A Pragmatic Study of Politeness and Gender: The Influence of Gender on Language Use: Lady Members of the American and British Parliaments as Case Study

Bushra Ni'ma Rashid

bushra.nima@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq

ABSTRACT

Politeness and Gender are represented in social and political interviews. Politeness is the main concept in linguistic pragmatics, and it is associated with human communication. While gender is simply described as being either male or female. The problem of this study is to organize which types of politeness strategies are used by Hillary Clinton and are not used by Margaret Thatcher. The study aims at explaining the role of different types of politeness strategies by the two women in order to show how social and cultural factors affect human behavior. It also intends to analyze the different kinds of politeness types, and politeness strategies (bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record) which are used by both Parliament’s members. To achieve this aim, it is hypothesized that: 1-there is a relation between gender and politeness. 2-British females are politer than American females. The model of the study is Brown and Levinson (1978-1987) of politeness because they categorize politeness types in clearest way with the strategies of politeness. The study is limited to some selecting internet interviews of the two members of parliaments, and some selected strategies of politeness. The data are collected from the internet as a data source case study and are analyzed according to the model chosen. The results show that British women use very small number of politeness strategies in their speech than American women.
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Introduction

In social life, the important function of language is by using it as a tool for communication because the speaker, by using the language, can explain what s/he wants to convey to the addressee. Yule (1996, p.4) states that pragmatics “is the study of the relationship between linguistic forms and the users of these forms.” Whereas, Yule (2010) states that, pragmatics is the study that deals with the use and interpretation of words and utterances in particular situation, and it is connected with politeness. Politeness is regarded as a communication strategy by which people can convey what they want to say, how they say it and with whom they speak to make a good communication and how people express their feeling or thought.

Brown and Levinson (1987) manifest the theory of politeness and Leech comments on that “politeness theory is the most commonly discussed account of language and politeness” (2014, p.81). According to Leech, there are three characteristics of politeness: the first characteristic is that ‘politeness is not obligatory’. He explains that it is possible to be impolite and if the person is impolite, s/he could be perceived as rude. Leech suggests that ‘the louder and the more prolonged the clapping is, the greater the appreciation signaled and the more polite the response’ is the second characteristic. The third characteristic is the kind of politeness which is used in ‘particular occasion’ for instance, if a violinist is playing a piano and the audience are clapping, it would be polite with this concert. But they keep clapping after the violinist departure, it would be over-politeness.

The study of politeness strategy is applied on the speech of the members of parliaments in both American and British congresses. The data are collected from the internet as a case study to reveal which type of speech is more polite than the other. To prove the hypothesis of this study, it will be clear in the analysis of the interviews. This study is divided into three sections. Section one represents the general introduction about the study’s topic. Section two includes a theoretical background of the subject and contains the relation between politeness and gender, factors of gender, women’s and men’s speech, politeness strategies and the notion of face. Finally, data analysis and results are codified in section three.

* Corresponding: College of Education, Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences, the University of Baghdad, Iraq.
**Politeness and Gender: A Theoretical Background**

The major theoretical work on politeness and gender has been undertaken by Penelope Brown and Janet Holmes by which each draw on the "stereotype of women's and men's behavior in relation to politeness" (Mills, 2003, p. 207). According to Holmes, women's speech as "more polite" than men's speech, because women tend to use "mitigating strategies" and express positive politeness in order to minimize or avoid threatening addressee's face (1995). Holmes (2003) proposes that women use positive politeness more than men and shows evidence for the feelings of the addressees more than men. Compliments and apologies are associated with positive and negative politeness respectively. Holmes (2003) also notes that women use tag questions to express positive politeness more than men who use (canonical) tag questions to express uncertainty and ask for confirmation. Women use different speech acts from those used by men, this means that women's language reflects "emotional expressivity" while men's language reflects toughness, control, and competitiveness. With the work of Brown and Levinson, Holmes defines politeness as a "behavior which activity shows positive concern for others." (Holmes, 1995). She states that positive politeness is a part of the "general stereotype" about women's behavior, also the use of negative politeness which is used to minimize the effect of FTA (Holmes, 2003). According to Brown (1980), politeness "is associated with care for others". Brown argues that the use of positive politeness by women is due to power differences across cultures. Lakoff states that women's speech includes the use of rising intonation with declarative utterance, women avoid imposing on their claims or mind on others they leave the desertion open to the hearer (Beeching, 2002).

Brown (1980) argues that women in general are more polite than men. She states that "in most cultures women among women may have a tendency to use more elaborated positive politeness strategies than men do among men" Brown adds in her work on the analysis of politeness amongst a Mayan community that "what politeness essentially consists in is a special way of treating people, saying and doing things in such a way as to take into account the other person's feelings. On the whole it means that what one says politely will be less straightforward or more complicated than what one would say if one wasn't taking the other person's feelings into account". She declares that the use of positive politeness by women because of the power differences within Mayan community. Many linguists have concluded that women's language trend to be hypercorrect than men's (Brown, 1980). According to Trudgill (1972), the reason behind women's style in using language is that women tend to obtain prestige through appearance and linguistic behavior. The assumption is that the hypercorrectness and the use of prestige types in English can be regarded as a matter of polite linguistic behavior, and this behavior will be insecure, so Brown claims that the women speak more formally and politely because their secondary status in contrast with the men since a higher level of politeness is expected from inferior to superior.

For Brown, if there is a shift in politeness, it means there is a change in respect, increase in social distance or a change of a threatening nature. She shows the ways in which the women are more polite than men by suggesting that “women either (1) generally speaking to superiors, (2) generally speaking to socially distant persons, or (3) involved in more face-threatening acts, or have a higher assessment than men have of what counts as imposition” (Brown, 1980).

According to Brown’s argument, gender is an extended complex variable. Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that Lakoff’s specific claim (that women are more polite than men) and all the empirical tests have been failed to prove them in detail ..., but the argument that women have a unique behavior due to their distinctive position in society, in spite of the appearance of negative evidence, (1987).

**Politeness**

Different definitions of the term politeness have been suggested, Yule (2010) clarifies that people can think of politeness in general as nice, modest, and tactful to others. It is the social and emotional sense "of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize." Thus, politeness can be defined as showing consideration and an awareness for another face. Politeness as "the action taken by competent speakers in a community" (Meyerhoff, 2011). Faspr and Nolan (1981) define politeness which is basically a contextual judgment: “no sentence is inherently polite or impolite, but the conditions under which they are used that determine the judgment of politeness”. Brown and Levinson (1987) insist that "in social interaction we present a face to other's faces."

To summarize, how people express politeness differs and varies on the basis of their cultures as well as context. Politeness is a form that people use in communication to maintain and construct relations.

**Politeness types and strategies**

Politeness strategy is "a strategy that is used to avoid of minimize disfiguration of self-image from Face Threatening Act by a speaker". There are four politeness strategies:

**Bald on record**
Bald on record “is a direct way of saying something without any minimization to the imposition, in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way.” (Brown and Levinson, 1978). According to Brown and Levinson, the speaker tells (explicitly or directly) what he/she wants from the hearer. Bald on Record strategy deals with Grice’s Maxims (1975) which reveals that people should put in their consideration (quality, quantity, relevance, and manner) Maxims. This means that people are obliged to tell the truth, not to say something less or more than is required, be relevant with the topic and avoid ambiguity. This type has 5 sub-strategies:

**Showing disagreement**

The speaker shows his opposition with hearer, for example:
1. Daniel: “Papa was going to let her take me”
   Nanny: “No, Daniel. Your Father would never have allowed it.”

**Give suggestion/advice**

This strategy is concerned with applying the suggestions/Advice to hearer, for example:
   Nanny: “you must undo it for yourselves”

**Requesting**

It is another sub-strategy of Bald on Record. This type of sub-strategy is employed by giving or making request to hearer to deliver the speaker’s intention. For Example:
3. Nanny: “Sebastian, your top button is undone. Lily, you have a little hair caught in your crook. Eric, help her, please. Your father will be down in a moment.”

**Warning/Threatening**

The most frequent type of Bald on Record, for example:
4. Brown: “Don’t contradict me!”
   Simon: “I’m not!”

**Using imperative form**

The speaker uses imperative to make a command by asking someone to do something. It consists of the base form of the verb alone, for example:
   Nanny: “Think. You are very clever, children. Think.”

**Positive politeness**

Brown and Levinson argue that positive politeness “anoints the face of addressee by indicating that in some respect, S (the speaker) wants H’s (the hearer) wants (for example, by treating him as a member of an in-group, a friend, a person whose wants and personality traits are known and liked). (Brown and Levinson, 1978).

