance of the maxims are also not only flouting, violating, and opting-out. There are other types such as infringing and suspending. Therefore, it is also suggested to analyze all the five types of the non-observance of the maxims for the next research because this research only indicates three types of the non-observance of the maxims.
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Donald Trump Explains All

In an interview with TIME, the leading Republican candidate talks about what’s wrong with the Clintons, his opponents’ weaknesses and what it takes to be great.

Donald Trump was interviewed by TIME Editor Nancy Gibbs, Washington Bureau Chief Michael Scherer, and political correspondent Zeke Miller on Aug. 18.

Jeb Bush was asked about your comment on “Meet the Press.” You were asked who your foreign policy advisors are and you said you “watch the shows.” He said it’s not enough to watch television. Do you have a response to that?

Well Jeb is a very low energy person. So he can sit around a table all day long with one general and talk and talk and you know. But I see that general as being grilled by you. And when I say I watch on television, I do, and I watch on TIME Magazine, and I watch in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, I read all of them a lot.
And I get my views from the media. A lot of the views, and frankly other people do. And the views that you will see during those ten or fifteen minute segments or during reading the story are not a lot different than Jeb sitting around with a policy group, if he really has such a thing.

It sounds good. I can say that too. You know I was an excellent student at the best school and I could also say, “Oh well, I have a great policy group, and we sit around.” I mean I wonder whether or not Jeb actually has that. But I’m being very honest. And I know when I say something like that, you can be criticized... When I see certain generals sitting at the different shows, I mean I think it’s a great way to learn about what’s going on. When I see the leaders of countries sitting on shows and frankly, you don’t have to go through the whole process. It’s a shortened version.

So I’m somebody that time is very important to me, and it saves time. But also you get really good views. You see some tremendous people.

In one of your books on leadership you actually said as advice to other people who want to be entrepreneurs, having a short attention span can be a benefit.

Well I mean I have an attention span that’s as long as it has to be. But I don’t have to sit around with a group of generals to tell me about Iraq being a failure. Iraq was a total failure.

Several of your rivals say that your experience in business doesn’t translate. Chris Christie said, “This is not negotiating a real estate deal. This is international diplomacy.” What do you say to that?

Well, I have the right temperament. I have the right leadership. I’ve built an incredible company. I went to a great school. I came out I built an incredible company. I wrote the number one selling business book of all time Trump: The Art of the Deal. I had tremendous success in show business—star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame. “The Apprentice” was one of the most successful shows. And as you know NBC renewed it, I just said I’m not doing it. They’re not exactly thrilled with me at all. But I’ve had a great career, and I know how to get along with people. I know how to deal with people.

I mean, if I was the governor of New Jersey, the George Washington Bridge would not have been shut. You talk about temperament.

You know people are talking about diplomacy, or tone. You know Bush brings up tone all the time. Tone. We need strong tone. We’re too far behind. We’re behind. We’re not winning. You know if we were winning we could sort of soften it up.

But you look at Putin can’t stand Obama, and Obama can’t stand him, in all fairness. But we don’t get along with anybody anymore. Hillary Clinton was the worst
Secretary of State in the history of the country. The world came apart under her reign as Secretary of State.

I want to ask you about the immigration plan you put out over the weekend. You had said in 2012 that Mitt Romney’s “self-deportation” comment was crazy and maniacal.

Well I thought it was stupid. Who’s going to self deport? It wasn’t that it was a bad plan from any other standpoint. But you tell people, oh, self deport. To me that just means what, you’re just going to walk across the border and say okay. They asked me to go. That’s not going to happen.

So how does the deportation happen under ...

Well what we’re going to do–we have a plan, and I think it’s a really good plan. And by the way, it’s been very well received and some of the candidates, my opponents I guess you could call them, but some of the candidates have said that’s really what you want. I worked with a number of people on it including [Alabama] Senator [Jeff] Sessions, highly respected, and not known as a radical person at all. But we’re going to have to – look, it’s very simple. We either have a country or we don’t.

