

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and Mr. Trump

Nur Ilyana Elisa Aiman Haris Fadzilah^{1*}, Maizura Mohd Noor²

¹ Akademi Pengajian Bahasa
Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM)
2018638384@student.uitm.edu.my

² Akademi Pengajian Bahasa
Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM)
maizu567@uitm.edu.my

*corresponding author

Article history:

Received: 2 October 2021

Accepted: 6 December 2021

Published: 10 December 2021

Abstract

Personal pronouns are often used to the point they often get overlooked. Unlike content words, they do not convey meaning but portray the perception of the speaker (Nakaggwe, 2012). Looking deeper into this, personal pronouns have the power to include or exclude a person or people of the subject (Khafaga, 2021), and it is crucial to master them especially in the political context. However, cultural differences exist in the use of personal pronouns since culture affects the way a person communicates and interprets information (Gocheo, 2012). For this reason, this qualitative research attempts to identify the use of personal pronouns, specifically those that demonstrate inclusiveness and exclusiveness, in the collectivistic Malaysian and individualistic American cultures, and compare the similarities and differences in the use of personal pronouns in speeches given by Tun Dr. Mahathir who represents the collectivistic Malaysian culture and Mr. Trump who represents the individualistic American culture. The *AntConc* software was used to determine the speech profiles and identify the personal pronouns based on the coding schemes and guidelines. It was found that the most popular personal pronoun used in their speeches is *we*, while the least popular are *me* and the subject singular *you*. *They* was used more frequently by Tun Dr. Mahathir to indirectly address the audience, while Mr. Trump opted to directly convey his message by using the plural *you*. The results have practical implications for speech writing and political persuasion and negotiation skills.

Keywords: *personal pronouns, political discourse, speeches, persuasive language, cultural background*

Introduction

In verbal communication, appropriate use of personal pronouns by a speaker in a specific context is able to produce a desirable impact on the audience (Wahyuningsih, 2018). The term ‘personal’ is used to label the pronoun class to which the grammatical category of a person applies (Bhattacharyya, 2015). Personal pronouns are one of the rhetorical devices (Alemi, Latifi & Nematzadeh, 2018; Allen, 2007; Hakansson, 2012) used to persuade audiences of political speeches. In this study, the political speeches were both presented at the 74th United Nations General Assembly (UNGA). Hence, it is imperative to describe the organisation and its role. United Nations (UN) is an international organisation established in 1945, which is currently made up of 193 Member States, and guided by the purposes and principles contained in its Charter (Fomerand, Lynch and Mingst, 2020). The objectives of the UN are to maintain peace and security, develop friendly relations among countries, achieve global cooperation to solve international problems, and serve as a centre where country leaders can come together and coordinate their actions and activities to achieve the aforementioned objectives (Asthana, 2020). In addition to that, the General Assembly is one of the six principal organs of the UN and is the only body in which all UN members are represented (Ramsden, 2021). According to Fomerand, Lynch and Mingst (2020), its primary role is to provide space for the members to discuss issues and offer suggestions, although it has no power to enforce its solutions or to induce state action. This can be challenging considering the diverse cultural backgrounds of the members.

Since culture affects nearly every aspect of our lives, it is necessary to be aware and respectful of the differences while communicating interculturally and cross-culturally. This practice should also be considered in the act of persuasion because culture also affects the way a person communicates and interprets information (Gochecho, 2012). By examining the use of personal pronouns by political leaders and speech writers of various cultures, it is hoped that we will be able to engineer the appropriate persuasive techniques when addressing an audience as diverse as the one at UNGA.

In the present globalized world, political leaders communicate not only with their own people, but also with people from other nations. It has become crucial for them to network with foreign political figures while communicating their ideas and policies cross-culturally. By using personal pronouns prudently, they would be able to impart their messages effectively in cross-cultural as

well as intercultural contexts. Furthermore, political leaders of a multicultural nation would also benefit from this study. They would be more aware of the cultural differences among their audiences and would strive to maintain the balance between inclusive and exclusive personal pronouns when addressing a multicultural audience. This way, they can explain better and convince the audience through their speeches. Contrastively, the audience would be educated to be culturally sensitive to the similarities and differences of the use of personal pronouns between collectivistic and individualistic cultures. This may help them to understand the roles and rationales behind the usage of a particular personal pronoun, which will consequently improve their understanding of the goal of the speech.

Problem Statement

Since the early stages of civilization, the art of persuasion has been central in politics (Field, 2018). The mastery of rhetorical skills demonstrates a politician's ability to move the hearts of others or motivate attitude change. A favourable outcome of a persuasive political speech might make a huge difference for the nation and even internationally. However, there are certain factors to consider when choosing the most appropriate persuasive technique to be used in a speech.

Cultural differences are one important aspect to consider in persuasion. Orji (2016) concludes that although some persuasive techniques are effective regardless of cultures, there are also some differences in relation to persuasion between collectivist and individualist cultures. This brings up the question of how political leaders should go about persuading an audience from a specific culture or an audience of diverse cultures.

Therefore, it is important to investigate the use of personal pronouns in political speeches of leaders from collectivist and individualist cultures to ensure effective persuasion. When used effectively, political leaders will be able to appeal better to their people. Unfortunately, there are inadequate studies on political persuasion and rhetorical skills that compare cultures, as they mostly focus on one particular culture (Setiarini, Winarni and Junining, 2019; Alemi, Latifi and Nematzadeh, 2018; Wahyuningsih, 2018; Nakaggwe, 2012). Hence, this study aims to fill the gap by comparing the use of personal pronouns by two political leaders from the collectivist Malaysian and individualist American cultures.

The research objectives of the study are:

1. To identify the functions of personal pronouns used in a political speech by Tun Dr. Mahathir.
2. To identify the functions of personal pronouns used in a political speech by President Trump.
3. To compare the functions of personal pronouns in political speeches between Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump.

Literature Review

Speeches in Political Discourse

Political discourse analysis is a discipline that takes place within the political environment, which are manifested by political performers, and can be referred to the written text, spoken language or non-verbal communication used by politicians to reach their goals (Bataneh, 2019). The objectives are to observe the utilisation of linguistic and rhetorical strategies, as well as the language choices made to achieve a particular political effect (Bataneh, 2019). Additionally, political leaders are responsible to present their or the party's ideas in an influential way (Nakaggwe, 2012). Their goals are to persuade the audience to concur with them or to motivate a change in perception or attitude towards a particular matter (Orji, 2016). In the current technological era, a politician's speech is easily spread worldwide. Due to this, their audience is not only those sitting in the hall, but also those sitting behind the screen. Hence, it is crucial for a political speech to be easily understood and appealing to the audience, in order to garner political support (Nakaggwe, 2012).

Hussein (2016) states that political discourse is not a genre by itself, but a class of genres defined by a social domain, namely politics. Parliamentary debates, programmes in a political party and speeches given by political leaders are among the genres that belong in the political domain. A speech is an example of spoken political discourse and refers to an activity of public speaking, commonly used in a formal setting to deliver an opinion (Wahyuningsih, 2018).

Political speeches are usually given by political leaders representing a political group rather than as an individual. The objectives are to increase the population's political participation and to

persuade them to have the same opinion as the politician (Hakansson, 2012). This is supported by Allen (2007) who further explains that all meanings intended by the speaker aim to fulfill a politically strategic function by carefully scripted words. Despite this, Hussein (2016) believes that the spoken discourse is spontaneous in comparison to the written discourse. Due to the persuasive nature of political speeches, political leaders rely significantly on the manipulation of language to meet the objectives. Chilton (2004), as cited in Bataineh (2019), asserts that both language and politics are intertwined, and politics is all about the appropriate use of language.

When communicating, people use discursal elements to construct, maintain and direct their interactions to their receptive audience (Farahani and Kazemian, 2021). This interaction is established via the communication between the conveyor of the message and its receiver. According to Hyland (2017), as cited in Farahani and Kazemian (2021), the discursal elements, also known as metadiscourse features, are responsible in establishing the speaker-audience interaction during the communication process. Wang and Zhang (2016) further add that the speaker uses metadiscourse features to assist the audience to understand the intention better. Markus (2006) supports this claim by stating that metadiscourse represents a speaker's attempts to guide the audience's perception of a message being conveyed. On top of that, Wang and Zhang (2016) and Markus (2006) agree that metadiscourse allows the speaker to make the audience understand their personalities and attitudes towards a message.

Interactional resources (Farahani and Kazemian, 2021; Markus, 2006; Wang and Zhang, 2016) are one of the defining characteristics of communication in metadiscourse, which functions to involve the audience in the interaction. It includes hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self-mentions (Farahani and Kazemian, 2021; Markus, 2006; Wang and Zhang, 2016).

Markus (2006) found that the use of personal pronouns is especially prominent in the interactional resource of self-mentions. According to Markus (2006), by using *we* and *us*, the speaker creates an atmosphere where the audience is welcomed into the interaction. Markus (2006) claims that the audience is not only drawn to the speech being delivered, but are also connected to the speaker through these inclusive personal pronouns. All in all, building a relationship between the speaker and audience is essential in a speaker-audience interaction to attract the attention of the audience and eventually, persuade them of the speaker's ideas.

Persuasive Language and Cultural Influence

According to Nakaggwe (2012), persuasion involves the use of rhetorical devices in order to make a message more appealing and convincing. In addition, Alemi, Latifi and Nematzadeh (2018) describe persuasive strategies as a manipulative language spilled into the media and political arena. This is because a majority of people may be influenced by this phenomenon. A successful persuasion is demonstrated through the change in perception or attitude of the audience towards a particular issue.

There are numerous persuasive linguistic strategies that can be used by political leaders to gain the favour of their people or change their attitude towards a particular matter. Persuasive linguistic strategies are not limited to metaphors, repetition and term choice (Bataneh, 2019). Kulsum-Binder (2017) also investigated parallelism, alliteration and intertextuality as persuasive linguistic strategies in American and British political speeches. In her study, Kulsum-Binder (2017) describes parallelism as the repetition of words or phrases, alliteration as the repetition of initial alphabets, and intertextuality as making references to other texts and people that may be unrelated to the field of the speech currently being made. Careful choice of personal pronouns is also one of these strategies (Nakaggwe, 2012).

The influence of culture cannot be ignored especially in the act of persuasion. It is a fundamental factor to consider when choosing the most appropriate strategy to persuade a person or a group of people (Orji, 2016). This is because culture affects the way a person communicates and interprets information (Giri, 2006). Therefore, during the process of persuasion, the use of personal pronouns must be chosen appropriately to match the culture of the audience, in order to ensure the desired outcome after a speech.

This study employs Hofstede's (1980) *Collectivism versus Individualism* cultural dimension because it accounts for the majority of variances in global differences (Orji, 2016). This cultural dimension underlines the relationship between an individual's self and his social group. Orji (2016) states that a major distinguishing factor between collectivist and individualist cultural orientation is the relationship that an individual perceives of oneself and group membership. Orji

(2016) further explains that in a collectivist culture, people get integrated into strong cohesive groups since birth. An indicator of this culture is the frequent use of first-person plural pronouns such as *we* and *us* (Tausczik & Pennebaker, 2010, as cited in Yu et al., 2016). Malaysia has a low *Individualism* score of 26, indicating that it is a collectivistic culture (Hofstede's Insights, 2020). In contrast, America has a high *Individualism* score of 91. Orji (2016) also explains that in an individualist culture, people are expected to look after themselves. An indicator of this culture is the frequent use of first-person singular pronouns such as *I* and *me* (Tausczik & Pennebaker, 2010, as cited in Yu et al., 2016). Hence, a comparison of the use of personal pronouns between Malaysian and American political leaders representing collectivist and individualist culture respectively would be able to provide better insights into the influence of culture in persuasion.