By using strategies oriented towards the positive face threat to the hearer, the FTA (Face Threatening Act) is performed. The hearer has a desire to be respected by the speaker and this will be clear in positive politeness, this relationship is friendly, and it expresses group reciprocity. This type of the main strategies is usually found among friends or with people know each other very well in social situation.

Bousfield’s (2008) point of view is that positive politeness shows the human desire to reflects engagement, ratification, and appreciation from others by using their self-image (2008). Brown and Levinson (1987) divided positive politeness into 15 parts:

**Notice attend to hearer (His interest, wants, needs, goods)**

In general, the hearer’s condition including, changes, remarkable possessions and anything should be noticed by the speaker, for example:
6. what a beautiful case this is! (this example shows the interest of the speaker in the case)
7. where did it come from? (the speaker asks the hearer a question in order to get the information from the hearer)

**Exaggeration**

This strategy is used with overstated intonation and stress when the speaker shows his interest, approval or any sympathy towards the hearer, for example:
8. How absolutely marvelous! (the speaker explains the good of extra ordinary! something with exaggeration)

**Intensify interest to H (hearer)**

The speaker may stress the interest and good intention to the hearer. The features of this strategy is the use of
a. past event, for example:
9. Last night, I went to that shop. I buy some things from him.
   (the speaker uses the past tense to stress the hearer’s interest)
b. Direct quoted speech, for example:
10. see what I mean?”, isn’t it?”.
   (the speaker says something in direct way)
c. exaggeration, for example:
11. I’ve never seen such a row!
   (the speaker is surprising to see that thing)

The exaggeration in these cases may redress an FTA simply by stressing the sincerity of S’s (speaker) good intensions.
**Use in-group identity markers**
This strategy shows the relationship between the speaker and the hearer whether it is close or not. The use of in-group language contains the way of code-switching from one language or dialect to another, and the use of jargon, and slang languages reveals that the speaker and the hearer have the same knowledge of a particular object, for example ( brand names)

12. come here, (mate, honey or buddy)

**Seek agreement**
Another characteristic of claiming common ground with hearer by seeking about ways in which it is possible to agree with him, alongside with the agreement, repeating a part of what the speaker has said previously.

13. A: She had an accident last week
B: Oh my God, an accident.

**Avoid disagreement**
To avoid disagreement there are three ways (namely token agreement, white lies, and hedging opinions) in order to avoid face-damaging of hearer, for instance:

14. A: Can you hear me?
B: Barely

**Presuppose/ raise/ assert common ground**
This strategy deals with gossiping and small talk. It represents a kind of friendship and interest with both the speaker and the hearer and it is also dealt with presupposition manipulation, i.e. the speaker can use presupposition manipulation of hearer's wants and presupposition of hearer's knowledge, for example:

15. look, you a pal of mine, so how about...
( The use of any term presupposes that the referents are known to the addressee)

**Joke**
Jokes can be used to minimize an FTA of requesting by stressing on background knowledge and values. Joke is also used to maintain the friendship, for example

16. so, it is okay if I throw away your book.

**Assert or presuppose**
This strategy is used to confirm the desires of the hearer

17. I know you can't bear parties, but this one will really be good, do come!
( the speaker knows that the hearer doesn't bear that before making a request but he express his request in this way I order to make the hear accept that request).

**Offer promise**
The speaker cooperates with the hearer in claiming whatever the hearer wants, for example

18. I 'll drop by sometime next week.

**Be optimistic**
The speaker is optimistic to help a hearer to obtain his wants, for instance:

19. I'm borrowing your pen for a sec, ok?
( which expresses the speaker's good intentions in satisfying the listener's wants).

**Include both speaker and hearer in the activity**
The speaker uses expressions like 'we' or 'you' in order to call the cooperative assumptions and redress FTAs, for example:

20. Give us break. (give me break)

**Give (or ask for) reasons**
The speaker gives reason why he wants what he wants, for example:

21. why don't we go to the seashore?

**Assume or assert reciprocity**
The cooperation between speaker and hearer by giving evidence of reciprocal right or obligations obtaining speaker and hearer, for example: the speaker may say

22. I 'll do X for you if you do Y for me.

**Give gifts to H (Goods, sympathy, understanding)**
The speaker may satisfy the hearer's positive face wants by giving gift, not only tangible gifts but also human relations such as (the wants to be liked, admired, cared about, understood and so on). This strategy is used to increase the relationship and solidarity between the speaker and hearer, for example:

23. Hey, look at me, if there is a will there is a way, so don’t give up.

**Negative politeness**
The other hearer's face is the negative politeness in which the speaker is in some way imposing on the hearer. Negative face appears as negative polite structure to show distance and wariness. To get freedom from impingement is the want that the negative face tries to represent it(Bousfield, 2008). According to Brown and Levinson (1987:128) "Negative
politeness is regressive action addressed to the addressee's negative face: his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded".

It can be seen from these explanations that negative politeness strategy is the use to prevent or to reduce threats to the hearer's negative face when the speaker wants something from the addressee such as positive politeness, and some strategies of negative politeness.


**Be conventionally indirect**

A speaker is faced with opposing tension: the desire to give hearer (an, out, by) being indirect and the desire to go on record. The use of phrases and sentences of this strategy that have contextually unambiguous meanings and which are different their literal meanings, for example:

24. could you pass the salt?

**Hedges**

Hedges in the literature, mean a particle, word, , or phrase that modifies the degree of membership that is more true and complete than might be expected, for example:

25. A swing is sort of a toy
26. I'm pretty sure I've read that book before

**Be pessimistic**

This strategy is used to minimize hearer's negative face by expressing doubt that the conditions for the appropriateness of speaker's speech act obtain, for example:

27. would you do?
28. or another way more polite pessimism like ( I don't imagine there'd be any chance of you).

**Minimize the degree of imposition**

Social factor is very important for the speaker and by this factor the hearer might accept the imposition well. This is achieved by the expression like:

29. I just want to ask you if you could lend me a single sheet of paper

**Give deference**

There are two ways to convey giving deference strategy: first, a speaker tends to be humble. Second, treats hearer as superior. In this case, the speaker realizes that he isn't in the position where he can force the hearer, for example:

30. Yes, I thought you wouldn't mind ...

**Apologize**

By apologizing for doing an FTA, the speaker can indicate his hesitation to influence on hearer's negative face and then try to repair that impingement, for example:

31. I don't want to interrupt you but ...

**Impersonalize speaker and hearer**

The speaker avoids reference to the person that involves in FTA, and he doesn't use ( I ) and (you) in conversation because it may refer to a little imposition, for instance:

32. it seems ( to me ) that ...

**State the FTA as a general rule**

Stating FTA as a general rule in the conversation is a safe way to minimize the imposition, then a speaker doesn't seem to impose a hearer.

**Nominalize**

This strategy deals with the degree of formality. The speaker can replace or normalize the subject, predicate, object or even complement to make the sentence gets more formal

· it is pleasant to be able to inform you
3.10 Go on Record as Incurring a Debt, or as not indebting a hearer.

In this strategy, the speaker can claim explicitly as a redress of the FTA, for example

33. I'll never be able to repay you if you ...

**Off record**

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), this strategy is called indirect strategy. Bousfield (2008, P. 58) states that "off- record (indirect) takes some of the pressure off of the speaker. Its utterances are indirect uses of language which precise meaning has to be interrupted. The FTA performs off record, typically through the deployment of an indirect illocutionary act which has more than one interpretation and, thus allows for plausible deniability on the part of the speaker if the intended recipient takes offence at the face threat inherent in the utterance." Brown and Levinson divided off record into 15 strategies, they are:

**Give hints**

There is the maxim of relevance with hints which are used by the speaker, for example:

34. It's cold in here (instead of being direct to say shut the window).

**Give association rules**

To convey the information to the hearer that the speaker wants something, for instance:
35. God, I've got a headache again (it is indirect way of saying I want aspirin).

**Presuppose**
The hearer may presuppose something from the speech of the speaker, for example:
36. I washed the car again today
(This may convey to the hearer that the speaker has done it before and he has a car)

**Understate**
The strategy is generating implicatures by saying less than required, for example:
37. A: what a marvelous place you have here.
B: oh, I don't know, it's a place

**Overstate**
The use of Quantity Maxim in another way, a speaker may convey implicatures. The speaker may do this by exaggerating or choosing a point on a scale which is higher than the actual state of affairs, for example:
38. I tried to call a hundred times, but there was never any answer.

**Use tautologies**
The use of Quantity Maxim, in which the speaker encourages the hearer to look for an informative interpretation of the non-informative utterance, for example:
39. if I won't give it, I won't (I mean it!)

