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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Research

A language consists of a lexicon, a set of words, and a grammar, a set of rules by which words are combined into meaningful construction (Francis 173). Linguistics is one of many disciplines struggling to understand and encompass the nature of human history, evolution and contemporary diversity (Hutton 261), and it is the scientific study of language, and the study of linguistics typically includes, among other things, it is study of sound systems (phonology), word structure (morphology), and sentence structure (syntax) (Birner 2).

The main objective of language is to communicate, the communication process involves a complex verbal behaviour where the participants have to accommodate a variety of interconnected factors before meaning can be generated. The linguistic system can be exploited for communication if the speakers succeed in making hearers aware of something (thoughts, opinions, facts, emotions and so on) which they were not aware of previously (Kaburise 3).

Meaning makes little sense except in the context of communication, the notion of communication therefore provides as good a place as any to start an exploration of meaning (Cruse 5). Meaning in interaction involves both speakers and hearers, the interactional meaning is what the speaker means by an utterance
and what the hearer understands by it, and how these emerge and are shaped during interaction (Culpeper, Haugh 5).

In pragmatics, it is generally conceptualized such meanings in terms of cognitive representations. A representation is essentially a generalized meaning form or interpretation that people find displayed in or through natural language constructions. Meaning representations are important because they are usually held to have considerable theoretical significance (Culpeper, Haugh 84). The context extends its obvious manifestation as the physical setting within an utterance is produced to include linguistic and social (Cummings 4).

One of the news that is interesting to study is speech uttered by one of the American presidential candidate from the Republican Party that is Donald Trump. His speech about banning Moslem has spread in the social media because of the sophisticated technology and social media have an important role at this time. In a political campaign is recognized will give an advantage. This advantage will often be shown in free speech doctrine, which is part of the larger legal order (Weinstein 100).

This is very interesting because the speech generated a lot of controversy. Like in Donald Trump’s speech in USS Yorktown in December 7, 2015, he stated that he will forbid Muslims enter the United States, the speech has implicit meaning. So that by using pragmatic we can know what he means.
J.L. Austin, in his important work *How to Do Things with Words* (1975), was critical of the fact that “for too long” it had been philosophers’ assumption that a statement either describes something or states facts (1975:1). He analysed the possibility that descriptive statements often include words which indicate that more is being undertaken than simply description. In exploring what it is speaker do when speaker speak (Gelber 51).

Uttering hate speech can either be conceived as having an ‘illocutionary’ or ‘perlocutionary’ purpose, whereas illocutionary speech act is an act of ’saying do what the speaker is saying, and doing so at a time when the adage that' perlocutionary speech act is an act which ‘produces certain effects as a consequence of these words; by saying something to the effect of any particular that follow (Waghid 78). Speech acts is also the acts of forecast: the speaker want to show his inner totality, implicitly with other. he can get feedback that he receives from those with whom he talks may reinforce him, or may cause him to change his forecast, both in their form and in their content (Kretzschmar 248-249). The importance of speaker’s intention applies to both the illocutionary and the locutionary aspects of utterances. On the illocutionary side, the hearer’s interpretation of the speech act performed by the speaker will depend (Riemer 114). There are five classes of speech acts, assertive, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations (Rust 100).

The class of commissives include the speech acts whose successful performance results in committing speaker bringing about the truth of the propositional content (Birner 148).
Look at the piece of Donald Trump’s below:

1) **We’re going to make our military so strong, so powerful, so great, nobody’s ever going to mess with us again.**

The sentence uses a commissive illocutionary act when Trump commits to perform the future action, in the other hand himself to do things. The sentence above shows that Trump wants to convey his wish in the future that if he is elected to be president, he will make a strong defense. He will make the military so strong, so powerful, so great until nobody's ever going to mess with them anymore. His utterance has the function is to show the strength, when they look strong. In addition, the speech can also attract the sympathy that Donald Trump is a man whose has extensive knowledge, smart people, and power.

**B. Focus of the Research**

Based on the background of the research, this research is limited in order to focus the problem, to get a specific explanation and avoid the large explanation. This research will be focused to analyze the speech that can be indicated as a hate speech in Donald Trump's speech in USS Yorktown on December 7, 2015, and after that focuses to know the function of the commissive speech acts in the speech.

**C. Research Questions**

Regarding to the research background above, the authors formulate the research question is as follows:
1. How does Donald Trump's speech in USS Yorktown on December 7, 2015 can be indicated hate speech by using illocutionary act theory?

2. How does the function of commissive speech act in Donald Trump's speech in USS Yorktown on December 7, 2015?

3. How does the commissive speech act in Donald Trump's speech uttered, directly or indirectly?

**D. Objectives of the Research**

Based on the formulation of the problem above, this study aims to determine the following matters:

1. To know how Donald Trump's speech in USS Yorktown on December 7, 2015 can be indicated hate speech.

2. To know the function of the commissive speech acts that contained in Donald Trump's speech in USS Yorktown on December 7, 2015.

3. To know how the commissive speech act in Donald Trump's speech uttered, it is directly or indirectly.

**E. Significance of Research**

This research is expected to benefit both theoretical and practical. The theoretical benefits that expected from this study are that the study would be useful to find out more about the application of speech act theory, and also can contribute to the development of speech act theory.

The practical benefit is expected to be obtained through this research is a deeper understanding of the utterances can be indicated hate
speech. This research also can be used as inputs for further research or add to their similar type of research that the commissive speech act.

F. Research of Methodology

1. The Method of Research

   This research uses qualitative method. Overall qualitative methods utilize interpretive meaning by presenting them in descriptive form (Ratna 46). This method gives attention to the natural data, the data in relation to the context of its existence (Ratna 47).

2. The Technique of Data Collecting and Data Analysis

   This research uses bibliography (teknik pustaka) study as a technique of data collecting. The bibliography technique is using written sources for obtaining data (Subroto 42). The steps of collecting the data are conducted in the following steps:

   a. Downloading the video of Donald Trump's speech in USS Yorktown on December 7, 2015 at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NzOslZ5mP2g.


   c. Reading and identifying the whole transcription.

   d. The data which contains illocutionary act are given a mark.
After collecting the data, the next steps are processing and analyzing the data. The collected data is analyzed using the commissive speech act by Searle and Vanderveken. The process of analysis is in some steps:

a. The researcher looks for the video of Donald Trump and its script.
b. The researcher watches the video and looks at its script.
c. The researcher uses the speech act theory in analyzing the utterances to know the function of the commissive speech act, the utterances that indicated as a hate speech and it is uttered directly or indirectly.

3. The Instrument of Research
The instrument of this research is data card. The data is put in data card and choose some of data findings and analyze one by one, the sentences that uttered in Donald Trump's speech in USS Yorktown on December 7 are analyzed by using Commissive speech act theory.

4. Unit of the Research
The unit of analysis is the whole entity with all its associated elements are the focus of the research study. Unit of the Research is a Donald Trump’s speech in the Pearl Harbor Day Rally on the USS Yorktown South Carolina on December 7, 2015.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Previous Research

The research of speech act has been examined before. In this section presents several similar previous researches. It is intended that the corpus and explanation differ with the previous research. Here are the previous researches which explain as follow:

First, the research has done by Stephen Gichuhi Kimotho, the title is Digitized Ethnic Hate speech: Understanding Effects of Digital Media Hate Speech on Citizen Journalism in Kenya. This research is published by Australian International Academic Centre, Australia in 26 March 2016. The study adopted a descriptive interpretive design utilizing qualitative and quantitative approaches. This study used Speech Act Theory and Hate Speech. Speech Act was assumed suitable because it explains how language (spoken or written) could be used to achieve suspicious intentions. The first conclusions is Hate speech seems like a firmly established phenomenon on the Kenyan digital space. The findings from this study corroborates Umati report which indicates that political events are the major triggers of ethnic hate speech in Kenya. Digitized ethnic hate speech in Kenya arises particularly when political activities like election campaigns are intensified and politicians are at war with one another. Most of the ethnic hate speech before and after 2013 general election in Kenya found its expression on the Facebook platform. The
second, this study demonstrated that digital media hate speech disseminators had varied intentions raging from inciting hatred, violence, or moral subordination among others.

Second, the research has done by Lilla Swashaning (2015) from Yogyakarta State University, This study aimed to describe the types of and the functions commissive speech acts in the 1960-1976 edition of the Tintin comics Hergé's work. The subjects were all contained in a comic speech Tintin 1960-1976 edition, consisting of 4 books. The object of this study is that an utterance commissive speech acts in Tintin comics. The validity of the applied is the validity of semantics and reliabilities interpreter The data reliability and expert judgment. The results showed that: the first is speech commissive in comics Tintin 1960-1976 edition is divided into two types, namely promises (promises), and offer (offer), the second, speech commissive in the comic function, a. betting (bet), b. swear that (swear), c. invite (invite), d. propose, and e. volunteering (offering devotion).

Third, the research has done by Sulistiyadi (2013) from Yogyakarta State University, This study aimed to describe the form of assertive speech acts contained in the novel Pawestri Without Idhentiti Brata soeparto work. In addition, it also describes the function of speech acts assertive contained in the novel Pawestri Without Idhentiti Brata soeparto work. This research is a descriptive research. The data source of this research is the novel Pawestri Without Idhentiti Brata soeparto work. Data obtained by the technique of reading, recording, and classifying the form of speech. Instruments in this
study is a human, which in this case researchers to learn about things related to speech acts and linguistic knowledge about the researchers become an important tool, as an instrument of data cards and tables of data analysis. The subjects were all the assertive speech utterances grouped by form and function assertive assertive speech. Data collection techniques in this research was done by using read and recorded. Analysis of the data used in this research is descriptive analysis to describe the form and function of assertive speech acts contained in the novel Pawestri Without Idhentiti Brata soeparto work. The validity of the data using semantic validity and reliability using the reliability perseverance observation. The results of this study are the form and function of speech acts assertive in a novel Pawestri Without Idhentiti Brata soeparto work. Form of assertive speech consists of three tenses that form of news sentences, interrogative sentence, and imperative sentences. Based on these data functions include: assertive utterances news functioning sentence stating, inform, advise, boast, complain, sue, reporting, and swagger. Assertive speech that serves interrogative sentence stating, inform, advise, and complain. Assertive speech command function sentence stating, inform, advise, proud, and complain.

Fourth, the research has done by Arfah Dzumillah (2016) from English Language and Literature Department, Letters and Humanities Faculty, State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, the title is the Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Act in the Reasonable Doubt, A Movie Directed by Peter Howitt. The aim of this research is to find out the classification of
Illocutionary acts performed by the speakers in the movie dialogues and to evaluate whether the hearers will respond to the same way the speaker is expecting, in other words, fulfilling the perlocutionary act of the speech act. The result of this study shows that all types of illocutionary acts are found in this movie, with representative as the most frequently used type of illocutionary act.

