

An Expository-Pragmatic Study of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton Campaigners

ASSIST.LECT. MALIK KAREEM HASSOUN

University of Wasit - College of Basic Education

1-Abstract

The main target of this research is to analyze political speeches of presidential campaigns which occur between Donald Trump as a Republic nominee and Hillary Clinton as a Democrat candidate in America 2016. An expository study, here, examines those nominees' formal speeches pragmatically. Throughout this study, the agent of the action commits himself/herself, in varying degrees, to the achievement of the propositional content as a part of his/her predication to some states of affairs. Various aspects of political utterances, manipulation of encoded messages, exploitation of power and position quantitatively and qualitatively, as well as the appropriateness of parameters of politeness are discussed in accordance with an eclectic model. Since the majority of speech acts that are used in political dialogues are involved direct and indirect tactics, pragmatic analyses assimilates discursal treatments in fixing some encoded goals. This study starts with a generic expository overview integrally with some modifications and then (it) exposes relevancy studies as well. It also sheds light on contextual relations between pragmatics on one hand, and politics, discourse, and some other new tactics. The analysis of this research is concerned the more important details of the two Presidential candidates' speeches, taking into consideration, most of linguistic dimensions to elaborate argumentative issues with apt findings, discussions and conclusions.

Key words: Elections, Campaigners, Pragmatics, Discourse, Addressor, Addressee, Political, Politicians, President, Trump, Hillary, Republic, Democrat, Promise, Threaten, Direct, Indirect, Maxims and politeness.

المخلص : يهدف هذا البحث الى تحليل الخطابات السياسية للحملات الإنتخابية الرئاسية والتي جرت في عام 2016 في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية بين المرشح الجمهوري دونالد ترمب والمرشحة عن الحزب الديمقراطي هيلاري كلينتون. حيث اختبرت الدراسة التفسيرية هنا الخطابات الرسمية للمرشحين الديمقراطي والجمهوري اختبارا تداوليا، وبينت الدراسة بأن القائم بالفعل الكلامي سواء كان وعد او تهديد

يُلزم نفسه بتنفيذ المحتوى الكامن والمقصود في الفعل الكلامي كجزء من مراحل الاخبار به وتحقيقه في المستقبل ولكن يبقى ذلك بدرجات متفاوتة، حيث إن الجوانب اللفظية المتنوعة والمختلفة وتفسير المعنى المقصود والتلاعب بمكوناته والاستغلال الكمي والنوعي للسلطة والموقع مثلت المادة التي حللت طبقا الى مودل تم تشكيله وانتقاه لهذا الغرض مع مراعاة معايير التأدب واللياقة الاجتماعية. وقد تم استخدام معالجات سياقية انصهرت في العملية التداولية والتي بُحثت في الخطابات المباشرة والغير مباشرة لفك الشفرات السياسية الكامنة. بدأت الدراسة بتقصي نظره عامه تفسيرية مع بعض الاضافات من قبل الباحث ، تُبعت بعد ذلك بدراسات سابقة ذات صلة ، وبحث الجانب التحليلي العلاقات السياقية بين الجوانب البراغماتية او التداولية والخطابية والسياسية والخوض بتفاصيلها وصولا الى مناقشات واستنتاجات مفيدة.

2-Introduction

One of the most important aspects of the English language nowadays is the multiple ways of discussing its bits. The word, for example, can be plainly used to reflect some addressors' technical, literal or nonliteral, direct or indirect ways and the sense can dependably go, as Crystal's (2006:1f) justifications, in various ways. Crystal shows that language forms of communication are different aspects of sense and nonsense. However, transmission of any target message and reception of any kind of info will be channelled via a much border context of liaison or communication (ibid).

The (above fruitful) input (or information) will be the result of sending-receiving process whether these inputs are conscious or unconscious constructions. Although politics represents one aspect of our language and linguistic factors, the use of pragmatic in an expoistorical way will govern our preferences of study the many and various channels of interaction, on one hand, and the impact of these preferences on others, on the other hand. In other words, the pragma-expository variance of formal political speeches or any linguistic genres follow a large number of generic social rules which constrain agents' ways of written or spoken messages.

Strictly speaking, the impact of written or spoken utterances on the behaviour of addressor and addressee depend on a variety of intellectual perspectives that this research here will focus on its formal encoded structures as they represent by

Trump-Clinton' speeches. Whilst the aspects of cooperation and politeness differ in accordance to their competence-performance meaning and to their frequency as well.

Thus, all useable aspects of political language precisely will exploit, for its purposes, pragmatic, cooperative, and politeness principles and practices for interactive linguistic performance to seek the usage of political performativity understandings and appropriateness felicitously and/or happily.

3-Literature Review of the Research Arena:

In general, a language in use seems to be as a coterie of components that links, fulfills, and impacts among all the needs of human beings, taking into consideration their differences in culture, religious doctrine, political issues, rights and obligations, and so on. The language in use or its modern nickname "pragmatics" today suffers from multiple faces of troubles that need to be improved its strategies, ways of analyzing, and its parameters that will be examined some of these (strategies) as a target problem. Since pragmatics closely connects with the agent of action, Bach (2008:1), strictly speaking, shows that if addressors always mean (or behave) exactly what they say, as determined by the sentences' meanings that they utter, later on ambiguity of those sentences' contents will be aside, making one's intention communicatively evident and realizing someone else's that would be optimally simple-hearted. But addressors, in fact, do not mean (and behave) meticulously what they want to say. Thus, in meaning something else in addition to what they mean, addressors will leave much to inference. Yule (1996:3), respectively, says that, pragmatics has more to achieve with the analysis of what people's utterances mean rather than with what these words, might mean by themselves, in the former utterances. Then, he adds that the concept of speech acts originally derived by Langshaw Austin, for many linguists, is the central core of pragmatics where these utterances perform actions. The

influence of power, in language in general, and in politics, in particular, as in Hassoun's (2011:4-5) workable explanations, maintains that a language has a genus of power used by its addressor to convey his/her message to his/her addressee. This power is often, and by its impact and work of course, described as a speech act theory, where it is dealt with the role of communicative actual acts, accomplished by performers and/or people in general.

It should be quite clear that these actions achieved by the utterances of performers, on any occasions and/or circumstances, must involve three basic kinds of performative speech acts. Authentic axes have some formulas (or conditions or characteristics as in Austin (1962:54-63), Allan (1994e:291-4), (which represent the researcher's modified version), wherever each speech act being accomplished via utterance, must subject to them, as in the following:

i-In explicit style, pragmatic performatives of speech acts, in any political or social context, must be in a first person singular and/or plural + active + present tense at the speaking time of perform + indicative + positive or negative but not with not, in a negating speech act + declarative (sometimes in an interrogative or an imperative), consider the 1.A below example.

ii-In an inexplicit style, pragmatic performatives of speech acts, in any context genre, can work with any subjects' kinds of personal pronouns or proper names (+ hereby) + any voice + any occurrence time + any mood + any case of not or without not + any type of propositional sentences, consider the 1.B below example.

iii-In a hybrid of an explicit + an inexplicit style, pragmatic performatives of speech acts depend on antecedents' components + context, consider the 1.C below example.

iv-In another style where none of the above styles, pragmatic performatives of speech acts depend on the impact of pragmatic charisma (of agents' action) +

power of utterances + gestures + others of transformational issues, consider the 1.D below example.

Examples are realized in 1 , as the following :-

A-I promise you that I 'll be there tomorrow.

B-The lion was killed.

C-Don't do it again. You promise. Yes.

D-He is an intelligent and a very persuasive man.

The performativity of speech act, in I.A for example fulfills a subset formula "i", where and when the circumstances for the required successes will be done, viz., the action of promise is obviously done. Whilst the other three examples maintain and embark with their related formulas subsets in an unobvious way, 1.B discusses the process of done by the performer in a passive way and it hereby does the "ii" subset. The 1.C works in the indirect way at first, then turns to arrest the performer's performativity with yes secondly and with an ambiguous case expedite the "iii" subset. The 1.D, ultimately, affirms on transformational power of a performers and his performativity to meet the "iv" subset. Otherwise, Bach (2004:464-5) and Yule (1996:49ff) potentially observe that Searle exploits these subsets to establish his illocutionary force indicating devices as indication formulas of addressors' communicative utterance in order to perform their purpose or force.

Since there are a slight difference between the work of speech acts constatively or performatively, Austin (1962:108) leads us to go back to fundamentals of language in use, and depends, in his view, on human beings' intentions to make their performance of speech acts sensually. Speech acts must consequentiality elaborate via a three levels, according to their functions, before they work performatively, to get their forces or goals. The three levels of speech acts, according to Leech (2008:88-91) with some modifications, by this paper's researcher, are as followings:

i-Locution - when the action's message explicitly or inexplicitly entails that an agent's proposition and thought works as a grammaticalized forms, viz., specific expressions (accompanied with intention) as semantic abstracted words. The performer at this level will be called, according to his/her performative result, the locutioner or the producer or the agent of the pre-illocution.

ii-Illocution - when the agent of the action assures what he performatively utters via specific reference of what he said before, viz., what the locutioner's enunciation happily appears as an addressor's fruitful action. The performer at this level will be called, according to his/her performative result, the illocutioner or the accomplisher.

iii-Perlocution - when the agent's states of affairs in what he utters firstly re-appears conscious and emotive effects and re-actions towards illocutioner's action who intends to do it. The performer at this level will be called, according to his/her performative result, the perlocutioner or the persuasiver or the agent of the post-illocution.

The broadest interpretation of the language's acts in use, as in Green's (1996:2f) view, is the study of understanding of intentionality in human actions. Thus, this sense involves the interpretation of speech acts, that we assume to be undertaken, for achieving some goals or forces, like promise, threaten, beg, warn, etc. Before specialists' detailed classification of these types or goals of speech acts, Searle (1979:2-8) gave his twelve standard parameters or dimensions in order to enable users and/or readers, with different cultures and other issues (that we mention before), to say and differentiate that function, purpose, or force of this utterance from the function, purpose, or force of that utterance. The researcher (here) picks up and blends the most significant one of these twelve points in three, as in the following hereunder clarification :

1-The point or purpose of the specified action plus direction of fit where its utterance resembles an attempt to perform specific action, by the addressor, by matching the world to his/her words via various degrees of strength or commitment as in a promising or a threatening speech acts.

2-The acts that are performed according to (a) the interest of the addressor or the addressee, (b) where those acts required extra-linguistic institution and a special position of the agent's action, (c) with special performative use of illocutionary act, and (d) the propositional contents need a special style of performance.

3-The psychological state, of the addressor or the addressee, expresses a special intention to do this or that force (ibid.).

However, the problem stands beyond any analysis of speech acts related to a colossal numbers of performative verbs in each spoken and written languages around the world. Therefore, pragmatics contribute in solution and establish the more general classifications of speech acts' types which are usually used, as in the following details :-

Illocutionary force, as a resultant work of the competence-performance interaction between the addressor and the addressee, represents the core of the five revisited types of speech acts' classifications of the most two well-known philosophers Austin (1962:147-51) and Searle (1969:57-63), such as representatives (or assertives or Austin's verdictives), directives (or Austin's exercitives), commissives (also Austin had the same terminological concept), expressives (or Austin's behabatives), declaratives (or Austin's sub-class of what he called declarations) and expositives (where Austin precedes the time in advance and constitutes this class both to speech acts and dialogues exploitations).

In order to blend successful and satisfied strategies of speech acts with ingredients of Grice's principles of oratorical and conversational, Searle uses

Grice's approach (of Cooperative principles when the latter shows that an addressee can understand any non-literal utterances depending on his inferences of the addressor's conversation before and by respecting the conversational maxims of the utterance too) maintaining that any addressor who non literally performs illocutionary acts intends that the addressee, by using his abilities and attitudes, can understand addressors' illocutionary force and felicity conditions of that action's quality purpose. And when an illocutionary speech act is totally successful and satisfied, it is of course perfect quantity. Thus, each illocutionary act, is a natural kind, serves to perform linguistic aims in the course of conversations, of use of language (Vanderveken, 2002,148-9).

Since there are a significant mutual of understanding meanings between the strategies of prosperous speech acts performance and the strategies of ending those strategies politely. And since, according to Leech (1983:132-41), the problem of ending any dialogue or any context of utterance successfully is closely familiar with the addressor's competence of language in use and the facts which obliges himself to do. The connection between politeness and an activity as an illocution speech acts to preserve their performance sociability is summing this research's model up. The researcher here chooses the agreement and sympathy maxims of Leech's Politeness Principles. Although, tact and generosity maxims appropriate, according to Leech, for commissives, this does not cancel (our) using of agreement-sympathy maxims with commitments since firstly Leech himself discusses the two latter maxims under the title "other maxims of politeness"(as opposed to other encounter maxims) and secondly declares that "there is less evidence for other maxims", and the researcher elucidates that, in politics, the agent's action needs to persuade his/her electorates by maximizing his/her agreement and sympathy with them and also by minimizing with them his/her disagreement and antipathy in order to get the highest degree of presidential elections' voices (ibid.).