**Use contradictions**
Contradictions, such as ironies, metaphors and recall questions involve violations of the Quality Maxims, for example:
40. A: are you upset about that?
B: well, I am, or I am not
Or be ironic , by saying the opposite of what he means, such as
41. John is a real genius (after John has just done twenty stupid things in a row).

**Use metaphor**
The use of metaphor is usually on record, but there is a possibility of the connections of the metaphor speaker intends may be off record, for example:
42. Harry's real fish (He drinks/swims/is slimy like a fish).

**Use rhetorical questions**
This strategy can be used by asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer in order to break sincerity condition on question, for example:
43. how many times do I have to tell you ...?(to many).

---

**Be ambiguous**
By using metaphor, the speaker can achieve the purposeful ambiguity, for example:
44. John's a pretty sharp cookie (it could be either compliment or insult)

**Be vague**
With an FTA, the speaker may go off record by being vague about who the object of the FTA.
45. I'm going to you – know – where

**Over-generalize**
The use of proverbs can be done through implicatures may be conventionalized to the extent of being on record, for example:
46. people who live in glass shouldn't throw stones

**Displace hearer**
A speaker may go off record as to whom the target for his FTA, is pretended to address the FTA to someone whom it wouldn't threaten. For example:
47. a secretary in an office asks another but with negative politeness - to pass the stapler, in circumstances whereas professor is much nearer to the stapler then the other secretary. His face isn't threatened, and he can choose to do it himself as a bonus free gift.

**Be in complete, use ellipsis**
Elliptical utterances are legitimated by various conversational contexts to answer the questions and the speaker doesn't complete his utterance, for example:
48. well, I didn't see you...

**Gender**
The term gender is usually used in sociolinguistics to refer to "the socially performed roles of Masculinities and Femininities with an indirect relationship to biological sex". There is another use of the term gender from the grammatical sense (Trask, 2007:97). Holmes (2008: 157) asserts that the term gender is more suitable for differentiating people on the basis of their "socio-cultural behavior". Gender is a result of what people do and the way they talk not what people are (Paltridge, 2012:20). The relationship between language and gender is "almost always indirect, mediated by something else"(Cameron and Kulick, 2003:57).

Eckert and McConnell- Ginet(2003:5) define gender "as the product of the social practice". It is part of the social interaction, ongoing work of every day, and routine. Sex and circumstances are important factors which lead to gender from a specific point not only in the way they talk but also in their dress and behavior.
when they are talking with friends. Eckert and McConnel-Ginet (2003:4) assert that “Gender does not just exist, but is continually produced, reproduced, and indeed changed through people's performance of gendered acts, as they project their own claimed gender identities, ratify challenge other's identities. Therefore, gender is a system of meaning, away of contrasting concepts of male and female, and language is fundamental means through which people perform it.

**Factors affecting gender differences**

According to Holmes (2008:157), The linguistic form which is used by men and women vary to different degrees. Mills (2003,174) states that various studies reveal that men and women behave differently relaying on specific factors such as, class, familiarity, context, and power. Each community develops (in relation to these factors) a set of linguistic behaviors which works in a little different way to the other "communities of practice". For example, some activities in particular communities of practice may be regarded as feminine or masculine character, and this according to male and females may be appropriate or inappropriate Gender is usually associated with social status factors, for instance, a conversation between the boss in a company and the worker is different from a conversation between two men friends or women. This means that the power relation can be considered a factor of gender differences. So, gender impacts on at the level of context rather than at the level of the individuals involved in the interaction (Mills, 2003, p.194).

**Women's and men's speech**

The speech of men and women is different in any community. Holmes (2008: 158) asserts that men and women are different in speech function, for instance, women are more linguistically polite than men. In the many speech communities' women use more standard forms than men whom they prefer the "overtly prestigious form". Whereas men use more vernacular forms than women, which is not admired by society and not considered as the " correct forms". There are numbers of studies and researchers on language and gender, either with the aim to determine "empirically" that men and women use particular feature or as Mills (2003) argues that women use tag- questions widely in their talking with the addressee and they are interrupted by men while men are less interrupted by women.

Lakoff presents two sentences which clarify the differences between men's dominant a language and women's subordinate language:

a) Oh dear, you've put the cake in the fridge again.

b) Damn, you've put the cake in the fridge again.

The first sentence represents women's language and the second is men's. So, sentence (a) is more polite than (b), because of the softer expression and thus, becomes less threatening to addressee's face (1975:10).

Another research assumes that "men use the same element to the same extent or more than women"(Mills, 2003:169), there is style by which the speaker mixes feature of women's speech like, the British ex-prime Minister Margaret Thatcher where she mixes in her speech features which associate with "the stereotypical language" of both men and women. In fact, the context is an important factor that determines the production of speech, and the evaluation of appropriate types of speech styles and language(Mills, 2003).

**The notion of face**

The important concepts in relation to politeness are face and facework. The definition of face is “the public self-image that every member of a society wants to claim for himself”(Brown& Levinson,1987, p.61). However, the concept of face is universal, and it is the basic concept within Brown and Levinson's model. There are two kinds of face: positive face (the desire of a member to be approved of) and Negative face (the desire of a member to be free in his actions and unimpeded by others), (Brown and Levinson, 1987:13).

A Face Threatening Act (FTA) refers to the threat to the positive or negative face by another person. FTA is divided into two types verbal (which is represented by using spoken language) and non-verbal (by using gestures). Brown and Levinson refer to “The relative weighting of at least three wants”.

1) The want to communicate the content of the FTA
2) The want to be efficient or urgent
3) The want to maintain the face of the addressee to any degree

**Practical Procedures: Preliminary Remarks**

In this section the researcher is going to analysis the interviews of two female parliament members. To show how different cultural background effects the personality and the speech of human by using different strategies of politeness types. This section involves the analysis of the data, participants, procedures, and the results.

**Data selection**

The data are collected from the internet interviews of the two parliament members. From the American Congress is the Prime Minister Hillary Clinton from the link https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-
The researcher begins to collect the data and present the model of the analysis that depended on. The two interviews of the two Prime Minster members of Parliaments are analyzed according the types and strategies of politeness. The results and the conclusion of the results are discussed in this section.

**The model of analysis**
The two interviews are analyzed according to Brown and Levinson(1987) model of politeness strategies (Watts,2003:87) , in the diagram below:

The table below shows the types of politeness and its strategies in the speech of both parliaments lady members (Hillary Clinton) and (Margaret Thatcher)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of politeness</th>
<th>Occurrence of politeness in Hillary Clinton interview</th>
<th>Occurrence of politeness in Margaret Thatcher interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Bald on record</td>
<td>• In fact, it would be the most extreme version, the biggest tax cuts for the top percent of the people in this country than we’ve ever had. That is not how we grow the economy.</td>
<td>• No, I don’t think so. I have made it quite clear from the beginning each time we have been elected with a good majority...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-(showing disagreement)</td>
<td>• Well, Donald, I know you live in your own reality, but that is not the facts. The facts are -- I did say I hoped it would be a good deal, but when it was negotiated...</td>
<td>• No, I do not. I think every election is different. This will be my eleventh election. They are all a bit different. The polls go up and down. The issues vary, and I do not think you can ever judge how an election will go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• You know, just join the debate by saying more crazy things. Now, let me say this, it is absolutely the case...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b-Giving suggestion/advice</td>
<td>• First, we have to build an economy that works for everyone, not just those on the top...</td>
<td>• We place ourselves, our record and our policy before the judgment... we must work every inch of the way for their...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I think building the middle class, investing in the middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
class, making college debt-free so more young people can get their education, helping people refinance their, their debt from college at a lower rate. Those are the kinds of things that will really boost the economy.

- You have a lot of plans for the future, as we have, and you want to feel that you have quite a number of years in which to implement them.

- Well, let's stop for a second and remember where we were eight years ago.
- Let's not assume that trade is the only challenge we have in the economy.
- So let's have paid family leave, earned sick days
- Let's be sure we have affordable child care and debt-free college.

- Well let us win the first election first. You know, life only comes one election at a time and if we win every one as it comes then we shall be doing what I want

- We want to be and what kind of future we ...
- We're going to enforce the trade deals we have, and we're going to hold people accountable.
- clearly, as Donald just admitted, he knew he was going to stand on this debate stage, and Lester Holt was going to be asking us questions, so he tried to put the whole racist birther lie to bed.
- We have to restore trust between communities and the police.

- We place ourselves before the electorate for the judgment of the electorate.

- They've looked at my plans and they've said, OK, if we can do this, and I intend to get it done, we will have 10 million more new jobs, because we will be making investments where we can grow the economy.
- And I think it's important that we grip this and deal with it, both at home and abroad. And here's what we can do. We can deploy a half a billion more solar panels. We can have enough clean energy to power every home. We can build a new modern electric grid. That's a lot of jobs; that's a lot of new economic activity.