The first thing I need is a wall, and I will build a wall. And you know that Hillary Clinton and almost everybody ten years ago wanted a wall built. Everybody wanted a wall built. But they couldn’t do it because they don’t know anything about building. They’re throwing out numbers to build a wall. I’ll build a far better wall, far higher, and just a much better—that’s what I do. I mean the thing I do best is build. Which is not bad to have as a president because our infrastructure in this country is also crumbling. But we’ll build a great wall. It will be a very effective wall. And it will be done quickly and Mexico will pay for it.

But the next step, if I understand your plan correctly, is that even the hardworking good people who are here without papers —

They’re illegally here. They will leave, and they’ll come back on an expedited basis if they...And they will leave.

You’re talking about 10% of California’s workforce, maybe 13% ...

Don’t forget in the meantime we have a real unemployment rate that’s probably 21%. It’s not 6. It’s not 5.2 and 5.5. Our real unemployment rate—in fact, I saw a chart the other day, our real unemployment—because you have ninety million people that aren’t working. Ninety-three million to be exact.

If you start adding it up, our real unemployment rate is 42%. We have a lot of room. We have a lot of people who want to work. But the good people I want them to come back. And I also want people of great talent to come to this country, to Silicon Valley
for engineers. If you go to Harvard and you graduate number one in your class, and you're from China, they send you home, you can't get back into the country.

So you end up working for companies in China and fighting us. And they're competitors of us. They're trained in our schools. I want people like that to come into this country. And if they want, I want that path to citizenship for these people. So they go to our best schools, they're fabulous students, they do well, they're going to be great and we throw them out of the country. It's ridiculous.

So again, just talking about the hardworking peaceful undocumented immigrants here.

Illegal immigrants, we're taking about the illegal. Do you know the word illegal? They go out ...

But do you forcibly remove them? I mean if they choose not to go, if they say, “No, I'm not going to go.”

It'll all work out. It's called management. Politicians can't manage. All they can do is talk. It's called management. And we'll do an expedited system. Because I agree with you, there are some very, very good people here who they are here illegally.

But they are illegal. We have to strengthen our border. We have to have people come in legally. And we will work out an expedited system where the really good people can come back legally.

If you became president, what needs to change about Super PACs and campaign financing? It's a system that you've said is basically corrupt.

Well I think this whole thing with PACs is nonsense. Because Jeb Bush puts his friend in charge of his PAC, and they don't talk....And he's going to work hard, as is Hillary Clinton. They all have their friends running the PACs. Now you're not supposed to talk, you're not supposed to — they go out and play golf, they get together, but they don't talk. Who believes that? So I want transparency. I don't mind the money coming in. Let it be transparent. Let them talk, but let there be total transparency.

Are you willing to sign the “No New Taxes” pledge of Grover Norquist?

Well I'm thinking about it but I have a problem because I may want to switch taxes around. I want to save the middle class. And I have hedge fund guys that are making a lot of money that aren't paying anything, okay. And I don't know how his pledge relates to that.

But I know a lot of bad people in this country that are making a hell of a lot of money and not paying taxes. And the tax law is totally screwed up. The complexity of it, the
size of it. I mean I spent millions of dollars every year on lawyers and accountants just to do a tax return. And I want to put H&R Block out of business. I want to make it very simple. And we can leave the tax code the way it is and simplify it, or you could go to a form of a flat tax. You could go to a fair tax. There’s a lot of things you could do.

Probably the simplest is simplify the existing. Because we have other projects. We have to beat China. We have to beat Japan. We have to beat Mexico. We have to beat everybody that beating us, which is 100% of the countries that we do business with. We have a lot of other things to work on.

**As president would you propose changes that increased the net amount of taxes?**

No, because there’s so much waste in Washington.