Personal Pronouns as a Rhetorical Device

Crystal (2008) defines rhetoric as the study of effective or persuasive speaking and writing. Along the same line, Setiarini, Winarni and Junining (2019) claim that rhetoric is a useful way to control the audience, persuade and attract the public's attention. It can be concluded that rhetoric is a style of persuasive speaking and a technique to attract the attention of the audience.

As a rhetorical device in political discourse, personal pronouns do not only refer to politicians and others, but also suggest multiple identities of themselves and others, presented from a range of perspectives (Allen, 2007). Allen (2007) claims that personal pronouns are used by politicians to present positive aspects of themselves and negative aspects of their opponents. Hakansson (2012) concurs by adding that politicians tend to present themselves to be perceived as suitable leaders of the nation by their people. This is due to the inclusive and exclusive nature of personal pronouns. Alemi, Latifi and Nematzadeh (2018) assert that personal pronouns are a powerful device in political speeches when it is necessary to include or exclude a part of the society or institutions.

Allen (2007) highlights a point on the traditional polarization in politics specifically on the pronouns *we* versus *they*, or *us* versus *them*. *We* and *us* are associated with inclusiveness and positive elements, while *they* and *them* are associated with exclusiveness and negative elements (Allen, 2007). Similarly, Jong (2018) simply describes *we* and *us* as togetherness and *they* and *them* as separateness.

He, him, she, her and both forms of *it* are irrelevant to the inclusiveness and exclusiveness aspects of a political speech, as they simply refer to a singular and specific third person which are used in everyday personal conversations. This is supported by Gochecho (2012) who agrees that the personal pronoun *we* and *us* is generally used to express solidarity and therefore indicates inclusiveness (Gochecho, 2012). Meanwhile, the personal pronouns *I, me, you, they* and *them* indicate exclusiveness (Gochecho, 2012; Jong, 2018). Other studies on the use of pronouns in political speeches (Bataineh, 2019; Setiarini, Winarni and Junining, 2019; Alemi, Latifi and Nematzadeh, 2018; Wahyuningsih, 2018; Kulsum-Binder, 2017; Hakansson, 2012; Nakaggwe, 2012) include some or all the aforementioned inclusive and exclusive personal pronouns but did not include *he, him, she, her* and *it*. Hence, it can be concluded that different personal pronouns can significantly affect the perception of the audience differently.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design to examine, analyse and compare political speech transcripts from two different cultures. The case study method was used to analyse and describe the use of personal pronouns in these transcripts. Conceptual content analysis was employed to determine the types of personal pronouns in the transcripts. This allows for direct examination on communication using text and provides insight into the complexities of human thought and language use (Bhasin, 2020).

The heterogeneous purposive sampling method was used in this study. This sampling method is suitable for this study because the speech transcripts must be from two different cultures. Tun Dr. Mahathir, the former Malaysian political leader represents the collectivistic culture, while Mr. Trump, the former American political leader represents the individualistic culture. It is important to note that during the time of data collection, these politicians were still country leaders. The decision to proceed with the data was made as although they both are no longer country leaders, they remain prominent in the political arena. The speech transcripts were chosen from the 74th Session of the UNGA which was the latest session of the General Assembly during the data collection stage. UNGA is a platform that provides opportunities for world leaders to not only

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

address but also convince the global audience on various pressing issues. The theme of the 74th Session of UNGA was “Galvanising multilateral efforts for poverty eradication, quality education, climate action and inclusion”, as highlighted by Tun Dr. Mahathir in his speech. The Malaysian Prime Minister discussed on the potential abuse of veto powers, terrorism, the fate of Rohingyas in Myanmar, economic issues faced by Malaysia and other nations, and climate change. Meanwhile, President Trump discussed on economic achievements in America, issues in World Trade Organisation, issues in Iran, building friendly relationships with other nations, illegal immigration and human rights. Hence, the sample is able to explain the ways the political leaders use personal pronouns to address and persuade an audience of multicultural backgrounds around the world.

One of the research instruments used in this study is *AntConc*. It is a free corpus analysis tool kit useful for linguistic analysis of texts which is highly maintained by its developer - Laurence Anthony (Froehlich, 2015), making it a reliable instrument to be used in research (Froehlich, 2015). This software was used in checking the speech profiles and identifying the personal pronouns in the speech transcripts. Another research instrument used in this study is coding schemes. They were structured in a concept-driven way and developed based on the categorisation of personal pronouns by Hall and Barduhn (2016). Most grammar references also label or categorise personal pronouns similarly as they are functional words and hence are stable. However, only personal pronouns that are relevant to the inclusiveness (*we, us*) and exclusiveness (*I, me, you, they, them*) aspects of the speeches were examined as this study aims to explain the ways the leaders manage their relationships with the audience. Hence, not all of the listed pronouns were included as the context would determine whether they are inclusive or exclusive. Since the pronouns *he, him, she, her* and *it* simply refer to a singular and specific third person which are used in daily personal conversations, they are inconsequential to the inclusiveness and exclusiveness aspects of a political speech. In addition to this, the coding schemes representing the personal pronouns based on Hall and Barduhn (2016) were first categorised as subjects and objects, and were further sub-categorised as first-person, second-person and third-person personal pronouns. The results of the identification work using the Word List tool of AntConc were also checked manually by the researchers. Once the identification work was done, the functions of each

type of personal pronouns (subjects and objects) were explained. Table 1 presents the coding schemes for exclusive and inclusive personal pronouns.

Table 1: Coding Schemes for Exclusive and Inclusive Personal Pronouns

Type	Personal Pronouns		Coding Schemes	
A	Subject Pronouns	First-Person Pronouns	Singular <i>I</i>	P1a(i)
			Plural <i>we</i>	P1a(ii)
		Second-Person Pronouns	Singular <i>you</i>	P1b(i)
			Plural <i>you</i>	P1b(ii)
		Third-Person Pronoun	Plural <i>they</i>	P1c
B	Object Pronouns	First-Person Pronouns	Singular <i>me</i>	P2a(i)
			Plural <i>us</i>	P2a(ii)
		Second-Person Pronouns	Singular <i>you</i>	P2b(i)
			Plural <i>you</i>	P2b(ii)
		Third-Person Pronoun	Plural <i>them</i>	P2c

Firstly, in the data collection procedure, the leaders were identified. Tun Dr. Mahathir Mohamad was chosen to represent the collectivistic culture and Mr. Donald Trump was chosen to represent the individualistic culture. Once identified, a common platform was chosen to ensure that the speeches are within the same context - UNGA. Their speech transcripts were then selected and extracted from the New Straits Times news portal (Tun Dr. Mahathir's speech transcript) and The White House official website (Mr. Trump's speech transcript). Then, they were copied into two separate *Microsoft Word* documents and labelled as MP and AP, representing Tun Dr. Mahathir's speech and Mr. Trump's speech respectively. The process of cleaning up the transcripts involved

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

removing paragraph numbers and headings. The files were then converted into text files and ran through *AntConc*. Next, the speech profiles were determined using the Word List tool of *AntConc*.

Based on the coding schemes, the Word List tool was utilized to record each personal pronoun in MP’s speech, along with the line numbers they appeared in the speech transcript. The results were tabulated into two sets of tables; the first set is the use of personal pronouns as subjects and the second set is the use of personal pronouns as objects. Similarly, the procedures were repeated for AP’s speech to answer the second research question. Finally, the results were then compared based on the context to analyse similarities and differences in the use of personal pronouns by the two country leaders from different cultural backgrounds.

Findings and Discussion

AntConc shows that there are 2842 word tokens and 893 word types in the Malaysian leader’s speech. Meanwhile, the American leader’s speech has 3882 word tokens and 1247 word types.

Functions of Personal Pronouns Used in the Malaysian Leader’s Speech

Table 2 shows the types of personal pronouns used as subjects in Tun Dr. Mahathir’s speech. A total of 93 items were identified.

Table 2: Types of Personal Pronouns as Subjects Used in the Malaysian Leader’s Speech

Person	Pronoun	Frequency
First-person	<i>I</i>	11
	<i>we</i>	56
Second-person	Singular <i>you</i>	0
	Plural <i>you</i>	1
Third-person	<i>they</i>	25

Examples are extracted from the speech to explain the use of the personal pronouns in context. However, due to space limitation, the complete list of the identification work is only made available as Appendix C.

Example (1)

I think, instead of preparing for war, we should be paying attention to the climate changes and accompanying natural disasters.

The personal pronoun *I* is observed to generally represent the speaker's point of view, opinions, and beliefs as shown in Example (1). It is taken from the MP's text when Tun Dr. Mahathir stated his strong opinion that country leaders should pay more attention to the global issue instead of preparing for war. This is in line with the work by Wahyuningsih (2018) who claims that the pronoun *I* functions to express the personal beliefs of a politician. UNGA is a platform that promotes expressions of ideas and opinions, and this allows world leaders to represent themselves as prominent individuals.

Example (2)

We must punish warmongers.

Meanwhile, the personal pronoun *we* is observed to represent the country leaders who attended UNGA. In Example (2), Tun Dr. Mahathir was closing his speech by stating his main points. One of his main points was that the country leaders, including himself, must collectively take action against warmongers. Allen (2007) states that the pronoun *we* is used to induce a general collective response or attitude to a matter. This clearly exemplifies Tun Dr. Mahathir's effort of convincing the country leaders that they are together in acting against warmongers.

Example (3)

We appeal to the good sense of the rich not to impoverish us, not to deprive hundreds of thousands of our workers from earning a living.

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

In addition, the personal pronoun *we* was also used to represent the speaker's country and citizens. In Example (3), the former Malaysian Prime Minister was addressing a rumour that palm oil produced in Malaysia is poisonous. He stated that there was no evidence of such, and this rumour had led to the economic struggles faced by Malaysians. In this sentence, he represented the voice of his country to appeal to the 'rich' nations to consume Malaysian palm oil. Belonging to the collectivistic culture, his use of *we* is expected as he needs to present his plea as unanimously agreed by his people in order to be more persuasive and convincing. This is a common political strategy concurred by Nakaggwe (2012), who states that the pronoun *we* is able to establish a patriotic connection between the country leader and the people. This is achieved while conveying specific political ideas which are similarly shared by the people.

Example (4)

We, the human creatures are clever.

The last observed function of the personal pronoun *we* is to refer to general humanity as shown in Example (4). Tun Dr. Mahathir referred to all humanity as 'clever'. This is to coax the country leaders to focus on concerted effort to reverse climate change instead of to prepare for war. It should be noted that attendees of UNGA include diplomatic officers and journalists. The sessions are televised all over the world. Although it is well-known that the pronoun *we* functions to include the audience and create a sense of togetherness (Alavidze, 2017), not many politicians have used it to refer to humanity. Therefore, Tun Dr. Mahathir's attempt of referring to all by ensuring that none is excluded in the environmental initiative is an applaudable persuasive move.

Example (5)

You will be doing a good deed by consuming palm oil.

The plural *you* is observed to refer to country leaders other than the speaker. In Example (5), Tun Dr. Mahathir was pleading for world leaders of 'rich' nations to help alleviate the economic struggles faced by Malaysians by consuming the palm oil produced in Malaysia. Bello (2013) and Kulsum-Binder (2017) describe this function as developing an affinity between the speaker and audience. Hence, in this sentence, Tun Dr. Mahathir was persuading the country leaders to assist

his nation by manipulating the affinity which creates a sense of community between himself and his audience.