- It will continue to be strong and give opportunities for people to be enterprising.
- We do not assume we work.

- We just have a different view about what's best for growing the economy, how we make investments that will actually produce jobs and rising income...
- Well, I think that trade is an important issue. Of course, we are
5 percent of the world's population; we have to trade with the other 95 percent. And we need to have smart, fair trade deals.

We also, though, need to have a tax system that rewards work and not just financial transactions. And the kind of plan that Donald has put forth would be trickle-down economics all over again.

Today is my granddaughter's second birthday, so I think about this a lot.

So we need to be more precise in how we talk about these issues. People around the world follow our presidential campaigns so closely, trying to get hints about what we will do. Can they rely on us? Are we going to lead the world with strength and in accordance with our values? That's what I intend to do. I intend to be a leader of our country that people can count on, both here at home and around the world, to make decisions that will further peace and prosperity, but also stand up to bullies, whether they're abroad or at home.

I don't think top-down works in America. I think building the middle class, investing in the middle class, making college debt-free so more young people can get their education, helping people refinance their debt from college at a lower rate. Those are the kinds of things that will really boost the economy. Broad-based, inclusive growth is what we need in America, not more advantages for people at the very top.

Finally, we tonight are on the stage together Donald Trump and I. Donald, it's good to be with you.

Well, you're right. Race remains a significant challenge in our country.

Well, let's stop for a second and remember where we were eight years ago. We had the worst financial crisis, the Great Recession, the worst since the
1930s. That was in large part because of tax policies that slashed taxes on the wealthy, failed to invest in the middle class, took their eyes off of Wall Street, and created a perfect storm.

- There are different views about what’s good for our country, our economy, and our leadership in the world. And I think it's important to look at what we need to do to get the economy going again. That's why I said new jobs with rising incomes, investments, not in more tax cuts that would add $5 trillion to the debt.
- I intend to get it done, we will have 10 million more new jobs, because we will be making investments where we can grow the economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-Negative politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-Hedges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Well, let’s stop for a second and remember where we were eight years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I think it’s important that we grip this and deal with it, both at home and abroad. And here's what we can do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Well, I think you’ve seen another example of bait-and-switch here. For 40 years, everyone running for president has released their tax returns. You can go and see nearly, I think, 39, 40 years of our tax returns, but everyone has done it. We know the IRS has made clear there is no prohibition on releasing it when you're under audit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I think the way the country is run: whether you have government doing the things which only government can do and doing them strongly, decisively and well and strong enough to leave the rest to the people,
- I think personalities maybe only come in in judging whether or not you are the kind of person who knows what he or she stands for, can be seen to make clear decisions at the time they are needed,...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b-Give differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Well, thank you, Lester, and thanks to Hofstra for hosting us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I have a feeling that by, the end of this evening, I’m going to be blamed for everything that’s ever happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They want support, they want more training, they want more assistance. And I think the federal government could be in a position where we would offer and provide that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- You know, he tried to switch from looks to stamina. But this is a man who has called women pigs, slobs and dogs, and someone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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who has said pregnancy is an inconvenience to employers, who has said...

TRUMP: I never said that.
CLINTON: ....women don't deserve equal pay unless **they do as good a job as men.**

c- Minimize the imposition

· First, we have to build an economy that works for everyone, not just those at the top.
· I don't think top-down works in America. **I think building the middle class,** investing in the middle class, making college debt-free so more young people can get their education, helping people refinance their **--** debt from college at a lower rate. Those are the kinds of things that will really boost the economy. Broad-based, inclusive growth is what we need in America, not more advantages for people at the very top.

d- Apologize

· I do you know, I made a mistake, using a private E-mail ...
· It was mistake and I take responsibility for that.

4- off record

· the kind of plan that Donald has put forth would be trickle-down economics all over again. **In fact, it would be the most extreme version, the biggest tax cuts** for the top percent of the people in this country than we've ever had. I call it trumped-up trickle-down, because that's exactly what it would be. That is not how we grow the economy.
· Now, **we have come back from that abyss.** And it has not been easy. So we're now on the precipice of having a potentially much better economy, but the last thing we need to do is to go back to the policies that failed us in the first place.
· TRUMP: Well, he approved NAFTA...
(CROSSTALK) CLINTON: ... million new jobs, a balanced budget

b- Metaphor

· now, we have back from that abyss

---

**The results**
The results are summarized in the following tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of politeness and strategies</th>
<th>Number of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinton's interview</strong></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1· Bald on record</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a· (showing disagreement)</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b· Giving suggestion/advice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c· Requesting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2· positive politeness</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a· Include both speaker and hearer in the activity</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b· Offer promise</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c· Avoid disagreement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d· Presuppose/ raise/ assert</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f· Give gifts to hearer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g· Give reason</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3· Negative politeness</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a· Hedges</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b· Give differences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c· Minimize the imposition</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d· Apologize</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4· off record</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a· Overstate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b· Metaphor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Margaret's interview</strong></td>
<td>99.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1· Bald on record</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a· (showing disagreement)</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b· Giving suggestion/advice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c· Requesting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2· positive politeness</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a· Include both speaker and hearer in the activity</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b· Offer promise</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c· Avoid disagreement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d· Presuppose/ raise/ assert</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f· Give gifts to hearer</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g· Give reason</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3· Negative politeness</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a· Hedges</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b· Give differences</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c· Minimize the imposition</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d· Apologize</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4· off record</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a· Overstate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b· Metaphor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Discussion of the results**

The results have shown that the most common strategies of politeness in the first interview are include both speaker and hearer in the activity, showing disagreement, and hedges. This is because these strategies are used easily by the speaker, and people be more polite with these strategies rather than with the latest ones such as metaphor, give gift to the hearer and so on. While in the second interview, the most common strategies are Include both speaker and hearer in the activity, hedges and, Give reason because the prime minister is found these are easily used than others to convey his polite expressions. From these two tables above, the researcher infers that the American Prime Minister (Hillary Clinton) uses the types of politeness more than the British Prime Minister (Margaret Thatcher).

**Conclusion**

To sum up things, gender and politeness are closely related with each other and have a kind of effect on one another. Politeness strategy is vary according to gender by stating the differences in the speech styles of men and women. Positive and negative politeness are the various function of politeness which are used according to the community and context. Gender is influenced by sex and circumstances which are considered as important factors to lead human behavior and their talk. The relation between the human beings also has important impact on gender especially if the conversation between friends, the boss and employee and if it is between males or females. Generally, women have the ability to change their way of speaking and to be more polite than men, whereas men don’t have this ability and use more vernacular forms.

Hillary Clinton, on one hand, is more careful in choosing words to express certain type of politeness more than the other. She affects the audience and the hearers’ feelings emotionally by mentioning the negative side of Trump and his way of dealing with people, such as “Donald. I’ve met dishwashers, painters, architects, glass installers, marble installers, drapery installers, like my dad was, who you refused to pay when they finished the work that you asked them to do.” She uses positive politeness type and its (Include both speaker and hearer in the activity, hedges and, Give reason) strategy more than the others as if she wants to make the people as an witnesses on Trump’s actions. On the other hand the speech by Margaret Thatcher lacks a lot of these types, and she always depends on the tone of masculine in her speech. From the two tables above, the researcher infers that politeness strategies are commonly used by the American Prime Minister (Hillary Clinton) than the British one who is (Margaret Thatcher).

According to this study, the results of these two interviews reject the second hypothesis and prove that American females are more polite than the British ones.

**References**


Appendix A

Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump went head-to-head for the first time Monday night in a debate at Hofstra University in Hempstead, N.Y. The debate was moderated by Lester Holt of NBC News and came as polls both nationally and in swing states are increasingly tight.

CLINTON: Well, thank you, Lester, and thanks to Hofstra for hosting us.

The central question in this election is really what kind of country we want to be and what kind of future we'll build together. Today is my granddaughter’s second birthday, so I think about this a lot. First, we have to build an economy that works for everyone, not just those at the top. That means we need new jobs, good jobs, with rising incomes.

I want us to invest in you. I want us to invest in your future. That means jobs in infrastructure, in advanced manufacturing, innovation and technology, clean, renewable energy, and small business, because most of the new jobs will come from small business. We also have to make the economy fairer. That starts with raising the national minimum wage and also guarantee, finally, equal pay for women’s work.

Finally, we tonight are on the stage together, Donald Trump and I. Donald, it's good to be with you. We're going to have a debate where we are talking about the important issues facing our country. You have to judge us, who can shoulder the immense, awesome responsibilities of the presidency, who can put into action the plans that will make your life better. I hope that I will be able to earn your vote on November 8th.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton, thank you.

