From Words to Chaos: Analyzing Trump's Speech Acts That Fueled the January 6th Insurrection

Ayatullah Salem
Faculty of Arts
Helwan University

Abstract

The January 6, 2021, insurrection following President Trump's speech was a pivotal moment marked by violence and an attempt to overturn the election results. This study seeks to address the impact of Trump's political rhetoric, guided by the research question: "What speech acts did Trump employ to influence his audience on January 6?" A forensic qualitative descriptive analysis was conducted, using Searle's five speech acts as the framework. The findings reveal that Trump used assertive accusations most frequently, accounting for nearly half of the speech, followed by commissives (33.9%) and assertive beliefs (20.3%). The dominance of accusations reflected Trump's efforts to shape the narrative by presenting accusations of election fraud, thus reinforcing the perception of an illegitimate election and victimizing himself and his supporters. The commissive acts, though less frequent, played a crucial role in aligning Trump's determination with that of his supporters, fostering a sense of unity and urging them toward action. The conclusion emphasizes how Trump's rhetorical strategy of blending accusations and commissive promises helped escalate tension and motivate his audience toward immediate collective action, contributing to the subsequent violent events at the Capitol. The study underscores the need for mechanisms to monitor and counteract harmful political rhetoric, highlighting its critical role in inciting violence and endangering societal stability. Understanding these rhetorical devices offers a path for policymakers to promote responsible communication and maintain democratic integrity.

Keywords

insurrection, political rhetoric, speech acts, assertive acts, Trump, forensic linguistics

Introduction

Forensic linguistics, a growing field that applies linguistic analysis to legal contexts, has gained global recognition for its role in decoding language's impact on legal decisions and criminal cases. Emerging from the Latin "forensis," meaning forum or court, this discipline traces its roots to seminal studies like Jan Svartvik's analysis of Timothy John Evans' statements in 1968, which uncovered distinct linguistic patterns crucial for understanding criminal cases.

This study delves into a pivotal event in recent American history: the January 6, 2020, speech by former President Donald Trump, which has become a focal point of intense political and legal examination following the unprecedented breach of the United States Capitol by his followers. This speech, delivered from the White House, is alleged to have played a significant role in inciting the violent insurrection that aimed to overturn certified election results and disrupt the democratic process.

In the realm of forensic linguistics, this research seeks to rigorously analyze Trump's speech using linguistic strategies to elucidate its impact and legal implications. Central to this inquiry is the hypothesis that Trump's deliberate language choices directly incited criminal action, thereby necessitating a forensic linguistic examination to uncover the persuasive techniques employed. Employing John Searle’s speech act theory as a methodological framework, this study aims to dissect the speech acts utilized by Trump to influence his audience on January 6. Searle’s framework offers a comprehensive toolset for categorizing speech functions, crucial for dissecting the rhetorical strategies that may have contributed to the Capitol insurrection.

The significance of this study extends beyond American borders, particularly in regions like the Arab world, where the influence of political rhetoric on public actions and societal stability since the Arab Spring events is profound. By comprehensively analyzing Trump's speech through a forensic

qualitative descriptive approach, this research aims to provide insights into how political rhetoric can manipulate and mobilize audiences toward criminal acts.

Research Question

This forensic linguistic study seeks to analyze the speech acts employed by Donald Trump in his January 6th speech, focusing on the speech acts, and examining their potential role in inciting insurrection. The predominant research question is: How did Trump's use of language in his January 6th speech contribute to the incitement of insurrection? To address this, the researcher explores the following question.

1. What speech acts did Trump employ to influence his audience on January 6?

This study employs Searle's Taxonomy of Speech Acts to address the question of how Trump used various speech acts to shape the emotional tone and urgency of his speech, Searle's taxonomy, which categorizes speech into assertives, directives, commissives, expressive, and declarations, is specifically chosen for its comprehensive approach to understanding the diverse purposes of Trump's language. This framework provides clarity on how Trump's varied speech acts aimed to inform, command, promise, express emotions, and alter perceptions of reality.

Literature review

Forensic linguistics, as defined by Svartvik (1968), involves the application of linguistic methods to issues relevant to the legal domain. Svartvik's seminal work marked the inception of forensic linguistics, emphasizing its significance in authorship investigation and linguistic analysis within legal proceedings (Svartvik, 1968). This interdisciplinary field has since been shaped by the contributions of scholars such as Coulthard and Johnson (2007) and Shuy (1993), who have advanced the understanding of

language and crime through their research. Coulthard and Johnson's (2007) approach integrates theories from various linguistic domains, including speech act theory and corpus linguistics, to analyze discourse in legal settings, providing valuable insights into the linguistic dynamics of legal communication. Similarly, Shuy's (1993) research delves into the use of language to enact, conceal, or justify illegal actions, highlighting the complex relationship between language and criminal behavior. His work is an in-depth application of 'illegal ' speech acts analysis on real-life criminal cases, showing the severe and pivotal role that forensic linguistics can play in guiding court rulings. In fact, this has become an acknowledged role for linguistic experts in giving forensic linguistic evidence in criminal court cases in the USA.

This study also incorporates concepts from pragmatics, a field that examines how language is used in context to convey meaning beyond the literal interpretation of words (Leech, 1983). Pragmatics explores the ways in which speakers use language to achieve communicative goals and interact with others. Central to pragmatics is the theory of speech acts proposed by Austin and further developed by Searle (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). Speech acts, a primary focus of pragmatics, refer to the actions performed through language utterances, such as making requests, giving commands, or expressing intentions (Austin, 1962). Searle (1969) expanded upon Austin's framework by categorizing speech acts into five primary types: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations (Searle, 1969). This classification system provides a systematic approach to analyzing the illocutionary force of utterances, enabling researchers to discern the intended meaning and effects of language use within specific contexts.

Theoretical concepts

Searle's explanation of speech acts builds upon the groundwork laid by Austin, emphasizing the performative nature

of language (Searle, 1969). Searle contends that utterances not only convey information but also perform actions, known as speech acts, within a given context. John Searle's contribution to the field of pragmatics primarily lies in his development and elaboration of speech act theory, which offers a systematic framework for understanding how language functions in communication. Searle expanded upon Austin's initial work by categorizing speech acts into various types, such as assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations (Searle, 1969). Assertive: Assertive speech acts involve making utterances that represent the speaker's beliefs or assertions about the world. For example, saying "It is raining outside" is an assertive speech act because it conveys the speaker's belief about the weather.

1. Directives: Directive speech acts aim to get the hearer to do something or to perform a specific action. Commands, requests, and suggestions are examples of directive speech acts. For instance, saying "Please close the door" is a directive speech act that requests the hearer to perform a specific action.

2. Commissives: Commissive speech acts involve commitments by the speaker to perform future actions. Promises, pledges, and vows are examples of commissive speech acts. When someone says, "I will help you with your project," they are making a commitment to assist in the future.

3. Assertive: Assertive speech acts state what the speaker believes to be accurate, offering descriptions, claims, or assessments of the world. Examples include stating facts, asserting opinions, or making predictions. When Trump says, "The economy is stronger than ever," he performs an assertive speech act by claiming something as factual. Assertives in political rhetoric often serve to build credibility and align the audience's beliefs with the speaker's viewpoint.

4. Expressives: Expressive speech acts convey the speaker's psychological state or attitude towards a situation. Apologies, congratulations, and condolences are examples of expressive speech acts. For instance, saying "I'm sorry for your loss" expresses sympathy and regret.

5. Declarations: Declarations are speech acts that bring about changes in the external world by the mere act of uttering them. Examples include pronouncing someone married, declaring war, or firing someone from a job. When a judge declares, "I now pronounce you husband and wife," the couple's marital status changes as a result of the declaration.

Searle's classification system allows researchers to analyze the illocutionary force of utterances, discerning both the intended meaning and the effects of language use within specific contexts. This framework facilitates a deeper understanding of how language functions in communication, enabling scholars to explore the complexities of human interaction and social behavior.

In conclusion, Searle's theory of speech acts provides a robust framework for analyzing speech acts within legal discourse, as exemplified in President Trump's January 6th speech with a focus on commissive and assertive acts. These two types only have been identified in the speech as central to understanding how Trump's language use succeeded in influencing and controlling/prompting behavior.

Previous studies

Several researchers have analyzed Donald Trump's discursive strategies using formal discourse analysis methods, often focusing on assertive, directive, and commissive speech acts. For instance, Feinstein and Bayer (2022) used critical discourse analysis to explore the construction of "us vs. them" dichotomies in Trump's rhetoric, which aligns with the current study's examination of assertiveness that reinforces social divisions. Similarly, Krämer and Lörke (2021) explored Trump's use of

directives during the COVID-19 pandemic, which parallels this study's focus on how directives incite action and create ideological pressure. These studies highlight the role of assertives and directives in constructing authority and political identities.

However, unlike most existing research, the current study takes a more focused approach by specifically analyzing Trump's use of speech acts following Searle's model, with an emphasis on their emotional and incitement effects. Previous research, such as Cramer's (2018) work on polarizing rhetoric, needs to delve into the emotional markers embedded in Trump's directives and commissives, which are a key focus here. Furthermore, the present analysis addresses gaps in studies like Tran and Pham (2021) by examining how Trump's use of conditionality in threats, particularly his use of "will," conveys certainty and imposes ideological pressure, which is not fully explored in prior work.

The current study contributes by bridging the gap between assertive speech acts and their role in inciting audience action, using a more granular analysis of the directive and commissive structures. Unlike previous research that often overlooks the lived experiences and responses of the audience, this study directly links Trump's rhetorical strategies with their impact on mobilizing his supporters.

Methodology

For the methodology of this present research, the authors adopt a qualitative descriptive approach, whose purpose is to "summarize the information straightforwardly regarding an occurrence" (Creswell, 2013, p. 43). This method, in particular, fits the purpose of this research by focusing on Trump's rhetorical strategies because it allows for an in-depth investigation of speech acts and their impact on the addressees. Qualitative descriptive analyses should be embraced in the study of political language where meaning and context are thoroughly studied without the dependence of numeric measurements.

A case study design was chosen due to its efficiency in studying one political communication incident in depth: Trump's speech that preceded the Capitol riot. This background supports the current design in that it facilitates a focused study of how history was and is made, in this case, action incitement using Trump's words, which is one of the research's goals.

The utterance is the basic unit of analysis, and it is defined in the Oxford English Dictionary as a spoken word, statement, or vocal sound. This is because utterances represent the full communicative purpose of each statement and, as such, define the most appropriate level for analysis. By focusing on utterances, the study demonstrates how language is used to construct persuasive and incitement messages strategically.

There are two types of speech acts that this study will analyze using Searle's framework: assertives and commissives. The rationale behind restricting the analysis to only these two types is based on these types' bearing on the objectives sought by Trump. Assertive include utterances that include making claims and declarations that shape the audience's view of specific aspects of reality, in this case, the elections and, more specifically, the associated election fraud and Mike Pence. On the other hand, commissives refer to the undertaking of a course of action in the future, in Trump's case, expressed in terms of threats or promises of what would follow. These two speech acts are essential in popularizing the concept of speech, which in this case is incitement by Trump, coercion of politicians, and cultivation of divisionism.

Thematic coding was used to systematically organize the utterances into recurring patterns, which allowed for a clearer understanding of Trump's rhetorical strategy. Creswell (2013) describes thematic coding as “identifying patterns or themes within qualitative data by organizing the data into categories that represent recurring ideas, concepts, or topics of interest” (p. 190). Through this process, four themes emerged in Trump’s speech:

1. Incitement to act: Utterances that directly or indirectly urge the audience to take specific actions.
2. Mike Pence's role: Utterances emphasizing or pressuring the Vice President to take action regarding election results.
3. Election fraud accusations: Assertions that focus on claims of a rigged election.
4. Arousing negative emotions: Utterances that evoke anger, resentment, or fear toward political opponents or perceived threats.

By focusing on assertives and commissives and applying thematic coding, this study delves into how Trump's speech acts contributed to mobilizing his supporters, exerting ideological pressure, and reinforcing a polarized political landscape. The use of these two speech act types allows the study to highlight the emotional and strategic dimensions of Trump's rhetoric, filling gaps in previous analyses that still need to explore the incitement aspect of his speech fully.