In sum up, the avoidance of any speech acts infelicitous performance and cooperative strategies violation, politeness obligation medium can be an appropriate strategy of addressor's exploitations of things to match his words politically.

4-Previous Studies of the Research Context

Some of the others' linguistic readings, according to the researcher's view, are appropriate for communicating uses and meanings and, in doing so, this process will add more advantages for analysts, interested in, or readers as well, in order to complete and develop the research's ideas.

People cannot expect many surprising issues during Americans presidential elections. The 2016 presidential campaign takes place between Donald Trump as a Republican Party candidate and Hillary₁ Clinton as a Democrat Party candidate. Many voters, inside and outside America, may have experienced discrepancy about their party's candidate via their campaign and the unavailable data appeared on both nominees were able to overcome with the contradiction and hesitation to their loyalist supporters. Therefore, the eighth of November is regarded as the United States' Day for choosing their forty fifth President.

Historically, one of the most traditional presidential elections is held in outdoor venues like Galesburg and Freeport between Stephen Douglas as a Democratic candidate and Abraham Lincoln as a Republican candidate. In these pragmatic contests, elections are required from the two candidates speaking a length oratory. In 1960 elections, the first well-known presidential debates are took place between Richard Nixon and John Kennedy. These debates between the republican candidate (Nixon) and the democratic candidate (Kennedy) are nationally televised. The most major topics in these debates are Soviet Union, China, Cuba and the Cold World War. Respectively, reporting news appear that there are no debates of presidential

elections in America from 1964 to 1976 because candidates, in that time, refused to meet their contenders. In 1976, three presidential debates are held between democratic candidate Jimmy Carter and republican candidate Gerald Ford. Ford's badly speech about Union of Soviet loses him the presidential position. In 1980, only one debate is done between the two major challengers Carter and Ronald Reagan and their important topics are recession in economy and nuclear threat. One of the most significant debates during 1984 to 2008 is held between republican nominee John McCain and democratic nominee Barack Obama since their topics approximately are carried again by 2016 presidential candidates and they fought heavily by using their past presidents' gaps.

Linguistic studies, which discuss the political speeches and debates, are many. However, Uvehammer (2005) concerned linguistic strategies impact, of political presidential debate which occurs between George Bush (the father), and John Kerry, on how they are used, by the two candidates, to persuade their addressees. In other words, Uvehammer elaborated on the effectiveness of the two candidates by using strategies in linguistics like rhetoric strategy as the most significant one.

The debates which happen between Obama and McCain are studied by Beers in 2010. However, it was concerned with constructive of communication politically via substantive and symbolic factors. In Beers' research, language, behaviour, rhetoric, and consistency of messages and images are used in analyzing communication. The prevailing research objective, of course, had applied these factors to see how they are worked in political arena.

Since language employs in human's hand as a vital weapon, Ayeomoni and Akinkuolere (2012) draw up the meaning to the fore issue of political meaning. Indeed, it is needed careful handling in any localizing situation and in any implementation of fruitful democratic rule. Therefore, Ayeomoni and Akinkuolere on one hand and Taiwo, on the other, assure that this aspect of language function

work as a conveyer belt of force whereof the orders of spoken (or written) words, phrases or clauses somehow occasionally turn into actions with specific or precise multi-uses of performativity of the language. Thus, this function motivates most vote-ages to participate in voting, debating, rebelling or edifying replying to candidates' illocutionary force speeches before.

Truths and texts of presidential debates are discussed by Southmayd in 2013. The study is exposed Obama and Mitt Romney's debates, and it has taken into consideration the truth or context of those debating facts. Even though overabundance of information, voters and dis-partisan could not separate the truth from the lies that were told by the nominees.

Thus, all these debates studies elaborated on different linguistic aspects from one side or another to get ultimately their goals perfectly.

5-Performativity in Politicians/Political Traits

Flaws in philosophical conception of language and in particular with its treatment of language as an abstract referential system are fundamentally discussed in Austinian phenomenon. Austin (1962:1) emphasizes the practical, active uses of language. A picture of dexterous philosopher that "It was for too long the assumption of philosophers that the business of a 'statement' can only be to 'describe' some state of affairs, or to 'state some fact', which it must do either truly or falsely" is declared that there are many uses of language which the linguistic appearance of fact stating, but they are really quite different. Since deeds and words, actions and utterances, manipulation and ideology, power-self and imperialism, and so on, are closely related to the agents of the action, like pragmatists in pragmatics, politicians in politics, and many others, the researcher sheds some further light on performative roots' features to either an addressor or an

addressee. The researcher also modifies and adds some of Austin's (ibid:40) ideas to re-produce them in a new version, as in the following :

1-Feeling: where an illocutioner's feeling, emotion or even behaviour or sympathetic conduct evaporates in workable speech acts as a way of attracting the others' enthusiasm and interest. In other words, pre-conscious feelings to be ready for post manipulation will be via personal property.

2-Thought: whenever and wherever an intention gap of the illocutioner's pre-done action results from the normality of hesitated conduct, the performer will here fill his/her gaping intention with a per-/-middle-/post- of his/her utterance to complete it with one of the initiative words or gestures as a recursive performative feelings. In other words, some performer's gaps of speech politically fix by some mitigated words via his/her intellectual ability.

3-Intention: each performative speech act elaborates itself outside the same norms of framework and thought that the others think they share with, to lie, behind the interlocutors' assumptions. In other words, the intentionality work of illocutioner breaks addressees' deceptions.

4-Body: any linguistic abilities derive from the importance of highly values and verbal and nonverbal ideas of communicative intention as a hostel situation of all the performative visual actions. In other words, leadership capability of the performer calculates the intentionality of meaning.

Similarly, Beard (2000:8) defines the term of politics performatively as it is "used by linguists to refer to a language variety particular to a specific group" and in this excerpt, Beard refers, as Austin did, to the appropriate persons that they must do it correctly and perfectly. In addition, he gives brief examples with their connotations as the following considerations:

1-"Government, regime, junta, democracy, dictatorship, faction, one-man Rule". They are used "as nouns to describe forms of government."

2-"Revolutionary, fundamentalist, dissident, zealot, critic, partisan, militant, separatist, paramilitary, protester, liberator". They are used "as nouns to describe opponents of those in power."

3-"Militant, hawk, dove, extremist, radical, moderate". They are used "as nouns to describe strength of attitude to a political issue" (ibid.).

6-Pragma-Political Context

In general, political speeches, in contexts of pragmatics and politics, are regarded the vital work of pragmaticians and politicians in declaring their campaigns' policies and in persuading the populaces to gain the latters' polling. Thus, there is a mutual relationship between persuasion and campaigns processes since there is a strong bindingness of politics depending on pragmatics. Accordingly, Robert Cockcroft and Susan Cockcroft (1992:3) show that Aristotle classifies the persuasion's means into three categories, as the following :

1-"Ethos (persuasion through personality and stance)";

2-"Pathos (persuasion through the arousal of emotion)"; and

3-"Logos (persuasion through reasoning)" (ibid).

Likewise, O'Sullivan, et al (1994:224-5) elucidate that persuasion deals with the intentional impact of attitudes opinions, or values as well as it has a very important role, according to sociologists and psychologists, in pragmatic and political campaigners. On the other hand, they precisely say that campaign is :

"An organized and co-ordinated process of persuasion, usually conducted and orchestrated by means of mass media, directed towards public opinion and behaviour in the attempt to achieve a defined set of objectives. Campaigns may be

initiated by a wide variety of institutions, groups and individuals in pursuit of their particular interests Perhaps the best and most obvious examples are political campaigns, where the goals may include election to political office, or the rejection or adoption of some principle or policy", then they add that "Professing to voice 'public opinion', to speak on behalf of 'the people', their readers or viewers, the media campaign is always a part of wider social and political conflicts and processes" (ibid:35-6).

Any traditional expressions of speeches of any presidential campaigners are always constrained to the propositions, which later on, must be explorable, in order to see whether they are true or false, when they represent any particular sort of sentences. Contrariwise, pragmaticians, politicians, and others who attended in, interestedly work within the field of language in use, tend to paraphrase or re-introduce these propositions to perform, with, specific things which universally call (deeds by words or) speech acts (Mey,1993:93).

However, propositions of utterances are mostly (and especially in language in use whether they are politically manipulated or explicitly represented) bound up to express, rather in some languages, subjectivity inherent in all and variety types of language uses. Vanderveken (2002:146f), logically, says that most propositions, which exist or not exist in our world autonomously of any human thought, represent facts and true when they instantiate how things are in our world. And since not all utterances' propositions (or contents), strictly speaking, are explicitly qualitative, there are a continuum which, sometimes, starts from the explicit conscious quality to the implicit conscious one or from an explicit unconscious quality to an implicit unconscious one (or the instrumentation would change from the explicit conscious to an implicit unconscious and/or from an explicit unconscious to the implicit conscious one). As a resultant, the implicit making of the instrumentation, in accordance to Bally(1944:41), (as quoted in Johansson and Suomela-Salmi (2011) and Zienkowski, et al (2011)) is not a sophisticated problem

since the spirit or intention can causally complete the deficiencies of expressions and then essentiality of utterances would be left out of it. Thus, this way of thought shares indirect speech act via the anticipation of situationality of speech act theories directly, and illocutionary function and force by inferences of interlocutors indirectly.

In fact and since pragmatics works as the most significant weapon in politicians' language, and, as an utterance's or an expression's meaning in a context, the electorates depend on bits of utterances to inference those politicians' contexts, and hence the text will be functioned pragmatically at the end. Therefore, the corpus-corpora medium should be part of communicating thought or mind (to whatsoever whether the other is individual person or group or anyone else since any proposition of whatsoever context is as a result of intention of speaking or writing subject vertically, and as a result of conscious interaction between the speaker/addressor and his/her interlocutors via exploiting the world to his/her words horizontally). Even though the meaning of these target messages within any [pragma-political] context is constructed in an interaction, and by the way, the explicit and implicit dimensions are, of course, used as a pragmatic power means of acting, from world to words, upon the interlocutors throughout for example political, social, psychological campaigners (Zienkowski, et al, 2011:77-8).

Political language and symbols, meanwhile, create, as Edelman's belief, problematic beliefs in both non-elites and elites political campaign medium since they have specific illocutions, as part of their illocution, to represent, as Searle's elucidation, specific role or point to get their direction of fit stretches between words (or beliefs or propositions) to match the world in ascertaining them, and on the other side, they worldly bring powerful things to match and correspond our propositions (or words or beliefs), therefore this process of interaction between world and words would construct our target illocution force and facilitate the

quiescent acceptance of chronic matters like poverty, inequality, and other political concerns to suit electioneering campaign promises and threatens. About what they do in dealing with chronic social troubles to be ameliorate and under the title that may apparently constrain between language and politics, Edelman argues that neither public bureaucracies nor helping professions are the most effective agents when politicians use language to shape their beliefs or propositions (Edelman,1977:xiiiif ; Searle,1979:13f).

Within pragmatic context, political language is used as a powerful toolkit within any national context in speeches of political leaders who often tend to manipulate and exploit the supportive language via best-suit of their rhetorical and pragmatic style or genre in order to pass their message through more effective effort to "gain political advantage, maintain power, and shirk responsibility", and under their entitled agendas that they want to undertake, they need to pragmatize the manufacture consent in their democratic polities. Thus, the interaction of pragmatics and politics, we assure, underpins the context and its components of proposition, as well as, it conveys both the corpus of political beliefs and the meaning of what is said (and beyond what is said) linguistically (El-Hussari, 2010:99ff).

Lastly and meanwhile, the researcher's view here meets researchers' views in above, that the total situation (namely, addressor, addressee, context, and others) can determine, in accordance to specific extents and fulfillments, promise, threaten or any other speech act by the context and what the addressor (or the agent of the action) is going to say, even before he/she has opened his/her mouth. In other words, this fruitful work or that act of speech acquire its value and force from the context, namely, the politician uses referring and linguistic expressions to enable his/her electorates to characterize their entity being referred to and thus, the consonance of pragmatics and politics, ends up reflecting a mulberry leaves' racks,

is literally or verbally making the world at the politicians' (or the illocutionary agents') finger-tips (Fetzer and Oishi, 2011:178).

7-Pragma-Discourse Treatments

At first and because of semantic theories and their treatments (itself) are not justice the most significant pragmatic bits of contextual components (and according to Joan Cutting, semantics means "the study of what the words mean by themselves, out of context, as they are used in a dictionary"(2002:1)), and since the meaning of each situational aspect integrated into various types of context and sometimes beyond these contextual types, the necessity to justice and treat these contextual constituents between linguistic expressions to/and what they express, approximately, all these matters, make the specialists, politicians, pragmaticians, and some others, seeking and looking for a manipulative larger zone and an alternative processes and what they later called and squeezed under the title "pragmatics". Pragmatics, consequently and according to Dylgjeri (2017:19f), is the cognizance of the speeches' message being communicated is sometimes not in the speeches themselves but in the meaning implied beyond them, and where the target speech act being politically performed, the participants of that political act must be involved as well as their intention, world to word direction of fit, and the impact of their political interactions towards the triumvirate characters : context, what is said and what is left. Since this paper discusses political speeches, discourse will overlap with pragmatics' treatments since discourse is a dynamical interactive channel wherein acts of speech affect the situations through which, of course, they can take place, and in which the situation can affect the way that these acts can be understood pragmatically. In other words, Cutting (2002:ibid.) affirmed that they (pragmatics and discourse) are concerned language's intentions and relations to its contextual background. For affirming of researcher's view, Robert Stalnaker (1998: 3ff) motivated it with two points :

First : (Any) speech(es) must be actions

Second : Speech acts are understood via their intended effects and the situation that they are used in.