Mr. Trump, the same question to you. It’s about putting money -- more money into the pockets of American workers. You have up to two minutes.

TRUMP: We cannot let it happen. Under my plan, I’ll be reducing taxes tremendously, from 35 percent to 15 percent for companies, small and big businesses. That’s going to be a job creator like we haven’t seen since Ronald Reagan. It’s going to be a beautiful thing to watch.

Companies will come. They will build. They will expand. New companies will start. And I look very, very much forward to doing it. We have to renegotiate our trade deals, and we have to stop these countries from stealing our companies and our jobs.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton, would you like to respond?

CLINTON: Well, I think that trade is an important issue. Of course, we are 5 percent of the world’s population; we have to trade with the other 95 percent. And we need to have smart, fair trade deals. We also, though, need to have a tax system that rewards work and not just financial transactions. And the kind of plan that Donald has put forth would be trickle-down economics all over again. In fact, it would be the most extreme version, the biggest tax cuts for the top percent of the people in this country than we’ve ever had. I call it trumped-up trickle-down, because that’s exactly what it would be. That is not how we grow the economy.

We just have a different view about what’s best for growing the economy, how we make investments that will actually produce jobs and rising incomes.

I think we come at it from somewhat different perspectives. I understand that. You know, Donald was very fortunate in his life, and that’s all to his benefit. He started his business with $14 million, borrowed from his father, and he really believes that the more you help wealthy people, the better off we’ll be and that everything will work out from there.

I don't buy that. I have a different experience. My father was a small businessman. He worked really hard. He printed drapery fabrics on long tables, where he pulled out those fabrics and he went down with a squeegee and dumped the paint in and took the silkscreen and kept going.

And so, what I believe is the more we can do for the middle class, the more we can invest in you, your education, your skills, your future, the better we will be off and the better we'll grow. That’s the kind of economy I want us to see again.

HOLT: Let me let Secretary Clinton get in here.

CLINTON: Well, let's stop for a second and remember where we were eight years ago. We had the worst financial crisis, the Great Recession, the worst since the 1930s. That was in large part because of tax policies that slashed taxes on the wealthy, failed to invest in the middle class, took their eyes off of Wall Street, and created a perfect storm.

In fact, Donald was one of the people who rooted for the housing crisis. He said, back in 2006, “Gee, I hope it does collapse, because then I can go in and buy some and make some money.” Well, it did collapse.

TRUMP: That's called business, by the way.

CLINTON: Nine million people -- nine million people lost their jobs. Five million people lost their
homes. And $13 trillion in family wealth was wiped out.

Now, we have come back from that abyss. And it has not been easy. So we're now on the precipice of having a potentially much better economy, but the last thing we need to do is to go back to the policies that failed us in the first place. Independent experts have looked at what I've proposed and looked at what Donald's proposed, and basically they've said this, that if his tax plan, which would blow up the debt by over $5 trillion and would in some instances disadvantage middle-class families compared to the wealthy, were to go into effect, we would lose 3.5 million jobs and maybe have another recession.

They've looked at my plans and they've said, OK, if we can do this, and I intend to get it done, we will have 10 million more new jobs, because we will be making investments where we can grow the economy. Take clean energy. Some country is going to be the clean energy superpower of the 21st century. Donald thinks that climate change is a hoax perpetrated by the Chinese. I think it's real.

TRUMP: I did not. I did not. I do not say that.

CLINTON: I think science is real.

TRUMP: I do not say that.

CLINTON: And I think it's important that we grip this and deal with it, both at home and abroad. And here's what we can do. We can deploy a half a billion more solar panels. We can have enough clean energy to power every home. We can build a new modern electric grid. That's a lot of jobs; that's a lot of new economic activity.

So I've tried to be very specific about what we can and should do, and I am determined that we're going to get the economy really moving again, building on the progress we've made over the last eight years, but never going back to what got us in trouble in the first place.

CLINTON: ... million new jobs, a balanced budget...

TRUMP: He approved NAFTA, which is the single worst trade deal ever approved in this country.

CLINTON: Incomes went up for everybody. Manufacturing jobs went up also in the 1990s, if we're actually going to look at the facts. When I was in the Senate, I had a number of trade deals that came before me, and I held them all to the same test. Will they create jobs in America? Will they raise incomes in America? And are they good for our national security? Some of them I voted for. The biggest one, a multinational one known as CAFTA, I voted against. And because I hold the same standards as I look at all of these trade deals. But let's not assume that trade is the only challenge we have in the economy. I think it is a part of it, and I've said what I'm going to do. I'm going to have a special prosecutor. We're going to enforce the trade deals we have, and we're going to hold people accountable. When I was secretary of state, we actually increased American exports globally 30 percent. We increased them to China 50 percent. So, I know how to really work to get new jobs and to get exports that helped to create more new jobs.

HOLT: Very quickly...

TRUMP: But you haven't done it in 30 years or 26 years or any number you want to...

CLINTON: Well, I've been a senator, Donald...

TRUMP: You haven't done it. You haven't done it.

CLINTON: And I have been a secretary of state...

TRUMP: Excuse me.

CLINTON: And I have done a lot...

TRUMP: Your husband signed NAFTA, which was one of the worst things that ever happened to the manufacturing industry.

CLINTON: Well, that's your opinion. That is your opinion.

TRUMP: You go to New England, you go to Ohio, Pennsylvania, you go anywhere you want, Secretary Clinton, and you will see devastation where manufacture is down 30, 40, sometimes 50 percent. NAFTA is the worst trade deal maybe ever signed anywhere, but certainly ever signed in this country.

And now you want to approve Trans-Pacific Partnership. You were totally in favor of it. Then you heard what I was saying, how bad it is, and you said, I can't win that debate. But you know that if you did win, you would approve that, and that will be almost as bad as NAFTA. Nothing will ever top NAFTA.

CLINTON: Well, that's just not accurate. I was against it once it was finally negotiated and the terms were laid out. I wrote about that in...

TRUMP: You called it the gold standard.

(CROSSTALK)

TRUMP: You called it the gold standard of trade deals. You said it's the finest deal you've ever seen.

CLINTON: No.

TRUMP: And then you heard what I said about it, and all of a sudden you were against it.

CLINTON: Well, Donald, I know you live in your own reality, but that is not the facts. The facts are -- I did say I hoped it would be a good deal, but when it was negotiated...

TRUMP: Not.

CLINTON: ... which I was not responsible for, I concluded it wasn't. I wrote about that in my book...

TRUMP: So, is it President Obama's fault?

CLINTON: ... before you even announced.

TRUMP: Is it President Obama's fault?
CLINTON: Look, there are differences...

TRUMP: Secretary, is it President Obama’s fault?

CLINTON: There are...

TRUMP: Because he’s pushing it.

CLINTON: There are different views about what’s good for our country, our economy, and our leadership in the world. And I think it’s important to look at what we need to do to get the economy going again. That’s why I said new jobs with rising incomes, investments, not in more tax cuts that would add $5 trillion to the debt.

TRUMP: But you have no plan.

CLINTON: But in -- oh, but I do.

TRUMP: Secretary, you have no plan.

CLINTON: In fact, I have written a book about it. It’s called “Stronger Together.” You can pick it up tomorrow at a bookstore...

TRUMP: That’s about all you’ve...

(CROSSTALK)

HOLT: Folks, we’re going to...

CLINTON: ... or at an airport near you.

HOLT: We’re going to move to...

CLINTON: But it’s because I see this -- we need to have strong growth, fair growth, sustained growth. We also have to look at how we help families balance the responsibilities at home and the responsibilities at business. So, we have a very robust set of plans. And people have looked at both of our plans, have concluded that mine would create 10 million jobs and yours would lose us 3.5 million jobs, and explode the debt which would have a recession.

TRUMP: You are going to approve one of the biggest tax cuts in history. You are going to approve one of the biggest tax increases in history. You are going to drive business out. Your regulations are a disaster, and you’re going to increase regulations all over the place. And by the way, my tax cut is the biggest since Ronald Reagan. I’m very proud of it. It will create tremendous numbers of new jobs. But regulations, you are going to regulate these businesses out of existence.

When I go around -- Lester, I tell you this, I’ve been all over. And when I go around, despite the tax cut, the thing -- the things that business as in people like the most is the fact that I’m cutting regulation. You have regulations on top of regulations, and new companies cannot form, and old companies are going out of business. And you want to increase the regulations and make them even worse. I’m going to cut regulations. I’m going to cut taxes big league, and you’re going to raise taxes big league, end of story.

HOLT: Let me get you to pause right there, because we’re going to move into -- we’re going to move into the next segment. We’re going to talk taxes...
repatriation, bringing back of money that's stranded overseas. I happen to support that.