Example (6)

And so, *they* gave themselves veto powers over the rest of the world in the organisation *they* built – an organisation *they* claim would end wars in the solution of conflicts.

The personal pronoun *they* was used to indirectly refer to country leaders. This is shown in Example (6). In this sentence, Tun Dr. Mahathir was indirectly referring to the country leaders with *veto* power. He criticised the undemocratic privilege and elaborated on the negative consequences of it. Interestingly, despite the presence of those leaders at the session, he referred to them using the third-person pronoun *they*. By using the pronoun *they*, he strongly demonstrated his ideological differences and disagreement which was also discovered in Allen's (2007) work on Australian political discourse. It is also worth noting that Malaysian values promote indirectness in communication (Jamaliah, 2017). Therefore, the pronoun *they* was used in this sentence to politely express disagreement, in order to save the face of countries with *veto* power.

Example (7)

I must again refer to the fate of the Rohingyas in Myanmar... *They* were forced to migrate and now *they* dare not return to Myanmar even when offered.

They was also used to refer to those who specifically were not present at UNGA. In Example (7), the former Malaysian Prime Minister was referring to the Rohingyas who had been driven away from their own homes, criticising the act of expelling non-natives and natives alike. The pronoun *they* in this sentence was used as an anaphoric reference to the Rohingya community mentioned earlier in his speech. Similarly, Allen (2007) also discovers that the use of *they* has an anaphoric reference to refer to something mentioned earlier in the discourse.

Table 3 shows the types of personal pronouns used as objects identified in the Malaysian leader's speech. Altogether, 18 personal pronouns were identified in Tun Dr. Mahathir's speech. It should be noted that *me* is missing from the text.

Table 3: Types of Personal Pronouns as Objects Used in the Malaysian Leader’s Speech

Person	Pronoun	Frequency
First-person	<i>me</i>	0
	<i>us</i>	8
Second-person	Singular <i>you</i>	1
	Plural <i>you</i>	1
Third-person	<i>them</i>	8

Similarly, examples from the speech are provided to explain the use of the personal pronouns in context. The complete list of the identification work is made available as Appendix D.

Example (8)

So, don’t impoverish *us* by forcing *us* to buy what we don’t need or to reduce our exports.

Based on Example (8), the personal pronoun *us* was used to represent the speaker and his people. Tun Dr. Mahathir was referring to himself and his people when he appealed to other country leaders not to pauperize Malaysians. According to Bataineh (2019), the pronoun *us* is used to indicate a sense of togetherness, similar to its subject counterpart, *we*. With this in mind, Tun Dr. Mahathir used the pronoun *us* to show that he stood with his people when he made the appeal.

Example (9)

I would like to join others in congratulating *you* Mr. President on your election as the President of the 74th Session of the United Nations General Assembly.

The singular *you* was used to address a specific person at UNGA. In the introduction of his speech as shown in Example (9), Tun Dr. Mahathir specifically congratulated the President of the 74th Session of UNGA on his election. This is not surprising as Malaysia scores high on the power distance index and this is reflected in how Malaysians approve social hierarchy (Wan et al., 2019). Despite being a common practice in such organisations, Tun Dr. Mahathir’s cultural background also influences his decision to first congratulate the newly elected UNGA President.

Example (10)

I thank *you*.

Furthermore, the plural *you* was used to address the UNGA attendees, as well as express appreciation. This is shown in Example (10). Tun Dr. Mahathir expressed his gratitude to all UNGA attendees at the end of his speech for being given the opportunity to present his ideas and opinions. This is in line with the work by Setiarini, Winarni and Junining (2019) who state that by thanking the attendees, the speaker is able to create an informal relationship and closeness between the speaker and audience. It should also be noted that his action is a common protocol to show support and commitment to the organisation.

Example (11)

It ensured that all solution to all conflicts could be negated by any one of *them*.

The personal pronoun *them* was used to indirectly refer to country leaders. Example (11) is an instance when the former Malaysian Prime Minister was indirectly referring to country leaders who possess the *veto* power and expressed his concern that the power can be easily abused. Similar to its subject counterpart *they*, these leaders were addressed using the third-person pronoun *them*, despite the fact that they were present at the 74th UNGA. Similar to Example (6), Tun Dr. Mahathir politely expressed his strong disagreement on the matter by using the third-person pronoun *them* instead of the second-person pronoun *you*. This demonstrates his commitment to save the face of the leaders of the powerful nations.

Example (12)

Muslims everywhere have been oppressed, expelled from their countries and refused asylum...
Now the wars and instability due to regime change have forced *them* to run away from their
countries.

The pronoun *them* was also used to refer to those who were not present at UNGA. This is shown in Example (12), when Tun Dr. Mahathir was raising the issue of Muslims who have become victims of prejudice. In this sentence, *them* was merely used as an anaphoric reference to Muslims

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

who are disowned by their own countries and forced to flee to other countries. Nakaggwe (2012) also discovers that plural third-person pronouns may also be used anaphorically in a non-strategic way.

Functions of Personal Pronouns Used in the American Leader’s Speech

Mr. Trump’s speech has a total of 104 instances of the use of personal pronouns as subjects as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Types of Personal Pronouns as Subjects Used in the American Leader’s Speech

Person	Pronoun	Frequency
First-person	<i>I</i>	22
	<i>we</i>	57
Second-person	Singular <i>you</i>	0
	Plural <i>you</i>	12
Third-person	<i>they</i>	13

Note that although only selected instances are presented due to space limitation, the complete list is available in Appendix E.

Example (13)

To confront these unfair practices, *I* placed massive tariffs on more than \$500 billion worth of Chinese-made goods.

Based on Example (13), the personal pronoun *I* was used to highlight the speaker’s past deeds. Mr. Trump underlined what he had done back home to counter the negative economic implications after China’s accession to the World Trade Organisation. It is interesting that he explicitly opted to use *I* suggesting his individual effort instead of the collective effort of his government. This is in line with the work by Hakansson (2012) who claims that the pronoun *I* functions to show

personal involvement in a matter, which is politically beneficial when good news is being delivered. The use of *I* in this sentence demonstrates Mr. Trump's effort at portraying and promoting himself as a responsible and proactive leader. Belonging to the individualistic culture, his action can be well-received by his people as they value personal achievements (Wang and Fan, 2013).

Example (14)

But *I* will never fail to defend America's interests.

Another observed function of the personal pronoun *I* was to represent the speaker's promise. Mr. Trump stated that the United States of America does not seek conflict with other nations, and desires peace, cooperation and mutual gain with others. In Example (14), he made a promise that he would continue to 'defend' the interests of his people - the Americans, in order to show that his priority is his country. This function is also found in the study by Bello (2013) who analysed Nigerian political discourse. By making this promise, Mr. Trump attempts to reassure his people that they will always be his priority, and accordingly garner more political support from them (Bello, 2013).

Example (15)

For this reason, my administration is working with other nations to stop criminalizing of homosexuality, and *we* stand in solidarity with LGBTQ people who live in countries that punish, jail, or execute individuals based upon sexual orientation.

In Example (15), the personal pronoun *we* was used to represent the speaker's government or administration. In this instance, Mr. Trump stressed that his administration was cooperating with other nations to support the LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender/Transexual and Queer/Questioning) community. However, it is intriguing that instead of using the pronoun *I* to present himself in a positive way as shown in Example (13), he now opted to use *we*. The pronoun *we* was used to show that he was speaking on behalf of his administration. This is supported by Bello (2013) and Allen (2007) who argue that the use of *we* reflects the government's stance as collective. His decision to use *we* is seen as a safety measure considering the backlash that he

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

would receive not only from American anti-LGBTQ hate groups, but also from other UNGA attendees (for example, Muslim and Catholic countries).

Example (16)

Because if *you* make it here, *you* will not be allowed in; *you* will be promptly returned home.

The plural *you* was used to directly refer to the country leaders other than the speaker. In Example (16), Mr. Trump was criticising illegal immigrants. He clearly stated his stance that they would not be welcomed in America due to the need to protect the American borders. Instead of using *they* to refer to the illegal immigrants, he repeatedly used *you* - in the If Clause to describe the conditional situation as well as in the next two clauses to lay out the punishment. This should be highlighted especially considering the fact that UNGA attendees are all respected members of the organisation. His decision to use *you* is seen as a stern warning to all countries. Hakansson (2012) explains that when the speaker uses the pronoun *you*, it is up to the audience to decide whether they are included or excluded in the group responsible for the issue being discussed. In this instance, leaders of countries with a significant number of illegal immigrants in America would certainly understand that the stern advice was directed towards them.

Example (17)

Events in Venezuela remind us all that socialism and communism are not about justice, *they* are not about equality, *they* are not about lifting up the poor, and *they* are certainly not about the good of the nation.

On top of that, the personal pronoun *they* was used to refer to concepts. In Example (17), the former American President stated that socialism and communism pose serious challenges to the countries and he also highlighted their negative aspects. Similar to Example (7), *they* was used as an anaphoric reference, and in this sentence, *they* refers to socialism and communism. In addition, the use of the pronoun *they* clearly shows his attempt to dissociate himself and his country from those ideologies. In fact, it serves to convince other nations to reject the ideologies as well. This function is also found in the work by Allen (2007) who states that the pronoun *they* can be used as a distancing strategy by distancing the speaker from the matter spoken of.

Table 5 presents the identification work on the types of personal pronouns as objects in Mr. Trump's speech. 25 instances were discovered. Similarly, the pronoun *me* is not available in the text.

Table 5: Types of Personal Pronouns as Objects Used in the American Political Leader's Speech

Person	Pronoun	Frequency
First-person	<i>me</i>	0
	<i>us</i>	12
Second-person	Singular <i>you</i>	0
	Plural <i>you</i>	7
Third-person	<i>them</i>	6

The complete list of the identification work is made available as Appendix F due to space limitation.

Example (18)

Like my beloved country, each nation represented in this hall has a cherished history, culture, and heritage that is worth defending and celebrating, and which gives *us* our singular potential and strength.

In Example (18), the personal pronoun *us* was used to represent the country leaders who attended the 74th UNGA. Mr. Trump was referring to all country leaders present in the hall who would defend and celebrate their respective nation's history, culture and heritage. The use of *us* in this sentence creates a sense of togetherness between the speaker and the other country leaders. This is in line with the work by Saj (2012) who states that *us* is used to indicate a sense of togetherness between the speaker and the audience.

Example (19)

To our country, I can tell **you** sincerely: We are working closely with our friends in the region...
prosperity for our people

The plural *you* was used to address the UNGA attendees. In Example (19), Mr. Trump was ensuring the UNGA members that he, together with his administration, was working with other nations to secure the American borders in order to maintain peace and prosperity of the citizens and region. Allen (2007) states that the *you* serves as an impersonal pronoun and refers to all related audiences. In this instance, *you* refers to all UNGA attendees.

Example (20)

Mexico is showing us great respect, and I respect **them** in return.

Lastly, *them* was used to address the citizens or representatives from another country. In Example (20), the American President expressed his respect towards the Mexican leader and his people for cooperating and allowing him to put 27 000 troops on the American southern border. The pronoun *them* was used as an anaphoric reference to the Mexican government. It should be noted that the Mexican leader and his government were referred to as *them*, despite their presence at the 74th UNGA. This suggests that Mr. Trump was particularly addressing the other UNGA attendees despite complimenting the Mexican government. It is common for the pronoun *them* to be used to distance oneself from others (Hakansson, 2012). However, Mr. Trump's exclusion of the Mexicans in his address, while complimenting them who were also present is particularly of interest. This questions his sincerity in expressing his gratitude towards the Mexicans' cooperation. Considering the long-standing strenuous relationship between the two countries, it was greatly expected from Mr. Trump.