However, there is an agreement among Cutting, Stalnaker, and Mesthrine about the potential connection between pragmatics and discourse. Mesthrine (2001:135) shows that pragmatics is broadly considered as discourse analysis since it has an ideal-typical features like the following:

"(a) it criticizes the idea that whole languages are exclusively formal grammatical sentence systems by proposing to examine actual contexts of language-in-use; (b) it construes language as primarily discourse(s)-as heterogeneous social actions in the first place rather than, say, as an innate property of the human mind which is merely put into social action or 'performed'; (c) it considers language to be produced and analyzable only in terms of the connection between utterances rather than in terms of single sentences; (d) it favors naturally occurring rather than elicited or invented data" (ibid).

Another channel of treatment, as Coultas' (2003:45f) view, is a power which can potentially be realized via promising acts or threatening acts, and in this way, it is maintained that there are great and so much works on these particular occupations of language, then the researcher would have how this power confer to the speaker, like a doctor-patient language and how the former exclude the latter depending on his place of power. The power, as the one which politicians depend on, works under the assumption is that "All communication is about the struggle to dominate", upon all types of written and spoken speeches are, in a much more positive sense, for cooperation and communication.

In sum, encoding should not be ignored to linguistic messages although it should not be regarded as decisive clue of the intentionality concept in a given

speech community. Duranti (2015:39f) affirms on what the researcher mentioned above. He (ibid.) shows that the target language as a code of where discourse, and pragmatics would be as a key code or as practice of intention which provide us with significant hints about the possible understandings of the human's combinations experience or goals. Whether or not the goals or purposes of an individuals in doing an action by saying something will be recognized in accordance to the interpretation of that individuals actions could depend on a number of social, emotional, interactional practices (that will have to reversed in any case).

8-Promise and Threaten Speech acts : General Expository Overview

Strictly speaking, most of language, linguistics, and pragmatics' linguists, pragmaticians, and philosophers assure that each spoken and written language contains events and acts which have accompanied by categories or groups of speech acts whereby the communicators or users can differentiate this language's acts from other's acts. One of the significant points is that most of those philosophers and linguists, as Austin (1962), Searle (1979), Bach and Harnish (1979), Lyons (1981), Levinson (1983), Leech (1983), Yule (1996), and others, unify their opinions on one category of speech act theory that they call "commissive" category of speech act. Again they also unify their views on the characteristics and universality of this category. They define acts of this category when they are committed the agent of the action to do something whether it is good or bad by matching things or world to that agent's words or utterances according to specific procedures which sometimes slightly change.

One of the most prominent acts in this category is a promise speech act. Austin (1962:11) elucidates that it is an aptness that the agent, who does the act of promise, should have a suitable communicative intent and it is better if the all concomitants procedures do not doubtlessly void, or given in not good faith. So,

Matthews (2007:322) logically diagnoses that promissive things will constitute a promise, by elaborating will, as in "I will certainly help".

Sadock (2004:62) shows that Searlean approach of speech act theory accepted what Austin's established. Searle reassures Austinian sufficient test of illocutionary act of promise, for example, via the ability to perform it in an explicit performative way. Whilst we can perform more than one illocutionary act via inexplicit or primary performative as in it really quiet nice today to imply the illocutionary act of stating a fact firstly, the illocutionary act of an offer to go out today, and the illocutionary act of the very implicit promise on the offering (picnic for instance and), by reassuring the very previous explicit and/or implicit promise of going. However, most theories seek inferencing to be a central base in deriving the utterance force or purpose.

Confusing conversational context with direct and indirect speech act creates some hiatus between the agent's meaning and his recipients or addressees' understanding. The researcher, therefore, maintains on Blakemore's suggestion. Blakemore (1992:7) suggests that "what the speaker means is a set of propositions, one of which is expressed directly through the meanings of the words he uses and the others conveyed indirectly and derived through inference" .

It 'll not go ahead too much in discussing these paradigms of verbs in speech act theory syntactically or step by step in picking them out carefully with pragmatics since the cornerstone of pragmatic issues depends on the seeking out, and somehow far away the target meaning, of context, co-text, or text, and with familiar working, pragmatics may void or abolish. Accordingly, Allan (1994i:350-52) deploys his viewpoints under the title "speech act and grammar", clarifying, that illocutionary acts and its bits constrained in declarative, interrogative, and imperative, phrase, clause, coordinating plus subordinating, to the last two Chomskyian modern approaches of surface and deep structure and

transformational plus grammar and semantics of Ross, Lakoff, and Sadock when they represent illocutionary act of promise or threaten purposes neither is syntactic category nor is semantic, but it is accurately pragmatic entity because of the expire of generative semantics finally, the performance of illocutionary act has been ignored in grammar. Ultimately, the researcher still beliefs that there is an unavoidable relationship between syntax and semantics, on one hand, and pragmatics, on the other hand, in his concerning issues of indirectness plus contextualization.

It is a consequence, after Searle's (1969:58) obvious realization the overlapping adjectives between verbs of speech act theory like promise and threat as in "a promise is a pledge to do something for you, not to you; but a threat is a pledge to do something to you, not for you.", Searle again with Vanderveken (1985:192f) make some approaches among speech act verbs according to their work, obligate, impart, abide, or their matching between things and words. In foundation of illocutionary act, there are a mediocrity of predicating logic to natural language. Therefore, they say "the paradigm commissive verb is "promise", but as it has some rather special features which are not common to many other members of the set of commissive verbs, we are following Austin in using the verb "commit", to provide the name of this set generally" . Then, they distinguish, the precise features of promise, from other verbs of commitments as in "first, a promise is always made to a hearer to do something for his benefit, and, secondly promises involve a rather special kind of commitment, namely an obligation"(ibid). Thus, this undertaking of an obligation will increase the degree of commitment strength. Meanwhile, they show that threatening speech act differs from promising one in :

"first,...the undertaking is not to do something for the benefit of the hearer but rather to detriment and, secondly, in that no obligation is involved in threatening. Because of the absence of obligation, threatening is not as institutionally dependent

as promising. "Threaten" is a hybrid verb, since one can threaten without performing a speech act at all, as for example when one simply makes menacing gestures at someone. Because a threat need not be a speech act, non-human agents can literally threaten, e.g. dogs can make threatening noises and clouds can had weather. In this respect promises differ from threats because a promise, like a speech act threat, is essentially hearer-directed and must involve a public performance when the hearer is not identical with the speaker" (ibid).

In other words, threaten can be achieved as a speech act by non verbal communication via either pronouncing locution threatening words and here the successful of doing it felicitously depends on the degree of sincere obligation as a pragmatic condition. Or through paralinguistic features and here no need to pronounce any sign of speech act. Therefore, pragmatics call it a "hybrid verb".

Otherwise, politics does not mean contradiction of pragmatics since electioneering campaign promise and threaten politically evaluate as a future course of action within politicians' plans or goals. These undertakings plans depend on the ability of the agent of the action, as a future leadership ability, in serving his/her pledge in accomplishing that action which encounters agent's former words, on one hand. And the agent does not make a promise or a threaten for example if he knows a priori that it is impossible to keep (it) on the other. Therefore, Whenever he/she utters a performative sentence which expresses a sort of contradiction, the agent eo ipso does not mean what he/she says (Vanderveken,2001:44f).

As a recapitulation, the agent's action integrally exploits cooperative rules carefully in order to achieve his/her promises or threatens of speech acts felicitously depending on his/her policies (which will discuss in briefings here-under) or character(s) (which are discussed under the title "Performativity in Politicians/Political Traits"). After examining pragmatic (proposition, preparatory,

sincerity, and, essential) and cooperative (quantitative, and, qualitative) conditions successfully, politeness rules will be a resultant episodes of the total elaboration.

9-Methodology of the Research

This research is concerned, in its investigations, dissections and analyses, a pragmatic expository approach which divides into two axes. The first axis particularizes the pragmatics aspect, as a vital process, and as a natural and artificial working of the language. Pragmaticians , according to Tendahl (2009:49), have always been dealt with the compound question of how to draw the lines of information between explicit and implicit ways in a cooperative dialogue. Levinson (1983:2-3) shows in words of Carnap's (1938:2) definition that in an explicit investigation, pragmatics brings reference meaning to the speaker, or put its sense in a more general view, then to the users of the language. Levinson subsequently comments that pragmatics, in this idea, studies "aspects of language that required reference to the users of the language", Then he connects this reference to an account of language understanding which contains inferences' bridge between what is said to what has assumed before, under potential blending or mixing of the relationship between language and situational context (Levinson,ibid:21).

Therefore, pragmatic, cooperative and politeness strategies will be the appropriate eclectic model, for this research's purposes that will be discussed in details, in the following section.

10-Promise and Threaten Model of The Research

This study is concerned with the ability of the addressor or the agent's action in keeping his/her obligation towards his/her addressees whether the action is beneficiary as in promise or costly action as in threaten since these illocutions are happily achieved whenever things are matched the words by the agent of the action

to correspond to the propositional content. Thus, this research's theoretical proposed and modified model has been simplified to involve six components of pragmatic conditions, and these ingredients are eclectically drawn from a space of work in pragmatics (and politics) area, as the following:

1-The condition of conventional proposition

a-A-G₂ predicates about future XSA₃ within conscious and commitment procedures.

b-A-

G must have power and authority to perform XSA to R₄.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory₅ and executory

a-Welfare beneficiary XSA is a desirable one [for] R who wants A-G perform it.

b-Worse Costly XSA is an undesirable one [to] R who does not want A-G perform it.

3-The condition of authentic sincere₆

a-A-G has a high intention to perform XSA [for] R.

b-A-G has a high desire to perform XSA [against] R.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially₇

a-A-G will obligate to perform the interested XSA [for] R.

b-A-G will strongly try militate R overtake to perform the bad XSA [to] R.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities

a-For quantity, A-G expresses XSA as required future things and tries to satisfy and match conversation's linguistic purpose, viz., illocution's performance is working if and only if the propositional content is the required one

b- For quality, XSA must be symmetrical with the content of the proposition, viz., illocution's felicitous is maintaining if the propositional content is true.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations

a-A-G exposes XSA in a polite (or impolite) way as a future course of action or strategies of maximizing the agreement in a beneficiary purpose of action, or of minimizing the agreement in a costly action.

b-A-G exposes XSA in a polite (or impolite) way as a future states of affairs of minimizing the antipathy with others and of maximizing the sympathy with others.

Thus, our model will be eclectic one (with some researcher's modifications), depending on blending Austin's and Searle's felicity conditions in one, conditions of Cooperative Principles and Politeness Principles for Grice and Leech, since :

1-Austin portrays the environment of a happily speech act as "the total situation in which the utterance is issued-the total speech-act if we are to see the parallel between statements and performative utterances, and how each can go wrong".

2-Searle affirms that some speech acts obligate the agent's action to the propositional contents it contains.

3-Grice's Cooperative Principles of Qualitative as truthful, and Quantitive as informative are very important to assure effective communication since those maxims are pragmatic universals of language use, and according to Harnish, quantity and quality can be integrated in one result.

4-Leech's maxims of agreement and sympathy can measure agent's action of either it is polite or impolite to/against his/her receiver.

(Austin,1962:14f; Searle,1969:62f; Harnish,1976:362; Grice,1989:26f; Vanderveken, 2002:148-50; and Leech,2008:132-39).

A pragmatic orientated model, by mingling our research in this way, appears which is constituted to shed light on complex contextual bits of language, and thus deducing the gaps of texts and utterances, that they deal with, in the next section.

11-Analysis Of Campaigners' Speech Acts

Strictly speaking, the analysis of politicians' speeches is the dynamic process between theoretical and practical elaborations. Any conversational context is not perfectly valid without pragmatic means since, the pragmatic account of conversational inferences, according to Leech (1983:88), leads to facilitations of standard logics and if the agent's action does not misguide the addressee, the addressee on the other hand will be able to deduce from the pragma-political context what does the agent intentionally mean. Hereunder, eclectic model which will analyze sixteen of Trumpian-Clintonian excerpts. The excerpts are divided into four subsections, where the first two subsections will elaborate Trumpian electioneering promise and threaten, whilst the other reminder two subsections will examine Clintonian promise and threaten in a separate way.