B. Pragmatics

In order to know what someone meant by what they said, it’s not enough to know the meanings of the words (semantics), and how they have been strung together into a sentence (syntax); we also need to know who uttered the sentence and in what context, and to be able to make inferences regarding why they said it and what they intended us to understand (Birner 1).

Linguists have applied speech act theory in the area of pragmatic analysis; but it has also been applied to literary texts. Austin observes that not all utterances have “truth value”. He thus makes a fundamental distinction between constatives, which are assertions which are either true or false, and performatives, which cannot be characterized as either true or false, but are, in Austin’s terms, “felicitous” (happy) or “infelicitous” (unhappy). These are utterances by which the speaker carries out an action, hence the term speech act. Examples of performatives are utterances such as the following bellow (Brinton 301):
1) I name this ship the “Queen Elizabeth”.
2) I refuse to answer that question.
3) I will pay you tomorrow.
4) We authorize the payment.
5) I promise.
6) I congratulate you.
7) I bet you a quarter.
8) I swear it’s true.

C. Classification of Speech Act

Speech act is acting oral Happens in the World. Uttering speech act is when somebody does something with the words, when he says actually he do the activity that brings a change in the existing state of affair (Mey 95). According to Austin behind every utterance there is a performative verb, such as ‘to order’, ‘to warn’, ‘to admit’, ‘to promise’ (Cutting 16). For example: if someone says to a human newborn: "I baptize you in the name of the father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost” the human is now and forever a Christian (Mey 95). Speech act theory is a linguistic approach to meaning advocated by two language philosophers, John Austin (1962) and John Searle (1969). Austin defined speech act as the actions performed in saying something (Cutting 16). There are three main kinds of speech acts in the use of language that he called locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts (Vanderveken and Kubo 3).
1. **Locutionary act**

   According to Austin, locutionary act is when an utterance is made by speaker performs, an act of saying something. A locutionary act is defined as uttering a sentence with a certain meaning (Gelber 55). Speakers characteristically perform locutionary acts by uttering sentences: they utter words with a certain sense and reference (Vanderveken and Kubo 3). It is also the basic linguistic act of conveying some meaning (Birner 186). For example (Riemer 109):

   9) “You will get your hands blown off.”

   A speaker performs the locutionary act of stating that the hearer will get their hands blown off.

2. **Illocutionary act**

   The illocutionary of an utterance can be isolated by asking in which sense we were using a given utterance. An utterance can be an order, a request, a suggestion, a statement, a promise, a threat (Wolfram, Norrick 380). It also refers to a speaker's intention in delivering an utterance or to the kind of illocutionary act the speaker is performing. It is also known as *illocutionary function* or *illocutionary point* (Searle and Vanderveken 1).

   Sometimes speakers perform speech acts whose communicative purpose or utterance meaning does not correspond to their obvious sentence meaning. For instance, to get someone to close the door, speaker may well not
choose an imperatival construction “close the door, please”, speaker may use a question such as: “could I get you to close the door?” or a statement “it’s suddenly got draughty in here”. Speech acts like this, when the illocutionary does not correspond to the most obvious illocutionary of their sentence type, are known as indirect speech acts (Riemer 111).

There are numerous ways in which our intended illocution can be communicated. The most straightforward is to mention directly what we are doing in making a particular utterance, as when someone says “I pronounce the defendant guilty”, “I promise you that I’ll mend the spinnaker”, and so on. An utterance of this form, whose highest clause has a first-person singular subject and a verb in the simple present that conveys the intended force of the utterance, is called an explicit performative, or sometimes just a performative (Sadock 9).

This is particularly so for performatives, such as the sentences in bellow:

10) I apologize for the mess I’ve made.

11) I bet you as much as you like that it’ll rain for the party.

12) I forbid you to touch that diamond.

13) I promise that I’ll never give you such a fright again.

According to Austin, the sentences do not make sense to ask whether it is true that ‘I apologize for the mess I’ve made’: the very act of saying the words I apologize constitutes the apology. To know the true or false, the
sentences in must conform to certain conditions, just like the conditions governing the act of requesting described above. Austin called these conditions felicity conditions (Riemer 111).

3. **Perlocutionary act**

According to Austin perlocutionary act always include some consequences (Kissine 12). Perlocutionary act is also the act of producing an effect in the hearer by means of utterance (Riemer 109). The effects are the result of a set of *illocutionary effects*. Communication was *successful* in the sense that the hearer at least understood what was required (Rust 76). The example of effect can be convincing, persuading, annoying, amusing, and frightening are all cases of perlocutionary acts (Searle, Kiefer and Bierwich vii). For example:

14) You will get your hands blown off (Riemer 109).

This sentence might be to dissuade the hearer from playing with a lighter, the goal is to warn and scare the hearer.

D. **Classification of Illocutionary Acts**

Illocutionary act: the act performed in saying something (Riemer 109). As Collavin said that Illocutionary act is the action performed by form of the force associated with a given linguistic expression. It is the performance of an act *in* saying something, as inverse the performance of an act *of* saying something (Wolfram, Norrick 380). And according to Austin  illocutionary
acts is discovered by noticing that successful literal utterances of sentences like “I request you to help me”, “You are invited to come” and “I open this session” are performative, in the sense that they constitute the performance by the speaker of the illocutionary act named by their main verb. This kind of sentence is called performative sentence and the main verb is performative verb (Vanderveken, Kubo 4). Austin claims that there is a large number of performative verbs in English which, when put in explicit performative form, effect an action. Here are some: to christen, to bequeath, to promise, to acquit, to sentence, to resign, to excommunicate, to vote for, to bet (Wolfran, Norrick 377).

Searle claimed that there are five fundamental types of illocutionary acts (Searle and Vanderveken 52):

1. **Assertive**

   Assertive speech act is when the speaker can say how things are (Searle and Vanderveken 52). Someone make assertions when he wishes to make a claim about how a part of the world is. In other words, assertives are truth functional and have the condition of satisfaction that there exists a state of affairs that corresponds with that which is represented by the assertion. For example: “Valentina Tereshkova was the first woman in space (Rust 100).

   Another example, if someone shouts “fire” and, by making that utterance, warns people in a building that there is in fact a fire and by implication suggests that they exit the building, they have performed an
Illocutionary act. If someone shouts “fire” and, by making that utterance, caused people in a building to fear that a fire existed even though none did (Gelber 55).

2. **Directive**

Directive is usually the speech acts that have purpose at provoking an action such as orders, commanding, requesting, inviting, forbidding, suggesting, and so on (Cutting 17). In short, speaker can try to get other people to do things (Searle and Vanderveken 52). For example:

15) Better remain silent and be thought a fool, than open your mouth and remove all (Cutting 17).

3. **Declaration**

Declaration the word or expression that change the world by the utterance such as I bet, I declare, I resign (Cutting 16). For example:

16) I baptize this boy John Smith, the utterance which changes a nameless baby into one with name (Cutting 17-18).

4. **Expressive**

Expressive is the word or expression to express one’s feelings and attitudes (Searle and Vanderveken 52), such as apologizing, praising, congratulating, deploring, and regretting (Cutting 17). For example:

17) I’ve been poor and I’ve been rich – rich is better(Cutting 17).
18) If I’d known I was gonna live this long, I’d have taken better care of myself (Cutting 17).

5. Commissives

When a speaker commits to perform or not to perform a future action, in the other hand it can commit oneself to do things (Searle and Vanderveken 52). There are commit word such as promising, offering, threatening, refusing, vowing, volunteering (Cutting 17). For example:

19) I’ll make him an offer he can’t refuse (Cutting 17).

20) I’ll love you, dear, I’ll love you / Till China and Africa meet, / And the river jump over the mountain, / And the salmon sing in the street (Cutting 17).

E. Direct and Indirect Speech Acts

Implicit performatives are often distinction that may at first appear to be explicit. Such as the case of saying I’m sorry rather than the explicitly performative “I apologize” (Birner 191). Other examples as follow bellow:

21) Sam Vimes sighed when he heard the scream, but he finished shaving before he did anything about it.

22) “Bloody stay there!” he yelled. “That is an order! You’ll go over!”

23) “Why’re you picking on me? What’m I supposed to have done?”

The examples above show the declarative form. None of these is an explicit performative, so the performs is called a direct speechact, in that its
Illocutionary force is the canonical illocutionary force for that form. (Birner 192).

In the case of direct speech, it is expected the same linguistic form as, or a linguistic form similar to the one which carried the original speech act, that is, often a full sentence (Coulmas 220). Usually when sentence use certain syntactic structures with the functions listed beside them in the following bellow.

Structures Functions

24) Did you eat the pizza? : Interrogative Question
25) Eat the pizza (please)! : Imperative Command (Request)
26) You ate the pizza. : Declarative Statement

When an interrogative structure such as Did you…?, Are they…? or Can we…? is used with the function of a question, it is described as a direct speech act. It is different when someone use the utterance “Can you pass the salt?”. In this example, speaker is not really asking a question about someone’s ability. By using a syntactic structure associated with the function of a question, someone use it to make a request (Yule 134). But in this case the sentence use for a request. This situation is called indirect speech act. Indirect speech act is when speaker speech so indirectly. For example, the speaker says to somebody “Could you move a bit?”, actually the speaker does not expect that person to answer the question with “yes”, or “yes, perhaps I could”. The speaker would consider such an “answer” highly inappropriate,
even though the speaker did indeed utter a question. By contrast, if the person did move, the speaker would be perfectly happy with his or her reaction (or ‘answer’) (Mey 112).

F. Commissive Speech Acts

According to Searle and Vanderveken there are some words that show the commissive speech act, the words such as, commit, promise, threaten, vow, pledge, swear, accept, consent, refuse, offer, bid, assure, guarantee, warrant, contract, covenant, and bet (Searle, Vanderveken 192).

Commit

Commit is the primitive English commissive, which names the primitive commissive illocutionary force (Searle, Vanderveken 192).

Promise

Promise has some special features which are not common to many other members of the set of commissive verb, the special feature is that distinguish it from other commissive verbs. The first, a promise is always made to hearer to do something or his benefit, and the second, promises involve a rather special kind of commitment, namely obligation (Searle, Vanderveken 192).

Threaten

Speech acts of threatening differ from promising. The first, the undertaking is not to do something for the benefit of the hearer but rather to
his detriment. The second, in that no obligation, threatening is not as institutionally dependent as promising (Searle, Vanderveken 193).

Vow

Vow need not be directed at a hearer. In vowing to do something, speaker undertake to do it. But the speaker need not undertake to do it either or against the hearers. Vowing furthermore has an additional element of solemnity which is not necessarily present in promising and threatening (Searle, Vanderveken 193).