Analysis of Trump's January 6 Speech

This section analyzes and classifies the directive and assertive speech acts following Searle's model in an attempt to identify if there is a predominant pattern of using and combining types of speech acts and how such patterns and alterations are conducive to building up, persuading, and incite the mob to take criminal action.

Searle's illocutionary speech acts

This section examines Trump's Speech, identifying the directives and assertive following Searle's model.

illocutionary speech acts of commissives

According to Searle's classification of speech acts, commissive speech acts involve committing the speaker to a future course of action. In other words, the speaker expresses a

commitment or promise to perform a specific action. Commissive speech acts typically involve the use of verbs such as "promise," "commit," "pledge," "guarantee," or "swear," or could be without a performative verb. The commissives are distributed at the beginning and the end of the speech, signaling Trump's intent to refuse to concede the election, resist silence, and fight against practices like universal mail-in balloting and ballot harvesting. These commitments are tied to Trump's broader narrative of election theft, emphasizing his promise to contest the results and take future action by inciting people.

Table 1 provides an analysis of all twenty commissive speech acts, comprising 33.9% of those identified in Donald Trump's January 6th speech. The table outlines specific examples, highlighting how these commissives contribute to the overall rhetoric of resistance and defiance against the election outcome. For the thematic coding, all Commissives are also identified as "Incite to Act." The analysis will also identify the underlying themes, which include incite to act.

Table 1: Commissive Speech Act

Commissives: The speaker commits to a future course of action	Thematic Coding
1. **"We will never give up."** 2. **"We will never concede." "It doesn't happen."** (p. 1, 3rd para., lines 5-6)	Incite to Act
3. **"We will not let them silence your voices."** 4. **"We're not going to let it happen."** 5. **"Not going to let it happen." (p. 1, 6th para., line 6-7)**	Incite to Act
6. "We will not take it anymore" (p. 1, 4th paragraph, line 1)	Incite to Act

7. **"Mike Pence has to agree to send it back." (p. 2, 3rd para., line 6) (it refers to election results)**	Incite to Act
8. "We're going to have to fight much harder" (p. 4, 1st para., line 6)	Incite to Act
9. "We're going to walk down – 10. and I'll be there with you – 11. we're going to walk down. 12. We're going to walk down" (P. 4, 1st para., line 9-10)	Incite to Act
13. **"We're going to walk down to the Capitol."** 14. **"We're going to cheer on our brave senators."** 15. **"We're going to cheer on our congressmen and women"** (P. 4, 1st para., line 10-11)	Incite to Act
16. **"And Mike Pence is going to have to come through for us." (p. 4, 1st para., lines 6-7)**	Incite to Act
17. **"But the only way that can happen is if Mike Pence agrees to send it back." (p. 8, 6th para., lines 3-4)**	Incite to Act
18. **"All Vice President Pence has to do is send it back to the states to recertify, and we become president, and you are the happiest people" (p. 9, 1st para., line 1)**	Incite to Act
19. **We will ban ballot harvesting and prohibit using unsecured drop boxes to commit rampant fraud (p. 14, 4th para., line 5)**	Incite to Act

20. **"We will stop the practice of universal, unsolicited mail-in balloting" (p. 14, 4th para., line 7)**	Incite to Act

Discussion of commissives

The table presents the twenty commissive utterances in Trump's speech, of which there are 59 total utterances, which are pivotal in shaping the rhetorical direction of his address. The pattern of commissive speech acts in Table 1 highlights a carefully crafted rhetorical strategy aimed at fostering unity, strengthening defiance, and motivating the audience toward collective action.

At the beginning of Trump's speech, the use of commissives like utterance 1 in Table 1("we will never give up") (p. 1, 3rd para., lines 5) and utterance 2 in Table 1 ("we will never concede") (p. 1, 3rd para., lines 6) establishes a foundation of resilience and determination. This means that the speaker pledges unwavering determination, vowing never to give up or concede. These early promises are more than just utterances of intent—they serve to establish a psychological contract with the audience, laying the groundwork for a narrative of strength and perseverance. By promising that the collective will never concede, the speaker is signaling that retreat or defeat is not an option, immediately framing the discourse in terms of victory or survival. The repeated use of the first-person plural "we will never give up," and "We will never concede" (p. 1, 3rd para., lines 5-6) emphasizes the speaker's alignment with the audience, suggesting that their struggles and hopes are intertwined. This strategic choice reinforces solidarity, making it clear that the speaker is part of the collective fight, not merely an observer or a leader giving instructions. This technique of inclusivity—using language that binds the speaker and audience together—creates a shared identity based on common goals and opposition to external forces. The refusal to concede, as articulated in these utterances, also works to elevate the stakes of the situation, making it clear that the battle is not only over specific outcomes but also over values like persistence and justice. By doing so, the

speaker evokes a sense of moral superiority and inevitability, encouraging the audience to view themselves as participants in a more significant, righteous cause that cannot afford to fail.

In utterances 4, 5, and 6 in Table 1, the speaker pledges to prevent specific adverse outcomes from happening, focusing on defending the audience from perceived threats. The adverse outcomes implied include the silencing of the audience's voices, electoral fraud, and the broader disempowerment of the group. Utterance 4, for example, vows to ensure that the audience's voices are not silenced, reinforcing the notion that their ability to speak and act freely is under attack. In utterances 5 and 6, the speaker makes a commitment to stop certain events from occurring, suggesting the prevention of electoral manipulation or injustice, which is presented as a direct threat to democratic integrity. These utterances not only promise protection but also establish a clear contrast between the speaker's commitment and the negative consequences that will be avoided through unified action.

In the middle of the speech, there is a notable transition to a more aggressive and proactive stance. Utterance 8, "we're going to have to fight much harder," exemplifies this shift. By introducing this call for increased effort, Trump signals that the initial phase of merely holding firm needs to be revised. The placement of this commissive at the midpoint is strategic—it represents a turning point in the rhetoric where the speech evolves from reinforcing commitment to demanding intensified action. This transition is crucial as it moves the audience from a state of passive support to an active role in the struggle. The strategic timing of this commissive serves several purposes. Firstly, it escalates the stakes by indicating that future actions will require greater involvement and exertion. The phrase "we’re going to have to" implies that the audience’s role will expand beyond previous expectations, signaling that the battle is intensifying, and that their contributions will be pivotal in achieving the desired outcomes. This not only heightens the sense of urgency but also deepens the audience's

emotional investment. Secondly, the placement of this call for more vigorous action in the middle of the speech is effective for maintaining audience engagement. By this point, the initial motivational fervor begins to fade, and the speech risks losing its momentum. This strategic escalation ensures that the audience remains focused and energized, ready to embrace the increased demands of their role in the ongoing struggle.

At the end of the speech, these utterances function as a final rallying cry, tying together the speech's earlier themes and setting clear, actionable objectives. Secondly, the specificity of these commissives—calling for a physical movement to the Capitol and placing responsibility on a key figure (Mike Pence)—translates the abstract idea of resistance into tangible steps. This direct approach aims to convert the audience's accumulated sense of urgency and determination into concrete actions. By specifying what the audience should do next and who should be held accountable, Trump effectively channels the audience's energy and focus into immediate, actionable goals.

In Trump's January 6th address, commissive speech acts strategically progress from establishing resilience and commitment to inciting immediate, often controversial actions, directly relating to the theme of inciting to act. Initially, these utterances build a foundation of collective resolve, urging supporters to persist.

In conclusion, the pattern that emerges from these utterances—seen in utterances 1, 5, 7, 9, 13, 16, and 18 in Table 1, suggests a gradual escalation from abstract resistance to concrete action. Each utterance works to build momentum, with early promises of defiance leading to later calls for immediate action and the application of external pressure. This deliberate use of commissives effectively mobilizes the audience, aligning their actions with Trump's objectives and intensifying the movement's impact, reinforcing the theme of incitement to act.

Illocutionary speech acts of assertive

According to Searle's speech act theory, an assertive speech act is an illocutionary act where the speaker asserts or states a proposition or a fact. It is used to convey information, make claims, or express beliefs. This section is organized to divide the assertives in Trump's speech into two distinct types: those expressing beliefs and those conveying accusations. Each type is then discussed in detail, with an explanation of the assertiveness.

In Trump's speech, a total of 39 assertive speech acts were identified from the 59 total utterances. The assertives are categorized into twelve expressing beliefs and twenty-seven conveying accusations—to emphasize their differing functions and impacts on the audience. This division into assertive expressing beliefs and accusative assertiveness is a crucial contribution by the researcher since by distinguishing between these types, the researcher provides a clearer understanding of their distinct rhetorical functions and impacts. Assertive beliefs are designed to evoke empathy and engage the audience personally, setting the tone for the speech. In contrast, accusative assertives are employed to manipulate perceptions and support controversial claims. This analytical approach underscores the multifaceted role of assertives in shaping audience responses and enhances the insight into how different types of assertives are strategically utilized throughout the speech.

First: Assertives expressing beliefs

The following section will provide a detailed discussion of each assertive belief, analyzing their impact on the speech— the following examples from Trump's speech show how he expressed his beliefs through an assertive speech act. In Trump's speech, the researcher identified twelve assertive speech acts that express strong beliefs.

Table 2: Assertiveness expressing beliefs

Assertives: expressing beliefs: the speaker conveys their beliefs about a particular situation or event.	Thematic coding: Two themes identified in Assertives: (a) Arousing Negative Emotions and (b) Empowering Supporters
1. "Our country has had enough" (p. 1, 4th paragraph, line 1)	arousing negative emotions
2. "Nobody knows what the hell is going on. 3. There's never been anything like this" (p. 1, 6th para., lines 5-6)	arousing negative emotions
4. "And we have great ones, Jim Jordan, and some of these guys. 5. They are out there fighting. 6. The house guys are fighting, 7. but it's incredible" (p. 3, 2nd para., lines 2-3)	Empowering supporters
8. "They fought a good race" (p. 5, 6th para., line 4-5)	Empowering supporters
9. "I fought like hell for them, one in particular I fought" (p. 7, 3rd para., line 2)	Empowering supporters

10. "This is a time for strength" (p. 9, 5th para., line 3)	Empowering supporters
11. "It's all part of the comprehensive assault on our democracy and the American people to finally standing up and saying no" (p. 9, 5th para., lines 5-6)	arousing strong emotions
12. "We are headed, and were headed, in the right direction" (P. 15, 2nd para., line 5-6)	Empowering supporters

Discussion of Assertive Beliefs in Trump's Speech

Of the 59 utterances in the speech, twelve express beliefs, reflecting Trump's convictions, strategic outlook, and interpretation of the political landscape. These assertive utterances communicate his assessment of the country's challenges, the nature of the political struggle, and his admiration for figures perceived to be on his side. Trump's rhetoric conveys a sense of national fatigue, the unprecedented nature of the situation, and respect for those aligned with his cause, framing the political struggle as a critical moment for the country. Through these utterances, he positions himself and his supporters as resolute defenders of democracy and agents of necessary change. His use of assertive speech acts serves to project confidence and provide a clear ideological framework for the audience, reinforcing the notion that they are engaged in a just and vital battle.

At the beginning of the speech, assertive such as "Our country has had enough" (p. 1, 4th para.) are employed to convey Trump's belief in the collective dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs. By articulating this belief, Trump sets the tone for the speech, framing the political situation as one of widespread

frustration and discontent. His early assertion establishes a foundational understanding of the grievances at hand, motivating the audience to engage with his narrative and prepare for the ensuing call to action.

In the middle of the speech, assertives like, "They fought a good race" (p. 5, 6th para.) and "I fought like hell for them" (p. 7, 3rd para.) shift the focus to admiration for allies and personal commitment. These utterances serve to reinforce Trump's narrative of relentless effort and personal sacrifice, highlighting both the collective and individual contributions made. By using phrases that emphasize pride and dedication, such as "fought a good race" and "fought like hell," Trump deepens the emotional investment of the audience in the cause. His mid-speech reinforcement of admiration and commitment ensures continued support and strengthens the audience's sense of urgency and loyalty.