11.1-Electioneering Campaign Promise of Donald Trump

11.1.1-The First Electioneering Campaign Promise is "Together, we are going to work on so many shared goals" by Donald Trump

1-The condition of conventional proposition: As the agent of the action, Trump, appropriately expresses his promises of educational issues in a high intention and desire. In this excerpt, he predicates the political medium and electorates about his future policy by using "we" and "shared goals" in order to amend governmental hiatus and thereby to gain their public motivation for his promise along with rules that grasp regularities of commitments, and by the way, ostensibly transfer some participation roles to them, for his predication action.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: Trump's clarification, for his followers, as a future chiefship man, that their illocutionary aims with him will be acted and done, motivates that he is the luckiest presidential nominee in 2016. In his campaign speeches such "as your president I will be the nation's biggest cheerleader for school choice. I understand many stale old politicians will resist, but it's time for our country to start thinking big and correct once again", he verifies illocutionary aims of his publics, via straddling the outlines between things and world, especially those aims that can be realized by agent's force, strive and necessity.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: One of the basic features of felicitous promise is to be required from the addressee. Meanwhile, Trump's strongly speech as in "there's no failed policy more in need of urgent change than our government-run education monopoly" makes his addressees feel that his sincerely promises will be the next and the very soon one in their hands.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: Trump as a responsible person and "as president, I will establish the national goal of providing school choice" undertakes for all the publics that his obligation for them will be in use since his pragmatic reality and policy of education is very different from for example psychological or political reality since pragmatic intention always works in use and on the ground. Trump rhetorically says that "I want to begin by discussing one goal that I know is so important to all of you: promoting American pride and patriotism in America's schools ... we want young Americans to recite the Pledge of Allegiance" pointing to his audiences with "we" plus non-past time explicitly that we need to proud our local power, education and history as a pragmatic aspects will interestingly be attached to human language.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-Trump mentions some quantitative aims for his future felicitous promise as in "school choice to every American child living in poverty", "provide \$12,000 in school choice funds to every single K-12 student who today is living in poverty", "get rid of Common Core", "we need to fix our broken education system!", "after all, teachers' unions are motivated by the same desires that move the rest of us", "loans should be viewed as an investment in America's future", and "comprehensive education". These consequences of required information is the basic stone of the quantitative promise and they are of being inferred by Trump's supporters successfully.

b-Therefore and in order to be in a safe side, these required information of "a" promise quantitatively must be truth and real. In observation, Trump assures his obligation via numbering their publics' aims pragmatically according to his ability of carrying out these specified point perfectly to save his promise qualitatively and those publics will infer the truth of Trump's evidences perfectly.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-Since he wants supporting, by his promisees, the total process of education, Trump continues in his patriotism role as in "Education should be local and locally managed" with the capital "E" accompanied by stronger obligation "should" he commits himself to the populaces' aims since an agreement reflects generalize relation of agent's opinion to addressees' proposals and of course he will politically gain their agreement and turns their disagreement to their opponents' policies.

b-One of the micro dynamic procedures in politeness interaction is to be sympathetic agent or antipathetic one in feelings. Therefore, Trump uses the plural subjective voice at the moment of his speeches like "we will be united by our common culture, values and principles-becoming One American Nation. One country, under one constitution, saluting one American Flag. The flag all of you

helped to protect and preserve. That flag deserves respect, and I will work with American Legion to help to strengthen respect for our flag" and at the end of this excerpt, he politely reflects himself as a model in a progressive aspect of "I will" to be in sincere in his speeches and under an obvious obligation and he is more specific when he is maximizing his reference to positive things in a world to match his positive feelings towards his addressees' aims.

11.1.2-The Second Electioneering Campaign Promise is "I 'll bring jobs back" by Donald Trump

1-The condition of conventional proposition: Trump, as an economist person according to his old-age experience and as the next forty-five president, predicates the publics about his future course of action, namely bringing jobs, from China, Japan, and Mexico, back again as a promise to the United States' citizens, depending on his economical and powerful warrant. How can agent's knowledge represent in his mind pragmatically concerns how can his information put in use whether in his speech of promise for example or in addressees' understanding and inferring the former's message.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: There is an addressor plus his intention here, Trump as a personal quality, who is the agent of the beneficiary promise, pledges his partisans by using the progressive case "will" and "going to" when he says "I'm going to bring jobs back and ..." to exasperate their enthusiasms since the agent's promises of political speech is the addressees' sufferings as a crucial source of their data. He successfully communicates with African-White American by this ideology that they want him to accomplish non defectively by his reference terms and power.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: The agent Trump intends to achieve that welfare bringing back again since he wants to elaborate that he is the 45 fair president, the most successful economist, and the most honest American citizen.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: The next justice president, Trump, wants to start his leading of Imperialism state sincerely by obliging himself under strong commitment "and I 'll start bringing them very fast". Trump's plan of making America number #1 again, gives him a credit especially when his spokesman declares that "Mr. Trump is the only one who can do it" by his intelligent and authority, namely what agent's focus on is primarily doing with words in that pragmatic situation.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-The quantity terms, in Trump's speech, discuss Americans' nation welfare, by trade, he will bring for them, as a future plan, manufacturing jobs back as they required, and he will fill their poorly gaps when he performs that bringing successfully. In other words, the agent's action and his interlocutors are cooperatively contributing to a political dialogue via accepted illocutionary force or promise.

b-The quality of Trump's promise concerns partisans' protagonist credibility in a "very fast" because he is the only one he can do those electors' goals. Thus, an intended meaning of the promisor recognizes when electorates does that recognition by themselves, then they make qualitative communication of ultimate successful promise.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-Here Trump, by this excerpt, politely excites his populaces' emotions towards him positively by maximizing the basic component of communication "the

agreement" and minimizing the basic component of defoliation "disagreement" against him. Trump intends, via his sincerely promise, to produce acceptable effect on his addressees that they want to concentrate on their benefits recognition.

b-Any presidential nominee tries to choose his campaign strategy in a very careful way. Meanwhile, no one, even Trump's opponents, can refuse his catchword "making America great again" and bringing the welfare to American families. Thus, by these strategies, he decreases his voters' antipathies and increases those voters' sympathies, which centrally hold up with illocution force and propositional acts, among the communicators.

11.1.3-The Third Electioneering Campaign Promise is "we have an amazing (tax) code. It will be simple, it will be easy, it will be fair" by Donald Trump

1-The condition of conventional proposition: One of the heaviest topics on American families' living standards is the taxes. The republican candidate, Trump, predicates, his ready voters and of middle class families, that he will cut the top rate of the taxes as a beneficiary act when he runs into the president position. It should be maintained that Trump-populaces' conversation does not only reflect linguistic and social principles, but it also involves linguistic and socio-pragmatic tactics and events.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: The next 45 president is persuasively contacting electorates, showing that "major tax relief for middle income and most other Americans", and because of this promise will be a benefit not only for his promisees, but for himself too. He potentially affirms that anything may be good for Americans people will be done and by the way such promising act are governed by pragma-political rules which sharing the ability of communication between agent's action and his addressees. In other words, he intends that the

largest taxes will be reduced for the middle class families by his dominance on America's decision.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: The beneficiary promising act is the future strategy that he will sincerely achieve (it) for promisees because of inside this strategy, Trump intends to make them believe that he will work with every person in America regardless of their beliefs, political culture or doctrine since he wants to be the 45 president for all of them.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: The strongest/weakest chance of the candidate Donald Trump, to lead United States, is the significance campaign issue, for his partisans at least, which can give guarantees for waiters that he is "lowering taxes far more than any other candidate. Any negotiated increase by congress to my proposal would still be lower than current!". Since, according to Hassoun (2011:63), "one of the most intriguing aspects of promises is related to the obligation which this act imposes on the promisor", and performative speeches in politics in an appropriate procedures or circumstances by an apt people can constitute doing things or deeds.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-The quantitative degree of promise increases when the agent's action (Trump) strongly matches things with words in "simple", "easy" and "fair" as required information and thus the maximizing of agreement is a cooperate process on his promising act of cutting taxes whilst the degree of disagreement will minimize between him and electorates that they entirely realize his required aim.

b-Trump qualitatively chooses his persuasive words carefully, in saying that "I know...better than anyone who has ever run for president", and by backing to what he mentions in the propositional content of Trump's dialogue of pre-performing and predicating, he, as a performer, manifests by the reference "our" that the

voters' problems concern the total publics' level of "our complex tax laws". Hence, he connects their problems' solving with him, re-maintaining again that "am the only one who can fix them", via pragmatic reference to the truest evidences whether they are intentions or actions.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-The American middle-statue families, as the carpetbaggers, recognize their next president's goals by sharing his advantaging promise of the future action for themselves, their children, and their grandchildren as well. Trump pragmatically practices his expertise as an economist man as in "the thing I'm going to do is make sure the middle class gets good tax breaks" and politely succeeds in leaving zone of populaces' disagreement when his illocutionary act can be an overlap with what their utilitarian agreement.

b-Donald Trump elucidates the usable ways of mitigation towards his anti-opponents throughout his activating multiple topics of human rights such taxes as a description of the whole system of being an "unfair to the poor", and if this system is not amended, this will be "unfair to workers". Therefore, his sympathian language politically deserves paying more attentions towards his voters and this is consequently fixes many of others' antipathies. In facing these difficulties (in above), the agent's expressionistic policy simplifies voters' problems directly when he will fix all of them correctly .

11.1.4-The Fourth Electioneering Campaign Promise is "I will do everything within my power not to touch Social Security" by Donald Trump

1-The condition of conventional proposition: Trump predicates about his commitment to carry out a future course of action through his implicit promise of preserving American's Security, of Medicare and of Social, in safe. He expresses his real intention with "I will" to bring out his promise speech act in non-past

period of time by putting his newest contribution inside the right rail way condition since as a Conservative Republican wants to help, not to obstacle, their followers' benefit. So, those predication must be effectively done for a particular illocutionary force which achieves in saying meaningful undertaking sentences.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: Trump politically succeeds in his ideologies, especially when he turns strong points and additional ammunition of his campaign speech against his democratic contenders. Thus, by his beneficiary promising, he pragmatically gathers, by this utterance "it's my absolute intention to leave Social Security the way it is" the differing understandings of the publics about his negative picture, according to opponents' speeches, and his positive seeking in social structures of human needs. And the agent will respectively appear to have largely awareness of the doctrine of pragmatic positivity.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: Shedding more light on security whether it is Social or Medicare, via readable analysis, elaborate Trump's intention to perform honestly his act to the needy of the American nation, according to his foregoing predication.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: Trump prototypically intends to accomplish the promising action perfectly and correctly since the speech act of promise can be achieved even though there are some constrains of the formality, power, and ideology among the communicators or agents for that action. Thus, Trump's promise will depend on politics in its relation to the pragmatic meaning as in "we're going to save your Social Security and we're going to save your Medicare. We are going to save it because we're going to make our country rich again" and on an appropriate understanding to keep asymmetrical points in save.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-Under the quantity terms, Trump expresses required things as his future action for the pre-voters. These required information as in "you save it by making the United States, by making us rich again, by taking back all of the money that's being lost" will depend on the agent's higher ability and the degree of optionality for the succession of quantitative illocutionary force.

b-Term of quality, in this excerpts, maintains the strength desire of the promise's agent plus his real trend performativity, unlike contenders' utterance who criticizes them that "all you hear is all talk, no action", and of course this will give him more preferability and acceptability than the other candidates, in reducing misunderstanding channels, through an apt equivalents and engagements.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-The degree of agreement or disagreement politely depends on the genus of the beneficiary action, and the tolerance of agent's ability. Therefore, Trump exemplary recognizes the American families' satisfaction, and this promising action, when it occurs, relies in part on those families' polling.

b-The degree of sympathy and antipathy will maximize or minimize by discussing the abstracted and unavoidable ideas as in "we have in Social Security thousands of people over 106 years old". Trump, regardless of some aggressive features, improves, by adopting polite and pragmatic program, that he is a practical man and tries to make America rich again. This issue is one of the most significant topics of his strategies and aims, that he will achieve in precedence if he will be the next forty-five President, under politeness conventions.