Pledge

Pledging is like vowing, only it does not necessarily have the solemnity of vowing. My pledges are undertakings but they need not be undertakings or against my hearer. When, for example, I pledge allegiance to the flag, I do not in any sense address the flag. The syntax of “pledge” allows it to take both “that” clauses, and, unlike “vow”, it also allow it to take nominal direct objects, as in, for example, the sentence “We pledge is a strong commitment to a future course of action (Searle, Vanderveken 193-194).

Swear

The commissive sense of “swear” is obtained from the primitive commissive in the same way the assertive sense of “swear” is obtained from the primitive assertive. When a speaker swear to do something he is committed to a vow to do it (Searle, Vanderveken 194).
Accept

When someone accepts a commissive the content of the acceptance is simply that the acceptor lets the original speaker do what he commits himself to doing (Searle, Vanderveken 194-195).

Consent

To consent to do something is to accept a directive to do it with the additional preparatory condition that one has reasons for not doing it and therefore one would probably not do it if one had not request (Searle, Vanderveken 195).

Refuse

Refuse is like accept, it has the additional preparatory condition that one has given the option of acceptance or refusal. The speaking can accept or refuse a speech act that allows for the opinion of acceptance or refusal. And that is why when one refuses to obey an order or command, one cannot say that one refuse to obey an order or command but rather than refuse to obey it (Searle, Vanderveken 195).

Offer

Offer is peculiar among commissive verbs in that it names a conditional commissive illocution. An offer is a promise that is conditional on
the hearer’s acceptance. It is also becoming binding only on acceptance. This speech act commits speaker to perform a certain course of action if it is accepted by the hearer (Searle, Vanderveken 195-196).

**Bid**

Bid is a highly specialized and structured form of an offer. An object has been presented for sale, with the understanding that the purchaser will be the person who makes the highest offer (Searle, Vanderveken 196).

**Assure**

To assure is to commit oneself to a future action with the perlocutionary intention of convincing the hearer that one will do it while presupposing that the hearer has doubt (Searle, Vanderveken 196).

** Guarantee, Warrant**

To guarantee something is to perform a complex speech act which is both assertive and commissive. A speaker guarantee a certain object or state of affairs both asserts that this object or state of affairs will continue in a certain condition and promises to the hearer a certain compensation. Beside, warrant is a guarantee usually within a legal context, concerned with properties and commercial products. In addition, warrant is also guarantee propositional
content conditions. What is guaranteed in case of warranty is the product or service or a certain property is secure (Searle, Vanderveken 197).

**Contract, Covenant, Bet**

There is a set of commissive name joint commitments by the speaker and hearer. A hearer then become a speaker. In the words “Contract” and “Bet” joint commitment is used. A contract is a mutual pair of commitments made by two contracting parties. Party A promise to do something for party B in return for which party B promises to do something for party A. Covenant is the same as contract, but covenant is weak, archaic, and dignified, and is favored in law and in religion (Searle, Vanderveken 197).

**G. Hate speech**

Rae Langton said that pragmatics can shed light on racial hate speech and pornography. Langton distinguishes five models for hate speech and pornography: a conditioning model, an imitation model, an argument model, a speech act model, and its descendant, the pragmatic model. A speech act model distinguishes illocutionary and perlocutionary dimensions of speech: e.g. hate speech can incite, and cause, hatred and violence. The pragmatic model tries to capture these dimensions via an account of accommodation (Maitra, McGowan 19-20).

From the explanation about illocutionary act, so far we know that Austin distinguished the act performed in saying certain words, which he
called the ‘illocutionary’ act, from the later effects achieved by saying them, which he called the ‘perlocutionary’ act. For example, ‘In saying “Shoot her”, Smith urged the man to shoot’: that describes an illocutionary act. ‘By saying “Shoot her”, Smith persuaded the man to shoot’: that describes a perlocutionary act. Both these dimensions are visible in hate speech. It has effects on hearers’ attitudes. The effects are on beliefs, and on other attitudes too. Some hearers begin to hate members of the target race, and desire to avoid them. The effects are there because of what hate speech is, as an illocutionary act: it incites hatred. The perlocutionary effects have their explanation in the illocutionary force. ‘incite’ is one of an illocutionary verb, in a class with others such as ‘encourage’, ‘order’, ‘advocate’, and ‘legitimate’. ‘Promote’. The word has a perlocutionary, causal sense, and an illocutionary, constitutive sense. So hate speech ‘promotes’ hatred in both illocutionary and perlocutionary ways, it advocates and causes hatred. Here the example: When Julius Streicher was tried at Nuremberg. He was condemned— for his 25 years of speaking, writing, and preaching hatred of the Jews. In his speeches and articles, week after week, month after month, he infected the German mind with the virus of anti-Semitism, and incited the German people to active persecution. His speech was an illocutionary act: he ‘incited’ his countrymen to persecute the Jews. As a result, his speech was also a perlocutionary act, with effects on his hearers’ mental states and actions, as they became ‘infected’ with anti-Semitism (Maitra, McGowan 75-76).
Hate speech is the speech which has a goal to build heeling and show their strength when compared with minority groups and it is uttered by the more dominant group, and it is also to limit the aspirations, ability, potential, strengths, and systematically create difference status of the lower classes (Maitra, McGowan 98). But another effect it may also invite a strong protest, recruitment, and set a conscious effort to reprimand hatred (Almagor 180-181).
A. Data Description

In this chapter, analysis and discussion is the utterances of Donald Trump's speech in USS Yorktown on December 7, 2015. The analysis was conducted based on the theories described in the previous chapter. The data were collected by used sampling, the sample is a segregation of the population as the object of the research. Samples are considered representative of the population as a whole (Subroto 32). And in this case there are five classifications of data, there are assertive, directive, commissive, declarative, and expressive. Assertive has 586 data, directive has 71 data, commissive 59 data, expressive 42, and there is no data for declarative. From the data, the researcher only focuses on the commissive speech act. There are 49 data commissive in 19 paragraphs, so that it will be conclude in 19 data analysis.

B. Data analysis

Data 1

“We don’t want that stuff. We don’t want World Trade Centers. We don’t want that ever happen to us again. It’s not going to happen to us again.”

The context of this speech shows about the refusing from Donald Trump, he refuse in the stuff. The stuff is World Trade Centers. It can know
because it is explained with the utterance after, “We don’t want that stuff.”, “We don’t want World Trade Centers.”. Then the refusing is repressed again, by the utterance “We don’t want that ever happen to us again.”. Then he assures that the World Trade Center will not be happen. It can be seen from his utterance “It’s not going to happen to us again.”.

From the utterance, Donald Trump wants to do something in the future to stop the stuff, or something like what happen in the World Trade Center. So, it will not be happen in the future. From that utterance he also convinces the hearer that it will be not happen.

Based on the context, the utterance contains commissive illocutionary act is that when a speaker commits to perform or not to perform a future action, in the other hand it can commit oneself to do things, and from the context we know that Donald Trump want to do something in the future, and he will do it when he become a president, so he will do by himself. And the utterance such as: “We don’t want that stuff.”, “We don’t want World Trade Centers.”, “We don’t want that ever happen to us again.” can classified into refusing because Donald Trump as speaker refuses a speech act that allows for the opinion. And the utterance “It’s not going to happen to us again.” Show that he sure that it will not happen, so that the utterance classified into assure.

The illocutionary act expected by the speaker is also can be indicated as hate speech because considering what has happened to the world trade
center, which was expected bombed by the terrorists who do not like the United State, and the executants of the incident alleged to Moslem. And indirectly he want to judge the leaders is weak, the security of the country is not going well. So the terror can happen.

Data 2

On a thing called ISIS…oh,don’t worry. We’ll have plenty – we’ll talk a lot about ISIS. Can you believe it?

The context of this dialogue shows about the America got terror from ISIS, as his explanation before, he said “We’re being run by people that don’t know what they’re doing. Very sad.” And after talk about it he said “On a thing called ISIS…oh, don’t worry. We’ll have plenty – we’ll talk a lot about ISIS. Can you believe it?”

From the utterance, “We’ll have plenty – we’ll talk a lot about ISIS”, we can know that it is the commissive illocutionary act, and it is classified into commit, because Donald Trump commit himself to tell the hearer more about ISIS in his speech after..

The illocutionary act expected by the speaker is also can be indicated as hate speech because considering that United States wants to cripple ISIS. And the public know that ISIS is an organization in the name of Islam. The speech is uttered indirectly, the sentence has the implicit meaning, it is indirectly want to tell or want to make people think about ISIS.
By the way, speaking of it, *we’re going to make our military so strong, so powerful, so great, nobody’s ever going to mess with us again.* Nobody. They’re never going to mess with us.

The context of this speech shows about The United State was in total confusion situation, get a lot of terror. And Donald Trump thinks that the reason of it is the weakening of the US military system. So when he becomes president, he'll commit to conduct a something.

The sentence use commissive illocutionary act that is when a speaker commits to perform a future action, in the other hand it can commit oneself to do things. It is also classified into Commit because the context of the speech shows about the commitment of Donald Trump, it shows that when he is Elected to be president, he will make a strong defense, this is evidenced by the sentence he commit that he will make the military strong, powerful and great, so nobody will mess them. It can be seen in the utterance "*we're going to a make our military so strong, so powerful, so great, nobody's ever going to mess with us again.*"

He sure that no one will mess them, and he emphasize with the utterance after “*Nobody. They’re never going to mess with us.*” so, the utterance which assure to commits oneself to a future action called assure.

The illocutionary act expected by the speaker is also can be indicated as hate speech because the function of hate speech is to show the strength, when they look strength nobody will mess them. In addition, the speech uttered indirectly it
has the function to attract the sympathy that Donald Trump is a man whose has extensive knowledge, smart people, and power.

Data 4

You know in many ways, it’s the cheapest thing we can do. The cheapest thing. Instead of fighting these wars that we don’t know what we’re doing and we have leaders that are afraid to do anything, we’re going to make it so great, so strong that people – gosh, they’re not messing. They’re not messing.

The context of this is Trump wants to show that America doesn’t know how to do to fight the war, because the leaders now are afraid and does not do anything. So he commit himself, when he become next leader he will make America so great, so strong, so no one mess them.

The sentence “we’re going to make it so great, so strong” use commissive illocutionary act, and it is classified into Commit because the context of the speech shows about the commitment of Donald Trump to make America great and strong. And it will do in the future, when he become the next president.

The illocutionary act is also indicated as hate speech because the function of hate speech is to show the strength, and it shows indirectly, Trump indirectly want to make America strong. Nothing can mess them. And it will do in the future when he become a president.

Data 5
And we’re going to take care of our great vets, our wounded warriors. We’re going to take care of them. Because they – thank you, they are not being taken care of.

The context of the sentence is Donald Trump thin that the vets do not take care well, different with the immigrants, the illegal immigrants are taken care better than vets. It is known in the next utterance “We have illegal immigrants that are taken care of better than our incredible veterans.”