In Trump's speech, assertives express beliefs strategically to achieve two main thematic goals: arousing negative emotions and empowering supporters. Early in the speech, assertives like "Our country has had enough" evoke a sense of urgency and discontent among the audience. In the middle of the speech, assertives shift to empowering supporters by celebrating their efforts, acknowledging their struggles, and reinforcing Trump's personal commitment. His approach boosts morale, fosters solidarity, and encourages continued support. Overall, Trump's use of assertives effectively mobilizes his audience by aligning their emotional responses with his political objectives.

In conclusion, the 12 assertive utterances expressing beliefs are strategically positioned at the beginning and middle of Trump's speech. At the beginning, these assertives set the stage by articulating Trump's perspective on the nation's challenges and aligning the audience with his view of the current political landscape. In the middle of the speech, assertives shift to emphasizing admiration for allies and personal commitment, reinforcing Trump's narrative of resilience and dedication. His

strategic placement ensures continued support, strengthens the audience's sense of urgency, and maintains alignment with his ideological framework, positioning them as integral players in the ongoing struggle.

Second: Assertive expressing accusations from Trump's speech

In Donald Trump's January 6th speech, assertives expressing accusations constitute all utterances of 27 assertives. The following section will provide a detailed discussion of each assertive accusation, analyzing their impact on Trump's speech. The analysis will also identify the underlying themes, which include accusations of election fraud, misrepresentation of Mike Pence's role, and exaggerated claims of voting irregularities. In his speech, former President Trump repeatedly advanced accusations regarding election integrity and the role of Mike Pence. Table 3 will explain these assertions, analyzing their rhetorical impact.

Table 3: Assertiveness expressing accusations

Assertive: All Assertives involve accusations concerning election fraud and Mike Pence's role in inciting Trump's followers to act criminally.	Thematic coding
1. "There is theft involved" (p. 1, 3rd para., line 6)	Election Fraud Accusation
2. "Because if Mike Pence does the right thing, we win the election" (p. 2, 3rd para., line 1)	Mike Pence's false role
3. "The states got defrauded. 4. They were given false information. 5. They voted on it" (p. 2, 3rd para., lines 4-5)	Election fraud accusation

6. “Democrats have gotten away with election fraud” (p. 3, 2nd para., line 1)	Election fraud accusation
7. "As you know, the media has constantly asserted that there was no evidence of widespread fraud. Have you ever seen these people? While there is no evidence of fraud" (p. 6, 2nd para., lines 1-2)	Election fraud accusation
8. “In every single swing state, local officials, state officials, almost all Democrats made illegal and unconstitutional changes to election procedures without the mandated approvals by the state legislatures” (p. 7, 6th para., lines 1-2)	Election fraud accusation
9. "You can't make a change on voting for a federal election unless the state legislature approves it. only judge can do it. Nobody can do it, only a legislature" (p. 7, 7th para., line 1-2)	Election fraud accusation
10. “There were over 205,000 more ballots counted in Pennsylvania” (p. 8, 2nd para., line 6)	Election fraud accusation
11. "That means you had 200 -- where did they come from? You know where they came from?" (p. 8, 2nd para., line 7-8)	Election fraud accusation
12. “So in Pennsylvania you had 205,000 more votes than you had voters!” (p. 8, 2nd para., line 9)	Election fraud accusation

13. “Pennsylvania has now seen all of this… 14. And they want to recertify their votes. 15. They want to recertify” (p. 8, 6th para., lines 2-3)	Election fraud accusation
16. “But the only way that can happen is if Mike Pence agrees to send it back” (p. 8, 6th para., lines 3-4)	Mike Pence’s false role
17. "Over 170,000 absentee votes were counted in Wisconsin without a valid absentee ballot application" (p. 10, 3rd para., lines 2-3)	Election fraud accusation
18. "And that's illegal in Wisconsin. meaning those votes were blatantly done in opposition to state law" (p. 10, 3rd para., lines 4-5)	Election fraud accusation
19. "They defrauded us out of a win in Georgia" (p. 11, 3rd para., line 2)	Election fraud accusation
20. “Over 10,300 ballots in Georgia were cast by individuals whose names and dates of birth match Georgia residents who died in 2020 and prior to the election” (p. 11, 5th para., lines 4-5)	Election fraud accusation
21. "In the state of Arizona, over 36,000 ballots were illegally cast by non-citizens" (p. 12, 2nd para., line 1)	Election fraud accusation
22. "There were also more than 42,000 double votes in Nevada. Over 150, 000 people were hurt so badly by	Election fraud accusation

what took place" (p. 12, 3rd para., lines 5-6)	
23. "And 1,500 ballots were cast by individuals whose names and dates of birth match Nevada residents who died in 2020, prior to (the) November 3 election" (p. 12, 3rd para., lines 6-7)	Election fraud accusation
24. "More than 17,000 Michigan ballots were cast by individuals whose names and dates of birth matched people who were deceased" (p. 12, 4th para., lines 3-4)	Election fraud accusation
25. "In Detroit, turnout was 139% of registered voters. Think of that. 26. So you had 139% of the people in Detroit voting" (p. 12, 4th para., lines 7-9)	Election fraud accusation
27. "Such gigantic and one-sided vote dumps were only observed in a few swing states" (p. 13, 1st para., lines 3-4)	Election fraud accusation

Discussion of Assertive accusations in Trump's speech

The following section provides a detailed explanation of each assertive utterance from Trump's speech, which involved accusations related to election fraud and Mike Pence's role.

At the beginning of the speech, assertives introduce doubt and suspicion, setting the stage for Trump's broader narrative of election fraud. The goal is to create an emotional impact by framing the election as illegitimate and stolen, encouraging the audience to

question the results. For example: "There is theft involved" (p. 1, 3rd para., line 6) introduces the accusation of wrongdoing in the election process. His utterance, placed early in the speech, serves to draw the audience into believing that their votes have been compromised, priming them emotionally for the rest of the speech. His assertion does not require further justification, which encourages the audience to align with this perspective. His emotional impact is immediate, setting the foundation for portraying the election as questionable.

- Utterance 1 in Table 3: This utterance accuses the election process of theft, implying that votes were improperly taken or manipulated. The function is to introduce doubt and foster suspicion about the electoral system as a whole.
- Utterance 2 in Table 3: This utterance suggests that Mike Pence has the power to influence the election outcome through his actions. It aims to highlight Pence's role and create a sense of urgency.
- Utterances 3-5 in Table 3: These claims accuse states of being defrauded. They function to challenge the legitimacy of the election results and support the broader narrative of election issues.
- Utterance 6 in Table 3: This utterance accuses Democrats of committing election fraud without presenting supporting evidence. Its function is to emphasize party divisions and reinforce the narrative of a contested election.
- Utterance 7 in Table 3: This claim suggests that the media is covering up election fraud by denying its occurrence. The function is to challenge media credibility and promote a narrative of bias.

In the middle of Trump's January 6th speech, assertive accusations intensify claims of electoral fraud, raising the stakes for the audience. Trump points to alleged irregularities in critical

states and accuses individuals, including the Vice President, of obstructing necessary actions. These accusations increase the audience's sense of frustration and urgency, encouraging them to take action. The strategic placement of these utterances keeps the audience engaged and maintains momentum toward action.

- Utterance 8 in Table 3: This utterance accuses local and state officials, particularly Democrats, of making illegal changes to election procedures. The function is to question the credibility of the election process and suggest manipulation.
- Utterance 9 in Table 3: This claim limits the authority to change voting procedures to state legislatures alone. The function is to challenge the legitimacy of actions taken by other authorities.
- Utterance 10 in Table 3: This assertion accuses Pennsylvania's vote count of irregularities. The function is to introduce doubt about the election results.
- Utterance 11 in Table 3: This claim questions the legitimacy of excess ballots, suggesting fraud. The function is to raise suspicion about the election process.
- Utterance 12 in Table 3: This utterance suggests a discrepancy between votes and voters in Pennsylvania. Its function is to question the accuracy of the election results.
- Utterances 13-15 in Table 3: These claims suggest Pennsylvania is reconsidering its results due to fraud. They aim to create urgency around the actions of state officials.
- Utterance 16 in Table 3: This assertion states that Mike Pence has the power to alter the election results by sending them back. The function is to emphasize Pence's role and suggest potential influence.
- Utterance 17 in Table 3: This claim accuses absentee votes in Wisconsin of being counted without valid applications. Its function is to raise questions about the credibility of absentee voting.

- Utterance 18 in Table 3: This utterance questions the legality of absentee votes in Wisconsin. Its function is to introduce doubt about the voting process.
- Utterance 19 in Table 3: This claim accuses election officials in Georgia of defrauding Trump of victory. Its function is to incite frustration and challenge the election results.
- Utterance 20 in Table 3: This assertion questions the number of ballots cast by deceased individuals in Georgia. Its function is to reinforce claims of irregularities.
- Utterance 21 in Table 3: This claim accuses non-citizens of casting ballots in Arizona. Its function is to incite suspicion about voter eligibility.
- Utterance 22 in Table 3: This utterance exaggerates the number of double votes in Nevada. Its function is to raise doubts about the integrity of the process.
- Utterance 23 in Table 3: This claim suggests that ballots were cast in the names of deceased individuals in Nevada. Its function is to question the legitimacy of the election.
- Utterance 24 in Table 3: This utterance suggests fraudulent ballots in Michigan. Its function is to introduce doubt about the accuracy of the results.
- Utterance 25 in Table 3: This claim questions voter turnout in Detroit. Its function is to suggest irregularities and challenge the election outcome.
- Utterance 26 in Table 3: This utterance highlights large vote swings in certain states. Its function is to suggest potential irregularities.
- Utterance 27 in Table 3: This claim suggests vote dumps in swing states, implying that anomalies are evidence of fraud. Its function is to foster suspicion about the electoral process.

The analysis of assertives in Trump's speech shows how he uses phrases like "theft," "fraud," and "Mike Pence" to present a narrative of election corruption. The speech frequently focuses on accusations of widespread election fraud and emphasizes Pence's

role in the outcome. These utterances incite the audience to question the election and feel compelled to act. Through these accusations, Trump mobilizes his supporters and sustains the message of a contested election.

Results and discussion

The results of this study provide a detailed examination of the linguistic tools employed by Donald Trump in his speech on January 6, 2020, focusing on the prevalence and impact of the speech act types employed. By analyzing the frequency and significance of these techniques, the study highlights their role in shaping audience perceptions and inciting action. He figures that modifications are needed for the analysis.

Table 4: Frequency and percentages of speech acts

Type	Frequency	Percentage
Commissives	20	33.9%
Assertive expressing beliefs	11	20.3%
Assertive expressing accusations	27	45.8%

The table presents the distribution of various linguistic tools utilized by Donald Trump in his January 6th speech, along with their frequency and their respective percentages. The significance lies in understanding how each type of linguistic expression contributes to the overall persuasive effect of the speech.

Commissives

The table presents twenty commissive utterances, which make up 33.9% of the total 59 utterances in Trump's speech. His interpretation of these results reveals how Trump's strategic use of commissive speech acts serves to build and sustain a powerful emotional and motivational bond with his audience. y constituting 33.9% of the total speech, commissives play a dominant role in shaping the narrative. Early promises of resilience, such as "we will never give up," establish a shared commitment to a cause framed as both morally just and urgent. hus, the overall pattern reveals that these commissives are not isolated utterances; they work in concert to build momentum, heighten urgency, and mobilize the audience toward immediate action. Trump's use of commissives creates a narrative where collective resistance, protection of values, and concrete actions merge into a cohesive strategy aimed at reinforcing audience loyalty and directing behavior. His rhetorical approach emphasizes unity and shared responsibility, ensuring that the audience remains engaged and ready to act.

Assertive beliefs

Moving down the hierarchy, Trump's assertive beliefs, making up 20.3% of his speech, are used to project his own convictions as shared truths, heightening emotional intensity. His rhetorical strategy translates Trump's personal convictions into shared beliefs, fostering a sense of unity and urgency among his audience. These utterances blur the line between fact and belief, creating an echo chamber where Trump's assertions become accepted truths. By doing so, Trump ensures that his supporters not only feel justified in their frustrations but are motivated to act on them. His tactic reinforces the collective momentum necessary to sustain the charged political environment.