11.2-Electioneering Campaign Threaten of Donald Trump

11.2.1-The First Electioneering Campaign Threaten is "My number one priority is to dismantle the disastrous deal with Iran" by Donald Trump

1-The condition of conventional proposition: Neuroticism, imperialism, and classes conflictions where they exist in any society improve that their agents are not believed the rights and obligations that the others must have, therefore those agents, like Trump, use threatening acts as a weapon and a propaganda of his campaign. After criticizing his opponents with their staff as a "terrible negotiators" as a part of his plan in amending their past contributions, Trump ultimately predicates that "Iran cannot be allowed to have a nuclear weapon" as a future threatening action. Thus, such threatening act expresses the agent's thought and ideologies.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: The language of conflict grows where agents exist. The struggle of dominance, under the titles of imperialism's issues, logically appears where there is a link and dislink of the general political uses and misuses. In pragmatic manipulation, Trump strongly uses the political language of "under a Trump Administration, will never be allowed to have a nuclear weapon" to fill the opponents' gaps and gain voters' enthusiasm, namely, the agent's certainty improves, through the pragmatic communication, that his threatening act has two dimensions, that they are social and emotional, especially when these actions are campaigner's plan.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: Trump sincerely intends to accomplish his threatening act against Iranian nuclear weapon since, he thinks that, that weapon is the only one whereby Iran can destroy Israel. And at the same time, he attacks the previous president Obama, saying that "President Obama has not been a friend to Israel. He has treated Iran with tender love and care and made it a great power. Iran has, indeed, become a great, great power in just a very short period of time, because of what we've done. All of the expense and all at the expense of Israel, our

allies in the region and very importantly, the United States itself" as a part of his general policy.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: Under the strong commitment, threaten speech act obligates the future United States' president to specific state of affairs. The negative state of affairs against Islamic republic of Iran increases where the latter's behaviour of non-compliance decreases toward the former's threatening action. Linguistically, threatening action in the utterance "Iran is a very big problem and will continue to be, but if I'm elected President, I know how to deal with trouble" regards a form of coercion in order to impose on that nuclearian states or countries, like Iran, to do reluctantly (involuntarily) matters according to what the agent means by his sets of (the abovesaid) propositions.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-The quantity performance of threatening speech act depends on the required and the precise needed information, no more and no less than the foregone formula. Since the topic of nuclear deal is argumentative one, the agent of threaten act , in order to gain national and global advocacy and in order to avoid the disagreement voices or actions, can depend, as Holfmann's (1993:276f) note, on interactional pragmatic aspects and supposed violations in confirming his sanctions or bad actions.

b-Threatening speech act of qualitative achievement depends on the numbers of evidences that Trump can provide them the other opponents of Democratic Party as well as the broad society. The truth of these evidence, from politics point of view, depends on moods, ethics, religious, the nearest distance with Israel and some other issues. Thus, supporters will cooperatively recognized Trumpian sanction as part of their president nominee's proposition of threatening act.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a. According to politeness parameters which are required to convey communicative intent, the agent Trump, in pragmatics and politics' viewpoints, confidently bridges threatening action with his partisan via titles of dangerous their world peace. Consequently, those publics share him, after their realization to specific identification of his attitudes, threatening future course by their agreement and turn their disagreement toward Iran.

b-Partisans in many times validate, their government's cabinet or candidate's speech act whether threatening or promising, as the language of semi-god. Elaborately, Trump's excerpts of threaten that "Iran has seeded terror groups all over the world", acquires him sympathies' supports and minimizes antipathies of the grey voters towards him. And Since Trump gives some predications of his threatening act directly and some others of it indirectly, the populaces must infer and drive those others' propositions cooperatively.

11.2.2-The Second Electioneering Campaign Threaten is "crush ISIS" by Donald Trump

1-The condition of conventional proposition: In order to lead United States into the safe side, the president candidacy puts himself under vigorous obligation. Trump, as if the next elected president wants to execute Islamic state in Iraq and Syria particularly, and around the world generically, depending on his leadership power and authority. Meanwhile and in his presidential campaign, Trump expresses, for populaces and the world, that "I'm the worst thing that's ever happened to ISIS" as a future course of action, i.e., Trump's propositions are not just abstract entities, but they are also objects of serious and various attitudes.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: After blaming ancestors of American presidents, especially Barack Obama, Trump Threatens ISIS gangs that he will be the bad thing against them. In this threatening action,

Trump potentially uses the speech act of promise to his followers on defeating ISIS groups since, according to Yule (1996:103-4), the agent of the action often uses, in his performance of strong obligation, some speech acts where they are not precisely promises in order to add more emphasis to the degree of that agent's commitment. Thus, Trump says, if he will be a president, the excerpt that "going to convey my top generals and give them a simple instruction. They will have 30 days to submit to the Oval Office a plan for soundly and quickly defeating ISIS" and by using a progressive aspect "going to", whatever the agent communicates, he wants to reflect a strong decision of threatening act before the time of speaking as a conscious policy.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: Trump emotionally impacts on the voters' feelings, after formal blaming Obama that the latter "is the founder of ISIS", via sharing the problem with them by using the pronoun "we" as in "we have no choice". Thus, he elaborates his obligation, by these utterances to them, correctly.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: In this type of treatment, threaten speech act, the agent, Trump, uses a series of states of affairs in order to improve his general ability to perform the bad action(s). Trump uses the pronoun "I" carefully as in "I have a plan...If I win" and "I would bomb the hell out of ISIS" which intending to terrify his opponents and broad enemies. So, this pronoun reflects agent's strong undertaking to American citizens. In other words, the truest proposition of these states of affairs represents what the electorates build, by one pragmatic inference way or another, to get their agent's need.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-Since the speech act of threatening sometimes divides into series of bad actions accompanied by an imperative clause, as Wierzbicka's (1987:178-9) explanation, that the agent does not specify what he importantly wants the other side to do.

Therefore, the researcher can here say that the required threatening acts are successfully if and only if these bad things perform quantitatively in a perfect way.

b-The use of the appropriate words regards one of the main techniques of the successful achievements. Trump uses qualitative threatening tactics when he imparts half battle to the apt and specialized persons as a future plan, for instance "and we can do that if we use our good people". And by this way, he politically exploits his threaten action with pre-voters positively.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-Within the rule of politeness, Trump uses threatening purpose to match electorates' things to his words. He refers to a nuclear weapon as a new tactic, but pragmatically he uses expressions which marking his humanity like "I'm never going to rule anything out-I wouldn't want to say. Even if I wasn't, I wouldn't want to tell you that because at a minimum, I want them to think maybe we would use them" in order to win voters of weak-hearted and then to avoid their disagreement against his threatening action.

b-One of the effectiveness words in politeness rule is the strategy of what the agent's has in two ways and keeps his solution's keys to an apt time. The 2016 candidate to run the position of authority, Trump, allegedly threatens his enemies by his famous words (which we above-mentioned completely) "I'm the worst thing..." on one way, and threatens American hesitated voters as in "really, ISIS was formed", on the other. These two ways ideologically turns voters' sympathies towards him whereas pushes antipathies against Islamic state in Iraq and Syria, and any elsewhere (which may be somewhere in America).

11.2.3-The Third Electioneering Campaign Threaten is "I will build a great, great wall on our southern border, and I will have Mexico pay for that wall" by Donald Trump

1-The condition of conventional proposition: The first predication of the 45 president candidate is that "we will make America safe again" as a general promise not only for American nation, rather than it is for all nations of the globe according to imperialistic viewpoints. In order to save his promise, Trump predicates populaces that Mexico is a dangerous source upon America and he will build the strongest wall, as a future course of threatening action, at the America state borders with that southern state. The agent's decision, here, does not only about what he wants to communicate badly, but also about what he will constrain the enemy's activations elaborately.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: Across geography, culture, trade, history and religion points wherein Mexico can stretch its outlines into United States borders. But Trump, across his threaten, accuses Mexico via an enquired of interrogative clause of "what can be simpler or more accurately stated? The Mexican Government is forcing their most unwanted people into the United States". Trump elucidates his threatening action, by warning those crimes, criminals, rapists, as well as drug dealers like heroin, cocaine and other illicit kinds which inter American borders via the Mexican suppliers. All these topics and according to his power, the American future candidate affirms that these matters are "got to stop fast". Respectively, this excerpt emphasizes the context of situation by an emphatic adverbial phrase of "fast" to link agent's charismatic dominance with his next verifiable position.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: After many enquiries to the president candidacy about sending Mexican away procedures, Trump affectionately replies by using the pronoun "we" as in "we're rounding them up in a very humane way, in a very nice way. And they're going to be happy because they want to be legalized. And, by the way, I know it doesn't sound nice. But not everything is nice" in order to send his message of a plural and cooperate intended decision.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: The most important commitment which stands beyond Trump's decision of building that wall is an imperative clause with the capital "E" as in "End Illegal Immigration Act". Trump wants to achieve his threatening act, as a presidency man, perfectly and correctly "we are not talking about isolation. We're talking about security. We're not talking about religion. We're talking about security" via procedures of exploitations and manipulation like the language of nation, modernity means, military or ethics conquest. Strictly speaking, the agent's indirect answer enforces Mexican government to his contextual assumptions of pragmatic threaten.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-The republic candidate gives his quantitative information, to the publics generically, as it is required. And he diagnoses these information pragmatically with a progressive and dynamic aspect that the Mexican people have "lots of problems", "bringing those problems to us", "bringing drugs", "bringing crime", and "rapists". Therefore, he will, as a forthcoming president, oblige himself to border guards. Whilst, Trump's electorates, according to all these information, can drive automatically their evaluative role toward their apt agent.

b-The necessity norms of quantitative information reflects, at the same time, the required evidence to achieve agent's justification of felicitous threatening speech acts since Trump's communicative intention can politely infers by his partisans that the Mexican are not the right persons. Thus, Trump's qualitative threaten speech act can work only in pragmatics since most speech acts, within any dialogue, can give more formal status to the implicature of linguistic events.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-Trump's speech in his 2016 presidential elections exposes impassive volition within placid expressions in order to make his pre-voters people sharing and

agreeing with him (whereas disagreeing feelings will be elicited) about the action when he says Mexican are rapists but some of them are good. While he immovably addresses Mexican government as in "Mexico will pay for the wall" as a coercive action.

b-Trump's information, that he gives about the worse things of those coming persons from borders, maximizes their sympathies with him especially after his famous words of ability with "can" as in "there certainly [can] be a softening because we're not looking to hurt people", and these tactics absolutely decrease their antipathies with his threatening speech act as a future states of affairs.

11.2.4-The Fourth Electioneering Campaign Threaten is "If Obama, through his weakness, lets them come in, I'm sending them out if I win" by Donald Trump

1-The condition of conventional proposition: In this threaten's excerpts, republican candidate delates the past democratic president Barack of allowing Syrian refugees to come United States in. Trump believes that people wants their president big and strong to make the state more tough, therefore he shows to his electorates that tens of thousands want to come to their country and uses the pronoun "we" in "we have no idea who they are" as a participation means to some coming outrageous troubles like refugees' proposition, then, he continues, pointing to those refugees: from where they are coming and what about their feelings towards our country are. Meanwhile, he predicates about his threatening act, if he wins, that he will send them out of United States again.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: Syrian refugees, under terrorism pressure, escape into European Union States and United States as well. Even though, some European states' policies of housing those poorly refugees, Donald Trump as the luckiest nominee of the presidential elections 2016

in his campaigns expostulates on let refugees of Syrian come in U.S. He inevitably threatens them by the pronoun "you" as in "you can't come here" referring to the precise future bad result would wait violators of them.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: Trump severely attempts to achieve his threaten action of prevent sheltering refugees. He, allegedly in plural pronoun "our", commits himself that "problems our country has" referring to many security hiatuses occur whereas those Syrians' people are come to have problems.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: Trump politically manipulates in campaign language to match world to words in Syrian refugees issues as in "their parents should always stay with them", and by using threaten action he seeks latter's excerpt problems in two ways, the first is the literal advising speech in an unoptional degree of "should", whilst the other implicit one is obliquity prevent of "can't" which borrows from the first excerpt (in here-up) which expresses the main nature of pressure and threat plus agent's commitment totally manifest that his worse action does not need to discuss it again since the agent of the action has all the keys of rights and obligation imperialistically.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-Here Trump uses politics of imperialism in decision of not accepting refugees' protection. When he disavows his face with the plural pronoun of "we" as in "we don't know where their parents come from. We have no documentation whatsoever. There's absolutely no way of saying where these people come from" and pointing to refugees saying "some of whom are going to have problem", he justifies, with those required appropriate information, his threatening action, as well as with subjective pronoun "we", he commits himself under costly future action.

b-The Trumpism evident of "no" as in "we don't...we have no...there's absolutely no way..." regards the truest one from the politics points of view. He also uses "can" and "can't" as in "I can look at their faces and say, 'Look, you can't come here" to expose that those verbs have modal and actual functions pragmatically when they occur in the present tense as well as they support agent's potential ability to perform perfect quality act of threaten.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-In order to gloss over the facts, Trump offensively besets German Chancellor Merkel as in "she ought to be ashamed of herself, what she's done" for letting refugees of Syria to lodge in her state. He wants, by this accusing act, to get domestic agreements of populaces on one side, and to minimize the hiatus of disagreement with him, and by the way, to support his guarantee of threatening performative action quintessentially.

b-Another manipulation (and somehow other researchers read it justifications as well), Trump tries to mitigate his followers, partisans, and grey voters as well when he politely declares of establishing "safe zone" in Syria's land for refugees in order to end his dialogue socially and to move (those's who represent electoral base) sympathies toward him and to rehash their antipathies against him simultaneously.