The sentence “And we’re going to take care of our great vets, our wounded warriors.”, “We’re going to take care of them.” use commissive illocutionary act, and it is classified into Commit because the context of the speech shows that Donald Trump commit to take care the vets, and the warriors better than the president does now.

The illocutionary act is also indicated as hate speech against the president currently. It shows indirectly that the president is not care enough to the vets. Because the president cannot take care better, so he states the statement that he will take care of our great vets, our wounded warriors.

Data 6

We have illegal immigrants that are taken care of better than our incredible veterans and it’s not going to happen any longer. Not going to happen. Not going to happen.
The context of the sentence above is still about the taking care of the vets and the warriors, but, in the statement he wants to refuse the condition, so he said “and it’s not going to happen any longer”. And he make it sure with the statement “Not going to happen. Not going to happen.”.

By using speech analysis we know that the sentence “and it’s not going to happen any longer” use commissive illocutionary act, and it is classified into Refusing. That is the condition which has the additional preparatory condition that one has given the option of refusal. The speaking can accept or refuse a speech act that allows for the opinion of acceptance or refusal. According to the context we can know that Donald Trump reuse the condition, even he promise that it will not happen. The promise we can know from the utterance “Not going to happen. Not going to happen.”, so that statement we can classified into the promising. The promising word has some special features which are not common to many other members of the set of commissive verb, it has special feature is that distinguish it from other commissive verbs. The first, a promise is always made to hearer to do something or his benefit, and the second, promises involve a rather special kind of commitment, namely obligation. Because Trump has promise to take care the vets and the warriors he must do it in the future.

The illocutionary act is indirectly indicated as hate speech that the function to Supports affect people for him. and also shows that he is better than the current president.

Data 7
You look at Mexico. We’re going to build a wall. It will be a real wall. It will be a real wall. Gonna happen. It’s gonna happen.

The context of the sentence above is America is now in trouble, it is known from the sentence of Donald Trump here, “We owe $21 trillion in the very near future. We’re really in trouble. We have to rebuild our country. We have to rebuild our infrastructure. We have to rebuild our military.”

from the statement we know that America is in trouble, stated that Trump wants to build a border wall, and border wall was very great, the walls will be built between America and Mexico. He wants to rebuild the country, infrastructure and the military. So he said “We’re going to build a wall. It will be a real wall. It will be a real wall. Gonna happen. It’s gonna happen.”

The sentence “We’re going to build a wall.” Can be classified into commit that is the primitive English commissive, which names the primitive commissive illocutionary force. Because his speech requires himself to do something, that he promised to build a border wall between America and Mexico.

While, the sentences “It will be a real wall. It will be a real wall.”, “Gonna happen. It’s gonna happen.” Can be classified to assure which has the function to commits himself to his future action with the perlocutionary intention of convincing the hearer that he will do it, so the hearer does not fell doubt with him.

The illocutionary act is also indicated as hate speech because it serves to limit the rights of others. In development planning with Mexico's separation wall indirectly want to restrict people right, because the wall has the function to fortify
the entering immigrants. The wall would limit the international cooperation. It also makes Mexican citizens who are on the border between the United States and Mexico is concerned if Donald Trump really elected the next US president. They find Trump will make the economic conditions in the region deteriorated. The statement, faces opposition from various parties.

Data 8

They have the cameras right in my face. I say fan the crowd just to show – look at all the people over here. It’s a record in the history of this ship. But they don’t show it. They don’t show it. No, no. and I say fan it and they never fan it. I say fan the crowd and they never fan it. And yet, I guarantee you that that young woman that just got taken out after interrupting us three times, I guarantee the cameras will be on her. I guarantee. It’s disgusting. Disgusting.

The context from the sentence is when Donald Trump give the speech in front of the public there is interruption by protester, and the protester is arrested, but he bet for her that he can make her understand the situation. And in the statement before he said “I’ll bet you that if I spoke to that young woman, that quickly I really think I can convince her that we’re all in this together, folks.” Then after that he continue by guarantee the protester,

The utterance “I guarantee you that that young woman that just got taken out after interrupting us three times, I guarantee the cameras will be on her.”, “I guarantee.” Is a commissive speech act, and it can be classified into guarantee, that is the condition when speaker guarantee something, and it is to
perform a complex speech act which is both assertive and commissive. A speaker guarantee a certain object or state of affairs both asserts that this object or state of affairs will continue in a certain condition and promises to the hearer a certain compensation. And according to the context Donald trump guarantee that the camera will be on the protester.

The illocutionary act expected by the speaker is also can be indicated as hate speech. The effects are on belief and on other attitudes too. Some hearers begin to hate other members. The utterance of hate speech utters indirectly, he indirectly wants persuade people. And in this case the member who become victim is the woman who protest the speech, and Donald Trump actually persuades the camera to look at the woman, and always on her, because he is actually angry with the woman who interrupted him for three times, and it was signified by the sentence after that "It's disgusting. Disgusting" the meaning of which he is insulting behavior of the woman.

Data 9

So I said here the mainstream media wants to surrender our Constitution and our constitutional rights. And I don’t want that. I want that. I want ISIS to surrender. Okay I want ISIS to surrender. Very simple.

The context is the mainstream media wants to surrender the constitution. And Trump thinks that they are the worst. They are so dishonest. The media do not act honestly in delivering election poll Donald Trump, it was because of the
media wants Trump to gave up in the election. But Trump does not believe that, even Trump continued his candidacy, and he wants ISIS to surrender.

The sentence “I don’t want that.” use commissive illocutionary act, and it is classified into Refusing. Refuse has the additional preparatory condition that one has given the option of acceptance or refusal. The speaking can accept or refuse a speech act that allows for the opinion of acceptance or refusal. And in this context Donald Trump as a speaker refuses to obey an order or command to stop his candidacy. While the sentence “I want ISIS to surrender. Okay I want ISIS to surrender.” use commissive illocutionary act, and it is classified into Commit, that is the primitive English commissive, which names the primitive commissive illocutionary force. It means the speaker commits himself to do something in the future, it is the same thing with what will Donald Trump do. He will do something to make ISIS surrender.

The illocutionary act expected by the speaker is also can be indicated as hate speech. The utterance of hate speech utters indirectly, he indirectly he deliberately show his hatred against ISIS, and show his power, if he later became president then what would he say is a commandment to do, and he wants ISIS to surrender.

Data 10

Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United stated until our country’s representatives can figure out what hell is going on.
In his speech he touched on terrorism and radical Islam, and look at the situation he commits gathering the world to against radical Islamic terrorism, and forbids Muslims to enter the United State. This case relates to war against terror and keep the America in order to remain safe.

Based on the context, the utterance contains commissive illocutionary act is that when a speaker commits to perform or not to perform a future action, in the other hand it can commit oneself to do things, and from the context we know that Donald Trump want to do something in the future, and he will ban the Muslim to enter the country.

The illocutionary act expected by the speaker is also can be indicated as hate speech because hate speech is the speech which has a goal to build healing and show their strength when compared with minority groups and it is uttered by the more dominant group, and it is also to limit the aspirations, ability, potential, strengths, and systematically create difference status of the lower classes. And the utterance “Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United stated until our country’s representatives can figure out what hell is going on.” Can be classified into indirect speech act, because it utter implicitly, and we can know the meaning if we look at the context, and the context is Trump wants to save the country from terror. So the effort to healing the terror is banning Muslim. But, the statement indirectly makes the discrimination in the society, and automatically he create the differences.

Data 11
They want to change your religion. I don’t think so. I don’t think so. Not going to happen.

The context of the sentence is that the number of immigrant population in America increase, Donald Trump think that the situation happen because of the global jihad. Then, this is proved in his statement “those polled agrees that violence against Americans here I the United States is justified as part – think of that – as part of the global jihad. As part of the global jihad.” And the statement “And 51% of those polled agreed Muslims in America should have the choice of being governed according to Sharia.” After thinking about that, he refuses to accept situation. He said “I don’t think so. I don’t think so. Not going to happen.”

The sentence “I don’t think so. I don’t think so.” use commissive illocutionary act that is when a speaker commits to perform a future action, in the other hand it can commit oneself to do things. commissive illocutionary act is classified into refusing. Refuse is like accept, it has the additional preparatory condition that one has given the option of acceptance or refusal. The speaker can accept or refuse a speech act that allows for the opinion of acceptance or refusal. And that is why when one refuses to obey an order or command, one cannot say that one refuse to obey an order or command but rather than refuse to obey it. As in this case, Donald Trump chose to reject it. He said "I do not think so, I do not think so." The sentence shows that for the future he refused to convert to Islam, and he emphasize with the utterance after “Not going to happen.” so, the utterance which assure to commits oneself to a future action called assure.
The illocutionary act expected by the speaker is also can be indicated as hate speech because hate speech ‘promotes’ hatred in both illocutionary and perlocutionary ways, it advocates and causes hatred. Besides, it is not the place to talk about Islam, since Trump is a Christian.

**Data 12**

Where the hatred comes from and why, we’ll have to determine. We’ll have to figure it out. We have to figure it out. We can’t live like this. It’s going to get worse and worse. You’re going to have more World Trade Centers. It’s going to get worse and worse folks.

“we’ll have to determine. We’ll have to figure it out.” Commit is the primitive English commissive, which names the primitive commissive illocutionary force

The context is according to refer to the history of terror in America, which is suspected of suicide attacks that have been set against some targets in New York City and Washington. United States responded to the attacks by launching the War on Terror. Trump explained in his speech that the American people cannot live like this. This will happen worse and worse, and they will have to determine the situation.

The utterance “We can’t live like this.” we can know that it is the commissive illocutionary act, and it is classified into refusing. Because speaker can accept or refuse a speech act that allows for the opinion of acceptance or refusal. And according to the context he rejected the circumstances that exist today, as part of the global jihad terrorists spread terror everywhere, and he refuse
to live like that. Then, in the next sentence he utters “It’s going to get worse and worse.” The utterance also use commissive illocutionary act, and it is classified into assure, that is the situation when speaker assure to commit himself to a future action with the perlocutionary intention of convincing the hearer that situation will happen. And then he utters the sentence “You’re going to have more World Trade Centers.” According to the context we can know that it is commissive illocutionary act, and it can be classified into threaten, speech acts of threatening differ from promising. The first, in that the undertaking is not to do something for the benefit of the hearer but rather to his detriment. The second, in that no obligation, threatening is not as institutionally dependent as promising. In this case indirectly threaten her hearing Donald Trump is the American people, if it is not stopped, there will be more such events in the world trade center. and that he stressed once again he is confident that the situation will become worse. This is evidenced in the sentence “It’s going to get worse and worse folks.” The utterance is also can be classified into assure, because he assures the hearer so that the hearer has no doubt.

The illocutionary act expected by the speaker is also can be indicated as hate speech because hate speech ‘promotes’ hatred in both illocutionary and perlocutionary ways, it advocates and causes hatred. It has the function to Provoke hearer, at least the hearer will think that it will be happen. And they will think better they choose Trump to be a president, so he can stop the terror. And they chose him in the election.