Assertive accusations

Assertive accusations, representing 45.8% of Trump's January 6th speech, were his primary rhetorical tool to reinforce the claim of a stolen election. These accusations were intended to present the narrative with certainty and authority despite lacking supporting evidence. Other than fabrications or falsehoods, they took the form of deliberate accusations to undermine his opponents and cast doubt on the legitimacy of the election. y framing the opposition as conspirators and portraying himself as a victim of systemic fraud; Trump sought to rally his supporters and justify their subsequent actions.

These accusations served dual purposes: to create a reality in which his loss was perceived as unjust and to cast doubt on the democratic process itself. By framing the election outcome as illegitimate, he aimed to disempower his political opponents and fuel a sense of injustice among his supporters. His strategic use of accusations not only heightened the emotional intensity of the crowd but also legitimized their eventual actions, including storming the Capitol, as a form of justified resistance against perceived corruption. Thus, the assertive accusations played a crucial role in escalating the conflict by reinforcing grievances and motivating action through a shared sense of urgency and injustice.

Distribution of types

In his efforts to mobilize supporters, Trump employs a strategic chronological sequence of language patterns aimed at galvanizing action and fostering a sense of urgency and loyalty.

Table 5: Distributions of types

Type	Utterances
Assertive accusations	1. "There is theft involved" (p. 1, 3rd para., line 6)

assertive beliefs	2. "Our country has had enough" (p. 1, 4th paragraph, line 1)
assertive beliefs	3. “Because if Mike Pence does the right thing, we win the election” (p. 2, 3rd para., line 1)
assertive beliefs	4. "Nobody knows what the hell is going on. 5. There’s never been anything like this" (p. 1, 6th para., lines 5-6)
Commissives	6. **"We will never give up."** 7. **"We will never concede." "It doesn’t happen."** (p. 1, 3rd para., lines 5-6)
Commissives	8. **"We will not let them silence your voices."** 9. **"We’re not going to let it happen."** 10. **"Not going to let it happen." (p. 1, 6th para., line 6-7)**
Commissives	11. “We will not take it anymore” (p. 1, 4th paragraph, line 1)
Assertive accusations	12. “Because if Mike Pence does the right thing, we win the election” (p. 2, 3rd para., line 1)
Assertive accusations	13. “The states got defrauded. 14. They were given false information. 15. They voted on it” (p. 2, 3rd para., lines 4-5)
Assertives accusations	16. “Democrats have gotten away with election fraud” (p. 3, 2nd para., line 1)
Assertives beliefs	17. “And we have great ones, Jim Jordan, and some of these guys. 18. They are out there fighting.

	19.The house guys are fighting, 20.but it's incredible" (p. 3, 2nd para., lines 2-3)
Commissives	21."We're going to have to fight much harder" (p. 4, 1st para., line 6)
Commissives	22."We're going to walk down – 23. and I'll be there with you – 24. we're going to walk down. 25. We're going to walk down" (P. 4, 1st para., line 9-10)
Commissives	26.**"We're going to walk down to the Capitol."** 27.**"We're going to cheer on our brave senators."** 28.**"We're going to cheer on our congressmen and women"** (P. 4, 1st para., line 10-11)
Commissives	29.**"And Mike Pence is going to have to come through for us." (p. 4, 1st para., lines 6-7)**
Assertive beliefs	30."They fought a good race" (p. 5, 6th para., line 4-5)
Assertives accusations	31."As you know, the media has constantly asserted that there was no evidence of widespread fraud. Have you ever see these people? While there is no evidence of fraud" (p. 6, 2nd para., lines 1-2)
Assertive beliefs	32."I fought like hell for them, one in particular I fought" (p. 7, 3rd para., line 2)
Assertives accusations	33."In every single swing state, local officials, state officials, almost all Democrats made illegal and

	unconstitutional changes to election procedures without the mandated approvals by the state legislatures" (p. 7, 6th para., lines 1-2)
Assertives accusations	34."You can't make a change on voting for a federal election unless the state legislature approves it. o judge can do it. Nobody can do it, only a legislature" (p. 7, 7th para., line 1-2)
Commissives	35.**"But the only way that can happen is if Mike Pence agrees to send it back." (p. 8, 6th para., lines 3-4)**
Assertives accusations	36."There were over 205,000 more ballots counted in Pennsylvania" (p. 8, 2nd para., line 6)
Assertives accusations	37."That means you had 200 -- where did they come from? Do you know where they came from?" (p. 8, 2nd para., line 7-8)
Assertives accusations	38."So in Pennsylvania you had 205,000 more votes than you had voters!" (p. 8, 2nd para., line 9)
Assertives accusations	39."Pennsylvania has now seen all of this… 40.And they want to recertify their votes. 41.They want to recertify" (p. 8, 6th para., lines 2-3)
Assertives accusations	42."But the only way that can happen is if Mike Pence agrees to send it back" (p. 8, 6th para., lines 3-4)
Commissives	43.**"All Vice President Pence has to do is send it back to the states to recertify, and we become president, and you are**

	the happiest people" (p. 9, 1st para., line 1)
Assertive beliefs	44."This is a time for strength" (p. 9, 5th para., line 3)
Assertive beliefs	45."It's all part of the comprehensive assault on our democracy and the American people to finally standing up and saying no" (p. 9, 5th para., lines 5-6)
Assertives accusations	46."over 170,000 absentee votes were counted in Wisconsin without a valid absentee ballot application" (p. 10, 3rd para., lines 2-3)
Assertives accusations	47."And that's illegal in Wisconsin. meaning those votes were blatantly done in opposition to state law" (p. 10, 3rd para., lines 4-5)
Assertives accusations	48."They defrauded us out of a win in Georgia" (p. 11, 3rd para., line 2)
Assertives accusations	49."Over 10,300 ballots in Georgia were cast by individuals whose names and dates of birth match Georgia residents who died in 2020 and prior to the election" (p. 11, 5th para., lines 4-5)
Assertives accusations	50."In the state of Arizona, over 36,000 ballots were illegally cast by non-citizens" (p. 12, 2nd para., line 1)
Assertives accusations	51."There were also more than 42,000 double votes in Nevada. Over 150, 000 people were hurt so badly by what took place" (p. 12, 3rd para., lines 5-6)
Assertives accusations	52."And 1,500 ballots were cast by individuals whose names and dates of

	birth match Nevada residents who died in 2020, prior to (the) November 3 election" (p. 12, 3rd para., lines 6-7)
Assertives accusations	53."More than 17,000 Michigan ballots were cast by individuals whose names and dates of birth matched people who were deceased" (p. 12, 4th para., lines 3-4)
Assertives accusations	54."In Detroit, turnout was 139% of registered voters. Think of that. 55. So you had 139% of the people in Detroit voting" (p. 12, 4th para., lines 7-9)
Assertives accusations	56."Such gigantic and one-sided vote dumps were only observed in a few swing states" (p. 13, 1st para., lines 3-4)
Commissives	57.**We will ban ballot harvesting and prohibit using unsecured drop boxes to commit rampant fraud (p. 14, 4th para., line 5)**
Commissives	58.**"We will stop the practice of universal, unsolicited mail-in balloting" (p. 14, 4th para., line 7)**
Assertive beliefs	59."We are headed, and were headed, in the right direction" (P. 15, 2nd para., line 5-6)

The table categorizes key speech acts into **assertive accusations, assertive beliefs,** and **commissives**, illustrating the progression of Trump's rhetoric. The pattern of assertive accusations, assertive beliefs, and commissives in the speech follows a strategic progression designed to intensify emotional engagement and direct the audience toward action.

The speech begins with assertive accusations, which serve to establish a clear enemy or source of wrongdoing, mainly the election process and specific political opponents. These accusations, such as “There is theft involved” or “The states got defrauded,” work to create a narrative of victimization, portraying the speaker and audience as wronged parties in an unfair system. These claims establish a foundation of distrust, suggesting widespread corruption and framing the situation as dire and urgent. The repetition of accusations, targeting various states, officials, and specific voting procedures, creates an overarching theme of systemic fraud, reinforcing the idea that the election was stolen and illegitimate.

As the accusations build a foundation of suspicion, assertive beliefs begin to surface, which aim to emotionally align the speaker's sentiments with those of the audience. Utterances such as "Our country has had enough" and "This is a time for strength" reflect shared frustration, anger, and resolve. These beliefs present the speaker as not only someone who understands the audience's grievances but as a leader who embodies their collective will. his emotional alignment strengthens the connection between the speaker and the audience, creating a sense of unity and shared purpose.

Following the accusations and beliefs, the speech transitions to commissives, which indicate a commitment to future actions and direct the audience toward specific goals. Trump makes commissive utterances that often reflect determination and defiance, such as "We will never give up," "We're going to have to fight much harder," and "We will not let them silence your voices." These utterances promise continued resistance, conveying that the speaker and audience are not passive victims but active participants in a struggle for justice. Importantly, these commissives build momentum, starting with more abstract commitments to perseverance and eventually leading to specific directives for

action, such as "We're going to walk down to the Capitol" and "We're going to cheer on our brave senators.

In conclusion, the strategic use of assertive accusations, assertive beliefs, and commissives creates a powerful rhetorical structure that not only shapes the narrative of victimization but also directs the audience toward action. The overall pattern serves to escalate tension, motivate defiance, and unify the speaker and audience in a common cause, ultimately culminating in a collective call to action. His progression ensures that the speech is not just a reflection of grievances but a roadmap for future engagement.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the analysis reveals that Trump primarily employed three types of speech acts—assertive accusations, assertive beliefs, and commissives—each serving distinct purposes in influencing his audience on January 6. The most frequent were assertive accusations, used to present the narrative of election fraud with a sense of certainty, effectively delegitimizing opponents and framing the election as stolen. These accusations laid the groundwork for a perceived injustice, positioning Trump and his supporters as victims. The second most frequent were commissives, which helped solidify collective commitment, moving from promises of defiance to specific actions. By asserting that "we will never give up" and "we're going to walk down to the Capitol," Trump fostered an atmosphere of unity and purpose. These utterances also served as psychological contracts between Trump and his supporters, encouraging them to remain engaged and act. His most minor use of assertive beliefs allowed Trump to project his personal convictions as shared truths, heightening the emotional stakes by framing the situation as dire and requiring immediate action. These findings help answer the research question by demonstrating how Trump used specific speech acts to influence his audience, shaping perceptions and channeling their frustrations into action, culminating in the Capitol insurrection.

Limitations of the study

Analyzing the linguistic dimensions of Donald Trump's speech preceding the events of January 6 also comes with inherent limitations. The notable limitation is that this study primarily focuses on verbal clues within Trump's speech, neglecting the analysis of non-verbal cues such as body language, facial expressions, and vocal tone, which can also play significant roles in conveying persuasive intent and emotional impact. On-verbal communication is known to complement and sometimes contradict verbal messages, thus providing additional layers of meaning that could enrich the interpretation of Trump's rhetoric. Therefore, future research could benefit from incorporating a multimodal approach that integrates both verbal and non-verbal cues to gain a more holistic understanding of the persuasive strategies employed by political figures in contentious contexts. Additionally, while the chosen theoretical framework offers valuable insights into the dynamics of persuasive communication, there may be aspects of Trump's speech and its impact on his supporters' behavior that still need to be fully captured by the theories discussed. Further research could explore alternative theoretical perspectives or interdisciplinary approaches to address these gaps and provide a more nuanced understanding of the complex interplay between language, emotion, motivation, and action in political discourse.

Another area for improvement of this study is its focus on a single speech, which restricts the generalizability of the findings. By analyzing only Trump's January 6th speech, the conclusions drawn may only partially capture the broader rhetorical strategies employed across his political communication. Applying the same analytical tools to a broader range of his speeches could validate the results, offering a more comprehensive understanding of how Trump systematically uses speech acts to influence his audience. Expanding the scope of analysis to include multiple speeches would allow for the identification of consistent patterns or variations in his use of commissives, assertive beliefs, and assertive

accusations. His broader application could strengthen the reliability of the findings and provide a more robust framework for understanding the strategic deployment of speech acts in Trump's rhetoric. t would also enable comparisons across different political contexts, further enriching the study of his persuasive techniques.