11.3-Electioneering Campaign Promise by Hillary Clinton

11.3.1-The First Electioneering Campaign Promise is "you'll always have a seat at the table" by Hillary Clinton

1-The condition of conventional proposition: Hillary Clinton, the first woman to be democrat presidential candidate of the 2016, supports the education, educators, students, and many others of reforming bits. She thinks that the education

constitutes the cornerstone in adopting any international reform program. She, in a highly progressive desire, predicates American's families and institutions as well that they will have the biggest zone in her presidential performance if she will be the elected president. Then, she adds, addressing populaces, that everyone of you will be "a partner in the White House" as a future electioneering promise of action.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: In blending politics with pragmatics, Hillary's ideology reflects in a more hopeful and optimistic aims when she addresses her electorates as in "If I am fortunate enough to be elected president". Regardless of the agent's will is very high, those populaces' optionality needn't be maximized since the promising action is programming for adults, children, and little kids as a beneficiary course of action, whilst the promisor appears as a very good responsible person with her voluntarily action on the other hand. Thus, Hillary's successful obligation is often stated in terms of contextual influences to explain what will achieve by what she meant before.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: Education concept, in presidential campaign, emphasizes a sincere will of the nominee when it connects macro performance of institutions with micro structures of individuals via multiple means of her ideology.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: Under strong obligation to achieve a future state of affairs, Hillary adopts in her campaigning program the education topic as a future duty and intends to perform his promising action since there are universal and specific connections between promising speech act and obligation which reflect agent's multiple means of speaking and performing. The pronoun "we" as in "we can and must do better" affirms that the promisor and the promisees will share in saving their carpetbagger action via an apt adoption and motivation for their heroine's presidential campaign.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-The program of education as a future course of action has multiple sides of advantages, purposes and practices such as the "Common Core", "Charter schools", "Public schools", "Better tests as to how to improve the educational outcomes", "Early childhood education", "Every child should have the same opportunity", "Accountability measures", and "Obama's plan to make community college free" which represents a very intensive required information that Hillary performs as future states of affairs, and in particular, perfect promise must determine the content or force of the quantitative illocutionary acts.

b-When the agent of the promising action, Hillary, adopts what she undertakes to achieve whole-heartedly, she will potentially elaborate the future pledge via the process of transportation of the carpetbagger's action to her voters who want every quality bit if it. And when the agent, Hillary, conveys something at a specific stage of the conversation, she establishes what things could be required and evident only in passing her things correctly.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-Between the advantages and disadvantages of each piece of education program, (agent of the action will work under the assumption that the addressees want her to perform that actual benefit action and) politely the electorates' will will increase their agreement whilst their will will decrease disagreement with agent's action "when schools get it right, whether they're traditional public schools or public charter schools, let's figure out what's working and share it with schools across America" on the other side, i.e., the positive and negative sides of the agreement sometimes elaborate a good deal of implied meaning rather than state it explicitly.

b-Since the purpose Hillary's promising action is to create balanced in opportunities, she supports reforming education's program for the interest of

American families and individuals as well. Her electoral base will adopt part of the ground edification as a kind of replying her polite action via their maximizing their sympathies toward her and vice versa with their antipathies. In successful overlapping between the promisor and the promisees as in "enroll in a simplified income based repayment program so that borrowers never have to pay more than 10 percent of what they make", the amount of Hillary's audiences' inferring information depends on the shared knowledge between the former and the latter.

11.3.2-The Second Electioneering Campaign Promise is "I won't cut Social Security" by Hillary Clinton

1-The condition of conventional proposition: The 2016 president candidate Hillary expresses her kindly intention to provide her campaigner with the most well-sensitive program that is a Social and Medicare Security. She predicates all the needy American families that their Security in both sides will be, if she is elected, a red line in the utterance "I 'll defend it" as a future states of affairs, which represent things, activities, relationships in the world in matching agent's words and then obligation.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: However, Hillary, as the agent of promising act, has high strongly emotions to perform her undertaking with the subjective pronoun "I" and the ability of "will" will assume at the moment of speech that the promisor via her pledge and undertaken, commits herself as a leadership power to the propositional content of the promising action in order to connect her ability via "I 'll expand it" as a future president and to bridge with her electorates faith and trustful action across her promise as a future action.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: Hillary, according to her humanity nature as a first nominee woman to be the 2016 America president, faithfully assures her reforming program via her excerpt's "we should protect and expand it" , thus, she

also affirms her obligation with "should" as a strongly commitment means in accomplishing future act.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: The obligation of promise speech act, whether in pragmatics, politics, or any other rhetoric speech, regards one of the most effective issues since the agent's action as Hillary here by aiding of the contextual and situational features, helps the addressee to be recognized of her wanting action via high certainty will of the ambidextrous promise who clearly knows the promisee's desire as in "her commitment to give Americans in every state the choice of a public-option insurance plan", viz., the kind of beneficiary knowledge depends on factors and things that the agent makes them in use through the context of situation.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-The actuality required information of politicians who obliges herself to perform the promising action as in "recognizing that nearly a fifth of all adults in the United States-more than 40 million people-are coping with a mental health problem" represents Hillary's commitment towards her populaces via the choice of the public insurance plan as a future course of action since the promising action is realized whenever the communicators aware.

b-Hillary as a candidate to lead American nation gives her partisans qualitative promise via her adopting the choice of the public insurance policy as the truest action. Further, she affirms her faithful obligation via her specific illocution of manipulation as in "I fully support Social Security" to declare with "I" the quality perfect of the full promise since in some cases of dialogues, the kind or quality of act is implicitly marking by the verb of that speech act.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-When the agent of the action, Hillary, has the closest relationship with her audiences or addressees, the degree of agreement will increase and the disagreement degree will decrease as in "I will not go along with raising the retirement age as the answer to everything that ails Social Security" which reflects a natural and personal obligation as being a member of these families' community, and in the latter's excerpt, she maintains with "not" indirectly to allow for her addressees some freedom to be interrogated.

b-Hillary's politely plan of Social and Medicare security supports government solidarity with the needed-classes of both families and individuals. She elucidates the positive effects of her beneficiary action as in "there's a clear choice in this election: either we're going to help American families and tackle health care cost issues, or we're going to throw 20 million people off their coverage and let the insurance companies write the rules again" in order to gain their voters sympathies and to minimize their antipathies and thus, her undertaking speech will politically rhapsodize the degree of her honestly achievement of her future action.

11.3.3-The Third Electioneering Campaign Promise is "I will make combating climate change a top priority from day one, and secure America's future as the clean energy superpower of the 21st century" by Hillary Clinton

1-The condition of conventional proposition: One of the successful ideologies that the candidate should be adopted is the effective topic to his/her presidential campaign. Hillary supports group of the last democrat president's decisions and policies with his staff, and the most significant one of these issues is the climate change as in "I applaud President Obama, Secretary Kerry, and our negotiating team for helping deliver a new, ambitious international climate agreement in Paris", then she predicates her electorates that she will fight for America's beneficiary action and this illocutionary utterance elucidates the attempt to obtain confirmation about the agent's ability to perform her predication.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: The democratic candidate Hillary advocates Obama's policies of energy, power, and climate change. The agent's of the action, here, expresses the general statement of the performance of the illocutionary force of promising action, namely "I", "will", "top priority", and "America's future" which reflects nominee's characteristics and ability to perform her future undertaken for the American nation to be "superpower". Consequently, this declarative illocutionary act suits to perform strong commitment depending on the sentence form that she utters, particular circumstances like agent's ability and action' positivism that the communicators have to do.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: Hillary intends to save her promise in multiple sides or dimensions, some of them are "we will fight climate change by making America the clean energy superpower of the 21st century" and "we'll build a cleaner, more resilient power grid with enough renewable energy" reflecting high degree of strength and ability, and by using the pronoun "we", the agent heartily cooperates in solution with her electoral base.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: Stability and continuity in an institution work represents one of the successful policies in any institutional polity system. Hillary affirms on her promising work since here not only the promisor, and the promisee are the carpetbaggers sides of the action, but also there is a third side which represents the States of Paris international climate accord. Moreover, She challenges further opponents, saying that "climate change deniers and obstructionists should know-their cynical efforts will fail" by using imperative "should" to declare her responsibility of such promising act.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-Hillary' harmonization with Obama's policies on energy and environmental shows, in addition to the most required information, that "proud the U.S. is signing the Paris climate deal. What better way to celebrate Earth Day than taking action to help save our planet?" would achieve her future quantitative states of affairs. And under the maxim umbrella, the agent's mechanism will exploit pragmatic coincidence and conversational adjustments to be cooperatively effectual.

b-Hillary's real and truest above evidences provides the superiority of America's cleaner energy and later on she expresses that "I'm proud that we shaped a global climate agreement. Now we have to hold every country accountable to their commitments" to be sincere in her universal obligations of this beneficiary action with all accord's countries, Hillary gives her electorates more guarantees that her propositional utterances will not be asymmetrical one with the targeting promise.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-Whenever the agent uses a pronoun in a subjective form as "we" in her speeches, this will function, under the pragmatic aspects, as a cooperating investigation which gives the agent's aptness degree of power while it gives the addressees appropriate technical option of inferring the implied points of quality promise via maximizing agreement doctrine and minimizing the not agreement one.

b-Collaborating purposes in politics manipulates pragmatic means like increasing sympathies between interlocutors while decreasing antipathies between them. Thus, Hillary politely reduces some viewpoints as in "the Paris climate agreement is an historic step. We don't have to choose between economic growth and protecting our planet-we can do both" to maintain that her responsible duty as a future course of action will be an actual calculation to their intended ambitions.

11.3.4-The Fourth Electioneering Campaign Promise is "We have always welcomed immigrants and refugees" by Hillary Clinton

1-The condition of conventional proposition: According to the international traditions and customs and according to an exceptional natural and Humana case of the agent of the action, Hillary pledges Syrian refugees especially and all immigrants generally, that if she will be the elected president, they will be welcomed. This promise speech act across the plural pronoun "we" significantly carries the ability of the achiever and the action's characteristics must contain more benefits for those escapers from their dangerous zone. Thus, she predicates that its propositional objects will contain what the promisor and the promisees do with its contents.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: Hillary, here in this excerpt, is the kindest woman will be the 2016 American president, promises, unlike her contender Donald, refugees of Syrian land and other tiredness countries as well as asylum seekers that they have a fair opportunity to inform their sufferings and stories and she, as a responsible person, welcomes and protects them as a future course of action. It is consequences that the agent's utterance in a particular context or conversation as in "I want to see them on a path to citizenship. That is exactly what I will do" conveys additional meaning which varies according to the utterance act's circumstances wherein can be described by the sentences of predication itself.

3-condition of authentic sincere: Honestly, Hillary pledges in her promise for her partisans at least that the refugees' issues will be the most fundamental topic if she will be elected. However, she assures that American nation is not "just electing a president", but "we're also electing a commander-in-chief. That choice matters" and by sharing the pronoun "we" and the present tense, she improves a good name and deserves the priority in performing her action pragmatically.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: Hillary intends to achieve her beneficiary undertaking action according to the title of obligation since

according to Leech (2008:89), there are a dynamic goals which enable the promisor of changing the environment and situation for her addressee. Thus, the agent's action here as in "If you're in law enforcement ... you want the people in the communities that you are looking to get information from to feel like they want to help you. And if the message from people who are running for president, for example, is that we don't want to take any Muslims whatsoever, that's not good for law enforcement." performs his pledging via matching things to her words, namely precise aspects of her speeches and deeds are encountered as strong obligation.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-The promisor's satisfied and enough information supports path of performance wherein the beneficiary action recognized by the promisees. Hillary strongly reassures, to her opponent candidate, her target goal as in "we may have differences but that's part of what makes us unique and strong", then adds, pointing to her supporters "we remain the symbol for human progress, for democracy, for an economy that produces real opportunity around the world" that this utterance of illocution force should infer by those supporters cooperatively as required knowledge of perfect quantitative promising action on basis of the agent's assumed intention.

b-Hillary's speech reflects cooperating side towards Syrian refugees and other cases of immigration. She perfectly means her pledging action as in "there would be a place for them in America", and under these real obligations and evidences, she sincerely performs her action qualitatively. And since cooperative maxims are an implicit pragmatics, Hillary's populaces will infer beyond what their agent's utter and mean explicitly.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-In order to pass an apt bridge from politeness rules to an achievement obligation of promise speech act, the agent of the action needs to justify her speeches' acceptability as in "we have made people feel that if they did their part, they sent their kids to school, they worked hard" and the result will politely and absolutely be the entrance of welcoming gate in America's land and by these elucidations, the degree of agree/disagree + maximize/minimize will end in voting for her pragmatically.

b-In using the language of pragmatics in use in politics, the agent intends to pass her experience via maximize sympathies and minimize antipathies channels for her populaces in general and for supporters in particular since the promisor knows, from her high previous leadership position, that the addressees will ratiocinate abovementioned implications. The interpretation of her utterance by her audiences correctly, Hillary will go ahead in her communicative intention evident as a future course of action.