**You’ve written more on leadership than any of the other candidates. George W. Bush or Bill Clinton, who is a better leader?**

I wasn’t a huge fan of Bush, as you know...I thought he was lost. I thought he was not a great president...He certainly wasn’t a good president. He got us into Iraq which by itself was a disaster. He also caused toward the end of his thing a financial problem by allowing exploding mortgages and other things that I predicted. I said you’re going to have a huge bubble here. We have another one coming up by the way. I predicted that. You have exploding mortgages. I understood. I made a lot of money because I went in and bought a lot of stuff at the low price after it exploded. But he really gave us Obama. Clinton had a lot of problems with the Monicas of the world and he not had those problems he would have had a pretty good presidency. Not a great one but a pretty solid presidency. But that was a disaster and a tremendous distraction.

**Are there any of the current candidates who you would not consider as a vice presidential candidate?**

Well I don’t want to say because – I will tell you when it’s all over, win, lose or draw, I’ll tell you who I respect, who I don’t respect. I think the thing that I most – that I’m very complimented by is that Rick Perry was doing really well, and then he decided he had to do better and he went after me and he went right down the tubes.

Senator Lindsey Graham was doing fine. Nobody got more publicity than this guy. He had zero. He’s the only one that had zero. That means not one person in the whole country – he had zero. Like [former New York Gov. George] Pataki had zero but slightly more than that, right. He actually had a zero down today on the CNN.

And these were the two guys that hit me very hard. And it was such a compliment to think – and now by the way Rand Paul’s going down the tubes. Because all of a
sudden he came out of nowhere and he hit me, and now he’s ... Now I hit back very hard. I think I hit back maybe sometimes harder than they hit me.

But I came out with a very strong statement about Rand Paul. First of all I think he’s totally taking advantage of the people in Kentucky. Because one of these afterthought, if I don’t win here I’ll go back to you. It doesn’t work that way. Somebody should primary him out. Because he can be beaten, believe me.

So he’s done very poorly. And since he attacked me, he’s gone down. And I’m greatly honored by that, you know. I get attacked but somebody and they go down. I thought that a guy like Perry, he was getting so much publicity, he went to Washington, he read a speech, he did a whole big thing, it was all over the television. He went down. So that’s a great honor.

What happened with “The Apprentice”? [NBC/Comcast Executives] came up to see me. And even after twelve years and fourteen seasons it was one of their most successful shows. It was a great success. And they tried to talk me into it and I just wouldn’t do it. And I just wouldn’t do it.

So I didn’t know this was going to happen, and they’re impressed too. They probably didn’t know this was going to happen either.

Do you still retain an interest in the show?

Yeah I do. A big interest. So it’s a very good question. When I say I’m not doing another season, that’s a lot of money. And even if you’re a rich person, that’s a lot of money to give up... They would have paid me whatever I wanted. So when I did this...I turned down a deal last week in China, because I’d have to go there. One of the biggest companies wanted me to do a deal in China. Guaranteed tens of millions of dollars. Turned it down because I can’t go to China... I’ve told my kids, this is going so wild. Let’s see what happens.

You know I’ve had great success. Even in golf I’ve won many golf club championships. I don’t know if you guys play golf. But to win a club championship is hard, literally hard. And you have to beat scratch players...You got a lot of good players. I’ve won many club championships. So my life has been about winning. My life has not been about losing. So I get a kick out of watching these guys who were not even successful people saying, “Oh, he’s just having fun.”

It’s not having fun. Actually I could have more fun. I own here’s a picture, I own Turnberry in Scotland that just hosted the Women’s British Open. I wouldn’t mind being at Turnberry. I may never see it again.

Are you surprised by your position?
So I’m a little surprised that it’s gone with this speed. I don’t expect to lose ever. But the speed is pretty rapid. You know. And unlike other people, I’ve stayed in the position.

**Why run for president this time? You’ve decided against it in the past.**

So it was really important that I do it, for myself...I mean I really considered it strongly last time. Before that I thought about it. But I never even had any staff. My secretary was my staff. But the time I looked at it was less time. But I was very busy, I was doing tremendous developments which are now completed and very successful. Because we’re all over the world. And I had a signed contract with “The Apprentice.” I would have had to break it. The other reason I wanted to do this for myself. I didn’t want to look back in ten years and say I could have done that or I could have done that. My family would look at me and say, “Ugh, stop.” I had to do it for myself.