Comparison of the Functions of Personal Pronouns Used by a Malaysian and an American Political Leaders

Firstly, a few similarities can be found in the use of *we* and *us*. Tun Dr. Mahathir and Mr. Trump used *we* and *us* to refer to country leaders present at UNGA. They also used *we* and *us* to refer to their countries and citizens. Furthermore, both used the plural *you* to refer to country leaders other

than themselves and express gratitude. Moreover, the pronoun *they* and *them* were used as an anaphoric reference. Another intriguing similarity between the two speeches is the absence of the use of *me*.

One of the differences in the use of personal pronouns by the two speakers is in the use of *I*. While Tun Dr. Mahathir used the pronoun *I* to express his opinion, Mr. Trump used the pronoun *I* to highlight his contributions and make a promise to his people. Interestingly, Tun Dr. Mahathir also used *we* to refer to the general humanity. However, Mr. Trump only used *we* to refer to himself and his administration and in fact, more often than to represent his country and citizens. Although both used the plural *you* as aforementioned, the pronoun was used in different ways. Tun Dr. Mahathir used the plural *you* to build an affinity with the other country leaders in the act of persuading them to assist his country, while Mr. Trump used the plural *you* as a stern warning to country leaders who contribute to the issue of illegal immigrants in his country. Tun Dr. Mahathir also used the singular *you* to specifically congratulate the President of the 74th Session of UNGA on his election, but the use of singular *you* is absent in Mr. Trump's speech. Finally, Tun Dr. Mahathir used *they* and *them* to indirectly refer to country leaders who were actually present at UNGA. On the other hand, Mr. Trump used *they* to distance himself and his country from unfavourable ideologies, and used *them* to exclude Mexicans in his address although he complimented them in their presence.

As members of the United Nations, it is not surprising for Tun Dr. Mahathir and Mr. Trump to use *we* and *us* to express unity with the other country leaders. After all, according to Saj (2012), the pronoun *we* and *us* is commonly used to create a sense of togetherness between the speaker and addressees. Moreover, the use of plural *you* to address the attendees and express gratitude is common to build a speaker-audience interaction, as it shows that Tun Dr. Mahathir and Mr. Trump were personally conveying their messages to the audience. In addition, it is not surprising to see the use of *they* and *them* as an anaphoric reference in both speeches because the pronoun *they* and *them* are commonly used to refer back to what has been mentioned earlier in the sentence in a non-strategic way, as agreed by Nakaggwe (2012). It should also be noted that not all instances of *they* and *them* in the speeches demonstrate inclusiveness and exclusiveness. Next, the absence of *me* in both speeches can be explained by its general use in the political discourse to relate to the audience on a personal level (Bello, 2013). At UNGA, where the platform is used by country leaders for

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

political discussion, the use of *me* is almost inapplicable. The pronoun *me* is more commonly found in speeches that require the speaker to gain political support from his people, such as election speeches. By relating to the people, the politician demonstrates his understanding for the people's troubles and shows that he is equal.

Furthermore, it is interesting to see how Mr. Trump used the pronoun *I* to not only repeatedly highlight his individual accomplishments and contributions as the country leader, but also to make a promise to his people. Tun Dr. Mahathir, on the other hand, simply used the pronoun *I* to express his opinions and concerns. These are best explained by the individualistic culture of America and collectivistic culture of Malaysia. It is important for Mr. Trump to highlight his personal achievements to demonstrate his credibility and responsibility as the country leader. This also explains the reason behind his use of *we* to represent himself and his administration more often than to represent his country and citizens. In contrast, it is important for Tun Dr. Mahathir to care for others and include everyone as a shared responsibility. This explains his reference to all humanity by using the pronoun *we*. The collectivist characteristic of the Malaysian culture also explains the use of plural *you* to build a relationship between Tun Dr. Mahathir and the other country leaders in his persuasion. Meanwhile, Mr. Trump used the plural *you* as a stern warning to certain country leaders because the American culture is more direct in their communication, as compared to the Malaysian culture. However, it is intriguing that Tun Dr. Mahathir used a singular *you* to address the President of UNGA, which is absent from Mr. Trump's speech. This is due to the extremely high power distance index of the Malaysian culture as opposed to the American culture. Therefore, he may have felt the need to specifically congratulate the President on his election. Lastly, the use of *they* and *them* in Tun Dr. Mahathir's speech reflects the indirect communication in Malaysian culture. The leaders of 'rich' nations with veto power need to be dealt with cautiously. He acknowledges the need to express his disagreement, while simultaneously attempts to save their face to ensure peace and harmony. This is understandable considering that UNGA aims to provide space for the members to discuss issues and offer suggestions in a peaceful manner. On the other hand, Mr. Trump used *they* to distance himself and his country from unfavourable ideologies, and *them* to exclude Mexicans in his address although he complimented them in their presence, because he wants to dissociate himself and his country from the ideologies and from Mexico. This helps to portray himself and his country in a positive

image. This is supported by Hakansson (2012) who states that the pronouns *they* and *them* are commonly used to present a positive image.

Conclusion

Although the findings of this study are based on two speeches; one speech given by the former Malaysian Prime Minister and another given by the former American President at the 74th Session of UNGA, there are observable patterns in the use of personal pronouns. It is interesting to see how inclusivity and solidarity are strongly portrayed by the use of personal pronouns - *we* and *us*, by both speakers, despite the fact that one belongs to a collectivistic culture, while the other to an individualistic culture. The Malaysian political leader employed them in his speech predominantly to express inclusivity and solidarity with other members at the 74th UNGA. However, the American political leader mainly utilised them for a different purpose that is to express solidarity with his administration itself. The idea of solidarity is perceived differently by the two leaders as the American leader is found to be strongly associated with his country, instead of the UN members. In addition, cultural perception towards directness and indirectness determines the decision to include or exclude the audience. For instance, when referring to a separate group of people whom he did not want to be associated with, Tun Dr. Mahathir used the plural third-person pronouns to indirectly refer to them. On the other hand, Mr. Trump opted for the more direct option, that is the plural second-person pronoun *you*. As a leader of a strong nation, he is more authoritative as compared to Tun Dr. Mahathir who is more diplomatic in his attempt. Clearly, as a developing country, Malaysia will have to employ a more amiable approach as compared to America.

Regardless of culture, the principal goals in political discourse are to attract the attention of the audience and eventually convince them to agree with the proposition. Therefore, managing this interaction with the appropriate use of personal pronouns is fundamental to the success of a political speech. Political leaders' cultural values can definitely influence their choices. Ultimately, it should not be viewed negatively as it demonstrates one's cultural identity.

References

- Alavidze, M. (2017). The use of pronouns in political discourse. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 9(4), 349-356.
<http://www.universitypublications.net/ijas/0904/html/R6ME325.xml>
- Alemi, M., Latifi, A., & Nematzadeh, A. (2018). Persuasion in political discourse: Barak Obama's presidential speeches against ISIS. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 22(2), 278-291. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-9182-2018-22-2-278-291>
- Allen, W. (2007). *Annual Meeting of the Australian Linguistic Society*. I. Mushin & M. Laughren (Eds.). School of English, Media & Art History, University of Queensland.
- Asthana, S. (2020, February 1). *History, objectives & principles of the United Nations*. iPleaders. https://blog.ipleaders.in/un-objectives/#General_Assembly
- Bataineh, M. T. (2019). Linguistic and pragmatic devices in King Abdullah's speech: A political discourse analysis. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 8(2), 40-44. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.8n.2p.40>
- Bello, U. (2013). "If I could make it, you too can make it!" Personal pronouns in political discourse: A CDA of President Jonathan's presidential declaration speech. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 3(6), 84-96. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v3n6p84>
- Bhasin, H. (2020, March 8). *Content analysis: Types, importance, advantages and steps*. Marketing91. <https://www.marketing91.com/content-analysis/#3-Conceptual-Analysis>
- Bhattacharyya, P. R. (2015). A sociolinguistic survey on personal pronouns in Assamese. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, 20(9), 19-32. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-20921932>

- Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th ed.). Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444302776>
- Farahani, M. V., & Kazemian, R. (2021). Speaker-audience interaction in spoken political discourse: A contrastive parallel corpus-based study of English-Persian translation of metadiscourse features in TED talks. *Corpus Pragmatics*, 5(2), 271-298. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-021-00099-z>
- Froehlich, H. (2015, June 19). *Corpus analysis with Antconc*. Programming Historian. <https://programminghistorian.org/en/lessons/corpus-analysis-with-antconc>
- Giri, V. N. (2006). Culture and communication style. *Review of Communication*, 6(1-2), 124-130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15358590600763391>
- Goheco, P. M. (2012). Pronominal choice: A reflection of culture and persuasion in Philippine political campaign discourse. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 8, 4-25.
- Hakansson, J. (2012). *The use of personal pronouns in political speeches: A comparative study of the pronominal choices of two American presidents* [Master's thesis]. <http://nu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A531167&dswid=9382>
- Hall, D., & Barduhn, S. (2016). *English for everyone English grammar guide: A comprehensive visual reference*. Dorling Kindersley.
- Hussein, I. (2015). Critical discourse analysis of the political speech of the Egyptian President, Abdel Fattah El-Sisi, at the New Suez Canal inauguration ceremony. *International Journal of Language and Literature*, 4(1), 85-106. <https://doi.org/10.15640/ijll.v4n1a10>
- Jamaliah, M. A. (2017). Why we don't say what we mean: A study of verbal indirection in communication. *Journal of Modern Languages*, 14(3), 33-43. <https://ejournal.um.edu.my/index.php/JML/article/view/3456>

- Jong, L. B. (2018). *A qualitative analysis of inclusiveness and exclusiveness of personal pronouns as a strategic maneuver in medical bad news conversations* [Master's thesis]. <https://studenttheses.universiteitleiden.nl/handle/1887/70204>
- Khafaga, A. F. (2021). Exploring ideologies of function words in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. *Pertanika Journals*, 29(3), 2089-2111. <https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.29.3.30>
- Kulsum-Binder, R. (2017). *American and British political speeches: An examination of linguistic strategies* [Master's thesis]. ResearchGate.
- Markus, M. (2006). *Interaction and persuasion: An analysis of the use of rhetorical devices in Gordon Brown's speech to the Labour Party Conference* [Master's thesis]. ResearchGate.
- Nakaggwe, L. (2012). *The persuasive power of personal pronouns in Barack Obama's rhetoric* [Master's thesis]. <http://lnu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A600522&dswid=4359>
- Orji, R. (2016). *Persuasion and culture: Individualism-Collectivism and susceptibility to influence strategies*. In *Personalization in Persuasive Technology* (pp. 30-39). CEUR Workshop Proceedings. <http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1582/16Orji.pdf>
- Ramsden, M. (2021). *International justice in the United Nations General Assembly*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Saj, H. E. (2012). Discourse analysis: Personal pronouns in Oprah Winfrey hosting Queen Rania of Jordan. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 2(6), 529-532. <https://doi.org/10.7763/ijssh.2012.v2.163>
- Setiarini, N., Winarni, I., & Junining, E. (2019). Rhetorical devices of pronoun on Donald Trump's presidential speech "Remarks by President Trump to march for life participants

- and pro-life leaders”. *Alphabet*, 2(2), 62-74. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.alphabet.2019.02.02.04>
- Wahyuningsih, S. (2018). *A discourse analysis: Personal pronouns in Donald Trump's inauguration speech*. In *Education 4.0: Trends and Future Perspectives in English Education, Linguistics, Literature, and Translation* (pp. 346-350). Muhammadiyah Semarang University. <https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/ELLIC/article/view/3553>
- Wan, Ahmad, Nurulhuda, Afdallyna, Juhaida, & Famie. (2019). Cultural dimensions of Malay cultures: Performance of IT professionals. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8(2), 17-21. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijrte.B1004.0782S219>
- Wang, L., & Zhang, Y. (2016). A study of metadiscourse features in English news reports. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*, 5(6), 75-83. https://ijac.org.uk/images/frontImages/gallery/Vol._5_No._6/7._75-83.pdf
- Wang, Z., & Fan, W. (2013). American values reflected in names of US supermarkets, the top five values and American dream. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 03(04), 348-355. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2013.34045>
- Yu, F., Peng, T., Peng, K., Tang, S., Chen, C. S., Qian, X., Sun, P., Han, T. and Chai, F. (2015). Cultural value shifting in pronoun use. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 47(2), 310-316. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022115619230>

Appendix A

Transcript of Tun Dr. Mahathir's Speech

1 I would like to join others in congratulating you Mr. President on your election as the President of the 74th
2 Session of the United Nations General Assembly. I would also like to thank Her Excellency Maria Espinosa,
3 for her dedication and stewardship in successfully completing the work of the 73rd Session of the General
4 Assembly.