11.4-Electioneering Campaign Threaten by Hillary Clinton

11.4.1-The First Electioneering Campaign Threaten is "Our goal is not to deter or contain ISIS, but to defeat and destroy ISIS" by Hillary Clinton

1-The condition of conventional proposition: Hillary expresses her high intention in performing what she threatens to do against what it was medially known "Islamic State in Iraq and Syria". She predicates American nation that her future action's "non-past" time begins in "a new phase and intensify and broaden our efforts to smash the would-be caliphate and deny ISIS control of territory in Iraq and Syria" and this implies the very worse threatening action will happen against those out-law groups of non-Islamic state, since the agent here wants to perform illocutionary acts whose its performance associated with the total situation.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: ISIS, as a terrorism organization or groups wherein their strongholds spread in west and north Iraqi's lands, most regions of Syria and Libya in addition to small Lebanonian zones as well as other separated regions. These gangs will not contain or deter, but they should be smashed as the 2016-2017 president candidacy, Hillary, maintains with "an accelerated coalition air campaign" and with the most supportive power of organized Iraqis and Syrian troops. Thus, The agent's action of threaten binds herself, with the most powerful means, which is described in the foregoing predication, that her performing will be the bad action.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: Hillary tries to elucidate the whole situation, as her future plans and general aims for her supporter and others of pre-voters that she will be firstly "like President Obama, I do not believe that we should again have 100,000 American troops in combat in the Middle East", secondly, "it's that local people and nations have to secure their own communities", and thirdly, "we can help them, and we should, but we cannot substitute for them" in order to be in sincere with them in performing threatening action.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: Hillary's words in her speeches, thought, knowledge, competence, and performance, maintains that her obligation does not recognizable function as an utterance only, it must always match its existence in the world outside to meet her promise perfectly. Therefore, Hillary's speech commits herself about how to fight ISIS, saying that "from my perspective, it matters what we do, not what we say" as a future course of action since her illocution threatening acts have high numbers in its connections with the nature types of its rooted sentences.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-The utterance of threaten speech act depends on successful quantitative strategies like "effective coalition air campaign", "allied planes", "more strikes", "a broader target set", "immediate intelligence surge", "technical assets", "Arabic speakers with deep expertise in the Middle East", and "closer partnership with regional intelligence services". It seems that the agent can not, in conversational pragmatics, cooperate something to the addressees without also cooperating those facts that she pledges to do as apart of her confirmation of how, as a president candidate, to fight terrors gang.

b-After Hillary predicates her successful strategies in accomplishing quantitative threaten act, she elaborates and shares it with her partisans throughout the performative pronoun "we" such the utterance as "we have seen that ISIS is a very effective recruiter", "propagandist" as well as "inciter" and "celebrator of violence" to complete her cooperative side of participation with truths and evidences in executing threatening act of form-quality to keep the all in safe.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-When the agent of the threatening action adopts a series of strategies like "we will provide essential, unique capabilities", then the agreement and disagreement relationship between the agent and the electorates will activate according to the close social distance and the acceptability of the threatening action. Thus, addressees' inferring of agent's utterances is potentially communicating their explicit enquires.

b-The relationship which takes place between Hillary and her publics politely concerns by using the agent's action cooperation issues and topics such as "I think there are three things that [we] have to get right". Consequently, the pronoun "I", the un steadfast word "think" and "we" imply agent's sympathies bridges and also reduce antipathies gaps. However, agent's action succeeds in her obligation of

doing what she pledges for her voters since her inquiries about addressees' polling involves that she knows her threatening act's content and also the capability of her addressees.

11.4.2-The Second Electioneering Campaign Threaten is "I oppose the Trans-Pacific Partnership" by Hillary Clinton

1-The condition of conventional proposition: The agent of the threatening action, Hillary, intends to withdraw from an accord of TPP, viz., Trans-Pacific Partnership. She exposes her viewpoints, via the utterance of may be taken as giving a command, threaten, or promise by depending on the context, at the Democratic platform of presidential campaign that there are too much loopholes in this agreement, therefore she predicates, those who trustful in her economical policies if she will elect, that her threaten action of withdraw will be for their advantage and at the same time, it will be very worse against China, and other participators in this accord as well.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: According to imperialistic policy in thriftiness of many opportunities for their followers' conciliation and interests, the agent logically indicates the precise illocutionary force by the platform's utterance. Here Hillary expresses her authority, strong capacity, and high intention to accomplish what she wants to do. The reason which stands beyond her action, Hillary declares about in "I saw what was in it, it was clear to me there were too many loopholes, too many opportunities for folks to be taken advantage of". After blending unjustified characteristics of this accord and bad results of it, Hillary simultaneously conveys her worried for their voters and elaborates her certainty which later on holds out her threatening act.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: After increasing loopholes of this accord with Pacific countries, Hillary reflects their Americans pre-voters' aims and ordinary

people's interests at the top of her priorities when she sincerely wants to achieve any future good or bad action.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: The 2016 democratic candidate for president position, Hillary, intends to make their partisans, grey voters and Pacific accord's states as well, believe that her obligation will strongly be achieved since the action of threaten psychologically depends on the agent's high desire in dominating and on manifestation of what she has of power, impose and at least coercion to do what she undertakes to achieve, since the effective achievement of the intended threatening meaning of the agent must be recognized by the addressees that this action will be done quintessentially.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-The agent of the action concerns specific quantitative obstacles which lead herself to execute the target course as in "we can not let rules of origin allow China-or anyone else, but principally China-to go around trade agreements". So the cooperative principles will enable the agent shares the foregoing conclusions, intended meanings, as well as contextual beliefs, and hence she and the partisans emphasis their communicative intent in a political situation which shifts the language from the formal system to the language in use in community .

b-The truth evidences, of the agent to perform executive threatening action, explain the multiple attempts to overcome these weaknesses and loopholes, and the agent hence achieves her qualitative threatening action successfully. Thus, the two maxims elaborate performativity of threaten speech act where it progresses in two directions. It is consequence that the equipoise of quantitative information enables interlocutors to perform qualitative threaten against the whole Pacific trade at the end.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-The agreement/disagreement degree between the agent of the action and his voters, against States of Pacific accord, depends on the ability after diagnosing the constrains as in "my standards for more new, good jobs for Americans, for raising wages for Americans. And I want to make sure that I can look into the eyes of any middle-class American and say, 'this will help raise your wages.' And I concluded I could not", and the solution of the agent's choice will be the threatening act against China and other latter colleagues in order to do her fulfillment things and inquires.

b-According to mathematical hypotheses, there are multiple choices to perform one result. Throughout sympathy and antipathy degree in politics and politeness, there is a dynamic flexible communicative intention where the differentiations of power maximizes and minimizes according to ethnicity and agent's community speech.

11.4.3-The Third Electioneering Campaign Threaten is "I support President Obama's call to both strengthen the sanctions passed earlier this year with the United Nations and to impose additional sanctions" by Hillary Clinton

1-The condition of conventional proposition: The democratic presidential nominee, 2016, via a series of discussions, expresses her careworn of the nuclear spread, alleges that the unfaithful regimes exploit this weapon nowadays. Hillary predicates her followers that United States' abilities in face to face military interaction developed too much, then adds that North Korea will be under very strong sanction as a future course of action whereby pragmatic functions.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: Hillary demonstrates her successful democratic platform when she advocates Obama's previous sanctions against Pyongyang. Exploiting pragmatic functions, according to the agent's threaten, sporadically consist worse object responses to universe labels of routines. As a president candidacy, Hillary's imperialistically sanctions depends on

serious universal refusable voice and the lack of mutual attentiveness with North Korean land.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: Under utilitarian sense, Hillary intends to save her pragmatic obligation not only in accomplishing it, but rather in establishing an addition to Obama's sanctions in order to maintain America's imperialistic rules of emergency, and she secondly wants to improve her chiefchip capability to perform threatening act sincerely.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: After, James Stavridis, a top adviser of Clinton's staff, tells that North Korea was "the most dangerous country in the world", Hillary apparently threatens her target enemy and their (semi-)allies as well that "we're going to ring China with missile defense. We're going to put more of our fleet in the area. So, China, come on, you either control them or we're going to have to defend against them" as a responsible person whose function is to weapon-control in the world perfectly and completely, i.e., the agent, for successful threaten, must communicate with her addressees the genus of speech act that she actually performs.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-The agent of this obligatory act, which discussed dichotomous discrimination of the most argumentative topics. One of the most happily quantitative view is that Hillary's words "If verified, this is a provocative and dangerous act, and North Korea must have no doubt that we will take whatever steps are necessary to defend ourselves and our treaty allies" to get electorates' pragmatically depiction of underlying speech functions and the required directness of the total situation.

b-Continuously with the required view to perfect threaten, Hillary re-affirms her unvague evidences as in "It's clear that the increasing threat posed by North Korea requires not only a rethinking of the strategy, but an urgent effort to convince the

neighbors, most particularly China, that this is not just a US issue", and Hillary implicitly declares the close mutual relationship between N.Korea and China and the latter must do her duty towards the universal society and United States will execute quality threatening speech act in use, against any negative violations on peaceful the world.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-Strictly speaking, Hillary exposes their campaigning policy of U.S multi-sides arrangement and institution regularities in order to attract their supporters' agreement and by the way, avoid bipartisans' disagreement, for instance "I would work with our allies in Asia, in Europe, in the Middle East, and elsewhere" and that's trilaterally ally (viz., the agent + Asia + Europe) will be appropriate sanctions against North-wicked land.

b-The major polite attractive or interactive speech act purposes is the sympathetic or antipathetic ways since when the agent's action, like the first presidential candidate woman Hillary, talks in such words as "that's the only way we're going to be able to keep the peace", the elaboration of tools pragmatically fills the hiatus positively via the pragmatic use of threatening act fulfillment over the earliest other speech uses.

11.4.4-The Fourth Electioneering Campaign Threaten is "pledging to act through executive action to close the gun-show loophole" by Hillary Clinton

1-The condition of conventional proposition: The agent of the action here wants to reduce, deter, and prevent the gun-sophisticated problem in order to protect innocent groups whether they are families or individuals. Although the differentiations in rules of correctness and adequacy used for assess the problem-target performance between democrat and republican delegates, Hillary as a

performer predicates her audiences and supporters about her future threatening act and hereby debars gun-selling.

2-The condition of non-defective preparatory and executory: Agent's rules of controlling the executive tools demonstrates that they are required an understanding of community relations. Thus, these rules represent the manifestation of illocution of threatening acts, against abusers, for which Hillary shows her willingness as in "it's hard. It's a very political, difficult issue in America, but I believe we are smart enough, we are compassionate enough, to figure out how to balance the legitimate" to be grasped accountable that are recognized via the presence of non-past time which accompanied by an imperative function of threatening speech.

3-The condition of authentic sincere: Hillary intends to perform her action by sharing her communicative intents to her populaces throughout certain conventions. She honestly puts her threatening speech acts, as responsible person between linguistic pragmatics and social leverage.

4-The Condition of performance perfectly and essentially: The 2016 president candidacy, Hillary, obligates herself to all aspects of pragmatic threatening act. In consequence, this excerpt in pragmatics and politics elucidate the many uses of people produce of well-formed meaningful force of proposition. In such words as "if Congress doesn't act, repealing a law that shields gun manufacturers from certain lawsuits, closing the 'Charleston loophole,' [and] prohibiting domestic abusers from being able to buy and possess firearms", the agent carries, the duty of saving America's domestic peace, upon herself as a responsible person.

5-The condition of quantitative-qualitative peculiarities:

a-The overlapping of required information actually occurs during an observable interaction between interlocutors. Meanwhile, the agent's action words maintains

that "we have got to do something about gun violence in America. [I will] take it on. There are many people who face it and know it, but then turn away" the problem is as a pluralistic phenomenon and with "we" the agent threatens violators whether they are individuals, manufacturers, or companies simultaneously, and by her cooperative means, she can pass threatening (or sanctioning) acts quantitatively.

b-These practical cases of violations need to social refusing and severely governmental procedures as a truth formats of meaningful laws and systems. Hillary cooperatively calls for the public in her utterance "I want to reiterate how important it is to not let yet another terrible instance go by without trying to do something more to prevent this incredible killing that is stalking our country" in order to go ahead, personally with "I", in establishing and performing the target threatening act of deterring and prohibiting this trade and of jailing the anti-laws users.

6-The condition of agreement-sympathy considerations:

a-The general list of expanded Obama's sanctions expresses social sufferings of the total community as a group. Hillary's polite expression as "we send this message of solidarity" seeks the use of the probabilities of language for the politician's interest via gradually evolving agreement and collapsing disagreement of the collaborators' interactive concern.

b-However, the verbal communication in culture, convention, and vocalization of the pragmatics' use of language such an interrogative type following form of inquires as "how many innocent people in our country-from little children, church members, to movie theater attendees-how many people do we need to see cut down before we act?", psychologically moves enthusiasm, sympathies, soliloquies, and

so on of participation and advocacy toward the agent's threatening action for their peace, and antipathies against abusers.