Bibliography

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *how to Do Things with Words*. xford University Press.
- Coulthard, M. (1994). *advances in Forensic Linguistics: Language, Evidence, and the Law*. outledge.
- Coulthard, M. (2004). *authorial Attribution: An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics*. outledge.
- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2007). *n Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence*. outledge.
- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2010). *orensic Linguistics: An Introduction to Language in the Justice System*. outledge.
- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2010). *the Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. outledge.
- Cramer, K. J. (2018). *The Politics of Resentment: Rural Consciousness in Wisconsin and the Rise of Scott Walker*. University of Chicago Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Feinstein, A., & Bayer, L. (2022). "Constructing the Enemy: Analyzing the 'Us vs. Them' Dichotomy in Donald Trump's Political Discourse." *Journal of Language and Politics*, 21(2), 314-332.
- Fraser, B. (1998). Threatening Revisited: An Analysis of Threats in Political Discourse." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 29(1), 63–82.
- Gibbons, J. (2003). *orensic Linguistics: An Introduction to Language in the Justice System*. Blackwell.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Krämer, B., & Lörke, S. (2021). "Pandemic Populism: The Rhetorical Construction of Authority in Donald Trump's COVID-19 Directives." *Discourse & Society*, 32(5), 540-558.

- Leech, G. N. (1993). *rinciples of Pragmatics* (1st ed.). Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Muschalik, M. (2015). *Form and Function of Threatening: An Analysis of Verbal Threats in Political Discourse*. outledge.
- Olsson, J. (2004). *Forensic Linguistics: An Introduction to Language, Crime and the Law*. ontinuum.
- **Oxford English Dictionary. (n.d.).** *Utterance.* In *Oxford English Dictionary* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://www.oed.com/
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Shuy, R. W. (1993). *Language Crimes: The Use and Abuse of Language Evidence in the Courtroom*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Svartvik, J. (1997). The Evans Case: A Forensic Linguistic Analysis." *Forensic Linguistics*, 4(1), 43–55.
- Tran, L., & Pham, T. (2021). Threats and Ideological Pressure in Political Rhetoric: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Trump's Speech Acts." *Pragmatics & Society*, 12(3), 376–398.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. AGE Publications.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). "Discourse and Manipulation." *Discourse & Society*, 17(2), 359-383.

Table of Figures

Appendix

The media will not show the magnitude of this crowd. Even I, when I turned on today, I looked, and I saw thousands of people here, but you don't see hundreds of thousands of people behind you because they don't want to show that. We have hundreds of thousands of people here, and I just want them to be recognized by the fake news media. Turn your cameras, please, and show what's really happening out here, because these people are not going to take it any longer. They're not going to take it any longer. Go ahead. Turn your cameras, please. Would you show? They came from all over the world, actually, but they came from all over our country. I just really want to see what they do. I just want to see how they covered. I've never seen anything like it. But it would be really great if we could be covered fairly by the media. The media is the biggest problem we have, as far as I'm concerned, single biggest problem -- the fake news and the big tech. Big tech is now coming into their own. We beat them four years ago. We surprised them. We took them by surprise and this year, they rigged an election. They rigged it like they've never rigged an election before. And by the way, last night they didn't do a bad job either, if you notice. I'm honest. Just, again, I want to thank you. It's just a great honor to have this kind of crowd and to be before you and hundreds of thousands of American patriots who are committed to the honesty of our elections and the integrity of our glorious republic. All of us here today do not want to see our election victory

stolen by emboldened radical left Democrats, which is what they're doing, and stolen by the fake news media. That's what they've done and what they're doing. We will never give up. We will never concede. It doesn't happen. You don't concede when there's theft involved. Our country has had enough. We will not take it anymore and that's what this is all about. And to use a favorite term that all of you people really came up with, we will "stop the steal." Today, I will lay out just some of the evidence proving that we won this election, and we won it by a landslide. This was not a close election. You know, I say sometimes jokingly, but there's no joke about it, I've been in two elections. I won them both and the second one, I won much bigger than the first. OK? Almost 75 million people voted for our campaign, the most of any incumbent president by far in the history of our country, 12 million more people than four years ago. And I was told by the real pollsters, we do have real pollsters. They know that we were going to do well, and we were going to win. What I was told, if I went from 63 million, which we had four years ago, to 66 million, there was no chance of losing. Well, we didn't go to 66. We went to 75 million, and they say we lost. We didn't lose. And by the way, does anybody believe that Joe had 80 million votes? Does anybody believe that? He had 80 million computer votes. It's a disgrace. There's never been anything like that. You could take Third World countries. Just take a look, take Third World countries. Their elections are more honest than what we've been going through in this country. It's a disgrace. It's a disgrace. Even when you look at last night, they're all running around like chickens with their heads cut off, with boxes. Nobody knows what the hell is going on. There's never been anything like this. We will not let them silence your voices. We're not going to let it happen. Not going to let it happen. [Crowd noise] Thank you. And I'd love to have, if those tens of thousands of people would be allowed, the military, the Secret Service, and we want to thank you, and the police, law enforcement. Great. You're doing a great job. But I'd love it if they could be allowed to come up here with us. Is that possible? Can

you just let them come up, please? And Rudy [Giuliani], you did a great job. He's got guts. You know what? He's got guts, unlike a lot of people in the Republican Party. He's got guts. He fights. He fights, and I'll tell you. Thank you very much, John [Eastman]. Fantastic job. I watched. That's a tough act to follow, those two. John is one of the most brilliant lawyers in the country, and he looked at this and he said, "What an absolute disgrace, that this could be happening to our Constitution." And he looked at Mike Pence, and I hope Mike is going to do the right thing. I hope so. I hope so, because if Mike Pence does the right thing, we win the election. All he has to do. All -- this is from the number one or certainly one of the top constitutional lawyers in our country. He has the absolute right to do it. We're supposed to protect our country, support our country, support our Constitution and protect our Constitution. States want to revote. The states got defrauded. They were given false information. They voted on it. Now they want to recertify. They want it back. All Vice President Pence has to do is send it back to the states to recertify, and we become president, and you are the happiest people. And I actually, I just spoke to Mike. I said, "Mike, that doesn't take courage. What takes courage is to do nothing. That takes courage," and then we're stuck with a president who lost the election by a lot, and we have to live with that for four more years. We're just not going to let that happen. Many of you have traveled from all across the nation to be here, and I want to thank you for the extraordinary love. That's what it is. There's never been a movement like this ever, ever, for the extraordinary love for this amazing country and this amazing movement. Thank you. [Crowd noise] By the way, this goes all the way back past the Washington Monument. Do you believe this? Look at this. Unfortunately, they gave the press the prime seats. I can't stand that. No, but you look at that, behind. I wish they'd flip those cameras and look behind you. That is the most amazing sight. When they make a mistake, you get to see it on television. Amazing, amazing, all the way back. And don't worry, we will not take the name off the Washington Monument. We will not. Cancel

culture. You know, they wanted to get rid of the Jefferson Memorial, either take it down or just put somebody else in there. I don't think that's going to happen. It damn well better not. Although with this administration, if this happens, it could happen. You'll see some really bad things happen. They'll knock out Lincoln too, by the way. They've been taking his statue down. But then we signed a little law. You hurt our monuments, you hurt our heroes, you go to jail for 10 years, and everything stopped. You notice that? It stopped. It all stopped. And they could use Rudy back in New York City. Rudy, they could use you. Your city is going to hell. They want Rudy Giuliani back in New York. We'll get a little younger version of Rudy. Is that OK, Rudy? We're gathered together in the heart of our nation's capital for one very, very basic and simple reason: to save our democracy. Most candidates on election evening -- of course this thing goes on so long, they still don't have any idea what the votes are. We still have congressional seats under review. They have no idea. They've totally lost control. They've used the pandemic as a way of defrauding the people in a proper election. But you know, you know, when you see this and when you see what's happening, number one, they all say, "Sir, we'll never let it happen again." I said, "That's good, but what about eight weeks ago?" You know, they try and get you to go. They say, "Sir, in four years, you're guaranteed." I said, "I'm not interested right now. Do me a favor, go back eight weeks. I want to go back eight weeks. Let's go back eight weeks." We want to go back, and we want to get this right because we're going to have somebody in there that should not be in there and our country will be destroyed, and we're not going to stand for that. For years, Democrats have gotten away with election fraud and weak Republicans, and that's what they are. There's so many weak Republicans. We have great ones, Jim Jordan, and some of these guys. They're out there fighting. The House guys are fighting, but it's incredible. Many of the Republicans, I helped them get in. I helped them get elected. I helped Mitch [McConnell] get elected. I helped -- I could name 24 of them, let's say. I won't

bore you with it, and then all of a sudden you have something like this. It's like, "Oh, gee, maybe I'll talk to the President sometime later." No, it's amazing. The weak Republicans, they're pathetic Republicans and that's what happens. If this happened to the Democrats, there'd be hell all over the country going on. There'd be hell all over the country. But just remember this. You're stronger. You're smarter. You've got more going than anybody, and they try and demean everybody having to do with us, and you're the real people. You're the people that built this nation. You're not the people that tore down our nation. The weak Republicans, and that's it. I really believe it. I think I'm going to use the term, the weak Republicans. You got a lot of them, and you got a lot of great ones, but you got a lot of weak ones. They've turned a blind eye even as Democrats enacted policies that chipped away our jobs, weakened our military, threw open our borders and put America last. Did you see the other day where Joe Biden said, "I want to get rid of the America First policy"? What's that all about, get rid of -- how do you say, "I want to get rid of America First"? Even if you're going to do it, don't talk about it, right? Unbelievable, what we have to go through, what we have to go through, and you have to get your people to fight. And if they don't fight, we have to primary the hell out of the ones that don't fight. You primary them. We're going to let you know who they are. I can already tell you, frankly. But this year, using the pretext of the China virus and the scam of mail-in ballots, Democrats attempted the most brazen and outrageous election theft. There's never been anything like this. It's a pure theft in American history. Everybody knows it. That election, our election was over at 10 o'clock in the evening. We're leading Pennsylvania, Michigan, Georgia by hundreds of thousands of votes, and then late in the evening or early in the morning, boom, these explosions of bullshit, and all of a sudden. All of a sudden it started to happen. Don't forget when [Mitt] Romney got beat. Romney. Did you see his -- I wonder if he enjoyed his flight in last night? But when Romney got beaten, you know, he stands up like you're more typical " –Well, I'd like to

congratulate the victor." The victor? Who was the victor, Mitt? "I'd like to congratulate." They don't go and look at the facts. Now, I don't know. He got slaughtered probably, maybe it was OK. Maybe it was -- that's what happened. But we look at the facts, and our election was so corrupt that in the history of this country we've never seen anything like it. You can go all the way back. You know, America is blessed with elections. All over the world, they talk about our elections. You know what the world says about us now? They say we don't have free and fair elections. And you know what else? We don't have a free and fair press. Our media is not free. It's not fair. It suppresses thought. It suppresses speech, and it's become the enemy of the people. It's become the enemy of the people. It's the biggest problem we have in this country. No Third World countries would even attempt to do what we caught them doing, and you'll hear about that in just a few minutes. Republicans are constantly fighting like a boxer with his hands tied behind his back. It's like a boxer, and we want to be so nice. We want to be so respectful of everybody, including bad people. And we're going to have to fight much harder, and Mike Pence is going to have to come through for us. And if he doesn't, that will be a sad day for our country because you're sworn to uphold our Constitution. Now it is up to Congress to confront this egregious assault on our democracy. And after this, we're going to walk down -- and I'll be there with you -- we're going to walk down. We're going to walk down any one you want, but I think right here. We're going walk down to the Capitol, and we're going to cheer on our brave senators, and congressmen and women. And we're probably not going to be cheering so much for some of them because you'll never take back our country with weakness. You have to show strength, and you have to be strong. We have come to demand that Congress do the right thing and only count the electors who have been lawfully slated, lawfully slated. I know that everyone here will soon be marching over to the Capitol building to peacefully and patriotically make your voices heard. Today we will see whether Republicans stand strong for integrity of our elections, but

whether or not they stand strong for our country, our country. Our country has been under siege for a long time, far longer than this four-year period. We've set it on a much straighter course, a much … I thought four more years. I thought it would be easy. We created the greatest economy in history. We rebuilt our military. We get you the biggest tax cuts in history. Right? We got you the biggest regulation cuts. There's no president, whether it's four years, eight years, or in one case more, got anywhere near the regulation cuts. It used to take 20 years to get a highway approved. Now we're down to two. I want to get it down to one, but we're down to two. And it may get rejected for environmental or safety reasons, but we got it down the safety. We created Space Force. Look at what we did. Our military has been totally rebuilt. So we create Space Force, which by and of itself is a major achievement for an administration. And with us, it's one of so many different things. Right to try. Everybody knows about right to try. We did things that nobody ever thought possible. We took care of our vets. Our vets, the VA now has the highest rating, 91%, the highest rating that it's had from the beginning, 91% approval rating. Always you watch the VA, when it was on television. Every night people living in a horrible, horrible manner. We got that done. We got accountability done. We got it so that now in the VA, you don't have to wait for four weeks, six weeks, eight weeks, four months to see a doctor. If you can't get a doctor, you go outside, you get the doctor, you have them taken care of. And we pay the doctor. And we've not only made life wonderful for so many people, we've saved tremendous amounts of money, far secondarily, but we've saved a lot of money. And now we have the right to fire bad people in the VA. We had 9,000 people that treated our veterans horribly. In prime time, they would not have treated our veterans badly. But they treated our veterans horribly. And we have what's called the VA Accountability Act. And the Accountability says if we see somebody in there that doesn't treat our vets well, or they steal, they rob, they do things badly, we say, "Joe, you're fired. Get out of here." Before, you couldn't do that. You couldn't do that before.