5 Malaysia welcomes the theme of this year's General Assembly, which is, "Galvanising multilateral efforts
6 for poverty eradication, quality education, climate action and inclusion". The key message of this theme is
7 "galvanising multilateral efforts", which is what the United Nations (UN) stands for. I will propose a few.

8 Almost three quarters of a century ago five countries claimed victory in the Second World War. On the basis
9 of that victory they insisted on the right practically to rule the world. And so, they gave themselves veto
10 powers over the rest of the world in the organisation they built – an organisation they claim would end wars
11 in the solution of conflicts.

12 The veto power - they must know was against all the principles of human rights which they themselves
13 claim to be the champions. It killed the very purpose of the great organisation that they had created. It
14 ensured that all solution to all conflicts could be negated by any one of them. Broken up into ideological
15 factions they frustrated all attempts at solving problems.

16 Each one of them can negate the wishes of the nearly 200 other members. It is totally and absolutely
17 undemocratic. Yet, there are among them those who berate other countries of the world for not being
18 democratic or being not democratic enough.

19 How much longer should this group be allowed to exercise this power? How long, forever? The unspoken
20 time frame seems to be eternal.

21 That very power has resulted in an arms race. Each one of the five rely on their military might in order to
22 challenge any attempt to take their power away. They feel they must be well armed to retain their right to
23 be the privileged five.

24 It is this structure of the United Nations that renders it incapable of achieving its principle objectives - that
25 of preventing wars between nations. Indeed, the structure had enabled the promotion of war within countries
26 and between countries.

27 True, the war-like European countries have not gone to war with each other over the past two-thirds of a
28 century. But elsewhere there is evidence that European countries have caused wars to break out, arms
29 and funds to be supplied and active participation in prolonging the wars. It is apparently good for business,
30 for weapons sale.

31 The first act engineered by the Western countries is the creation of the state of Israel by seizing Palestinian
32 land and expelling its 90% Arab population. Since then wars have been fought in many countries, many
33 related to the creation of Israel. And now we have terrorism when there was none before or at least none
34 on the present scale. Military action against Acts of terrorism will not succeed. We need to identify the cause
35 and remove it. But the great powers refuse to deal with the root cause.

36 They prefer military action and sanctions. And they will continue to fail to stop terrorism.

37 Malaysia accepts the state of Israel as a fait accompli. But it cannot accept the blatant seizure of Palestine
38 land by Israel for their settlements as well as the occupation of Jerusalem by Israel. The Palestinians cannot
39 even enter the settlements built on their land.

40 Because of the creation of Israel, there is now enmity towards the Muslims and Islam. Muslims are accused
41 of terrorism even if they did nothing. Muslim countries have been destabilised through the campaign for
42 democracy and regime change. Muslims everywhere have been oppressed, expelled from their countries
43 and refused asylum. Thousands have died at sea and in the severe winters. One cannot deny that in the
44 past there were no massive migration. Now the wars and instability due to regime change have forced them
45 to run away from their countries.

46 I will admit that democracy is a better form of Government than dictatorship. But democracy is not the
47 easiest form of Government to operate. This is especially so when the adoption is overnight. Time should
48 be allowed for a gradual change to democracy. Indeed, the very countries which promote democracy
49 became democratic over a period of decades if not centuries. The result of overnight switch to democracy
50 is destabilisation and civil wars, reducing some into Government-less wilderness. And some of course have
51 reverted to authoritarian regimes worse than the one that was displaced. Unable to suffer from wars and
52 violence their people had to migrate.

53 The great democrats talk incessantly about the rule of law. But they are selective. Friends may break any
54 law and get away scot-free. Thus, Israel can break all the international laws and norms of the world and it
55 will continue to be supported and defended. The unfriendly countries can do nothing right. There is no
56 justice in the world.

57 I must again refer to the fate of the Rohingyas in Myanmar. Many colonies of the West, upon independence,
58 expelled non-natives in their countries. But nowhere have they been as brutal as Myanmar. Even natives
59 massacred, brutally killed and raped in full view of the world backgrounded by the burning houses and
60 villages of the victims. They were forced to migrate and now they dare not return to Myanmar even when
61 offered. They cannot trust the Myanmar military unless some form of non-Myanmar protection is given.

62 The helplessness of the world in stopping atrocities inflicted on the Rohingyas in Myanmar had reduced the
63 regard for the resolution of the UN. Now, despite UN resolution on Jammu and Kashmir, the country has
64 been invaded and occupied. There may be reasons for this action but it is still wrong. The problem must be
65 solved by peaceful means. India should work with Pakistan to resolve this problem. Ignoring the UN would
66 lead to other forms of disregard for the UN and the Rule of Law.

67 All the countries of the world wish to prosper, to grow their economies. During their colonial days their
68 wealth had been exploited to enrich their colonial masters. They cannot expect much from their former
69 colonial masters. But they do expect to be allowed to develop their own countries themselves. But they are
70 hampered from doing so.

71 There is much talk about free trade. But all the time new regulations are being introduced which are
72 detrimental to the development of poor countries. This is because proposals on rules and regulations are
73 made by the rich, often secretly. The poor are practically forced to accept them. One example is the Trans
74 Pacific partnership. It was cooked up in Washington with inputs from their big businesses. In the agreement
75 Governments of small countries could be forced to compensate the big foreign companies with huge sums
76 of money, should their decision affect the profitability of the big companies, including future profit.

77 Fortunately, now the powerful country which prepared these agreements has rejected it. With the exclusion
78 of this country, the Agreement has become more palatable. But the agreements still laid down conditions
79 for trade – which negates free trade. We are told that we must remove duties on imports, or reduce it so
80 that foreign products can knock out our infant industries. We are reduced to exporting only raw material.
81 How do we industrialise and create jobs for our people?

82 A classic case of the denial of free trade is the ban on the import of palm oil proposed by the European
83 countries. Unable to sustain the competitiveness of their own edible oils, a campaign is mounted to ban

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

84 palm oil. It is said that palm oil is poisonous to health, destroys the habitat of longnosed monkeys, reduce
85 carbon dioxide absorption etc. Products of Europe are labelled palm oil free. Biofuel using palm oil are
86 banned.

87 Malaysia produces palm oil. Many poor countries produce palm oil. Malaysia will not clear more forests for
88 palm plantations. We are as concerned about our environment as the Europeans. At the Rio Earth Summit
89 in 1992, Malaysia pledged to maintain at least 50 percent of our land mass under forest cover. We have
90 made good our pledge and better. Our forest cover is currently at 55.3 percent exceeding our Rio pledge.

91 Palm oil is still a big contributor to our economy. There is no evidence that it is poisonous. We appeal to
92 the good sense of the rich not to impoverish us, not to deprive hundreds of thousands of our workers from
93 earning a living. You will be doing a good deed by consuming palm oil.

94 In keeping with the objectives of the United Nations, Malaysia had launched a campaign to criminalise war.
95 It is ridiculous to hang a murderer for killing one person but to glorify the people who are responsible for the
96 deaths of millions of people. Modern wars are total in every way. Not only will combatants be killed but
97 innocent people, the children, the sick and incapacitated are also killed and wounded. Whole countries are
98 devastated, and trillions of dollars lost. In the end, both the victors and losers suffer.

99 We consider ourselves civilised but we are still very primitive since we accept killing people as a way to
100 settle disputes between nations or within nations.

101 There are other ways of settling disputes. We can negotiate or submit to arbitration by third parties. Or we
102 can resort to the courts of law – the World Court, the International Court of Justice for example.

103 Malaysia does not just talk. We do. We settle disputes with our neighbours through negotiation and through
104 the World Court. We won some and we lost some. But no one has been killed.

105 This talk about “not one inch of my territory” is ridiculous. We know that if we go to war, that inch is going
106 to cost us more than what it is worth.

107 When one goes to court one does not always get what one claims to be rightfully ours. But it is the same
108 with war. We do not always win. In a contest between two parties, one must lose if the other is to win. But
109 if we use peaceful means we can still lose but it will cost us much less. No one would die, nor land
110 devastated.

111 The world is experiencing climate change. Malaysia is hotter than ever before. It does not seem to return
112 to previous temperatures. In fact, it seems to be getting hotter.

113 Elsewhere powerful typhoons and hurricanes are destroying whole towns, killing thousands, wreaking
114 havoc of unprecedented proportions. Flood waters from storms inundate huge areas of land. Sometimes
115 there would be a dry spell and wild fires would destroy forest and towns. Hundreds would die.

116 Earthquakes and volcanic eruptions are more frequent and they destroy towns and cities. Melting snow in
117 the Arctic and Antarctic is raising the levels of the seas and threaten to overrun islands.

118 I have a feeling that these disasters are a part of the cycles of change that our planet has been going
119 through for millions of years. Can it be that the stable salubrious climate that we have been enjoying has
120 come to the end of its cycle? Could it be that the cycle is changing, as it did in prehistoric millions of years?
121 Is it possible that the temperatures rise to a level that living conditions would become unbearable?

122 I think, instead of preparing for war, we should be paying attention to the climate changes and
123 accompanying natural disasters. We should be preparing to combat climate change, to bring back the

124 normal environment we had been used to over the last thousands of years. We should be preparing
125 ourselves for major earthquakes, typhoons and hurricanes, floods and landslides etc. We should learn how
126 to mitigate these natural disasters. We should be constructing shelters, make rain and grow food without
127 sunlight, evacuate the sea side etc. etc.

128 We should have teams of well-equipped disaster experts ready to rush to disaster areas. Every disaster is
129 a world disaster.

130 All these natural disasters may not happen of course. But we cannot rely on that. We are wasting our money
131 preparing for wars, inventing ever more destructive weapons, when all of us may be wiped out by natural
132 disasters as the planet goes through its next cycle.

133 We, the human creatures are clever. We can still survive the next cycle if we set our researchers to come
134 up with defences against catastrophes. If we reduce our budget for killing people, we will have the funds
135 for research and preparation.

136 Malaysia is a middle-income country. It depends on trade to grow. Naturally our markets are the rich
137 countries.

138 Now the rich want us to balance the trade, to buy more of their goods, to correct the imbalance. To do this
139 we will have to spend the money we earn from trade to import the goods of the rich. Our growth will be
140 stunted so that the already rich will become richer.

141 Trade enriches everyone. It has been shown through the ages. Malaysia is a trading nation. Our population
142 is too small to provide a good market. We need the world market. With the new communication
143 technologies, we can increase our trade with the world. So, don't impoverish us by forcing us to buy what
144 we don't need or to reduce our exports.