TRUMP: Then you didn't read it.

CLINTON: I happen to -- I happen to support that in a way that will actually work to our benefit. But when I look at what you have proposed, you have what is called now the Trump loophole, because it would so advantage you and the business you do. You've proposed an approach that has a...

TRUMP: Who gave it that name? The first I've -- who gave it that name?

(CROSSTALK)

HOLT: Mr. Trump, this is Secretary Clinton's two minutes.

CLINTON: ... $4 billion tax benefit for your family. And when you look at what you are proposing...

TRUMP: How much? How much for my family?

CLINTON: ... it is...

TRUMP: Lester, how much?

CLINTON: ... as I said, trumped-up trickle-down. Trickle-down did not work. It got us into the mess we were in, in 2008 and 2009. Slashing taxes on the wealthy hasn't worked.

And a lot of really smart, wealthy people know that. And they are saying, hey, we need to do more to make the contributions we should be making to rebuild the middle class.

CLINTON: I don't think top-down works in America. I think building the middle class, investing in the middle class, making college debt-free so more young people can get their education, helping people refinance their -- their debt from college at a lower rate. Those are the kinds of things that will really boost the economy. Broad-based, inclusive growth is what we need in America, not more advantages for people at the very top.

HOLT: Well, I'll let her answer that. But let me just admonish the audience one more time. There was an agreement. We did ask you to be silent, so it would be helpful for us. Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I think you've seen another example of bait-and-switch here. For 40 years, everyone running for president has released their tax returns. You can go and see nearly, I think, 39, 40 years of our tax returns, but everyone has done it. We know the IRS has made clear there is no prohibition on releasing it when you're under audit.

So, you've got to ask yourself, why won't he release his tax returns? And I think there may be a couple of reasons. First, maybe he's not as rich as he says he is. Second, maybe he's not as charitable as he claims to be.

CLINTON: Third, we don't know all of his business dealings, but we have been told through investigative reporting that he owes about $650 million to Wall Street and foreign banks. Or maybe he doesn't want the American people, all of you watching tonight, to know that he's paid nothing in federal taxes, because the only years that anybody's ever seen were a couple of years when he had to turn them over to state authorities when he was trying to get a casino license, and they showed he didn't pay any federal income tax.

TRUMP: That makes me smart.

CLINTON: So, if he's paid zero, that means zero for troops, zero for vets, zero for schools or health. And I think probably he's not all that enthusiastic about having the rest of our country see what the real reasons are, because it must be something really important, even terrible, that he's trying to hide. And the financial disclosure statements, they don't give you the tax rate. They don't give you all the details that tax returns would. And it just seems to me that this is something that the American people deserve to see. And I have no reason to believe that he's ever going to release his tax returns, because there's something he's hiding.

And we'll guess. We'll keep guessing at what it might be that he's hiding. But I think the question is, were he ever to get near the White House, what would be those conflicts? Who does he owe money to? Well, he owes you the answers to that, and he should provide them.

HOLT: He also -- he also raised the issue of your e-mails. Do you want to respond to that?

CLINTON: I do. You know, I made a mistake using a private e-mail. TRUMP: That's for sure.

CLINTON: And if I had to do it over again, I would, obviously, do it differently. But I'm not going to make any excuses. It was a mistake, and I take responsibility for that.

HOLT: We'll let you respond, and we'll move on to the next segment.

CLINTON: And maybe because you haven't paid any federal income tax for a lot of years. (APPLAUSE) And the other thing I think is important...

TRUMP: It would be squandered, too, believe me.

CLINTON: ... is if your main claim to be president of the United States is your business, then I think we should talk about that. You know, your campaign manager said that you built a lot of businesses on the backs of little guys. And, indeed, I have met a lot of the people who were stiffed by you and your businesses, Donald. I've met dishwashers, painters, architects, glass installers, marble installers, drapery installers, like my dad was, who you refused to pay when they finished the work that you asked them to do. We have an architect in the audience who designed one of your clubhouses at one of your golf courses. It's a beautiful facility. It immediately was put
to use. And you wouldn't pay what the man needed to be paid, what he was charging you to do...

TRUMP: Maybe he didn't do a good job and I was unsatisfied with his work...
CLINTON: Well, to...
TRUMP: Which our country should do, too.

CLINTON: Do the thousands of people that you have stiffed over the course of your business not deserve some kind of apology from someone who has taken their labor, taken the goods that they produced, and then refused to pay them? I can only say that I'm certainly relieved that my late father never did business with you. He provided a good middle-class life for us, but the people he worked for, he expected the bargain to be kept on both sides. And when we talk about your business, you've taken business bankruptcy six times. There are a lot of great businesspeople that have never taken bankruptcy once. You call yourself the King of Debt. You talk about leverage. You even at one time suggested that you would try to negotiate down the national debt of the United States.

TRUMP: Wrong. Wrong.

CLINTON: Well, sometimes there's not a direct transfer of skills from business to government, but sometimes what happened in business would be really bad for government.
HOLT: Let's let Mr. Trump...
CLINTON: And we need to be very clear about that.

CLINTON: Well, you're right. Race remains a significant challenge in our country. Unfortunately, race still determines too much, often determines where people live, determines what kind of education in their public schools they can get, and, yes, it determines how they're treated in the criminal justice system. We've just seen those two tragic examples in both Tulsa and Charlotte. And we've got to do several things at the same time. We have to restore trust between communities and the police. We have to work to make sure that our police are using the best training, the best techniques, that they're well prepared to use force only when necessary. Everyone should be respected by the law, and everyone should respect the law.

CLINTON: Right now, that's not the case in a lot of our neighborhoods. So, I have, ever since the first day of my campaign, called for criminal justice reform. I've laid out a platform that I think would begin to remedy some of the problems we have in the criminal justice system. But we also have to recognize, in addition to the challenges that we face with policing, there are so many good, brave police officers who equally want reform. So, we have to bring communities together in order to begin working on that as a mutual goal. And we've got to get guns out of the hands of people who should not have them.

The gun epidemic is the leading cause of death of young African-American men, more than the next nine causes put together. So, we have to do two things, as I said. We have to restore trust. We have to work with the police. We have to make sure they respect the communities and the communities respect them. And we have to tackle the plague of gun violence, which is a big contributor to a lot of the problems that we're seeing today.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?
CLINTON: Well, I've heard -- I've heard Donald say this at his rallies, and it's really unfortunate that he paints such a dire negative picture of black communities in our country.
TRUMP: Ugh.

CLINTON: You know, the vibrancy of the black church, the black businesses that employ so many people, the opportunities that so many families are working to provide for their kids. There's a lot that we should be proud of and we should be supporting and lifting up. But we do always have to make sure we keep people safe. There are the right ways of doing it, and then there are ways that are ineffective. Stop-and-frisk was found to be unconstitutional and, in part, because it was ineffective. It did not do what it needed to do. Now, I believe in community policing. And, in fact, violent crime is one-half of what it was in 1991. Property crime is down 40 percent. We just don't want to see it creep back up. We've had 25 years of very good cooperation.

But there were some problems, some unintended consequences. Too many young African American and Latino men ended up in jail for nonviolent offenses. And it's just a fact that if you're a young African American man and you do the same thing as a young white man, you are more likely to be arrested, charged, convicted, and incarcerated. So, we've got to address the systemic racism in our criminal justice system. We cannot just say law and order. We have to say -- we have to come forward with a plan that is going to divert people from the criminal justice system, deal with mandatory minimum sentences, which have put too many people away for too long for doing too little.

We need to have more second chance programs. I'm glad that we're ending private prisons in the federal system; I want to see them ended in the state system. You shouldn't have a profit motivation to fill prison cells with young Americans. So, there are some positive ways we can work on this.

And I believe strongly that commonsense gun safety measures would assist us. Right now -- and this is something Donald has supported, along with the gun lobby -- right now, we've got too many military-style
weapons on the streets. In a lot of places, our police are outgunned. We need comprehensive background checks, and we need to keep guns out of the hands of those who will do harm. And we finally need to pass a prohibition on anyone who's on the terrorist watch list from being able to buy a gun in our country. If you're too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun. So there are things we can do, and we ought to do it in a bipartisan way.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton, last week, you said we've got to do everything possible to improve policing, to go right at implicit bias. Do you believe that police are implicitly biased against black people?

CLINTON: Lester, I think implicit bias is a problem for everyone, not just police. I think, unfortunately, too many of us in our great country jump to conclusions about each other. And therefore, I think we need all of us to be asking hard questions about, you know, why am I feeling this way? But when it comes to policing, since it can have literally fatal consequences, I have said, in my first budget, we would put money into that budget to help us deal with implicit bias by retraining a lot of our police officers.