Data 13
We could be politically correct and we can be stupid but it’s going to get worse and worse.

The context is still about the terror and election, in the sentence “We could be politically correct and we can be stupid but it’s going to get worse and worse” Trump explain that United State is good in politic, but indirectly he wants to say that If the American still become stupid it will get worse and worse.

The sentence “We could be politically correct and we can be stupid but it’s going to get worse and worse” use commissive illocutionary act, and it is classified into assure, to assure is to commits oneself to a future action with the perlocutionary intention of convincing the hearer that one will do it while presupposing that the hearer has doubt.

The illocutionary act is also indicated as hate speech against to the American leader currently. It shows indirectly said that the people should be smart, people should think how to stop the situation, so that it cannot be any longer. And it indirectly wants to tell the hearer that it just Trump who can stop the situation.

Data 14

We’ve got to maybe do something with the internet because they are recruiting by the thousands. They’re leaving our country. And then when they come back, we take them back. “Oh, come on back. Where were you?” “I was fighting for ISIS.” “Oh, come on back. Go home. Enjoy yourself.”
The context of the sentence above is Donald Trump wants the people especially solder to go against ISIS, and the recruiting is from the internet, he wants to recruit thousands people, he wants to send them leave the country, and when they come back, he will take them back. Like in the sentence “when they come back, we take them back.” “Oh, come on back. Where were you?” “I was fighting for ISIS.” “Oh, come on back. Go home. Enjoy yourself.”

The sentence “when they come back, we take them back.”, “Oh, come on back. Go home. Enjoy yourself.” it can be seen that the utterances are commissive speech act, and it can be classified into Commit which the primitive English commissive, because the utterances requires Trump to do something, that is to welcomes the fighters ISIS.

The illocutionary act is also indicated as hate speech against the president currently who cannot handle the terror, cannot stop ISIS. It shows indirectly that he wants to doctrine people to go war, leave the country to against ISIS, and after they come back, they will welcome, like a hero.

Data 15

When they leave our country and they go to fight for ISIS or any other groups, they never come back. They never can come back. They never can come back. They can ever, ever, ever come back. It’s over.

The context of the sentence When they leave our country and they go to fight for ISIS or any other groups, they never come back.”, “They never can come back.”; “They never can come back. They can ever, ever, ever come
back. It's over.” describes when people leave the country to fight ISIS, they will never come back.

The sentence “When they leave our country and they go to fight for ISIS or any other groups, they never come back.”, “They never can come back.”, “They never can come back. They can ever, ever, ever come back. It’s over.” it can be seen that the utterances are commissive speech act, and it can be classified into assure, that is to commits oneself to a future action with the perlocutionary intention of convincing the hearer that one will do it while presupposing that the hearer has doubt.

The utterances of illocutionary act above are also can be indicated as hate speech against ISIS, it says indirectly that Donald Trump wants to fight ISIS. It also say how danger ISIS, when people go to fight ISIS they never come back.

Data 16

We have to be strong. When we see violations, you have to report those violations and quickly. Don’t worry about profiling. I promise I will defend you from profiling. I promise.

The context base on situation that have occurred in the California, an accident happen estimates because of terrorism, trump calling for strong people, and if anyone sees violations he wants so that people who saw the incident reported immediately. He said "We cannot be people that knew what was going on two weeks ago in California, probably for months they Knew what was going on and they did not want to tell anybody. We cannot be that. We have to be
strong. When we see violations, you have to report those violations and quickly ". And then he said that the people do not worry because he would protect people from crime, like he was saying, “I promise I will defend you from profiling. I promise.”

The sentence “I promise I will defend you from profiling.” “I promise” use commissive illocutionary act, and it is also can be classified into Promise. Promise has some special features which are not common to many other members of the set of commissive verb, the special feature is that distinguish it from other commissive verbs. The first, a promise is always made to hearer to do something or his benefit, and the second, promises involve a rather special kind of commitment, namely obligation. And look at the context, Trump promises to defend people from profiling. He will do it in the future.

The utterances of illocutionary act above are also can be indicated as hate speech against ISIS too, it is said indirectly, when we look at back, the speech utters because Donald Trump as a speaker said about the accident that happen in California. And the accident is indicated terror from ISIS.

Data 17

But we can’t let people use and abuse our rights. We can’t let people kill us. They want to kill us. They want to destroy us. We can’t let it happen. We just can’t let it happen.

The context of this speech shows about The United State was in total confusion situation, get a lot of terror. And Donald Trump thinks that the reason
of it is the weakening of the US military system. So when he becomes president he'll commit to conduct a something

The sentence use commissive illocutionary act “But we can’t let people use and abuse our rights.” “We can’t let people kill us.” “They want to kill us. We can’t let it happen.”, “We just can’t let it happen.” Refuse is like accept, it has the additional preparatory condition that one has given the option of acceptance or refusal. The speaking can accept or refuse a speech act that allows for the opinion of acceptance or refusal. And that is why when one refuses to obey an order or command, one cannot say that one refuse to obey an order or command but rather than refuse to obey it.

The illocutionary act expected by the speaker is also can be indicated as hate speech because hate speech ‘promotes’ hatred in both illocutionary and perlocutionary ways, it advocates and causes hatred. It has the function to Provoke hearer. According to the context, it wants to fight back. It is shown indirectly that Trump wants people do something to fight back. Because he cannot let it happen.

Data 18

Think of this, think of this, I don’t work for any of the lobbyists. I don’t work for any of these people that are leading our country in the wrong direction. We don’t.

The context of the sentence “I don’t work for any of the lobbyists. I don’t work for any of these people that are leading our country in the wrong direction. We don’t.” He wanted to show that when he served as president later,
he was not brought anyone lobby. And the utterance “what we want to do or what I
want to do is I want to be the people’s president.”, explain he wants to be people’s
president.

The utterance “I don’t work for any of the lobbyists.”, “I don’t work for
any of these people that are leading our country in the wrong direction.” “We
don’t.” it use commissive illocutionary act that is when a speaker commits and it
is can be classified in refusing, that function is to perform or not to perform a
future action, in the other hand it can commit oneself to do things Refuse is like
accept, it has the additional preparatory condition that one has given the option of
acceptance or refusal. The speaking can accept or refuse a speech act that allows
for the opinion of acceptance or refusal. And in the utterances above it shows the
refusal of the speaker. He refuse that he will be work under lobbyists, he explain
that he will work by people.

The illocutionary act expected by the speaker is also can be indicated as
hate speech against the current leaders. It is shown indirectly, because Trump
always thinks that the current leader is not care with the people. They prefer care
of the illegal immigrant, and Trump does not like it.

Data 19

We’re going to make America great again. And you know what? We’re
going to make it grater, greater, than ever before. And I love you all and thank
you very much. South Carolina. Great. Thank you! We love you. Thank you!
The context of utterance above is to closing his speech. He wants to reiterate, that his goal of running for president is to make America great again than ever before.

The sentence “We’re going to make America great again.” “We’re going to make it grater, greater, than ever before.” Use commissive illocutionary act, and it is classified into Promise has some special features which are not common to many other members of the set of commissive verb. A promise is always made to hearer to do something or his benefit, and it involve a rather special kind of commitment, namely obligatin. And the utterance shows his commitment when he become the future president he will make America great.

The illocutionary act expected by the speaker is also can be indicated as hate speech because hate speech give the effect to some hearers begin to hate members of the target race, and desire to avoid them. The effects are there because of what hate speech is, as an illocutionary act: it incites hatred. The perlocutionary effects have their explanation in the illocutionary force: ‘incite’ is one of an illocutionary verb, in a class with others such as ‘encourage’, ‘order’, ‘advocate’, and ‘legitimate’. ‘Promote’. And by look at the context it can say indirectly that by using his speech Trump wants to advocate people to choose him as the next president.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Base on the analysis of the sentences delivered by Donald Trump in USS Yorktown in December, 7 2015, researcher draws some conclusions as follows:

First, it can be explained that the speech is indicated as hate speech by using illocutionary act. By using commissive illocutionary act we can know what he will do in the future, when he becomes the next American president. He wants to make the military strong, so that the security of the country cannot be messed by the other. In addition, he will build the wall between America and Mexico. He also insults the current American leader. The hate speech makes the discrimination among others, protester, leaders and Muslim.

Second, from the data analysis we can know that Donald Trump's speech use commissive illocutionary act, which it is classified into Commit, promise, threaten, refuse, assure, guarantee, and bet. That classification is used to do something in the future.

Third, the illocutionary acts in Donald Trump speech can be indicated as hate speech, which is in the form provoke sentence, order, advocate and Promote. Looking at the context, it can be concludes that the speech of Donald
Trump uttered indirectly wants to advocate people to choose him as the next president.

**B. Suggestion**

Based on the analysis which is described in the discussion, the writer gives some suggestions to the readers whether who are interesting in the study of pragmatic. The researcher suggests to the next researcher who want to do a research in pragmatic approach, to more deeply explore about speech act theory, such as assertive, directive, expressive, and declarative. This research can also be used as insights for further research which study on the commissive speech act. The researcher hopes that this research will give a contribution to the readers in understanding speech acts theory.
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Donald J Trump Speech

Wow. Thank you. Thank you so much. Thank you.

We start by paying our great respects to Pearl Harbor.

We don’t want that stuff. We don’t want World Trade Centers. We don’t want that ever happen to us again. It’s not going t happen to us again.

So I want to thank everybody for being here. It’s a great honor.

They have thousands of people outside and sometimes they’ll say “would you like to wait about an hour until they all come in?” But we can’t get them in anyways so what difference there. We all got lucky. We’re together tonight. Thank You.

So we have a lot of big news today. To me, very big was CNN just came out with a new poll about an hour ago and Iowa – great, great state - and in Iowa, Trump 33%. Beating everybody by a lot. You have Cruz at 20% and Carson 16% and going down and Rubio at 11% and Bush at 4%. But it’s Trump at 33%. It just came out. It’s Iowa – we love Iowa.

By the way, great ship named after Iowa too. I’ve been on that one too. A really great one.

The other big poll that came out just two days ago was the national poll. Trump 36% and then I won’t even mention the other numbers because they’re so low.

You know, when you have so many people running – we had 17 and then they started to drop. Ding. Bing. I love it. I love it. And you’ll be losing a lot over the next little while I would imagine. I don’t know. When somebody’s down at zero I would think that eventually they’ll drop out. The only difference is there’s nothing to pick up if there is zero. What do you pick up? So anyways you’ll be seeing that.

One of the things I think that’s so important because to me very important in the same poll, which is the big national CNN poll, on the economy – so important – Trump 55%. Everyone else nothing.

On the budget – I’m really good at these things – economy, budget. I sort of expected this. On this budget, Trump – this is with 15 people remaining – Trump 51%. Everyone else bing.