145 Trade wars are wasteful. Now that the whole world has become a market for everyone, trade wars will
146 stultify the potential for everyone to become rich.

147 We are also seeing sanctions being applied to countries. We do not know under what laws sanctions are
148 applied. It appears to be the privilege of the rich and the powerful. If we want to have sanctions, let us have
149 a law to govern them. The fact is that when sanction is applied to a country, other countries get sanctioned
150 as well. Malaysia and many others lost a big market when sanction is applied on Iran.

151 I believe in capitalism. But capitalism has gone mad. They are already talking of making trillions. It is
152 dangerous for a person or a company to have so much money. It can influence things. It can buy power.
153 Hence the anti-trust laws. We see in the Trans Pacific Partnership – TPP, when the rich companies had
154 given themselves the power to sue Governments. The terms of the agreements were drawn up by them.
155 And they are not all like Bill Gates. Most are bent on exploiting the power money gives them.

156 The UN has failed in protecting the poor from the scourge of war. But in other fields it has done much better.
157 It has contributed to better health, to alleviating the sufferings of some of the poor and the needy. It does
158 provide a degree of security and stability in places plagued by internal conflicts.

159 It can do more. But it is short of funds. Countries including the very rich are not paying their dues. It is
160 shameful.

161 We need to support the UN even though it has failed to banish wars. Its work on health, education and
162 social security make the UN worth having.

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

163 I would like to thank the staff and officers of the UN for their work and dedication, in all these fields. Malaysia
164 has been able to contribute by doing peace-keeping tasks in many countries. I look forward to the time
165 when their services will no longer be needed, when countries are able to ensure their own security.

166 The UN should play a major role in the restoration of failed governments. Many countries have failed
167 because the administrative machinery does not function well. Modern technology can help but there is a
168 need for good training.

169 Countries and people should be allowed to retain their cultures and ways of life. Only if the way of life
170 involves taking away the rights of people should there be international interference sanctioned by the UN
171 General Assembly.

172 As for the UN Security Council, the time has come when the veto power should be modified if it cannot be
173 done away with completely. The veto should only be valid if two Veto Powers together with three non-Veto
174 members agree to apply it. That way abuses would be less frequent.

175 Three quarters of a century is a long time. We cannot be held to ransom by events of the distant past. The
176 veto powers should not think they would always be above international laws and norms. Now – new, cheap
177 but powerful weapons have been invented which even the poor can produce and use. If we do not make
178 wars a crime our security cannot be sustained.

179 We must resuscitate the original purpose of this great organisation – the United Nations Organisation. We
180 must punish warmongers. We must make the world peaceful for all. That was our mission and that must
181 remain our mission. Only if we succeed can we claim that we are civilised. I thank you.

Appendix B

Transcript of Mr. Trump's Speech

1 Thank you very much. Mr. President, Mr. Secretary-General, distinguished delegates, ambassadors, and
2 world leaders:

3 Seven decades of history have passed through this hall, in all of their richness and drama. Where I stand,
4 the world has heard from presidents and premiers at the height of the Cold War. We have seen the
5 foundation of nations. We have seen the ringleaders of revolution. We have beheld saints who inspired
6 us with hope, rebels who stirred us with passion, and heroes who emboldened us with courage — all here
7 to share plans, proposals, visions, and ideas on the world's biggest stage.

8 Like those who met us before, our time is one of great contests, high stakes, and clear choices. The
9 essential divide that runs all around the world and throughout history is once again thrown into stark relief. It
10 is the divide between those whose thirst for control deludes them into thinking they are destined to rule over
11 others and those people and nations who want only to rule themselves.

12 I have the immense privilege of addressing you today as the elected leader of a nation that prizes liberty,
13 independence, and self-government above all. The United States, after having spent over two and a half
14 trillion dollars since my election to completely rebuild our great military, is also, by far, the world's most
15 powerful nation. Hopefully, it will never have to use this power.

16 Americans know that in a world where others seek conquest and domination, our nation must be strong in
17 wealth, in might, and in spirit. That is why the United States vigorously defends the traditions and customs
18 that have made us who we are.

19 Like my beloved country, each nation represented in this hall has a cherished history, culture, and heritage
20 that is worth defending and celebrating, and which gives us our singular potential and strength.

21 The free world must embrace its national foundations. It must not attempt to erase them or replace them.

22 Looking around and all over this large, magnificent planet, the truth is plain to see: If you want freedom,
23 take pride in your country. If you want democracy, hold on to your sovereignty. And if you want peace,
24 love your nation. Wise leaders always put the good of their own people and their own country first.

25 The future does not belong to globalists. The future belongs to patriots. The future belongs to sovereign
26 and independent nations who protect their citizens, respect their neighbors, and honor the differences that
27 make each country special and unique.

28 It is why we in the United States have embarked on an exciting program of national renewal. In everything
29 we do, we are focused on empowering the dreams and aspirations of our citizens.

30 Thanks to our pro-growth economic policies, our domestic unemployment rate reached its lowest level in
31 over half a century. Fueled by massive tax cuts and regulations cuts, jobs are being produced at a historic
32 rate. Six million Americans have been added to the employment rolls in under three years.

33 Last month, African American, Hispanic American, and Asian American unemployment reached their lowest
34 rates ever recorded. We are marshaling our nation's vast energy abundance, and the United States is now
35 the number one producer of oil and natural gas anywhere in the world. Wages are rising, incomes are
36 soaring, and 2.5 million Americans have been lifted out of poverty in less than three years.

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

37 As we rebuild the unrivaled might of the American military, we are also revitalizing our alliances by making
38 it very clear that all of our partners are expected to pay their fair share of the tremendous defense burden,
39 which the United States has borne in the past.

40 At the center of our vision for national renewal is an ambitious campaign to reform international trade. For
41 decades, the international trading system has been easily exploited by nations acting in very bad faith. As
42 jobs were outsourced, a small handful grew wealthy at the expense of the middle class.

43 In America, the result was 4.2 million lost manufacturing jobs and \$15 trillion in trade deficits over the last
44 quarter century. The United States is now taking that decisive action to end this grave economic
45 injustice. Our goal is simple: We want balanced trade that is both fair and reciprocal.

46 We have worked closely with our partners in Mexico and Canada to replace NAFTA with the brand new
47 and hopefully bipartisan U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

48 Tomorrow, I will join Prime Minister Abe of Japan to continue our progress in finalizing a terrific new trade
49 deal.

50 As the United Kingdom makes preparations to exit the European Union, I have made clear that we stand
51 ready to complete an exceptional new trade agreement with the UK that will bring tremendous benefits to
52 both of our countries. We are working closely with Prime Minister Boris Johnson on a magnificent new
53 trade deal.

54 The most important difference in America's new approach on trade concerns our relationship with China. In
55 2001, China was admitted to the World Trade Organization. Our leaders then argued that this decision
56 would compel China to liberalize its economy and strengthen protections to provide things that were
57 unacceptable to us, and for private property and for the rule of law. Two decades later, this theory has
58 been tested and proven completely wrong.

59 Not only has China declined to adopt promised reforms, it has embraced an economic model dependent
60 on massive market barriers, heavy state subsidies, currency manipulation, product dumping, forced
61 technology transfers, and the theft of intellectual property and also trade secrets on a grand scale.

62 As just one example, I recently met the CEO of a terrific American company, Micron Technology, at the
63 White House. Micron produces memory chips used in countless electronics. To advance the Chinese
64 government's five-year economic plan, a company owned by the Chinese state allegedly stole Micron's
65 designs, valued at up to \$8.7 billion. Soon, the Chinese company obtains patents for nearly an identical
66 product, and Micron was banned from selling its own goods in China. But we are seeking justice.

67 The United States lost 60,000 factories after China entered the WTO. This is happening to other countries
68 all over the globe.

69 The World Trade Organization needs drastic change. The second-largest economy in the world should not
70 be permitted to declare itself a "developing country" in order to game the system at others' expense.

71 For years, these abuses were tolerated, ignored, or even encouraged. Globalism exerted a religious pull
72 over past leaders, causing them to ignore their own national interests.

73 But as far as America is concerned, those days are over. To confront these unfair practices, I placed
74 massive tariffs on more than \$500 billion worth of Chinese-made goods. Already, as a result of these tariffs,
75 supply chains are relocating back to America and to other nations, and billions of dollars are being paid to
76 our Treasury.

77 The American people are absolutely committed to restoring balance to our relationship with
78 China. Hopefully, we can reach an agreement that would be beneficial for both countries. But as I have
79 made very clear, I will not accept a bad deal for the American people.

80 As we endeavor to stabilize our relationship, we're also carefully monitoring the situation in Hong Kong. The
81 world fully expects that the Chinese government will honor its binding treaty, made with the British and
82 registered with the United Nations, in which China commits to protect Hong Kong's freedom, legal system,
83 and democratic ways of life. How China chooses to handle the situation will say a great deal about its role
84 in the world in the future. We are all counting on President Xi as a great leader.

85 The United States does not seek conflict with any other nation. We desire peace, cooperation, and mutual
86 gain with all. But I will never fail to defend America's interests.

87 One of the greatest security threats facing peace-loving nations today is the repressive regime in Iran. The
88 regime's record of death and destruction is well known to us all. Not only is Iran the world's number one
89 state sponsor of terrorism, but Iran's leaders are fueling the tragic wars in both Syria and Yemen.

90 At the same time, the regime is squandering the nation's wealth and future in a fanatical quest for nuclear
91 weapons and the means to deliver them. We must never allow this to happen.

92 To stop Iran's path to nuclear weapons and missiles, I withdrew the United States from the terrible Iran
93 nuclear deal, which has very little time remaining, did not allow inspection of important sites, and did not
94 cover ballistic missiles.

95 Following our withdrawal, we have implemented severe economic sanctions on the country. Hoping to
96 free itself from sanctions, the regime has escalated its violent and unprovoked aggression. In response
97 to Iran's recent attack on Saudi Arabian oil facilities, we just imposed the highest level of sanctions on
98 Iran's central bank and sovereign wealth fund.

99 All nations have a duty to act. No responsible government should subsidize Iran's bloodlust. As long as
100 Iran's menacing behavior continues, sanctions will not be lifted; they will be tightened. Iran's leaders will
101 have turned a proud nation into just another cautionary tale of what happens when a ruling class abandons
102 its people and embarks on a crusade for personal power and riches.

103 For 40 years, the world has listened to Iran's rulers as they lash out at everyone else for the problems they
104 alone have created. They conduct ritual chants of "Death to America" and traffic in monstrous anti-
105 Semitism. Last year the country's Supreme Leader stated, "Israel is a malignant cancerous tumor...that
106 has to be removed and eradicated: it is possible and it will happen." America will never tolerate such anti-
107 Semitic hate.

108 Fanatics have long used hatred of Israel to distract from their own failures. Thankfully, there is a growing
109 recognition in the wider Middle East that the countries of the region share common interests in battling
110 extremism and unleashing economic opportunity. That is why it is so important to have full, normalized
111 relations between Israel and its neighbors. Only a relationship built on common interests, mutual respect,
112 and religious tolerance can forge a better future.

113 Iran's citizens deserve a government that cares about reducing poverty, ending corruption, and increasing
114 jobs — not stealing their money to fund a massacre abroad and at home.

115 After four decades of failure, it is time for Iran's leaders to step forward and to stop threatening other
116 countries, and focus on building up their own country. It is time for Iran's leaders to finally put the Iranian
117 people first.