I've met with a group of very distinguished, experienced police chiefs a few weeks ago. They admit it's an issue. They've got a lot of concerns. Mental health is one of the biggest concerns, because now police are having to handle a lot of really difficult mental health problems on the street.

CLINTON: They want support, they want more training, they want more assistance. And I think the federal government could be in a position where we would offer and provide that.

HOLT: Mr. Trump...

TRUMP: I'd like to respond to that.

CLINTON: Well, it's also fair to say, if we're going to talk about mayors, that under the current mayor, crime has continued to drop, including murders. So, there is...

TRUMP: No, you're wrong. You're wrong.

CLINTON: No, I'm not.

TRUMP: Murders are up. All right. You check it.

CLINTON: New York -- New York has done an excellent job. And I give credit -- I give credit across the board going back two mayors, two police chiefs, because it has worked. And other communities need to come together to do what will work, as well. Look, one murder is too many. But it is important that we learn about what has been effective. And not go to things that sound good that really did not have the kind of impact that we would want. Who disagrees with keeping neighborhoods safe?

But let's also add, no one should disagree about respecting the rights of young men who live in those neighborhoods. And so, we need to do a better job of working, again, with the communities, faith communities, business communities, as well as the police to try to deal with this problem.

CLINTON: Well, I -- I do think...

TRUMP: And I will tell you, you look at the inner cities -- and I just left Detroit, and I just left Philadelphia, and I just -- you know, you've seen me, I've been all over the place. You decided to stay home, and that's OK. But I will tell you, I've been all over. And I've met some of the greatest people I'll ever meet within these communities. And they are very, very upset with what their politicians have told them and what their politicians have done.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, I...

CLINTON: I think -- I think -- I think Donald just criticized me for preparing for this debate. And, yes, I did. And you know what else I prepared for? I prepared to be president. And I think that's a good thing.

(APPLAUSE)

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, just listen to what you heard.

(LAUGHTER)

And clearly, as Donald just admitted, he knew he was going to stand on this debate stage, and Lester Holt was going to be asking us questions, so he tried to put the whole racist birther lie to bed.

But it can't be dismissed that easily. He has really started his political activity based on this racist lie that our first black president was not an American citizen. There was absolutely no evidence for it, but he persisted, he persisted year after year, because some of his supporters, people that he was trying to bring into his fold, apparently believed it or wanted to believe it. But, remember, Donald started his career back in 1973 being sued by the Justice Department for racial discrimination because he would not rent apartments in one of his developments to African-Americans, and he made sure that the people who worked for him understood that was the policy. He actually was sued twice by the Justice Department. So, he has a long record of engaging in racist behavior. And the birther lie was a very hurtful one. You know, Barack Obama is a man of great dignity. And I could tell how much it bothered him and annoyed him that this was being touted and used against him.

But I like to remember what Michelle Obama said in her amazing speech at our Democratic National Convention: When they go low, we go high. And Barack Obama went high, despite Donald Trump's best efforts to bring him down.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, you can respond and we're going to move on to the next segment.

TRUMP: I would love to respond. First of all, I got to watch in preparing for this some of your debates
against Barack Obama. You treated him with terrible disrespect. And I watched the way you talk now about how lovely everything is and how wonderful you are. It doesn't work that way. You were after him, you were trying to -- you even sent out or your campaign sent out pictures of him in a certain garb, very famous pictures. I don't think you can deny that. But just last week, your campaign manager said it was true. So, when you tried to act holier than thou, it really doesn't work. It really doesn't. Now, as far as the lawsuit, yes, when I was very young, I went into my father's company, had a real estate company in Brooklyn and Queens, and we, along with many, many other companies throughout the country -- it was a federal lawsuit -- were sued. We settled the suit with zero -- with no admission of guilt. It was very easy to do.

HOLT: Our next segment is called "Securing America." We want to start with a 21st century war happening every day in this country. Our institutions are under cyber-attack, and our secrets are being stolen. So my question is, who's behind it? And how do we fight it?

Secretary Clinton, this answer goes to you.

CLINTON: Well, I think cyber security, cyber warfare will be one of the biggest challenges facing the next president, because clearly, we're facing at this point two different kinds of adversaries. There are the independent hacking groups that do it mostly for commercial reasons to try to steal information that they can use to make money. But increasingly, we are seeing cyber-attacks coming from states, organs of states. The most recent and troubling of these has been Russia. There's no doubt now that Russia has used cyber-attacks against all kinds of organizations in our country, and I am deeply concerned about this. I know Donald's very praiseworthy of Vladimir Putin, but Putin is playing a really...

(CROSSTALK)

CLINTON: ... tough, long game here. And one of the things he's done is to let loose cyber attackers to hack into government files, to hack into personal files, hack into the Democratic National Committee. And we recently have learned that, you know, that this is one of their preferred methods of trying to wreak havoc and collect information. We need to make it very clear -- whether it's Russia, China, Iran or anybody else -- the United States has much greater capacity. And we are not going to sit idly by and permit state actors to go after our information, our private-sector information or our public-sector information.

And we're going to have to make it clear that we don't want to use the kinds of tools that we have. We don't want to engage in a different kind of warfare. But we will defend the citizens of this country. And the

Russians need to understand that. I think they've been treating it as almost a probing, how far would we go, how much would we do. And that's why I was so -- I was so shocked when Donald publicly invited Putin to hack into Americans. That is just unacceptable. It's one of the reasons why 50 national security officials who served in Republican information -- in administrations...

HOLT: Your two minutes have expired.

CLINTON: ... have said that Donald is unfit to be the commander-in-chief. It's comments like that that really worry people who understand the threats that we face.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I think there are a number of issues that we should be addressing. I have put forth a plan to defeat ISIS. It does involve going after them online. I think we need to do much more with our tech companies to prevent ISIS and their operatives from being able to use the Internet to radicalize, even direct people in our country and Europe and elsewhere. But we also have to intensify our air strikes against ISIS and eventually support our Arab and Kurdish partners to be able to actually take out ISIS in Raqqa, end their claim of being a Caliphate.

We're making progress. Our military is assisting in Iraq. And we're hoping that within the year we'll be able to push ISIS out of Iraq and then, you know, really squeeze them in Syria.

But we have to be cognizant of the fact that they've had foreign fighters coming to volunteer for them, foreign money, foreign weapons, so we have to make this the top priority.

And I would also do everything possible to take out their leadership. I was involved in a number of efforts to take out Al Qaeda leadership when I was secretary of state, including, of course, taking out bin Laden. And I think we need to go after Baghdadi, as well, make that one of our organizing principles. Because we've got to defeat ISIS, and we've got to do everything we can to disrupt their propaganda efforts online.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

CLINTON: Well, I hope the fact-checkers are turning up the volume and really working hard. Donald supported the invasion of Iraq.

TRUMP: Wrong.

CLINTON: That is absolutely proved over and over again.

TRUMP: Wrong. Wrong.

CLINTON: He actually advocated for the actions we took in Libya and urged that Gadhafi be taken out, after actually doing some business with him one time.

CLINTON: But the larger point -- and he says this constantly -- is George W. Bush made the agreement
about when American troops would leave Iraq, not Barack Obama. And the only way that American troops could have stayed in Iraq is to get an agreement from the then-Iraqi government that would have protected our troops, and the Iraqi government would not give that.

But let’s talk about the question you asked, Lester. The question you asked is, what do we do here in the United States? That’s the most important part of this. How do we prevent attacks? How do we protect our people?

And I think we’ve got to have an intelligence surge, where we are looking for every scrap of information. I was so proud of law enforcement in New York, in Minnesota, in New Jersey. You know, they responded so quickly, so professionally to the attacks that occurred by Rahami. And they brought him down. And we may find out more information because he is still alive, which may prove to be an intelligence benefit.

So, we’ve got to do everything we can to vacuum up intelligence from Europe, from the Middle East. That means we’ve got to work more closely with our allies, and that’s something that Donald has been very dismissive of.

We’re working with NATO, the longest military alliance in the history of the world, to really turn our attention to terrorism. We’re working with our friends in the Middle East, many of which, as you know, are Muslim majority nations. Donald has consistently insulted Muslims abroad, Muslims at home, when we need to be cooperating with Muslim nations and with the American Muslim community. They’re on the front lines. They can provide information to us that we might not get anywhere else. They need to have close working cooperation with law enforcement in these communities, not be alienated and pushed away as some of Donald’s rhetoric, unfortunately, has led to.

CLINTON: Lester, we’ve covered...
TRUMP: No, wait a minute.
CLINTON: We’ve covered this ground.
HOLT: Secretary Clinton?