Oh, here’s one that I started and I took a lot of heat. I took a lot of heat. Sort of like the one we’re talking about today. I guess you’ve heard a little bit about it. But I’ve taken a lot of heat on this one. Illegal immigration. Now, had I not brought that up in Trump Tower in June when I announced that I was going to run for president, believe me.
You know, all of my life, I’ve heard that if you’re a successful person, especially if you have very success – you’ve done a lot of things, a lot of deals, a lot of everything, you can’t run for president.

And yet, that’s the kind of mindset and thinking this country needs.

We’re being run by people that don’t know what they’re doing. Very sad.

On illegal immigration, Trump 48%. That’s with 15 people. Everyone else, no good.

On a thing called ISIS…oh, don’t worry. We’ll have plenty – we’ll talk a lot about ISIS. Can you believe it?

Here we have generals. They go on television and talk. They do all talk. You people – a lot of military people here. Who’s military here? All right, I love you.

By the way, speaking of it, we’re going to make our military so strong, so powerful, so great, nobody’s ever going to mess with us again. Nobody. They’re never going to mess with us.

You know in many ways, it’s the cheapest thing we can do. The cheapest thing. Instead of fighting these wars that we don’t know what we’re doing and we have leaders that are afraid to do anything, we’re going to make it so great, so strong, that people – gosh, they’re not messing. They’re not messing.

And we’re going to take care of our great vets, our wounded warriors. We’re going to take care of them. Because they – thank you, they are not being taken care of.

We have illegal immigrants that are taken care of better than our incredible veterans and it’s not going to happen any longer. Not going to happen. Not going to happen.

So with ISIS – Trump 46%. Can you imagine that? With all of these characters running.

On foreign policy, Trump way up. And you know, in theory you could say “well, maybe it’s not my thing.” But people want to see strong, they want to see strength, they want to see protection, they want to be protected. And that’s it.

I watched last night and I watched the president truly that didn’t know what he was doing. He didn’t know why he was there. He refuses to use the term “Radical Islamic Terrorism”. He refuses to use the Term.

I don’t even know if he knows what the hell is going on. I really don’t.

And then we’re looking at Hillary Clinton. Honestly, I know Hillary. It’s just going to be an extension of Obama. I think maybe worse.

She’s got no strength. She’s got no stamina. Remember that.
You don’t need a president with no strength or stamina when we’re being ripped off to trade, we’re being ripped off on Obamacare, which is going to be repealed and replaced by something really good.

When our soldiers aren’t being taken care of, when our military is never been like it is today.

One of the generals was on the television, as usual, saying that we’re the least prepared now that anytime that he’s ever seen it and he’s been there a long time retiring. That’s how we are.

In the most dangerous world we’ve ever had because of the power of weapons, we have people that don’t know – they don’t – I’m telling you. I watch them. I watch these generals being interviewed.

Do you think gen. George Patton would be interviewed?

… They’d be interviewed after total and complete victory.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur. They’re not big for interviews. You know, they shoot first, they talk later.

These guys – and I don’t think we’ll have to.

You know, just so you understand, Bush – Bush, he said yesterday he was being interviewed, he said that, he was talking about me. He was saying the nicest things about me. He was saying the nicest things about me. Of course, he says he’ll be elected. He’s at what 3%? Right?

No, but he said some things and I was like – I said “Who says that about an opponent? You don’t say those things.” You’ll find out what he said. But he said very nice things.

But, if you look at what happens where he is upset with me because he says the tone – the tone – of Donald trump is not nice.

And I say it all the time. We have people whose heads are being chopped off in the Middle East because they’re Christian and for other reasons. They’re being dumped and drowned in steel cages. And we talk about my tone.

Hillary said the same thing. “Mr. Trump’s tone is not nice.”

These people are living in a different planet. Different planet.

And I remember what I said about Hillary. We need somebody who’s strong. We need somebody with incredible energy but incredible intelligence and all of these things.

You know, I know a lot of tough. We need smart. We need like every character. We are so far behind the eight ball in this country. We owe $19 trillion. The budget they signed two weeks ago is going to make it $21 trillion. It’s a – think of it. Trillion.
Trillion. Trillion dollars. Who the hell ever of the word 10 years ago? There was no such word.

We owe $21 trillion in the very near future. We’re really in trouble. We have to rebuild our country. We have to rebuild our infrastructure. We have to rebuild our military.

And yet, we do deals with China where there’s a trade imbalance of over $400 billion a year in their favor, by the way, in case you had any question.

Japan – they send their cars by the millions. $70 billion a year imbalance. That’s like a loss.

You look at Mexico. We’re going to build a wall. It will be a real wall. It will be a real wall. Gonna happen. It’s gonna happen.

The people I’m dealing with – and you know, I really focus on Hillary later because I have to get through there 15 people. You know, there’s 15 us.

I had Perry came at me strong, he went down. I had Gov. Walker, nice guy, he went down. Every guy that attacks me so far they’ve all gone down. We’ve got to keep it that way, right?

I mean, Lindsey Graham. He’s at zero. He’s at zero. Zero.

Let me ask you a question. I don’t get Lindsey Graham. I don’t get him… He’s literally at zero. You see him. And he keeps talking. He gets so much television. I mean, he’s on television all the time and he doesn’t go up. He’s at zero, folks.

His ideas are so bad. I’m more militaristic than him. But I know how to win, he doesn’t. He just wants to attack everything. He doesn’t know where the hell – ra ha.

And he always sits with John McCain. It’s like they’re the Bobbsey twins. They’re always sitting together. No, it’s true. Do you ever notice? Sometimes I want to see him by himself. He’s always sitting with John McCain, who’s fine. I’m not knocking it. But you got to know what to do.

Now me, I was against the war in Iraq. So, everyone says, you have the right temperament – I have a great temperament. But you’ve got to attack. If you’ve got to do something, you’ve got to know what you’re doing.

I said if you attack Iraq and you wipe it out, Iran is going to take over the entire Middle East because you’re going to ruin the balance. It was so simple to me.

And actually they sent a group from the white House to see me because I got so much publicity, so much publicity that they sent a group from the White House to see Mr. Trump. I said, “Fellas, you’re going to have Iran take over the Middle East and that’s what’s happening.”

And Iran’s going to take over Iraq as sure as you’re sitting there.
And by the way, Iraq with the second largest oil reserves anywhere in the world. We lost of thousands of lives. We have wounded warriors all over the place. $2 trillion. We have nothing. We got nothing. We have absolutely nothing. And we left.

And we have a president – we shouldn’t have been there but then we shouldn’t have left the way we left.

…. [Interrupted by protester]

You know, the funny thing is I look at democrats and liberals and conservatives and Republicans – wouldn’t it be good all of us if we can get together and really make our country great again? Is that what we want to do?

I’ll bet you that if I spoke to that young woman, that quickly I really think I can convince her that we’re all in this together, folks. We want to have a strong country. Right?

… But you know, if you think about it and you’ll have some that can never be satisfied no matter what. They’re just troublemakers, et cetera, et cetera. But most people aren’t and they believe something. And I have some very smart friends don’t agree with me; they agree with the other side.

But I really believe that if you took it about making America great, we have to be strong, we have to be vigilant, and if we’re no vigilant – [interrupted by protester] – that was the same person. I’ve got to tell you, and if we’re not vigilant – [interrupted by protester] – that was the same person. I’ve got to tell you that. That was the same person. You do very nice but why don’t you get her out because honestly it’s inappropriate. So, security, strengthen yourself up.

See, our country has this kind of security. That’s the problem we have … Treat her very nicely please but she should now be take out. Same person. One person. It’s one person. They let her out. They gave her a second chance and the same thing happens.

But you would think that everybody we’re all on the same basket that everybody every single person – [interrupted protester]

… so you would think that if we could get together, we’d all in the same boat.

Now, last night we all saw and we witnessed something that I thought was highly inappropriate.

In fact, I tweeted “is that all there is?” about the president’s speech and I wrote something today that I think is very, very salient, very important, and probably not politically correct but I don’t care. I don’t care.

You know, we had a situation I California very recently where somebody was making bombs in an apartment. The mother saw them. The mother didn’t notice anything wrong. I watched the sister being interviewed. Believe me, in my opinion, she was lying
like crazy. I watched that interview. “Oh, my brother was such a wonderful guy. I didn’t know. I didn’t know, I didn’t know.

And I watched the next door neighbor saying, “Oh, well we didn’t report them because we didn’t want to racially profile or we didn’t want to profile.” Give me a break. Give me a break.

We’re like the stupid country in so many different ways. It’s so – can you imagine what our great leaders of the past would have said with the kind of crap that’s happening with us?

They didn’t want to report them because they thought it was profiling.

Okay, they saw bombs. They saw, you saw, you know, the pipe bombs only this wasn’t to build a bathroom. When a bomb is this long, can’t put too many of the together for a bathroom, right? And we thought they maybe but we didn’t want to racially profile. Oh, okay, you’re okay, you’re innocent.

Or how about where the families and the girlfriends and the wives and everything and they go back to World Trade center – the worst, worse than Pearl Harbor because with the World Trade Center they were killing innocent civilians. At least while it was a dirty, rotten sneak attack, at least they were… but while it was an attack, at least it was military. But this was an attack on the World Trade center.

So, what’s happened is we’re out of control. We have no idea who’s coming into our country. We have no idea if they love us or if they hate us. We have no idea if they want to bomb us. We have no idea what’s going on.

And then I looked at poll numbers and I don’t mean poll where I’m winning; those numbers I like looking at. These numbers I hated to look at. And it’s very, very sad.

I’ll go after some of the numbers. 25% of those polled and this was from the Center for Security Policy – very highly respected group of people who I know actually.

This is people living in this country 25% of those polled agreed that violence against Americans is justified as Muslims. 25%.

51% of the Muslims living in this country – by the way, I have friends that are Muslims; they’re great people. But they know we have a problem. They know we have a real problem. Because something’s going on, and we can’t put up with it, folks. We can’t put up with it.

51% - 51% highly respected number of polling group want to be governed according to Sharia. You know what Sharia is.

So I wrote this out. The mainstream media wants to surrender the constitution. The mainstream media – these people back here. They’re the worst. They are so dishonest. No, no, they’re so dishonest. They are so dishonest.
I mean, I have one from NBC, a reporter from NBC, and actually another one from CBS, they actually in Columbus, Ohio, I had a tremendous crowd like 10,000 people. It was a love fest. It went on for a long time. Everybody stayed right it’s the end. I had one of the politicians – Kasich – who just getting – he’s a horrible debater… He made a statement that “Oh, they left after 10 minutes.” Now, the press was there. They saw it. Nobody said it was a lie. It was a total lie. In fact, I had more people at the end than I had at the beginning. Nobody’s leaving. Nobody’s leaving here except for the one person that was screaming.