So we've taken care of things. We've done things like nobody's ever thought possible. And that's part of the reason that many people don't like us, because we've done too much, but we've done it quickly. And we were going to sit home and watch a big victory. And everybody had us down for a victory. It was going to be great. And now we're out here fighting. I said to somebody, I was going to take a few days and relax after our big electoral victory. Ten o'clock, it was over. But I was going to take a few days. And I can say this, since our election, I believe, which was a catastrophe when I watch and even these guys knew what happened, they know what happened. They're saying, "Wow, Pennsylvania's insurmountable. Wow, Wisconsin, look at the big leads we had." Even though the press said we were going to lose Wisconsin by 17 points. Even though the press said Ohio is going to be close, we set a record. Florida's going to be close -- we set a record. Texas is going to be close. Texas is going to be close -- we set a record. And we set a record with Hispanic, with the Black community. We set a record with everybody. Today, we see a very important event though, because right over there, right there, we see the event going to take place. And I'm going to be watching, because history is going to be made. We're going to see whether or not we have great and courageous leaders or whether or not we have leaders that should be ashamed of themselves throughout history, throughout eternity, they'll be ashamed. And you know what? If they do the wrong thing, we should never ever forget that they did. Never forget. We should never ever forget. With only three of the seven states in question, we win the presidency of the United States. And by the way, it's much more important today than it was 24 hours ago. Because I spoke to David Perdue, what a great person, and Kelly Loeffler, two great people, but it was a setup. And, you know, I said, "We have no back line anymore." The only back line, the only line of demarcation, the only line that we have is the veto of the President of the United States. So this is now what we're doing, a far more important election than it was two days ago. I want to thank the more than 140 members of the House. Those are warriors.

They're over there working like you've never seen before, studying, talking, actually going all the way back, studying the roots of the Constitution, because they know we have the right to send a bad vote that was illegally got. They gave these people bad things to vote for and they voted, because what did they know? And then when they found out a few weeks later -- again, it took them four years to devise history. And the only unhappy person in the United States, single most unhappy, is Hillary Clinton because she said, "Why didn't you do this for me four years ago? Why didn't you do this for me four years ago? Change the votes! 10,000 in Michigan. You could have changed the whole thing!" But she's not too happy. You notice you don't see her anymore. What happened? Where is Hillary? Where is she? But I want to thank all of those congressmen and women. I also want to thank our 13 most courageous members of the US Senate, Sen. Ted Cruz, Sen. Ron Johnson, Sen. Josh Hawley, Kelly Loeffler. And Kelly Loeffler, I'll tell you, she's been so great. She works so hard. So let's give her and David a little special -- because it was rigged against them. Let's give her and David. Kelly Loeffler, David Perdue. They fought a good race. They never had a shot. That equipment should never have been allowed to be used, and I was telling these people don't let them use this stuff. Marsha Blackburn, terrific person. Mike Braun, Indiana. Steve Daines, great guy. Bill Hagerty, John Kennedy, James Lankford, Cynthia Lummis. Tommy Tuberville, the coach. And Roger Marshall. We want to thank them, senators that stepped up, we want to thank them. I actually think, though, it takes, again, more courage not to step up. And I think a lot of those people are going to find that out, and you better start looking at your leadership because the leadership has led you down the tubes. You know? "We don't want to give $2,000 to people. We want to give them $600." Oh, great. How does that play politically? Pretty good? And this has nothing to do with politics. But how does it play politically? China destroyed these people. We didn't destroy -- China destroyed them, totally destroyed them. We want to give them $600, and they just wouldn't change. I said, "Give them

$2,000. We'll pay it back. We'll pay it back fast. You already owe 26 trillion. Give them a couple of bucks. Let them live. Give them a couple of bucks!" And some of the people here disagree with me on that. But I just say, look, you got to let people live. And how does that play though? OK, number one, it's the right thing to do. But how does that play politically? I think it's the primary reason, one of the primary reasons, the other was just pure cheating. That was the super primary reason. But you can't do that. You got to use your head. As you know the media has constantly asserted the outrageous lie that there was no evidence of widespread fraud. You ever see these people? "While there is no evidence of fraud" -- oh, really? Well, I'm going to read you pages. I hope you don't get bored listening to it. Promise? Don't get bored listening to it, all those hundreds of thousands of people back there. Move them up, please. Yeah. All these people, don't get bored. Don't get angry at me because you're going to get bored because it's so much. The American people do not believe the corrupt fake news anymore. They have ruined their reputation. But it used to be that they'd argue with me, I'd fight. So I'd fight, they'd fight. I'd fight, they'd fight. Boop-boop. You'd believe me, you'd believe them. Somebody comes out. You know. They had their point of view, I had my point of view. But you'd have an argument. Now what they do is they go silent. It's called suppression. And that's what happens in a communist country. That's what they do. They suppress. You don't fight with them anymore, unless it's a bad story. If they have a little bad story about me, they'll make it 10 times worse and it's a major headline. But Hunter Biden, they don't talk about him. What happened to Hunter? Where's Hunter? Where is Hunter? They don't talk about him. Now watch, all the sets will go off. Well, they can't do that because they get good ratings. The ratings are too good. Now where is Hunter? And how come Joe was allowed to give a billion dollars of money to get rid of the prosecutor in Ukraine? How does that happen? I'd ask you that question. How does that happen? Can you imagine if I said that? If I said that it would be a whole different ball game. And how come

Hunter gets three and a half million dollars from the mayor of Moscow's wife, and gets hundreds of thousands of dollars to sit on an energy board even though he admits he has no knowledge of energy, and millions of dollars up front, and how come they go into China and they leave with billions of dollars to manage? "Have you managed money before?" "No, I haven't." "Oh, that's good. Here's about $3 billion." No, they don't talk about that. No, we have a corrupt media. They've gone silent. They've gone dead. I now realize how good it was if you go back 10 years. I realize how good, even though I didn't necessarily love him, I realized how good, it was like a cleansing motion. Right? But we don't have that anymore. We don't have a fair media anymore. It's suppression, and you have to be very careful with that. And they've lost all credibility in this country. We will not be intimidated into accepting the hoaxes and the lies that we've been forced to believe over the past several weeks. We've amassed overwhelming evidence about a fake election. This is the presidential election. Last night was a little bit better because of the fact that we had a lot of eyes watching one specific state, but they cheated like hell anyway. You have one of the dumbest governors in the United States. And, you know, when I endorsed him, I didn't know this guy. At the request of David Perdue. He said, "A friend of mine is running for governor." "What's his name?" And you know the rest. He was in fourth place, fifth place. I don't know. He was way -- He was doing poorly. I endorsed him. He went like a rocket ship and he won. And then I had to beat Stacey Abrams with this guy, Brian Kemp. I had to beat Stacey Abrams and I had to beat Oprah, used to be a friend of mine. I was on her last show. Her last week she picked the five outstanding people. I don't think she thinks that anymore. Once I ran for president, I didn't notice there were too many calls coming in from Oprah. Believe it or not, she used to like me, but I was one of the five outstanding people. And I had a campaign against Michelle Obama and Barack Hussein Obama against Stacey. And I had Brian Kemp, he weighs 130 pounds. He said he played offensive line in football. I'm trying to figure that.

I'm still trying to figure that out. He said that the other night, "I was an offensive lineman." I'm saying, "Really? That must've been a very small team." But I look at that and I look at what's happened, and he turned out to be a disaster. This stuff happens. You know, look, I'm not happy with the Supreme Court. They love to rule against me. I picked three people. I fought like hell for them, one in particular I fought. They all said, "Sir, cut him loose. He's killing us." The senators, you know, very loyal senators. They're very loyal people. "Sir, cut him loose. He's killing us, sir. Cut him loose, sir." I must've gotten half of the senators. I said, "No, I can't do that. It's unfair to him. And it's unfair to the family. He didn't do anything wrong. They're made-up stories. They were all made-up stories. He didn't do anything wrong." "Cut him loose, sir." I said, "No, I won't do that." We got him through. And you know what? They couldn't give a damn. They couldn't give a damn. Let them rule the right way, but it almost seems that they're all going out of their way to hurt all of us, and to hurt our country. To hurt our country. You know, I read a story in one of the newspapers recently, how I control the three Supreme Court justices. I control them. They're puppets. I read it about Bill Barr, that he's my personal attorney. That he'll do anything for me. And I said, "You know, it really is genius," because what they do is that, and it makes it really impossible for them to ever give you a victory, because all of a sudden Bill Barr changed, if you hadn't noticed. I like Bill Barr, but he changed, because he didn't want to be considered my personal attorney. And the Supreme Court, they rule against me so much. You know why? Because the story is I haven't spoken to any of them, any of them, since virtually they got in. But the story is that they're my puppet. That they're puppets. And now that the only way they can get out of that, because they hate that, it's not good in the social circuit. And the only way they get out is to rule against Trump. So let's rule against Trump, and they do that. So I want to congratulate them. But it shows you the media's genius. In fact, probably, if I was the media, I'd do it the same way. I hate to say it. But we got to get them straightened out. Today, for the sake

of our democracy, for the sake of our Constitution, and for the sake of our children, we lay out the case for the entire world to hear. You want to hear it? In every single swing state, local officials, state officials, almost all Democrats made illegal and unconstitutional changes to election procedures without the mandated approvals by the state legislatures, that these changes paved the way for fraud on a scale never seen before. And I think we'd go a long way outside of our country when I say that. So just in a nutshell, you can't make a change on voting for a federal election unless the state legislature approves it. No judge can do it. Nobody can do it, only a legislature. So as an example in Pennsylvania or whatever, you have a Republican legislature, you have a Democrat mayor, and you have a lot of Democrats all over the place. They go to the legislature, the legislature laughs at them. Says, "We're not going to do that." They say, "Thank you very much." And they go and make the changes themselves. They do it anyway. And that's totally illegal. That's totally illegal. You can't do that. In Pennsylvania, the Democrat secretary of state and the Democrat state Supreme Court justices illegally abolished the signature verification requirements just 11 days prior to the election. So think of what they did. No longer is there signature verification. Oh, that's OK. We want voter ID, by the way. But no longer is there signature verification, 11 days before the election! They say, "We don't want it." You know why they don't want it? Because they want to cheat. That's the only reason. Who would even think of that? We don't want to verify a signature? There were over 205,000 more ballots counted in Pennsylvania. Now think of this. You had 205,000 more ballots than you had voters. That means you had 200 -- where did they come from? You know where they came from? Somebody's imagination. Whatever they needed. So in Pennsylvania you had 205,000 more votes than you had voters! And it's -- the number is actually much greater than that now. That was as of a week ago. And this is a mathematical impossibility, unless you want to say it's a total fraud. So Pennsylvania was defrauded. Over 8,000 ballots in Pennsylvania