12-Findings, Discussions, And Conclusions

At first, this research is regarded as an attempt to shed further confirmation on a very new of an argumentative issue of the so called direct and indirect speech acts in presidential campaign. So, the need for further study on this topic is done apparent by the generic survey of the most significant and related theories of speech acts in section three and four. In this survey, we seek how the agent's knowledge and his/her significant role work in performativity of utterances. Two scopes of meaning of explicit and implicit, by careful search, improves that there are further and potential meanings of illocutionary acts, that are "hybrid" explicit meaning and "none" meaning which they are provided with examples. Then, some modifications add to the three traditional levels of utterances. Elaborately, the importance of Cooperative Principle is done through its existence in performing quantitative and qualitative speech acts perfectly and in order to end the speech act situation in a sociability way, we need to apply Politeness Principles to manage the agreement or sympathy positively for the benefit of the agent of the action since Trump and Clinton's campaigners speeches more direct and explicit than implicit and indirect one, these politeness strategies, particularly in self/other enrichment, will exploit, as Leech's (1983:39) clarifications, as a general pragmatic tenets of goal directed behaviour that are judged to be compatible with the performance of their purposes.

The other sections of this research shows that there are many struggles along with previous traditional campaigns inside and outside America via the nominee's characters and policies. Even though the differences of candidates' characters or traits, there are a unified features of the performers or politicians, or the total political situation which were discussed in "performativity traits". Those

candidates' accusations, via charismatic illocutions, may beset their opponents by stigmatized their social and vocational picture immediately as in Trump's excerpt "If I win I am going to instruct my attorney general to get a special prosecutor to look into your situation-there has never been so many lies and so much deception", then he adds "you would be in jail", or they may accuse the others' party ancestors circuitously, especially when trump accuses Barack Obama's as an ancestor democratic president as in "If Obama, through his weakness, ...if I win", to come, after Trump's allegations, Clinton's vindication in refuting accusations in order to restore her lost preferability. So she (Clinton) starts in this excerpt "everything you have heard from Donald just now is not true. I am sorry to keep saying this but he lives in an alternative reality". Since political issues to feminists, according to Beard (2000:22), involves "far more than electing a government or voting for representatives; it involves a complete and thorough analysis of the way gender issues work in society. This was expressed at the time in the slogans 'the personal is political' and 'the political is personal'", Clinton's expostulation against Trump, saying that "we know, in our country, the difference between leadership and dictatorship. And the peaceful transition of power is something that sets us apart" on her comments on Trump's suspicions, and accusations.

On the other hand, Trump and Clinton's policies, in their presidential campaigners, contain their general goals or slogans, amenable plans, and future promises and threatens domestically and globally. Therefore, we shall mention some of their comparisons and differences, hereunder:

Trump carries his enthusiasm slogan "We will make America strong again. We will make America proud again. We will make America safe again. And we will Make America Great Again!", While Clinton's strongly slogan is "Stronger Together". But the specialists, of campaigners and slogans, say that Trump's slogan more effectual and elates Americans' feelings than Clinton's one since the dynamic

picture of Trump's slogan pragmatically maintains his performativity traits than Clinton's dynamicity reduction of her slogan. And electorates' reaction will make, future cooperative projects of Trump, performing in a more easiest way, the most quantitative and the most qualitative one via his domestically promises such as bringing more jobs, fixing education system, cutting taxes, and the like, or somehow globally threatens like protecting refugees, Iranian nuclear weapon, and so on. At the same time, Clinton has some fortunate since she focuses on global issues somehow more than the domestic one. She promises her partisans with fixing and investing education, and does not touch their Security of Social and Medicare but unfortunately failed when she remains Obama's care system. She also seeks global matters like immigrants protection and climate change, while her threatening actions discuss ISIS, controlling of spreading weapons, and some other topics.

However, leadership ability of the American economist Trump helps him on careful choosing to his campaign emotive issues. Trump politically manipulates at his threatening action since he ethnically threatens America's neighborhood "Mexican government" in building the strongest insulation wall, decrying Obama when he rejects immigrations, Iranian nuclear deal, and ISIS. These strongest threatens inevitably make Trump's ideology the very acceptable one among the other opponents. Contrariwise, Clinton's integrated her policy with the previous president Obama's one was exploited in a negative way by her chancellors' staff. When she attacks ISIS, she contradicts herself saying that America is the founder of ISIS in previous avowal. Then, she weakly threatens Pyongyang, Trans-Pacific Partnership, and controlling of weapons. These un emotive issues ideologically create hiatus with her populaces' goals.

Strictly speaking, Trump's propositions and predications based on pragmatic preparatory achievements. And his highly intention helps him in persuading the

publics about his essential obligation and sincerity pledging. After representing satisfied information and justifying truths and evidences like his comments on Climate Accord as a "total hoax", his partisans increase and he quantitatively and qualitatively expresses his promises and threatens. Ultimately, since he, according to Leech's (1983:82) note, politely assures the social counterpoise and close relations which draw his electorates to be cooperatively with him, Trump gains populaces' agreements and sympathies via their polling positively for him. Contrariwise, propositional contents of Clinton based on her previous political expertise in preparatory accomplishment. So with a highly kindness as a women, she make other opponents fall under suspicion and this also negatively impacts on American families' contentedness. She appears a very high intention to save her essential undertaking towards her supporters and this positively maximizes their agreement and sympathy towards her but this does not encounter Trumpian big number of supporting voices.

Linguistically, the researcher manifests that pragmatics in political use means the exploitation of the agent of the action to an appropriateness of sediment power and inheritance of practices. All these processes will be preceded by the utilization of the intention by the agent to match deeds to words wherein the agent's knowledge constitutes competence and performance to shape or reshape the context of situation again and again, whilst campaign in politics and pragmatics represents an attempt of manufacturing a communicative situation in a directness or an indirectness way. Its implicit tools and means mostly belongs to pragmatics since any spoken or written dialogue regards one aspect of the total pragmatic phenomenon, choices and its contextual meaning. Thus, they add that promise and threaten speech acts can be achieved felicitously in any conversational context , if firstly:

1-its convention of propositional content meticulously represents bits of execution of combinations' utterances.

2-its executory bifurcation concerns the speech facets of agent's performance of intention, (thoughts and manipulations) as pragmatic concrete of functions.

3-its sincere intention reflects psychological pragmatic marks, or signs, or images, or things.

4-its essential scope gives an appropriate approach to doubtless investigations.

And those speech acts can be performed felicitously, in any conversational medium, if secondly :

5-its cooperative strategies match things and words quantitatively and

qualitatively. 6-its politeness strategies match things and words correctly and perfectly where the agent precisely expresses him/her by self while refers to his/her populaces by others .

Consequently, the most well-known philosophers like Austin, Searle, Bach, Harnish, etc., logically agree with Burkhardt's (1990:69-72) views, that promise or threaten should depend on :

-Intending to do that promised or threatened thing

-Intending that promising or threatening words should place the agent under an obligation

-Intending that the addressee perfectly knows that this action (viz., promise or threaten) place the agent under the obligation

-Intending that the addressee recognizes this last intent by understanding the meaning of promising or threatening words.

As a recapitulation, Trump, uses direct and explicit promising and/or threatening speech acts in a very extremism way. He strongly discusses his issues with his opponents and allies as well. Also, he deftly and directly accuses former

presidents with their proper names. Threatens by Trump look a very bully and explicitly severe with his enemies. Sometimes, he uses "none" speech act as his spokesman's speech "... Trump is the only one who can do..." , and he assures it in an explicit and a hybrid ways simultaneously when he threatens Mexican government as in " as in "Mexico will pay for the wall" , then it is supposed that the Mexican answer, under America's authority and superiority will be yes. Whilst an indirect style of speech act verbs somehow inexplicitly functions in Trumpian's contexts. On the other hand, Hillary uses an unobvious explicit and direct style with her promises or threatens of speech acts. She kindly and sensitively dialogues and promises her supporters, devotees, and allies too. But, she nebulously and indirectly threatens America's and Americans' foes. Therefore and ultimately her slogan "stronger together" does not emulates pre-voters' aims and purposes.

13-Notes

1-This study mostly refers to the Democrat candidate with her first name "Hillary" in order to differentiate her from the former ancestor president, namely, Bill Clinton.

2-A-G represents the agent of the future course of action, as well as an addressor generally, here, represents the agent of the actions.

3-XSA elaborates on the future promise or threaten speech act.

4-R reflects multiple faces of an addressee as a receiver of the action.

5-Preparaory condition, in this paper, executes addressors' goals in accordance with Austin and Searle's potential and ostensible conditions of an obligation and commitment.

6-Sincerity condition is an authentic work, if the agent's action precisely achieves his/her future thing whether that thing is advantageous or costly one.

7-The performativity of the action essentially and perfectly depends on an appropriate propositional content.

13-References

Allan, K. (1994e). "Performative clauses". In: Brown, K. and Miller, J. (eds.): Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories. Oxford: Elsevier Science 1999, pp.291-294.

Allan, K. (1994i). "Speech acts and grammar". In: Brown, K. and Miller, J. (eds.): Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories. Oxford: Elsevier Science 1999, pp.350-352.

Austin, J. (1962). How to do Thing with Words. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bach, K. (2008). "Applying Pragmatics to Epistemology". Philosophical Issues, 18, pp.68-88.

Bach, K. (2004). "Speech acts and Pragmatics". In: Devitt, M. and Hanley, R. (eds.), The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Language. Oxford : Blackwell.

Bally, C. (1944). Linguistique générale et linguistique française. Francke.

https://ballotpedia.org/Presidential_election,_2016

Beard, A. (2000). The Language of Politics. London: Routledge.

Blackemore, D. (1992). Understanding Utterances: An Introduction to Pragmatics. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.

Burkhardt, A. (1990). Speech Acts, Meaning and Intentions: Critical Approaches to the Philosophy of John R. Searle. New York: de Gruyter.

Carnap, R. (1938). "Foundations of logic and mathematics". In: Neurath, O, Carnap, R. and Morris, C.W. (eds.), International Encyclopedia of United Science, Vol.1, pp.139-214.

<https://www.cbsnews.com/elections/2016/president/>

Cockcroft, R and Cockcroft, S. (1992). *Persuading People: An Introduction to Rhetoric*. London: Macmillan.

Coultras, A. (2003). *Language and Social Contexts*. London: Routledge.

Crystal, D. (2006). *How language works*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge.

Duranti, A. (2015). *The Anthropology of Intentions: Language in a World of Others*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dylgjeri, Ardita. 2017. "Analysis of Speech Acts in Political Speeches". *European Journal of Social Sciences Studies*, Vol.2,pp.19-26.

Edelman, M. (1977). *Political Language: Words That Succeed and Policies That Fail*. San Francisco: Academic Press, Inc.

El-Hussari, I.A. 2010. "President Bush's Address to The Nation on U.S. Policy in Iraq: A Critical Discourse Analysis Approach". In: Cap, P. and Okulska, U. (eds.), *Perspectives in Politics and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co, pp.99-117.

Fetzer, A and Oishi, E. (2011). *Context and Contexts: Parts meet whole?* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Green, G. (1996). *Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Mahwah: New Jersey.

Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harnish, R. (1976). "Logical Form and Implicature". In T. Bever, T, Katz, J. and Langendoem, T. (eds.), *An integrated theory of linguistic ability*. New York: Crowell, pp. 464-479.

Hassoun, M.K. (2011). *Pragmatic Analysis of Commissive Speech Acts in Some Selected Bernard Shaw's Plays*. Unpublished Thesis.

Holmann, T. (1993). *Realms of Meaning: An Introduction to Semantics*. United Kingdom: Longman.

Johansson, M, and Suomela-Salmi, E. (2011). "Énonciation". In Zienkowski, J, Verschueren, J. and Östman, J. (eds.), *Discursive pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp.71-101.

Leech, G. (2008). *Language in Literature: Style and Foregrounding*. Harlow, England: Pearson Longman.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mesthrine, R. (2001). *Concise Encyclopedia of Sociolinguistics*. Shannon: Elsevier.

Matthews, P. (2007). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. 2nd edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

May, J. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

<https://www.nytimes.com/elections/results/california>

O'Sullivan, T, Hartley, J, Saunders, D, Montgomery, M, and Fiske, J. (1994). *Key Concepts in Communication and Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Sadock, J. (2004). "Speech Acts". In: Horn, L and Ward, G (eds.), The Handbook of Pragmatics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp.53-73.

Searle, J. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1979). Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J and Vanderveken, D. (1985). Foundation of Illocutionary logic . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stalnaker, R. (1998). "On the Representation of Context". Journal of Logic, Language, and Information 7, pp.3–19.

Tendahl, M. (2009). A Hybrid Theory of Metaphor Relevance Theory and Cognitive Linguistics. England: Palgrave Macmillan.

<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/us-elections-2016>

Vanderveken, D. (2001). Universal Grammar and Speech Act Theory. In: Vanderveken, D. and Kubo, S. (eds.), Essays in Speech Act Theory. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co, pp.25-62.

Vanderveken, D. (2002). Searle on Meaning and Action. In Grewendorf, G. and Meggle, G. (eds.), Speech Acts, Mind and Social Reality: Discussions with Searle. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp.141-161.

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/category/2016-presidential-election/?utm_term=.2860b30bbb5a.

Wierzbicka, A. (1987). English Speech Act Verbs: A Semantic Dictionary. New York : Academic Press.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Zienkowski, J, Östman, J. and Verschueren, J. (2011). Discursive pragmatics.
Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.