So, we asked the press to report that it was a total lie and they didn’t want to do that because it’s not their thing to do.

You know, we get the biggest crowds. They don’t want to show this crowd tonight. They’re not going to show all the people outside trying to get in. they don’t do that. They have the cameras right in my face. I say fan the crowd just to show – look at all the people over here. It’s a record in the history of this ship. But they don’t show it. They don’t show it. No, no, and I say fan it and they never fan it. I say fan the crowd and they never fan it. And yet, I guarantee you that that young woman that just got taken out after interrupting us three times, I guarantee the cameras will be on her. I guarantee. It’s disgusting. Disgusting.

…and by the way, some of the media’s terrific but most of it 70%, 75% is absolute dishonest, absolute scum. Remember that. Scum. Scum. They totally dishonest people.

I had one the other day where I finished the speech and they said “Oh, Trump was interrupted and he left early.” I spoke for like 45, 50 minutes. I then answered questions and then I went around, you know, everybody it was false.

Amazingly, there’s a media group that calls the media and the next day they did the most beautiful story about what a lie it was from NBC. She’s back there. Little Katie. She’s back there. What a lie it was. No, what a lie – Katie Tur – what a lie it was from NBC to have written that. It was a total a lie. And they did a story where they – I didn’t know they had a group likes this where they actually criticized the media. And they said it was a total lie. And I loved it. I loved it.

And then other people pick it up. You know it’s NBC so somebody picks it up. Third rate reporter. Remember that. Third rate. Third rate.

So I said here the mainstream media wants to surrender our Constitution and our constitutional rights. And I don’t want that. I want that. I want ISIS to surrender. Okay/ I want ISIS to surrender. Very simple.

It’s very simple. So here’s what happened. It’s been a little controversial. It’s been a great day because the poll numbers are through the roof. I like that.

But I have more… I wish could call – is there any way we could call the election tomorrow? Wouldn’t you love that?
Now they’re coming at us in full force. They’re coming – not coming at me. They’re coming at all of us. Because you know, we have a noisy majority. They used to call it the quiet majority. People are fed up. They’re fed up with incompetence. They’re fed up with stupid leaders. They’re fed up with stupid people.

They are fed up with stupid people, where our president makes a deal for sergeant Bergdahl, a dirty, rotten, no good traitor who – think of it. They knew he was a traitor because a general and a colonel went to see his group. Six people were killed looking for him. Okay? Six people were killed. Young. Unbelievable. I watched the parents on television. I’ve seen the parents. But I watched the parents on television devastated, will never be the same. They left to try to bring them back. He left. He deserted.

You know, in the old days when we were strong country it would be boom, gone. It was called desertion. Now I heard the other day they won’t even do anything to him. Can you believe it? They think he’s going to get away with nothing. He’s going to have nothing.

So he left. Oh, they treated him pretty though. He got in there, he said, “I shouldn’t have done this. This isn’t working out they way I thought.”

Anyways, so we get him back and here’s the deal made. We get a dirty, no good traitor. Six people killed…. They get five of their greatest killers that they’ve been after – after – think of it for six years. In fact, I hear nine years.

So we get Bergdahl and they get five of the killers that they’ve wanted for many years. That’s the way we do it.

The Iran deal. We gave them $150 billion. It’s called amateur night. We gave them $150 billion. 24 days – 24 days – we think there’s something wrong, 24 days we have to wait but it’s much longer than that because there’s a whole process before the clock starts ticking. So it could be forever.

But the best is where they have the right to self-inspect. “Are you doing nuclear weapons over there?” “Oh, we’ll inspect tomorrow.” “Oh, no, we’re not doing nuclear weapons.”

You know the Persian are the great negotiators. Always have been. And somebody would say that’s profiling. Trust me, they’re great negotiators.

And Kerry is a horrible negotiator and Obama is a horrible negotiator. Horrible. He’s a horrible negotiator. These people are horrible.

I always Obama would be a unifier. I never thought of him as being like a divider because I said “You know what? I don’t think he’s going to be a good president.”

I backed McCain; he lost by the way. And you know, I don’t blame McCain for losing because a lot of bad things will happen; it was a tough one. But I backed McCain; he lost.
I backed Romney; he should have won but sort of went away on vacation or something the last month and he lost. And I said, “this time I’m going to do it myself. We’re not going to lose.” We’re not going to lose. We’re not losing.

And the recent Fox poll that just came out has me beating Hillary very easily one on one. I love that. That’s so important.

So, we put our statement today. We watched this. And it’s impossible to watch this gross incompetence but I watched last night.

Shall I read you the statement?

Donald J. Trump is calling for – now, you’ve got listen to this because this is pretty heavy stuff and it’s common sense and we have to do it. Remember the poll numbers. 25%, 51%. Remember the poll numbers. So remember this. So listen.

**Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United stated until our country’s representatives can figure out what hell is going on.**

We have no choice. We have no choice.

According to Pew Research, among others, there is a great hatred toward Americans by large segments of the Muslim population.

Most recently, a poll from center for Security Policy released data showing 25% of those polled agreed that violence against Americans – these are people that are here by the way, people that are here – 25% not 1%. By the way, 1% would be unacceptable. 1% is unacceptable. 25% of those polled agrees that violence against Americans here I the United States is justified as part – think of that – as part of the global jihad.

They want to change your religion. I don’t think so. I don’t think so. Not going to happen.

As part of the global jihad. And 51% of those polled agreed Muslims in America should have the choice of being governed according to Sharia. You know what Sharia is. 51%.

Sharia authorizes – now look, this is, I mean, it’s terrible. Sharia authorizes such atrocities as murder against non-believers who won’t convert, beheadings, and more unthinkable acts that pose great harm to Americans especially women. I mean, you look – especially women. Though stuff.

And we have a president that won’t even mention the term and you’re talking about numbers like this.

Mr. Trump stated without looking at the various data, it’s obvious to anybody the hatred is beyond comprehension…
Where the hatred comes from and why, we’ll have to determine. We’ll have to figure it out. We have to figure it out. We can’t live like this. It’s going to get worse and worse. You’re going to have more World Trade Centers. It’s going to get worse and worse folks.

We could be politically correct and we can be stupid but it’s going to get worse and worse.

Until we are able to determine and understand this problem and the dangerous threat it poses, our country cannot be the victim of horrendous attacks by people that believe only in jihad.

These are people believe in jihad. They don’t want our system. They don’t want our system and have no sense of reason or respect for human life. They have no respect for human life.

[Interrupted by protester] … So they have no respect for human life. So we have to do something.

Now, we can be weak. We can be ineffective. We can be foolish.

…. [Interrupted by protester]

…. So prior to Paris, which was a disaster, which by the way if some of the people I those places where it was slaughter, absolute slaughter, had guns, you wouldn’t have had the carnage that you had in Paris. You wouldn’t had that carnage.

So important the Second Amendment. We have to preserve it and cherish it. And we can’t let these weak leaders diminish it.

If they had guns in Paris, if five people in that room, Paris and France has probably the toughest gun laws anywhere in the world and it was like target practice “come over here. Boom! Come over here. Boom!” People are sitting by the hundreds and many others are going to be dying. They’re sitting in the hospital in many cases waiting to die.

Now, the same thing a few days ago in California. No gun. We didn’t have guns. The bad guys had the gun. 

And these young people – and I tell the press you’ve got to stop calling them “masterminds” - these are dirty, rotten scum. These aren’t masterminds.

Remember the guy in Paris with the big dirty hat? Remember the guy in Paris – the “mastermind”. I was watching all the networks. I won’t mention who but some of them disgusted me. “The mastermind is on the loose.”

And we have kids that are watching the internet and they want to be mastermind and then you wonder why do we lose all these kids – they go over there. They’re young. They’re impressionable. They go over there and they want to join ISIS.
And we have our anchors – I think I got the mostly stopped. Did you notice that/ I don’t hear it too much. But they say “the young mastermind”. Oh, he’s brilliant. Young man, he’s brilliant.

I don’t even he’s got a high IQ…. In Paris, I call him the guy with the dirty filthy hat.. Okay? Not a smart guy. A dummy. Puts people in there – mastermind – bing, bing, bing, it’s like shooting everybody. You’ve got to be mastermind.

So the press has to responsible. They’re not being responsible because we’re losing a lot of people because of the internet.

And we have to do something. We have to go see Bill Gates and a lot of different people that really understand what’s happening. We have to talk to them. Maybe in certain area closing that internet up in some way.

Somebody will “Oh, freedom of speech, freedom of speech”. These are foolish people. We have a lot of foolish people. We have a lot of foolish people.

We’ve got to maybe do something with the internet because they are recruiting by the thousands. They’re leaving our country. And then when they come back, we take them back. “Oh, come o back. Where were you?” “I was fighting for ISIS.” “Oh, come on back. Go home. Enjoy yourself.”

When they leave our country and they go to fight for ISIS or any other groups, they never come back. They never can come back. They never can come back. They can ever, ever, ever come back. It’s over.

How about that? And now that they’ve become radicalized, they’re totally radicalized.

And how about the woman? She was in Pakistan then Saudi Arabia. She comes in on an engagement deal and she radicalized the guy. Probably a guy who couldn’t get women. I don’t know what the hell his problem is. It’s probably the first women he’s ever had. I don’t know what was going on. But he became radicalized quickly. Notice how easy it is? He becomes radicalized and then they go on a speed.

Folk, those days are over. Those days are over. We have to be tough. We have to be smart. We have to be vigilant.

Yes, we have to look at mosques and we have to respect mosques. But yes, we have to look at mosques. We have no choice. We have to see what’s happening because something is happening in there. Man, there’s anger. There’s anger. And we have to know about it. We can’t be these people that are sitting back like in the World Trade Center, like so many different things.

We can’t be people that knew what was going on two weeks ago in California, probably for months they knew what was going on and they didn’t want to tell anybody. We can’t be that.
We have to be strong. When we see violations, you have to report those violations and quickly. Don’t worry about profiling. I promise I will defend you from profiling. I promise.

So when I started this whole quest – I mean, who knew it was going to turn into this? It’s been an amazing thing. No matter where I go, I have tremendous crowds, packed crowds, packed.

We went to Dallas – 20,000 people in Dallas. 25,000 people. Mobile, Alabama – 35,000 people. Here, every time I come to south Carolina, every time I go to North Carolina, every time I go to Iowa, New Hampshire, Virginia, wherever I go – Florida – we have crowds that are maxed. The only problem we have is the size of the room – thousands of people outside trying to get in. usually I do a double. I go talk to them for a while, which I wouldn’t say I exactly love doing after the first one.

But there is an unbelievable love in these rooms – all the same. I love you too. I love you… thank you thank you. I love you too. There’s an unbelievable love in all of these places – Oklahoma – 20,000 people standing in a park on quick notice. There’s an unbelievable love. And there’s an unbelievable love of the country. We want you see good things. We don’t want to be bad people. We don’t want to be tough and nasty. We believe in the constitution more than anybody.