were cast by people whose names and dates of birth match individuals who died in 2020 and prior to the election. Think of that. Dead people! Lots of dead people, thousands. And some dead people actually requested an application. That bothers me even more. Not only are they voting, they want an application to vote. One of them was 29 years ago died. It's incredible. Over 14,000 ballots were cast by out-of-state voters. So these are voters that don't live in the state. And by the way, these numbers are what they call outcome determinative. Meaning these numbers far surpass -- I lost by a very little bit. These numbers are massive. Massive. More than 10,000 votes in Pennsylvania were illegally counted, even though they were received after Election Day. In other words, "They were received after Election Day, let's count them anyway!" And what they did in many cases is they did fraud. They took the date and they moved it back, so that it no longer is after Election Day. And more than 60,000 ballots in Pennsylvania were reported received back. They got back before they were ever supposedly mailed out. In other words, you got the ballot back before you mailed it! Which is also logically and logistically impossible, right? Think of that one. You got the ballot back. Let's send the ballots. Oh, they've already been sent. But we got the ballot back before they were sent. I don't think that's too good. Twenty-five thousand ballots in Pennsylvania were requested by nursing home residents, all in a single giant batch -- not legal -- indicating an enormous illegal ballot-harvesting operation. You're not allowed to do it. It's against the law. The day before the election, the state of Pennsylvania reported the number of absentee ballots that had been sent out. Yet this number was suddenly and drastically increased by 400,000 people. It was increased. Nobody knows where it came from -- by 400,000 ballots. One day after the election, it remains totally unexplained. They said, "Well, we can't figure that." Now that's many, many times what it would take to overthrow the state. Just that one element. 400,000 ballots appeared from nowhere, right after the election. By the way, Pennsylvania has now seen all of this. They didn't know because it was so quick. They had a vote,

they voted, but now they see all this stuff. It's all come to light. Doesn't happen that fast. And they want to recertify their votes. They want to recertify. But the only way that can happen is if Mike Pence agrees to send it back. Mike Pence has to agree to send it back. And many people in Congress want it sent back, and think of what you're doing. Let's say you don't do it. Somebody says, "Well, we have to obey the Constitution." And you are, because you're protecting our country and you're protecting the Constitution, so you are. But think of what happens. Let's say they're stiffs and they're stupid people. And they say, "Well, we really have no choice." Even though Pennsylvania and other states want to redo their votes, they want to see the numbers. They already have the numbers. Go very quickly and they want to redo their legislature because many of these votes were taken, as I said, because it wasn't approved by their legislature. That in itself is illegal and then you have the scam and that's all of the things that we're talking about. But think of this: If you don't do that, that means you will have a president of the United States for four years, with his wonderful son. You will have a president who lost all of these states, or you will have a president, to put it another way, who was voted on by a bunch of stupid people who lost all of these things. You will have an illegitimate president, that's what you'll have. And we can't let that happen. These are the facts that you won't hear from the fake news media. It's all part of the suppression effort. They don't want to talk about it. They don't want to talk about it. In fact, when I started talking about that, I guarantee you a lot of the television sets and a lot of those cameras went off and that's how a lot of cameras back there. But a lot of them went off, but these are the things you don't hear about. You don't hear what you just heard. And I'm going to go over a few more states. But you don't hear it by the people who want to deceive you and demoralize you and control you -- big tech, media. Just like the suppression polls that said we're going to lose Wisconsin by 17 points. Well, we won Wisconsin. They don't have it that way because they lose just by a little sliver. But they had me

down the day before. Washington Post/ABC poll: down 17 points. I called up a real pollster. I said, "What is that?" "Sir, that's called a suppression poll. I think you're going to win Wisconsin, sir." I said, "But why do they make it 4 or 5 points?" "Because then people vote. But when you're down 17, they say, 'Hey, I'm not going to waste my time. I love the President, but there's no way. ' "Despite that, despite that, we won Wisconsin. We're going to see. We're going to see. But that's called suppression because a lot of people, when they see that, it's very interesting. This pollster said, "Sir, if you're down 3, 4 or 5, people vote. When you go down 17, they say, 'Let's save, let's go and have dinner, and let's watch the presidential defeat tonight on television darling. " 'And just like the radical left tries to blacklist you on social media, every time I put out a tweet, even if it's totally correct, totally correct, I get a flag. I get a flag. And they also don't let you get out. On Twitter, it's very hard to come onto my account. It's very hard to get out a message. They don't let the message get out nearly like they should, but I've had many people say, "I can't get on your Twitter." I don't care about Twitter. Twitter is bad news. They're all bad news. But you know what? If you want to get out of message, and if you want to go through big tech, social media, they are really, if you're a conservative, if you're a Republican, if you have a big voice, I guess they call it shadow ban, right? Shadow ban. They shadow ban you, and it should be illegal. I've been telling these Republicans get rid of Section 230. And for some reason, Mitch and the group, they don't want to put it in there. And they don't realize that that's going to be the end of the Republican Party as we know it, but it's never going to be the end of us, never. Let them get out. Let the weak ones get out. This is a time for strength. They also want to indoctrinate your children in school by teaching them things that aren't so. They want to indoctrinate your children. It's all part of the comprehensive assault on our democracy and the American people to finally standing up and saying no. This crowd is, again, a testament to it. I did no advertising. I did nothing. You do have some groups that are big supporters. I want to thank that -

- Amy [Kremer] and everybody. We have some incredible supporters, incredible, but we didn't do anything. This just happened. Two months ago, we had a massive crowd come down to Washington. I said, "What are they there for?" "Sir, they're there for you." We have nothing to do with it. These groups, they're forming all over the United States. And we got to remember, in a year from now, you're going to start working on Congress. And we got to get rid of the weak congresspeople, the ones that aren't any good, the Liz Cheneys of the world, we got to get rid of them. We got to get rid -- you know, she never wants a soldier brought home. I've brought a lot of our soldiers home. I don't know, some like it. They're in countries that nobody even knows the name. Nobody knows where they are. They're dying. They're great, but they're dying. They're losing their arms, their legs, their face. I brought them back home, largely back home, Afghanistan, Iraq. Remember I used to say in the old days, "Don't go into Iraq. But if you go in, keep the oil." We didn't keep the oil. So stupid. So stupid, these people. And Iraq has billions and billions of dollars now in the bank. And what did we do? We get nothing. We never get. But we do actually, we kept the oil here. We did good. We got rid of the ISIS caliphate. We got rid of plenty of different things that everybody knows and the rebuilding of our military in three years, people said it couldn't be done. And it was all made in the USA, all made in the USA. Best equipment in the world. In Wisconsin, corrupt Democrat run cities deployed more than 500 illegal unmanned, unsecured drop boxes, which collected a minimum of 91,000 unlawful votes. It was razor thin, the loss. This one thing alone is much more than we would need, but there are many things. They have these lockboxes and they pick them up and they disappear for two days. People would say, "Where's that box?" They disappeared. Nobody even knew where the hell it was. In addition, over 170,000 absentee votes were counted in Wisconsin without a valid absentee ballot application. So they had a vote, but they had no application. And that's illegal in Wisconsin. Meaning those votes were blatantly done in opposition to state law. And they

came 100% from Democrat areas, such as Milwaukee and Madison, 100%. In Madison, 17,000 votes were deposited in so-called human drop boxes. You know what that is, right? Where operatives stuff thousands of unsecured ballots into duffel bags on park benches across the city in complete defiance of cease and desist letters from state legislatures. Your state legislature said, "Don't do it." They're the only ones that could approve it. They gave tens of thousands of votes. They came in, in duffel bags. Where the hell did they come from? According to eyewitness testimony, postal service workers in Wisconsin were also instructed to illegally backdate approximately 100,000 ballots. The margin of difference in Wisconsin was less than 20,000 votes. Each one of these things alone wins us the state. Great state, we love the state, we won the state. In Georgia, your secretary of state, who -- I can't believe this guy's a Republican. He loves recording telephone conversations. I thought it was a great conversation personally, so did a lot of other -- people love that conversation, because it says what's going on. These people are crooked. They're 100%, in my opinion, one of the most corrupt between your governor and your secretary of state. And now you have it again last night, just take a look at what happened, what a mess. And the Democrat party operatives entered into an illegal and unconstitutional settlement agreement that drastically weakened signature verification and other election security procedures. Stacey Abrams, she took them to lunch. And I beat her two years ago with a bad candidate, Brian Kemp. But they took -- the Democrats took the Republicans to lunch because the secretary of state had no clue what the hell was happening, unless he did have a clue. That's interesting. Maybe he was with the other side, but we've been trying to get verifications of signatures in Fulton County. They won't let us do it. The only reason they won't is because we'll find things in the hundreds of thousands. Why wouldn't they let us verify signatures in Fulton County, which is known for being very corrupt? They won't do it. They go to some other county where you would live. I said, "That's not the problem.

The problem is Fulton County." Home of Stacey Abrams. She did a good job. I congratulate her, but it was done in such a way that we can't let this stuff happen. We won't have a country if it happens. As a result, Georgia's absentee ballot rejection rate was more than 10 times lower than previous levels, because the criteria was so off. Forty-eight counties in Georgia with thousands and thousands of votes rejected zero ballots. There wasn't one ballot. In other words, in a year in which more mail-in ballots were sent than ever before, and more people were voting by mail for the first time, the rejection rate was drastically lower than it had ever been before. The only way this can be explained is if tens of thousands of illegitimate votes were added to the tally. That's the only way you could explain it. By the way, you're talking about tens of thousands. If Georgia had merely rejected the same number of unlawful ballots, as in other years, there should have been approximately 45,000 ballots rejected -- far more than what we needed to win, just over 11,000. They should find those votes. They should absolutely find that. Just over 11,000 votes, that's all we need. They defrauded us out of a win in Georgia, and we're not going to forget it. There's only one reason the Democrats could possibly want to eliminate signature matching, oppose voter ID and stop citizenship confirmation. Are you a citizenship? (sic) You're not allowed to ask that question. Because they want to steal the election. The radical left knows exactly what they're doing. They're ruthless and it's time that somebody did something about it. And Mike Pence, I hope you're going to stand up for the good of our Constitution and for the good of our country. And if you're not, I'm going to be very disappointed in you. I will tell you right now. I'm not hearing good stories. In Fulton County, Republican poll watchers were ejected, in some cases physically, from the room under the false pretense of a pipe burst. Water main burst, everybody leave. Which we now know was a total lie. Then election officials pulled boxes -- Democrats -- and suitcases of ballots out from under a table. You all saw it on television. Totally fraudulent. And illegally scanned them for nearly two hours totally

unsupervised. Tens of thousands of votes, as that coincided with a mysterious vote dump of up to 100,000 votes for Joe Biden, almost none for Trump. Oh, that sounds fair. That was at 1:34 a.m. The Georgia secretary of state and pathetic governor of Georgia -- although he says, I'm a great president. You know, I sort of maybe have to -- He said the other day, "Yes, I disagree with (the) president but he's been a great president." OK. Thank you very much. Because of him and others -- Brian Kemp, vote him the hell out of office, please. Well, his rates are so low, his approval rating now, I think it just reached a record low. They've rejected five separate appeals for an independent and comprehensive audit of signatures in Fulton County. Even without an audit, the number of fraudulent ballots that we've identified across the state is staggering. Over 10,300 ballots in Georgia were cast by individuals whose names and dates of birth match Georgia residents who died in 2020 and prior to the election. More than 2,500 ballots were cast by individuals whose names and dates of birth match incarcerated felons in Georgia prison. People who are not allowed to vote. More than 4,500 illegal ballots were cast by individuals who do not appear on the state's own voter rolls. Over 18,000 illegal ballots were cast by individuals who registered to vote using an address listed as vacant, according to the Postal Service. At least 88,000 ballots in Georgia were cast by people whose registrations were illegally backdated. Sixty-six thousand votes -- each one of these is far more than we need. Sixty-six thousand votes in Georgia were cast by individuals under the legal voting age. And at least 15,000 ballots were cast by individuals who moved out of the state prior to (the) November 3 election. They say they moved right back. They move right back. Oh, they moved out. They moved right back. OK. They miss Georgia that much. I do. I love Georgia, but it's a corrupt system. Despite all of this, the margin in Georgia is only 11,779 votes. Each and every one of these issues is enough to give us a victory in Georgia, a big, beautiful victory. Make no mistake, this election stolen from you, from me and from the country. And not a single swing state has conducted a