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

118 America is ready to embrace friendship with all who genuinely seek peace and respect.

119 Many of America's closest friends today were once our gravest foes. The United States has never believed
120 in permanent enemies. We want partners, not adversaries. America knows that while anyone can make
121 war, only the most courageous can choose peace.

122 For this same reason, we have pursued bold diplomacy on the Korean Peninsula. I have told Kim Jong Un
123 what I truly believe: that, like Iran, his country is full of tremendous untapped potential, but that to realize
124 that promise, North Korea must denuclearize.

125 Around the world, our message is clear: America's goal is lasting, America's goal is harmony, and America's
126 goal is not to go with these endless wars — wars that never end.

127 With that goal in mind, my administration is also pursuing the hope of a brighter future in
128 Afghanistan. Unfortunately, the Taliban has chosen to continue their savage attacks. And we will continue
129 to work with our coalition of Afghan partners to stamp out terrorism, and we will never stop working to make
130 peace a reality.

131 Here in the Western Hemisphere, we are joining with our partners to ensure stability and opportunity all
132 across the region. In that mission, one of our most critical challenges is illegal immigration, which
133 undermines prosperity, rips apart societies, and empowers ruthless criminal cartels.

134 Mass illegal migration is unfair, unsafe, and unsustainable for everyone involved: the sending countries and
135 the depleted countries. And they become depleted very fast, but their youth is not taken care of and human
136 capital goes to waste.

137 The receiving countries are overburdened with more migrants than they can responsibly accept. And the
138 migrants themselves are exploited, assaulted, and abused by vicious coyotes. Nearly one third of women
139 who make the journey north to our border are sexually assaulted along the way. Yet, here in the United
140 States and around the world, there is a growing cottage industry of radical activists and non-governmental
141 organizations that promote human smuggling. These groups encourage illegal migration and demand
142 erasure of national borders.

143 Today, I have a message for those open border activists who cloak themselves in the rhetoric of social
144 justice: Your policies are not just. Your policies are cruel and evil. You are empowering criminal
145 organizations that prey on innocent men, women, and children. You put your own false sense of virtue
146 before the lives, wellbeing, and [of] countless innocent people. When you undermine border security, you
147 are undermining human rights and human dignity.

148 Many of the countries here today are coping with the challenges of uncontrolled migration. Each of you
149 has the absolute right to protect your borders, and so, of course, does our country. Today, we must resolve
150 to work together to end human smuggling, end human trafficking, and put these criminal networks out of
151 business for good.

152 To our country, I can tell you sincerely: We are working closely with our friends in the region — including
153 Mexico, Canada, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, and Panama — to uphold the integrity of borders and
154 ensure safety and prosperity for our people. I would like to thank President López Obrador of Mexico for
155 the great cooperation we are receiving and for right now putting 27,000 troops on our southern
156 border. Mexico is showing us great respect, and I respect them in return.

157 The U.S., we have taken very unprecedented action to stop the flow of illegal immigration. To anyone
158 considering crossings of our border illegally, please hear these words: Do not pay the smugglers. Do not
159 pay the coyotes. Do not put yourself in danger. Do not put your children in danger. Because if you make

160 it here, you will not be allowed in; you will be promptly returned home. You will not be released into our
161 country. As long as I am President of the United States, we will enforce our laws and protect our borders.

162 For all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere, our goal is to help people invest in the bright futures of
163 their own nation. Our region is full of such incredible promise: dreams waiting to be built and national
164 destinies for all. And they are waiting also to be pursued.

165 Throughout the hemisphere, there are millions of hardworking, patriotic young people eager to build,
166 innovate, and achieve. But these nations cannot reach their potential if a generation of youth abandon their
167 homes in search of a life elsewhere. We want every nation in our region to flourish and its people to thrive
168 in freedom and peace.

169 In that mission, we are also committed to supporting those people in the Western Hemisphere who live
170 under brutal oppression, such as those in Cuba, Nicaragua, and Venezuela.

171 According to a recent report from the U.N. Human Rights Council, women in Venezuela stand in line for 10
172 hours a day waiting for food. Over 15,000 people have been detained as political prisoners. Modern-day
173 death squads are carrying out thousands of extrajudicial killings.

174 The dictator Maduro is a Cuban puppet, protected by Cuban bodyguards, hiding from his own people while
175 Cuba plunders Venezuela's oil wealth to sustain its own corrupt communist rule.

176 Since I last spoke in this hall, the United States and our partners have built a historic coalition of 55 countries
177 that recognize the legitimate government of Venezuela.

178 To the Venezuelans trapped in this nightmare: Please know that all of America is united behind you. The
179 United States has vast quantities of humanitarian aid ready and waiting to be delivered. We are watching
180 the Venezuela situation very closely. We await the day when democracy will be restored, when Venezuela
181 will be free, and when liberty will prevail throughout this hemisphere.

182 One of the most serious challenges our countries face is the specter of socialism. It's the wrecker of nations
183 and destroyer of societies.

184 Events in Venezuela remind us all that socialism and communism are not about justice, they are not about
185 equality, they are not about lifting up the poor, and they are certainly not about the good of the
186 nation. Socialism and communism are about one thing only: power for the ruling class.

187 Today, I repeat a message for the world that I have delivered at home: America will never be a socialist
188 country.

189 In the last century, socialism and communism killed 100 million people. Sadly, as we see in Venezuela,
190 the death toll continues in this country. These totalitarian ideologies, combined with modern technology,
191 have the power to excise [exercise] new and disturbing forms of suppression and domination.

192 For this reason, the United States is taking steps to better screen foreign technology and investments and
193 to protect our data and our security. We urge every nation present to do the same.

194 Freedom and democracy must be constantly guarded and protected, both abroad and from within. We
195 must always be skeptical of those who want conformity and control. Even in free nations, we see alarming
196 signs and new challenges to liberty.

197 A small number of social media platforms are acquiring immense power over what we can see and over
198 what we are allowed to say. A permanent political class is openly disdainful, dismissive, and defiant of the

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

199 will of the people. A faceless bureaucracy operates in secret and weakens democratic rule. Media and
200 academic institutions push flat-out assaults on our histories, traditions, and values.

201 In the United States, my administration has made clear to social media companies that we will uphold the
202 right of free speech. A free society cannot allow social media giants to silence the voices of the people,
203 and a free people must never, ever be enlisted in the cause of silencing, coercing, canceling, or blacklisting
204 their own neighbors.

205 As we defend American values, we affirm the right of all people to live in dignity. For this reason, my
206 administration is working with other nations to stop criminalizing of homosexuality, and we stand in solidarity
207 with LGBTQ people who live in countries that punish, jail, or execute individuals based upon sexual
208 orientation.

209 We are also championing the role of women in our societies. Nations that empower women are much
210 wealthier, safer, and much more politically stable. It is therefore vital not only to a nation's prosperity, but
211 also is vital to its national security, to pursue women's economic development.

212 Guided by these principles, my administration launched the Women's Global Development and Prosperity
213 Initiatives. The W-GDP is first-ever government-wide approach to women's economic empowerment,
214 working to ensure that women all over the planet have the legal right to own and inherit property, work in
215 the same industries as men, travel freely, and access credit and institutions.

216 Yesterday, I was also pleased to host leaders for a discussion about an ironclad American commitment:
217 protecting religious leaders and also protecting religious freedom. This fundamental right is under growing
218 threat around the world. Hard to believe, but 80 percent of the world's population lives in countries where
219 religious liberty is in significant danger or even completely outlawed. Americans will never tire in our
220 effort to defend and promote freedom of worship and religion. We want and support religious liberty for all.

221 Americans will also never tire of defending innocent life. We are aware that many United Nations projects
222 have attempted to assert a global right to taxpayer-funded abortion on demand, right up until the moment
223 of delivery. Global bureaucrats have absolutely no business attacking the sovereignty of nations that wish
224 to protect innocent life. Like many nations here today, we in America believe that every child — born and
225 unborn — is a sacred gift from God.

226 There is no circumstance under which the United States will allow international entities [entities] to trample
227 on the rights of our citizens, including the right to self-defense. That is why, this year, I announced that we
228 will never ratify the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty, which would threaten the liberties of law-abiding American
229 citizens. The United States will always uphold our constitutional right to keep and bear arms. We will
230 always uphold our Second Amendment.

231 The core rights and values America defends today were inscribed in America's founding documents. Our
232 nation's Founders understood that there will always be those who believe they are entitled to wield power
233 and control over others. Tyranny advances under many names and many theories, but it always comes
234 down to the desire for domination. It protects not the interests of many, but the privilege of few.

235 Our Founders gave us a system designed to restrain this dangerous impulse. They chose to entrust
236 American power to those most invested in the fate of our nation: a proud and fiercely independent people.

237 The true good of a nation can only be pursued by those who love it: by citizens who are rooted in its history,
238 who are nourished by its culture, committed to its values, attached to its people, and who know that its
239 future is theirs to build or theirs to lose. Patriots see a nation and its destiny in ways no one else can.

240 Liberty is only preserved, sovereignty is only secured, democracy is only sustained, greatness is only
241 realized, by the will and devotion of patriots. In their spirit is found the strength to resist oppression, the
242 inspiration to forge legacy, the goodwill to seek friendship, and the bravery to reach for peace. Love of our
243 nations makes the world better for all nations.

244 So to all the leaders here today, join us in the most fulfilling mission a person could have, the most profound
245 contribution anyone can make: Lift up your nations. Cherish your culture. Honor your histories. Treasure
246 your citizens. Make your countries strong, and prosperous, and righteous. Honor the dignity of your people,
247 and nothing will be outside of your reach.

248 When our nations are greater, the future will be brighter, our people will be happier, and our partnerships
249 will be stronger.

250 With God's help, together we will cast off the enemies of liberty and overcome the oppressors of dignity. We
251 will set new standards of living and reach new heights of human achievement. We will rediscover old truths,
252 unravel old mysteries, and make thrilling new breakthroughs. And we will find more beautiful friendship
253 and more harmony among nations than ever before.

254 My fellow leaders, the path to peace and progress, and freedom and justice, and a better world for all
255 humanity, begins at home.

256 Thank you. God bless you. God bless the nations of the world. And God bless America. Thank you very
257 much.

Appendix C

Types of Personal Pronouns as Subjects Used in the Malaysian Leader's Speech

Coding Scheme	Pronoun	Line	Sentence
P1a(i)	I	1, 2	<i>I</i> would like to join others in congratulating you Mr. President on your election as the President of the 74th Session of the United Nations General Assembly.
		2, 3, 4	<i>I</i> would also like to thank Her Excellency Maria Espinosa, for her dedication and stewardship in successfully completing the work of the 73rd Session of the General Assembly.
		7	<i>I</i> will propose a few.
		46	<i>I</i> will admit that democracy is a better form of Government than dictatorship.
		57	<i>I</i> must again refer to the fate of the Rohingyas in Myanmar.
		118	<i>I</i> have a feeling that these disasters are a part of the cycles of change that our planet has been going through for millions of years.
		122	<i>I</i> think, instead of preparing for war, we should be paying attention to the climate changes and accompanying natural disasters.
		151	<i>I</i> believe in capitalism.
		163	<i>I</i> would like to thank the staff and officers of the UN for their work and dedication, in all these fields.
		164, 165	<i>I</i> look forward to the time when their services will no longer be needed, when countries are able to ensure their own security.
		181	<i>I</i> thank you.
P1a(ii)	we	33, 34	And now <i>we</i> have terrorism when there was none before or at least none on the present scale.
		34, 35	<i>We</i> need to identify the cause and remove it.