**How has this changed your life?**

So I am enjoying it. And I think people see that...I’m watching my opponents. Certainly Hillary is not enjoying it, okay. She’s going through something that for me, for me is Watergate. Her only hope is that because the prosecutors are Democrats she doesn’t get prosecuted. That’s the only hope she’s got. Because what she did is wrong and what she did far worse than General Petraeus....And I saw her joke yesterday, it wasn’t a joke ... but it was sort of like you’re laughing at people’s faces when they say – and they automatically – you know by saying they were automatically deleted, right, you know she made that statement yesterday, by saying that you’re almost saying that you deleted them on purpose....It was supposed to be a joke. It wasn’t funny, but there was a lot into that if you think about it.

A lot of your supporters are not wealthy. They can never imagine themselves in your shoes.

And they like me.

You’re not the average American in a way, you’ve never been – but you connect with them. How do you explain that?

Actually, the funny thing is, I do worse with the wealthy people. Okay, it’s funny in my opinion. Now, they’ll all support me if I want them to, but I don’t want them. If they want to send something, I don’t care....I have a dot com. I had a woman send me $7 the other day. Another guy sent me $12. There was a long beautiful letter. I love that, because it’s like they’re investing. That’s called a great thing. They’re investing...They’re doing that because they’re investing in the campaign and that I really do like. But somehow I related to exactly what you’re saying, to the middle class, to the working person, and people don’t understand.

You come in on a Boeing 757, then you get on a helicopter, and you go over to the fair, and you give the kids the rides, which the kids loved. But you land in this
incredible Sikorsky, and people like it. I’ve always felt that when Jimmy Carter would walk out of—off Air Force One carrying his own suits and bags, I always said, that’s not what the country wants... He would walk off Air Force One carrying his suit and his bag. He’s the President of the United States, and he didn’t want anybody to carry his stuff, because he thought, “Why should they? I can carry it myself.” I always felt that’s not what they want. They don’t want that. They want someone who’s going to beat China, beat Japan.

I was in Los Angeles, I saw boats coming in with cars from Japan, the largest ships I’ve ever seen, loaded to the gills, cars just pouring off, made in Japan. How does that help us, and we give them a fraction—a tiny fraction—and they don’t even want it. Those days are gone. Those days will be gone. But we have to make ourselves wealthy again in order to save our country. We can’t continuously lose money.

**How do you view the state of the American banking system?**

We’re having a huge problem, again. You know you look at the junk. You know all the junk that’s floating all over the place. You look at some of this Internet stuff that’s floating all over. We’re in a bubble again, okay. It’s not – and I’ll tell you the problem with the banks, if you’re really rich, like with me, if I want to borrow money I can buy all the money I want. But if there’s a young Donald Trump that needs some money to do a couple of really good deals can’t get it because the regulators are making it absolutely impossible for the banks to loan money.

**Do you want to repeal Dodd Frank and similar financial regulation reforms passed by President Obama?**

Well Dodd Frank is probably not a very good thing. There are aspects of it you could leave. But generally speaking Dodd Frank stifles business. It just totally stifles business.

I’ll tell you another subject that I’m going to start talking about because nobody talks about it. Corporate inversion, where companies are going over to other places. You know it used to be they moved from New York to Florida, they moved from New Jersey to...Pfizer is talking about moving to Ireland. Or someplace else. We’re talking about Pfizer. Do you know how big that is? It would wipe out New Jersey. I mean that is a massive Merck.

They have $2.5 trillion sitting out of the country that they can’t get back because they don’t want to pay the tax. Nor would I. Everybody agrees that shouldn’t happen. We should let them back in. Everybody. Even if you paid nothing it would be a good deal. Because they’ll take that money then and use it for other things.