comprehensive audit to remove the illegal ballots. This should absolutely occur in every single contested state before the election is certified. In the state of Arizona, over 36,000 ballots were illegally cast by non-citizens. Two-thousand ballots were returned with no address. More than 22,000 ballots were returned before they were ever supposedly mailed out. They returned, but we haven't mailed them yet. Eleven thousand six hundred more ballots and votes were counted more than there were actual voters. You see that? So you have more votes, again, than you have voters. One hundred fifty thousand people registered in (Maricopa) County after the registration deadline. One hundred three thousand ballots in the county were sent for electronic adjudication with no Republican observers. In Clark County, Nevada, the accuracy settings on signature verification machines were purposely lowered before they were used to count over 130,000 ballots. If you signed your name as Santa Claus, it would go through. There were also more than 42,000 double votes in Nevada. Over 150, 000 people were hurt so badly by what took place. And 1,500 ballots were cast by individuals whose names and dates of birth match Nevada residents who died in 2020, prior to (the) November 3 election. More than 8,000 votes were cast by individuals who had no address and probably didn't live there. The margin in Nevada is down at a very low number. Any of these things would have taken care of the situation. We would have won Nevada, also. Every one of these we're going over, we win. In Michigan quickly, the secretary of state, a real great one, flooded the state with unsolicited mail-in ballot applications, sent to every person on the rolls, in direct violation of state law. More than 17,000 Michigan ballots were cast by individuals whose names and dates of birth matched people who were deceased. In Wayne County -- that's a great one, that's Detroit -- 174,000 ballots were counted without being tied to an actual registered voter. Nobody knows where they came from. Also in Wayne County, poll watchers observed canvassers re-scanning batches of ballots over and over again, up to three or four or five times. In Detroit, turnout was 139% of registered voters. Think of

that. So you had 139% of the people in Detroit voting. This is in Michigan -- Detroit, Michigan. A career employee of the Detroit, City of Detroit, testified under penalty of perjury that she witnessed city workers coaching voters to vote straight Democrat, while accompanying them to watch who they voted for. When a Republican came in, they wouldn't talk to him. The same worker was instructed not to ask for any voter ID and not to attempt to validate any signatures if they were Democrats. She (was) also told to illegally and was told, backdate ballots received after the deadline and reports that thousands and thousands of ballots were improperly backdated. That's Michigan. Four witnesses have testified under penalty of perjury that after officials in Detroit announced the last votes had been counted, tens of thousands of additional ballots arrived without required envelopes. Every single one was for a Democrat. I got no votes. At 6:31 a.m., in the early morning hours after voting had ended, Michigan suddenly reported 147,000 votes. An astounding 94% went to Joe Biden, who campaigned brilliantly from his basement. Only a couple of percentage points went to Trump. Such gigantic and one-sided vote dumps were only observed in a few swing states and they were observed in the states where it was necessary. You know what's interesting, President Obama beat Biden in every state other than the swing states where Biden killed him. But the swing States were the ones that mattered. There were always just enough to push Joe Biden barely into the lead. We were ahead by a lot and within the number of hours we were losing by a little. In addition, there is the highly troubling matter of Dominion Voting Systems. In one Michigan county alone, 6,000 votes were switched from Trump to Biden and the same systems are used in the majority of states in our country. Sen. William Ligon, a great gentleman, chairman of Georgia Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, Senator Ligon, highly respected on elections has written a letter describing his concerns with Dominion in Georgia. He wrote, and I quote, "The Dominion voting machines employed in Fulton County had an astronomical and astounding 93.67% error rate." It's only wrong 93% of the

time. “In the scanning of ballots requiring a review panel to adjudicate or determine the voter’s interest, in over 106,000 ballots out of a total of 113,000.” Think of it, you go in and you vote and then they tell people who you’re supposed to be voting for. They make up whatever they want. Nobody’s ever even heard. They adjudicate your vote. They say, “Well, we don’t think Trump wants to vote for Trump. We think he wants to vote for Biden. Put it down for Biden.” The national average for such an error rate is far less than 1% and yet you’re at 93%. “The source of this astronomical error rate must be identified to determine if these machines were set up or destroyed to allow for a third party to disregard the actual ballot cast by the registered voter.” The letter continues, “There is clear evidence that tens of thousands of votes were switched from President Trump to former Vice President Biden in several counties in Georgia. For example, in Bibb County, President Trump was reported to have 29, 391 votes at 9:11 PM eastern time. While simultaneously Vice President Joe Biden was reported to have 17,213. Minutes later, just minutes, at the next update, these vote numbers switched with President Trump going way down to 17,000 and Biden going way up to 29,391.” And that was very quick, a 12,000 vote switch, all in Mr. Biden’s favor. So, I mean, I could go on and on about this fraud that took place in every state and all of these legislatures want this back. I don’t want to do it to you because I love you and it’s freezing out here, but I could just go on forever. I can tell you this. So when you hear, when you hear, “While there is no evidence to prove any wrongdoing,” this is the most fraudulent thing anybody’s -- This is a criminal enterprise. This is a criminal enterprise and the press will say, and I’m sure they won’t put any of that on there because that’s no good, do you ever see, “While there is no evidence to back President Trump’s assertion,” I could go on for another hour reading this stuff to you and telling you about it. There’s never been anything like it. Think about it, Detroit had more votes than it had voters. Pennsylvania had 205,000 more votes than it had more -- but you don’t have to go any -- Between that, I think that’s almost better than dead

people, if you think, right? More votes than they had voters, and many other States are also. It's a disgrace that the United States of America, tens of millions of people are allowed to go vote without so much as even showing identification. In no state is there any question or effort made to verify the identity, citizenship, residency, or eligibility of the votes cast. The Republicans have to get tougher. You're not going to have a Republican Party if you don't get tougher. They want to play so straight, they want to play so, "Sir, yes, the United States, the Constitution doesn't allow me to send them back to the States." Well, I say, "Yes, it does because the Constitution says you have to protect our country and you have to protect our Constitution and you can't vote on fraud, and fraud breaks up everything, doesn't it?" When you catch somebody in a fraud, you're allowed to go by very different rules. So I hope Mike has the courage to do what he has to do. And I hope he doesn't listen to the RINOs and the stupid people that he's listening to. It is also widely understood that the voter rolls are crammed full of non-citizens, felons and people who have moved out of state and individuals who are otherwise ineligible to vote. Yet Democrats oppose every effort to clean up their voter rolls. They don't want to clean them up. They are loaded. And how many people here know other people that when the hundreds of thousands and then millions of ballots got sent out, got three, four, five, six, and I heard one who got seven ballots. And then they say, "You didn't quite make it, sir." We won. We won in a landslide. This was a landslide. They said, "It's not American to challenge the election." This is the most corrupt election in the history, maybe of the world. You know, you could go (to) Third World countries, but I don't think they had hundreds of thousands of votes and they don't have voters for them. I mean, no matter where you go, nobody would think this. In fact, it's so egregious, it's so bad, that a lot of people don't even believe it. It's so crazy that people don't even believe it. It can't be true. So they don't believe it. This is not just a matter of domestic politics, this is a matter of national security. So today, in addition to challenging the certification of the election, I'm calling on

Congress and the state legislatures to quickly pass sweeping election reforms, and you better do it before we have no country left. Today is not the end. It's just the beginning. With your help over the last four years, we built the greatest political movement in the history of our country and nobody even challenges that. I say that over and over, and I never get challenged by the fake news, and they challenge almost everything we say. But our fight against the big donors, big media, big tech and others is just getting started. This is the greatest in history. There's never been a movement like that. You look back there all the way to the Washington Monument. It's hard to believe. We must stop the steal and then we must ensure that such outrageous election fraud never happens again, can never be allowed to happen again, but we're going forward. We'll take care of going forward. We got to take care of going back. Don't let them talk, "OK, well we promise," I've had a lot of people, "Sir, you're at 96% for four years." I said, "I'm not interested right now. I'm interested in right there." With your help we will finally pass powerful requirements for voter ID. You need an ID to cash your check. You need an ID to go to a bank, to buy alcohol, to drive a car. Every person should need to show an ID in order to cast your most important thing, a vote. We will also require proof of American citizenship in order to vote in American elections. We just had a good victory in court on that one, actually. We will ban ballot harvesting and prohibit the use of unsecured drop boxes to commit rampant fraud. These drop boxes are fraudulent. There for, they get -- they disappear and then all of a sudden they show up. It's fraudulent. We will stop the practice of universal, unsolicited mail-in balloting. We will clean up the voter rolls that ensure that every single person who cast a vote is a citizen of our country, a resident of the state in which they vote and their vote is cast in a lawful and honest manner. We will restore the vital civic tradition of in-person voting on Election Day so that voters can be fully informed when they make their choice. We will finally hold big tech accountable and if these people had courage and guts, they would get rid of Section 230, something that no other company, no

other person in America, in the world, has. All of these tech monopolies are going to abuse their power and interfere in our elections and it has to be stopped and the Republicans have to get a lot tougher and so should the Democrats. They should be regulated, investigated and brought to justice under the fullest extent of the law. They're totally breaking the law. Together we will drain the Washington swamp and we will clean up the corruption in our nation's capital. We have done a big job on it, but you think it's easy, it's a dirty business. It's a dirty business. You have a lot of bad people out there. Despite everything we've been through, looking out all over this country and seeing fantastic crowds, although this I think is our all-time record. I think you have 250,000 people. Two hundred fifty thousand! Looking out at all the amazing patriots here today, I have never been more confident in our nation's future. Well, I have to say we have to be a little bit careful. That's a nice statement, but we have to be a little careful with that statement. If we allow this group of people to illegally take over our country, because it's illegal when the votes are illegal, when the way they got there is illegal, when the States that vote are given false and fraudulent information. We are the greatest country on Earth and we are headed, and were headed, in the right direction. You know, the wall is built. We're doing record numbers at the wall. Now they want to take down the wall. Let's let everyone flow in. Let's let everybody flow in. We did a great job in the wall. Remember the wall? They said it could never be done. One of the largest infrastructure projects we've ever had in this country and it's had a tremendous impact and we got rid of catch and release, we got rid of all of the stuff that we had to live with. But now the caravans, they think Biden's getting in, the caravans are forming again. They want to come in again and rip off our country. Can't let it happen. As this enormous crowd shows, we have truth and justice on our side. We have a deep and enduring love for America in our hearts. We love our country. We have overwhelming pride in this great country, and we have it deep in our souls. Together we are determined to defend and preserve government of the people,

by the people and for the people. Our brightest days are before us. Our greatest achievements still wait. I think one of our great achievements will be election security because nobody until I came along, had any idea how corrupt our elections were. And again, most people would stand there at 9:00 in the evening and say, "I want to thank you very much," and they go off to some other life, but I said, "Something's wrong here. Something's really wrong. Can't have happened." And we fight. We fight like hell and if you don't fight like hell, you're not going to have a country anymore. Our exciting adventures and boldest endeavors have not yet begun. My fellow Americans, for our movement, for our children and for our beloved country, and I say this, despite all that's happened, the best is yet to come. So we're going to, we're going to walk down Pennsylvania Avenue, I love Pennsylvania Avenue, and we're going to the Capitol and we're going to try and give -- the Democrats are hopeless. They're never voting for anything, not even one vote. But we're going to try and give our Republicans, the weak ones, because the strong ones don't need any of our help, we're going to try and give them the kind of pride and boldness that they need to take back our country. So let's walk down Pennsylvania Avenue. I want to thank you all. God bless you and God bless America. Thank you all for being here. This is incredible. Thank you very much. Thank you.

(Retrieved from https://edition.cnn.com/2021/02/08/politics/trump-january-6-speech-transcript/index.html)