TRUMP: Wait. The AFL-CIO the other day, behind the blue screen, I don’t know who you were talking to, Secretary Clinton, but you were totally out of control. I said, there’s a person with a temperament that’s got a problem.

HOLT: Secretary Clinton?
CLINTON: Whew, OK.
(LAUGHTER)

Let’s talk about two important issues that were briefly mentioned by Donald, first, NATO. You know, NATO as a military alliance has something called Article 5, and basically it says this: An attack on one is an attack on all. And you know the only time it’s ever been invoked? After 9/11, when the 28 nations of NATO said that they would go to Afghanistan with us to fight terrorism, something that they still are doing by our side.

With respect to Iran, when I became secretary of state, Iran was weeks away from having enough nuclear material to form a bomb. They had mastered the nuclear fuel cycle under the Bush administration. They had built covert facilities. They had stocked them with centrifuges that were whirling away. And we had sanctioned them. I voted for every sanction against Iran when I was in the Senate, but it wasn’t enough. So, I spent a year-and-a-half putting together a coalition that included Russia and China to impose the toughest sanctions on Iran.

And we did drive them to the negotiating table. And my successor, John Kerry, and President Obama got a deal that put a lid on Iran’s nuclear program without firing a single shot. That’s diplomacy. That’s coalition-building. That’s working with other nations. The other day, I saw Donald saying that there were some Iranian sailors on a ship in the waters off of Iran, and they were taunting American sailors who were on a nearby ship. He said, you know, if they taunted our sailors, I’d blow them out of the water and start another war. That’s not good judgment.

TRUMP: That would not start a war.
CLINTON: That is not the right temperament to be commander-in-chief, to be taunted. And the worst part...

TRUMP: No, they were taunting us.
CLINTON: ... have a good time, folks.
TRUMP: It’s lies.

CLINTON: And, in fact, his cavalier attitude about nuclear weapons is so deeply troubling. That is the number-one threat we face in the world. And it becomes particularly threatening if terrorists ever get their hands on any nuclear material. So, a man who can be provoked by a tweet should not have his fingers anywhere near the nuclear codes, as far as I think anyone with any sense about this should be concerned.

TRUMP: That line’s getting a little bit old, I must say. I would like to...
CLINTON: It’s a good one, though. It well describes the problem.
(LAUGHTER)
HOLT: Our last...
HOLT: All right. Mrs. Clinton, Secretary Clinton, you have two minutes.

CLINTON: Well, let me ... let me start by saying, words matter. Words matter when you run for president. And they really matter when you are president. And I want to reassure our allies in Japan
and South Korea and elsewhere that we have mutual defense treaties and we will honor them.

It is essential that America's word be good. And so, I know that this campaign has caused some questioning and worries on the part of many leaders across the globe. I've talked with a number of them. But I want to -- on behalf of myself, and I think on behalf of a majority of the American people, say that, you know, our word is good. It's also important that we look at the entire global situation. There's no doubt that we have other problems with Iran. But personally, I'd rather deal with the other problems having put that lid on their nuclear program than still to be facing that.

And Donald never tells you what he would do. Would he have started a war? Would he have bombed Iran? If he's going to criticize a deal that has been very successful in giving us access to Iranian facilities that we never had before, then he should tell us what his alternative would be. But it's like his plan to defeat ISIS. He says it's a secret plan, but the only secret is that he has no plan.

So, we need to be more precise in how we talk about these issues. People around the word follow our presidential campaigns so closely, trying to get hints about what we will do. Can they rely on us? Are we going to lead the world with strength and in accordance with our values? That's what I intend to do. I intend to be a leader of our country that people can count on, both here at home and around the world, to make decisions that will further peace and prosperity, but also stand up to bullies, whether they're abroad or at home. We cannot let those who would try to destabilize the world to interfere with American interests and security...

HOLT: Your two minutes is...

CLINTON: ... to be given any opportunities at all.

CLINTON: You know, he tried to switch from looks to stamina. But this is a man who has called women pigs, slobs and dogs, and someone who has said pregnancy is an inconvenience to employers, who has said...

TRUMP: I never said that.

CLINTON: .... women don't deserve equal pay unless they do as good a job as men.

TRUMP: I didn't say that.

CLINTON: And one of the worst things he said was about a woman in a beauty contest. He loves beauty contests, supporting them and hanging around them. And he called this woman "Miss Piggy." Then he called her "Miss Housekeeping," because she was Latina. Donald, she has a name.

TRUMP: Where did you find this? Where did you find this?

CLINTON: Her name is Alicia Machado.
run in putting into practice the policies that you place before the electorate.

John Cole, BBC

*Question paraphrased:* There are stories you felt rushed into calling this election by public comment and you wished people would stay quiet?

Prime Minister

No, I have not been rushed into it by public comment. I know that there are some decisions now which are being held up, both in this country and abroad, because people want to be certain about the future and therefore, we are trying to end uncertainty.

John Cole, BBC

*Question paraphrased:* You are far the most senior, in years and experience, of all the party leaders. Will that be an election issue, indeed will personalities of party leaders be an issue?

Prime Minister

I hope that it will be fought on policies. I think it is the policy. I think personalities maybe only come in in judging whether or not you are the kind of person who knows what he or she stands for, can be seen to make clear decisions at the time they are needed, not hum and ha or haver, and can be seen to be able to stand up to your opposite numbers in international negotiations and see that Britain gets a good deal and Britain is respected.

John Cole, BBC

*Question paraphrased:* Do you think other party leaders could achieve that?

Prime Minister

That is a matter for the electorate to judge. I am not going to make any comment upon them. We place ourselves before the electorate for the judgment of the electorate.

John Cole, BBC

*Question paraphrased:* Given polls same as 1983 do you think this General Election will be a repeat of that one? Your opponents divided ...

Prime Minister

No, I do not. I think every election is different. This will be my eleventh election. They are all a bit different. The polls go up and down. The issues vary, and I do not think you can ever judge how an election will go. After years of hard work and training, you just hope to be able to cope with whatever comes up, but above all, you have got to explain your positive policies for the future because elections are about the future, but you judge parties on their record during their time in government.
one nation, not to look at them as north or south, one class or another. We say: It does not matter who you are, where you come from, you shall have your opportunity and you too shall own property; you too shall have the chance to own shares, build up your savings.” That is the way to build one Britain — and we are doing it.

John Cole, BBC

*Question paraphrased:* But what if business does not take opportunities in these poorer areas?

Prime Minister

Business is taking the opportunities. Why do you run it down? Business is doing really well. Yes, business is competing in the markets of the world. Britain is economically strong. It is not governments that create wealth - creating business. It is people. Manufacturing industry is far fitter than it was. It is competing well. The new sunrise industries are doing well. The new service industries are doing well, not only in London. Edinburgh is the second financial centre of the United Kingdom. Tourism is doing well. Look at the numbers of people now who are earning so well that they are able to go abroad for their holidays. Business is doing well and that is because we have returned to the people the freedom, the opportunity, the enterprise which was their birthright as British citizens and they are rising to their responsibilities and that is why Britain has been transformed in the last eight years.

John Cole, BBC

*Question paraphrased:* Opposition has suggested that your personality and style of government — the cry of one-woman government — will be component of their campaign. How will you reply?

Prime Minister

Well, if that is all they have got to say I really should not take much notice of them! If in that way they are saying Britain has had strong government in which people know where they are with it, a government which knows where it is going, of clear, positive policies, then they are right. We have just that sort of government. I do not think they could provide it.

John Cole, BBC

*Question paraphrased:* Will this be your last General Election as leader of the Conservatives?

Prime Minister

I would hope not; I would hope not. This is only the third term we are asking for. There is quite a long way to go. Do you know, I think in our manifesto, which will come out next week, I think that it may take longer than five years. I think it really is a manifesto to set the course to go up to the end of the century. We are going to be rather lucky to be living at a time when you get the turn of the thousand years, and we really ought to set Britain’s course for the next century as well as this, but it is a Britain that must be strong. It is a Britain that must be respected in the world because of the strength of its people, because its government is determined to defend the freedom, the justice, the opportunity. Yes, people do know where they stand with us. Yes, they do know we are strong government. Yes, they do know we have a property-owning democracy the like of which we have never had, which will give opportunity in the future we have never had before. Yes, I hope to go on and on, because I believe passionately in our policies. I believe they are right for Britain and I believe people like to feel they live in a country which is respected the world over for its talents and the abilities and the character of its people.

John Cole, BBC

*Question paraphrased:* You’ve mentioned the end of the century. How close to then will you continue?

Prime Minister

Well, let us win the first election first. You know, life only comes one election at a time and if we win every one as it comes then we shall be doing what I want.