But they’ll pay something. Ten percent, they’ll pay something. Every Republican, every Democrat for years they have all agreed ... They all agree. So now what’s happening is companies are moving out to get their money. And they’re moving out because they’ll pay lower taxes. That’s a huge problem.
You don’t have any Cayman accounts?

No I don’t. I could have.

**Have you ever, because you’d benefit a lot I’m sure.**

I could have and I said – I’ve been thinking about doing this – that really hurt Romney in my book, when he set up these stupid accounts. In the end, when you do the Cayman accounts you don’t gain that much.

The way you criticize the political process seems like the underlying theme of this campaign is that the people who are running stuff now are all phonies. That pretending it’s something they can’t actually do.

They can’t do it.

And they use pollsters to tell you what they think, that they’re just not real. And then you’re presenting yourself as the more authentic person. That’s the underlying —

I’m a person who’s had great success in getting things done. They do use pollsters. I’m much richer than all of them put together. I don’t want to pay a pollster. They pay these pollsters a hundred thousand dollars a month for doing what?

And then these guys come in and they want to be tough. Like Romney, but the time he got to the last debate he couldn’t even talk. He was afraid to say anything.

**In 2014, you had Republicans saying we’re going to take back Congress, we need it. And they raised five hundred million dollars to do it. The first thing we’re going to do is repeal Obamacare. And they haven’t done it.**

They joked. They couldn’t do it.

So do you think that they’re not honest?

They got elected on the basis. So they got in, something happened.

**Are they the real phonies though?**

Look, I was just as disappointed in the Republicans as I am the Democrats. I mean at least the Democrats you know where they’re coming from. The Republicans – and many of them got elected on the basis of we’re going to get rid of Obamacare.

It’s almost like when they get to Washington, I will not let this happen to me. They’re so enamored with the magnificence that they sort of say, “Oh, we can’t do this. We can’t do that.” They become different. Does that make sense?
It’s just so false and so phony and they can’t move. It’s moribund. They become weak and ineffective except at one thing: get themselves reelected...I have friends who are in Congress and they run every two years. And good guys, I’ve known then for a long time. As soon as that cycle is up, you know they win their election, then they take one day off and then the next day they start fundraising.

All they do it fundraise. They don’t really govern. They just fundraise. Their whole life is raising money. And I say what percentage of the time you’re raising money as opposed to legislating? ...I mean they’re constantly – it’s that time of year, you come in. I mean that’s all they do is raise money.

So you say that they’re puppets. You understand the game.

They’re puppets. I’m the only non-puppet in the group.

What was the best example of something you got from a politician?

Well I wasn’t an asker. I would just give just in case. I would always be treated well. But I’ll say this. If the Speaker of the House, somebody they come up to see you and they’d like to know if you’d make a contribution. It’s not a lot of money.

Let’s say you say no. “No, I’m sorry, I can’t. I have great respect for you, I like you a lot. I will not make a contribution.” “Oh, thank you Mr. Trump, thank you.” Now let’s say three years go by and I call, I need something from the Speaker of the House or I need something from somebody.

We’re talking really human nature, okay. It’s fairly hard. It’s the rare politician that can do what’s right in the face of massive contributions. And who can blame them. You could say you’re disloyal. You can do whatever you want to say. But let’s say you say no and then you call three years later. Nothing quid pro quo, none of that stuff. 100%.

Hillary’s thing with the speeches is interesting because to me that’s just as interesting as the emails. Because you look at the speeches and you look at the people who are paying all of that money for those speeches and then approvals of ... going to be granted are granted. To me that’s as big a deal. People have forgotten about that.

What do you think of David Koch?

Yes, he’s a member of my club. Well you saw my Tweets on David where all these guys ... they’re tying to get money and influence ... He’s a member of my club... Big guy. So is his brother, a big guy. And I think they’re well meaning people too by the way. I think they’re actually very well meaning people. But when I see all these guys running over to go get money – okay so when David calls and needs something do you think they’re going to say no? Possible. It’s just something that’s pretty far out. It’s pretty much impossible.
You've said that you can't tear up an Iran deal on Day One.