But we can’t let people use and abuse our rights. We can’t let people kill us. They want to kill us. They want to destroy us. We can’t let it happen. We just can’t let it happen.

And I have a friend who’s a very, very successful man, and I went to one event – he came with me. We had 24,000 people. And this guy’s a real tough cookie. He’s a great financial guy. One of the guys I’d definitely use to negotiate with Japan, China. Believe me, you’re going to be in good shape when that happens. We won’t have these characters.

You know, this whole thing with all of these guys. By the way, I’m the only one that’s self-funding my campaign. Everyone else is controlled. Only one. I’m the only one. Only one.

I’m self-funding my campaign. And these other guys. You know, they’re getting millions and millions of dollars from people I know.

I have one guy came and wanted to give me a lot of money. I said, “Honestly, I can’t take it. I don’t want to do.” I can’t take it, which is very sort of like for me to not take money – my whole life I’ve been taking money. Now, I’m sort of like what am I doing? But came in and I said, “So what are you going to do? I don’t want your money.” But I said, “You like me best.” “I like you best but I’m going to go someplace else.” Because they want to be part – they want to –

… Let me tell you, who is more than me? I gave millions to these guys. Nobody knows the system better than me. I knew it from the other side. Don’t forget, I was the
fair – haired boy. I was like the establishment. They’d all come to me, and I’d give them all money I write checks sometimes to Senators whatever the max – bing, bing, bing.

I used to say “Senators, don’t come to my office. Anybody that’s a U.S. Senator that calls me, we’ll send you a campaign contribution.”

But you know what? I’ll tell you something. In the end, the people that gives these millions of dollars to these horrible, corrupt PACS – they’re corrupt – they totally control Bush and Rubio and I won’t say Cruz because he’s been very nice to me. Nah, he’s been nice. He’s got to hit me first. Once he hits me, I promise you. I promise you.

No, I’ve been ice to Christie but he really hit me today. Chris Christie. I mean, I don’t know. He’s a friend of mine but he’s not doing well in the polls and he really hit me today. He hated this and yet he said anybody could come. You’ve got to look at some of the statements from the past. But he really hit me on the whole thing that we have to stop the Muslims until we find out what’s going on.

Does that make sense by the way? Until we find out.

And he talked about – that’s inexperience and you know in other words he has experience right?

But that’s the statement of an inexperienced man… about we have to stop people that want to kill us from coming in. does that sound like inexperience?

So Chris, who’s friend of mine, he hit me hard. And I said I got to hit him at least once. So I won’t do this a lot.

Look, here’s the story. The George Washington Bridge. He knew about it.

Hey, how do you breakfast with people everyday of your lives, they’re closing up the largest bridge in the world, the biggest in the United States, traffic flowing rush hour. People couldn’t get across for 6, 7 hours. Ambulances fire trucks. They’re with him all the time – the people that did it.

They never said, “Hey boss, we’re closing up the George Washington Bridge tonight. “ No, they never said that. They’re talking about weather right?

He knew about it. He knew about it. He’s a got a very friendly group of people over there that they don’t think so. But I don’t know. It’s called life. You’ve got to be smart in life.

I would say there’s less than 1% chance. It could be but I doubt it. He knew about it. They didn’t mention at one of their meetings? I think they had breakfast like every day or every other day. They’re just say, “Chris, tonight we’re closing up the George Washington Bridge because the mayor a certain area is against you.” “Oh, Okay” They didn’t mention? Nobody believes that.

Number two. Nine downgrades of the state. Nine downgrades. It’s a disaster. I have property over there – the taxes are through – I’ll use an expression – coming out of
my cars, Okay? Tremendous taxes over there. You had nine downgrades. You had Christie, you know, so friendly with President Obama during the flood.

I actually called. I said, “Let me ask you. Is he going to vote for Obama?” I thought he was going to vote for Obama. I don’t know. I think he possibly did.

And Romney I was very disappointed. One of the reasons I was disappointed was he called Christie and had dinner right after the election. If Christie did that to me, I would have never spoken to him again. I would have never done it.

So when Chris talks about – When he talks about – when he talked about lack of experience – I built this incredible company. I filed papers where everyone said “Wow, that is unbelievable.” I would have probably filed them even when I didn’t run because I built a great, great company. Tremendous cash. Tremendous assets. Tremendous net worth. Very little debt. Unbelievable cash flow. And I filed.

Everybody said “Number one, he won’t run.” And I ran. I took a deep breath and I said, “Let’s go” to my wife and we come down that escalator. Right, the famous escalators. Hopefully in many years that will be a very famous scene because we will have turned around our country and that will be a positive note, okay?

But then they said, “Oh, well he announced.” So these talking heads – most of whom a rot even smart people, believe me. Then they’d say well, they went to Ivy Leagues colleges. So did I go to Ivy League college. They went to this. Most of them didn’t go to Ivy League colleges by the way but they say they’re brilliant. One’s brilliant because he wears glasses, you know? Like Perry. Remember Perry? We don’t like him.

But what happens is they say “well, he’ll never file form A.” That’s basically where you sign your life away. I filed form A.

Then they said, “Well, he’ll never sign his financial statement because maybe he’s not as rich as everybody thinks.” Then they said, “And if he does, he’ll ask for many, many delays because you’re entitled to 45 day delays, and you can delay it until forever. And they’ll delay it until after the election.”

I said, “No” so I filed it ahead of schedule. And what happened? Remember? They went down. They couldn’t believe it was much, much, much better than anybody ever envisioned.

I built a great company and the reason – honestly worth billions and billions of dollars. Remember that – low debt, great cash flow, and the greatest assets – Doral, Trump Tower, the Trump Building, big chuck of the Bank of America building in San Francisco, 1290 Ave, land all over, land on the Potomac, land all over.

In North Carolina, I have a great piece of property. Trump National Golf Club. Some of you know it. Great, right at the best location.

And what happens? What happens? So I filed and everyone said “Oh, I can’t believe it.”
Then they said “Well, maybe he won’t do so well with the polls.” And you know, before I went, people never believed I was going to run. They never thought I was going to run.

And I told the story the other night for really the first real time. But my wife said to me “You know if you run you will win. Don’t you?” She’s very smart.

I said, “What do you mean?” She said, “If you don’t run, you’re never going to poll before. Nobody believes you’re going to run.” So if they do polls like they did these early polls, they weren’t great before I announced. She said, “No, the only way you’re going to get a poll number is you’ve got to announce.” Nobody believes even though they say, even though they say you’re running, it doesn’t matter. Nobody believes you’re running.

So I said, “All right.” I’m getting these lousy early numbers and I’m saying, “I don’t know. I don’t want to run and find out it doesn’t work.” I don’t want to be embarrassed like Lindsey Graham and all these guys who have nothing. It’s true. It’s true.

So I said, “All right. Let’s take it.”

So we go down on the escalator. You know what I did? You Remember I took a deep breath because I’m telling you and you know what I’m talking about the press down there look like the Academy Awards. There were so many cameras. I have never seen anything like it. The entire atrium of Trump Tower was packed with cameras and press. And I just said, “Let’s go” to my wife.

I took a deep breath and I went down and I talked about lots of things, including illegal immigration.

And illegal immigration was such a big subject. And I’m telling you had I not brought it up, it has turned out to be – and I took heat. I took heat like nobody has ever taken heat. Rush Limbaugh said “The most incredible incoming that I’ve ever seen a human being endure”. And then he doubled down a week later because I was right.

And now, illegal immigration is one of the biggest things.

And then you had the killing of Kate [Steinle] and the killing of Jamiel and the killing recently in California of a 66-Year-old – think of it, 66-year-old – Veteran, female, raped, sodomized and killed by an illegal immigrant. And many, many more. It’s a huge problem.

And they take our jobs and a lot of other things.

So all of a sudden, everyone’s saying “Wow”…. And from almost at the beginning, you’ve seen I’ve been at the top like from almost day one.

…. The reason I tell you certain things and the reason I talk about what I’ve done and lots of good things. A little thing – Wollman ice skating rink. The city couldn’t get it built for high years. They were in there for like $20 million. They couldn’t get it done. I
went to the mayor of New York, I said, “Ed Koch, I’ll get it done real quick.” He didn’t like it because he didn’t want to show up. I said I’ll do it and if costs more than $2 million I’ll pay for it. I got it built for peanuts. Got it done in four months. And we had ice skating in Central Park and I still run it.

I did another one – I did a bigger version of that recently Ferry Point out in the Bronx. They were having – things have been under construction from anywhere between 20 and 30 years, they couldn’t get it done. I got it done under a year. It’s operating now. It’s very successful.

It’s what I do and that’s what we need. That’s what we need in our country.

I’m building on Pennsylvania Avenue an incredible hotel. One of the great hotels of the world. The Old Post Office site. Think of it. I got it in the Obama administration. Everybody was bidding. Everybody wanted it. One of the most sought after projects in the history of the GSA – general services. And I got it. Can you imagine me getting it from the Obama administration? Because the GSA, who are really professionals, they want to make sure number one that it got built. So they wanted strong financials. And they also wanted a great plan. So we came up with Ivanka and my kids came up with this incredible plan. The job is under budget, ahead of schedule. It was going to open up in ’17 – sometime during the year ’17. Now, it’s going to open probably in September of ’16 right before the election on Pennsylvania Avenue.

And this is the kind of mindset you need.

Carl Icahn, one of the great businessmen, and others have endorsed me.

We have trillions and trillions of dollars offshore. Pfizer’s leaving the United Stated.

In the old days, somebody would leave for, frankly, South Carolina. They’d leave New York or Florida or someplace where the taxes are lower. They’d leave for North Carolina. They’d leave – today they’d leave this country for other countries.

So now, we’re losing Pfizer. We’re losing many of our great companies.

We have $2.5 trillion offshore at least. And everybody agrees it should come home – the Democrats, the Republicans. For three years, they can’t make a deal. They can’t make a deal because there’s such gridlock. There’s no leadership in Washington.

We will make this country so great. We have people and I’ll tell you something, I’ll tell you something … [interrupted by protester] said something to me the other day ad what I really what to do – [interrupted by protester] what we want to do or what I want to do is I want to be the people’s president.

Think of this, think of this, I don’t work for any of the lobbyists. I don’t work for any of these people that are leading our country in the wrong direction. We don’t.
The best thing that I’ve seen in going around and the thing that I’ve seen more than anything else is how smart the people are. They don’t believe those people in the back that write with fork. I’m telling you, they don’t believe them. The people are really smart.

What’s giving me more inspiration than any other single thing are the people that I’ve met – the incredible of this country.

We’re going to make America great again. And you know what? We’re going to make it greater, greater, than ever before. And I love you all and thank you very much. South Carolina. Great. Thank you! We love you. Thank you!