I’m a deal maker, when a person makes a deal ... But I’ve taken on some really bad deals and made the other side suffer.

Do your rivals who say they’d tear up the deal understand how the world works?

They don’t...It's a terrible deal. But I would enforce that deal like they never saw ... I’d demand to go – and the twenty-four day thing is ridiculous. And the fact that we didn’t get the prisoners back is ridiculous.

There are so many things wrong with it....I’m a dealmaker...There are things in the deal that I’m sure Kerry doesn’t even know about that I will find. And if they make a mistake they’ve got big problems.

What do your daughters give you a hard time about?

I’ve been very lucky, they’re both smart and both went to the Wharton School. Tiffany goes to Penn and Ivanka went to the Wharton School, both very good students. Tiffany’s got all A’s, Ivanka the same, very good students.

Ivanka was interesting because I’m very strong on women’s health issues. And I couldn’t believe what Bush said last week about he wouldn’t fund, essentially wouldn’t fund women’s health issues. And I hit him hard. And she came back and she said I’m so glad you did that Dad, because people don’t know how you respect women, they don’t know how you get it, and you have to get that word out.

There still seems to be a ceiling in the polls that there’s a big chunk of the country who know you very well and don’t want to see you in the Oval Office. How can you deal with that?

Well they’ve been saying the ceiling from the time I started in six. When I first got in it was six. Well that’s the ceiling and he’ll stay around there ...There was one poll that said thirty-two.

People are surprised, it’s the Tea Party but it’s also straight across the board. It’s men, it’s women, it’s a lot of Democrats. In fact ... said you were better with the Democrats...The states where they know me best there’s a huge positive. In fact I had the biggest swing of anybody that they’ve seen. You know what I mean, right?

So I think that’s just a question of time. And I think that I will be the one to beat Hillary.

You’d told people that Bill Clinton told you a third party ticket is possible.
Well he’d love that. I love a third party too. I think Bernie Sanders should run on the Green Party. I think that Bernie Sanders should run. I would love to see Bernie Sanders...Now look, I’m running as a Republican. I’m running as a Republican ... And honestly they’ve been treating me fairly. I don’t want nice or anything I just want fair. They’ve been very fair.

Both parties approval ratings are falling even as yours have gone up. What’s the problem?

Because I don’t think the people running for office are real. Because Jeb Bush and others will come out against women’s health issues because – and then he’ll say he misspoke. You’ll see that. He misspoke. Five hours late he comes in with the opposite...I really think they have to throw a lot of their consultants away and just be themselves. I think it’s one of the things that’s helped me. You know, I’m a smart person. I don’t have somebody telling me what I should say.

And I don’t want to go against myself either when I believe in something. Because that’s false. I saw it today with ... you saw it big league with [Wisconsin Gov. Scott] Walker today. When he made a statement based on my immigration plan and then his consultants said you’ve got to change that. But I think they would do better if they were themselves.

Do you think there’s any chance watching what has happened with you, that here will be a wave of authenticity?

I think that’s what they need. There’s so little authenticity in many of the people that I’m watching. And that includes the other side. Hillary. I mean it certainly includes Hillary...

What’s the most significant learning experience in your life?

Look, I do say this. Just in watching – I give speeches on success for friends and for charities. I put the money into charity. And they pay me a lot. I will say this, over my lifetime I’ve seen a lot of very smart people who were quitters. They never made it. And I’ve seen people that weren’t as smart who never ever, ever gave up. And those were the people that made it. And I’ve seen it to this day. I’ve seen people that graduated ... in school who were super geniuses. And they never made it. And I’ve seen people that were not as smart as them and they’re the biggest people out there. And the ones that are the biggest people are the people that never gave up. It’s something I’ve just observed over the years.

So I take it you’re not giving up.

No, I don’t give up.