	79, 80	<i>We are told that we must remove duties on imports, or reduce it so that foreign products can knock out our infant industries.</i>
	80	<i>We are reduced to exporting only raw material.</i>
	81	<i>How do we industrialise and create jobs for our people?</i>
	88	<i>We are as concerned about our environment as the Europeans.</i>
	89, 90	<i>We have made good our pledge and better.</i>
	91, 92, 93	<i>We appeal to the good sense of the rich not to impoverish us, not to deprive hundreds of thousands of our workers from earning a living.</i>
	99, 100	<i>We consider ourselves civilised but we are still very primitive since we accept killing people as a way to settle disputes between nations or within nations.</i>
	101	<i>We can negotiate or submit to arbitration by third parties.</i>
	101, 102	<i>Or we can resort to the courts of law – the World Court, the International Court of Justice for example.</i>
	103	<i>We do.</i>
	103, 104	<i>We settle disputes with our neighbours through negotiation and through the World Court.</i>
	104	<i>We won some and we lost some.</i>
	105, 106	<i>We know that if we go to war, that inch is going to cost us more than what it is worth.</i>
	108	<i>We do not always win.</i>
	108, 109	<i>But if we use peaceful means we can still lose but it will cost us much less.</i>
	119, 120	<i>Can it be that the stable salubrious climate that we have been enjoying has come to the end of its cycle?</i>

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

		122, 123	I think, instead of preparing for war, we should be paying attention to the climate changes and accompanying natural disasters.
		123, 124	We should be preparing to combat climate change, to bring back the normal environment we had been used to over the last thousands of years.
		124, 125	We should be preparing ourselves for major earthquakes, typhoons and hurricanes, floods and landslides etc.
		125, 126	We should learn how to mitigate these natural disasters.
		126, 127	We should be constructing shelters, make rain and grow food without sunlight, evacuate the sea side etc. etc.
		128	We should have teams of well-equipped disaster experts ready to rush to disaster areas.
		130	But we cannot rely on that.
		130, 131, 132	We are wasting our money preparing for wars, inventing ever more destructive weapons, when all of us may be wiped out by natural disasters as the planet goes through its next cycle.
		133	We, the human creatures are clever.
		133, 134	We can still survive the next cycle if we set our researchers to come up with defences against catastrophes.
		134, 135	If we reduce our budget for killing people, we will have the funds for research and preparation.
		138, 139	To do this we will have to spend the money we earn from trade to import the goods of the rich.
		142	We need the world market.
		142, 143	With the new communication technologies, we can increase our trade with the world.
		143, 144	So, don't impoverish us by forcing us to buy what we don't need or to reduce our exports.
		147	We are also seeing sanctions being applied to countries.

		147, 148	<i>We do not know under what laws sanctions are applied.</i>
		148, 149	<i>If we want to have sanctions, let us have a law to govern them.</i>
		153, 154	<i>We see in the Trans Pacific Partnership – TPP, when the rich companies had given themselves the power to sue Governments.</i>
		161	<i>We need to support the UN even though it has failed to banish wars.</i>
		175	<i>We cannot be held to ransom by events of the distant past.</i>
		177, 178	<i>If we do not make wars a crime our security cannot be sustained.</i>
		179	<i>We must resuscitate the original purpose of this great organisation – the United Nations Organisation.</i>
		179, 180	<i>We must punish warmongers.</i>
		180	<i>We must make the world peaceful for all.</i>
		181	<i>Only if we succeed can we claim that we are civilised.</i>
P1b(ii)	you	93	<i>You will be doing a good deed by consuming palm oil.</i>
P1c	they	8, 9	<i>On the basis of that victory they insisted on the right practically to rule the world.</i>
		9, 10, 11	<i>And so, they gave themselves veto powers over the rest of the world in the organisation they built – an organisation they claim would end wars in the solution of conflicts.</i>
		12, 13	<i>The veto power - they must know was against all the principles of human rights which they themselves claim to be the champions.</i>
		13	<i>It killed the very purpose of the great organisation that they had created.</i>
		14, 15	<i>Broken up into ideological factions they frustrated all attempts at solving problems.</i>

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

	22, 23	<i>They</i> feel <i>they</i> must be well armed to retain their right to be the privileged five.
	36	<i>They</i> prefer military action and sanctions.
	36	And <i>they</i> will continue to fail to stop terrorism.
	40, 41	Muslims are accused of terrorism even if <i>they</i> did nothing.
	53	But <i>they</i> are selective.
	58	But nowhere have <i>they</i> been as brutal as Myanmar.
	60, 61	<i>They</i> were forced to migrate and now <i>they</i> dare not return to Myanmar even when offered.
	61	<i>They</i> cannot trust the Myanmar military unless some form of non-Myanmar protection is given.
	68, 69	<i>They</i> cannot expect much from their former colonial masters.
	69	But <i>they</i> do expect to be allowed to develop their own countries themselves.
	69, 70	But <i>they</i> are hampered from doing so.
	116	Earthquakes and volcanic eruptions are more frequent and <i>they</i> destroy towns and cities.
	151	<i>They</i> are already talking of making trillions.
	155	And <i>they</i> are not all like Bill Gates.
	175, 176	The veto powers should not think <i>they</i> would always be above international laws and norms.

Appendix D

Types of Personal Pronouns as Objects Used in the Malaysian Leader's Speech

Coding Scheme	Pronoun	Line	Sentence
P2a(ii)	us	91, 92, 93	We appeal to the good sense of the rich not to impoverish <i>us</i> , not to deprive hundreds of thousands of our workers from earning a living.
		105, 106	We know that if we go to war, that inch is going to cost <i>us</i> more than what it is worth.
		108, 109	But if we use peaceful means we can still lose but it will cost <i>us</i> much less.
		130, 131, 132	We are wasting our money preparing for wars, inventing ever more destructive weapons, when all of <i>us</i> may be wiped out by natural disasters as the planet goes through its next cycle.
		138	Now the rich want <i>us</i> to balance the trade, to buy more of their goods, to correct the imbalance.
		143, 144	So, don't impoverish <i>us</i> by forcing <i>us</i> to buy what we don't need or to reduce our exports.
		148, 149	If we want to have sanctions, let <i>us</i> have a law to govern them.
		P2b(i)	you
P2b(ii)	you	181	I thank <i>you</i> .
P2c	them	13, 14	It ensured that all solution to all conflicts could be negated by any one of <i>them</i> .
		16	Each one of <i>them</i> can negate the wishes of the nearly 200 other members.
		17, 18	Yet, there are among <i>them</i> those who berate other countries of the world for not being democratic or being not democratic enough.

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

		44, 45	Now the wars and instability due to regime change have forced <i>them</i> to run away from their countries.
		73	The poor are practically forced to accept <i>them</i> .
		148, 149	If we want to have sanctions, let us have a law to govern <i>them</i> .
		154	The terms of the agreements were drawn up by <i>them</i> .
		155	Most are bent on exploiting the power money gives <i>them</i> .

Appendix E

Types of Personal Pronouns as Subjects Used in the American Leader’s Speech

Coding Scheme	Pronoun	Line	Sentence
P1a(i)	I	3, 4	Where <i>I</i> stand, the world has heard from presidents and premiers at the height of the Cold War.
		12, 13	<i>I</i> have the immense privilege of addressing you today as the elected leader of a nation that prizes liberty, independence, and self-government above all.
		48, 49	Tomorrow, <i>I</i> will join Prime Minister Abe of Japan to continue our progress in finalizing a terrific new trade deal.
		50, 51, 52	As the United Kingdom makes preparations to exit the European Union, <i>I</i> have made clear that we stand ready to complete an exceptional new trade agreement with the UK that will bring tremendous benefits to both of our countries.
		62, 63	As just one example, <i>I</i> recently met the CEO of a terrific American company, Micron Technology, at the White House.
		73, 74	To confront these unfair practices, <i>I</i> placed massive tariffs on more than \$500 billion worth of Chinese-made goods.
		78, 79	But as <i>I</i> have made very clear, <i>I</i> will not accept a bad deal for the American people.
		86	But <i>I</i> will never fail to defend America’s interests.
		92, 93, 94	To stop Iran’s path to nuclear weapons and missiles, <i>I</i> withdrew the United States from the terrible Iran nuclear deal, which has very little time remaining, did not allow inspection of important sites, and did not cover ballistic missiles.

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

		122, 123, 124	<i>I</i> have told Kim Jong Un what <i>I</i> truly believe: that, like Iran, his country is full of tremendous untapped potential, but that to realize that promise, North Korea must denuclearize.
		143, 144	Today, <i>I</i> have a message for those open border activists who cloak themselves in the rhetoric of social justice: Your policies are not just.
		152, 153, 154	To our country, <i>I</i> can tell you sincerely: We are working closely with our friends in the region — including Mexico, Canada, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, and Panama — to uphold the integrity of borders and ensure safety and prosperity for our people.
		154, 155, 156	<i>I</i> would like to thank President López Obrador of Mexico for the great cooperation we are receiving and for right now putting 27,000 troops on our southern border.
		156	Mexico is showing us great respect, and <i>I</i> respect them in return.
		161	As long as <i>I</i> am President of the United States, we will enforce our laws and protect our borders.
		176, 177	Since <i>I</i> last spoke in this hall, the United States and our partners have built a historic coalition of 55 countries that recognize the legitimate government of Venezuela.
		187, 188	Today, <i>I</i> repeat a message for the world that <i>I</i> have delivered at home: America will never be a socialist country.
		216, 217	Yesterday, <i>I</i> was also pleased to host leaders for a discussion about an ironclad American commitment: protecting religious leaders and also protecting religious freedom.
		227, 228, 229	That is why, this year, <i>I</i> announced that we will never ratify the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty, which would threaten the liberties of law-abiding American citizens.

P1a(ii)	we	4, 5	<i>We</i> have seen the foundation of nations.
		5	<i>We</i> have seen the ringleaders of revolution.
		5, 6, 7	<i>We</i> have beheld saints who inspired us with hope, rebels who stirred us with passion, and heroes who emboldened us with courage — all here to share plans, proposals, visions, and ideas on the world’s biggest stage.
		17, 18	That is why the United States vigorously defends the traditions and customs that have made us who <i>we</i> are.
		28	It is why <i>we</i> in the United States have embarked on an exciting program of national renewal.
		28, 29	In everything <i>we</i> do, <i>we</i> are focused on empowering the dreams and aspirations of our citizens.
		34, 35	<i>We</i> are marshaling our nation’s vast energy abundance, and the United States is now the number one producer of oil and natural gas anywhere in the world.
		37, 38, 39	As <i>we</i> rebuild the unrivaled might of the American military, <i>we</i> are also revitalizing our alliances by making it very clear that all of our partners are expected to pay their fair share of the tremendous defense burden, which the United States has borne in the past.
		45	Our goal is simple: <i>We</i> want balanced trade that is both fair and reciprocal.
		46, 47	<i>We</i> have worked closely with our partners in Mexico and Canada to replace NAFTA with the brand new and hopefully bipartisan U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement.
		50, 51, 52	As the United Kingdom makes preparations to exit the European Union, I have made clear that <i>we</i> stand ready to complete an exceptional new trade

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

			agreement with the UK that will bring tremendous benefits to both of our countries.
		52, 53	<i>We</i> are working closely with Prime Minister Boris Johnson on a magnificent new trade deal.
		66	But <i>we</i> are seeking justice.
		78	Hopefully, <i>we</i> can reach an agreement that would be beneficial for both countries.
		80	As <i>we</i> endeavor to stabilize our relationship, <i>we're</i> also carefully monitoring the situation in Hong Kong.
		84	<i>We</i> are all counting on President Xi as a great leader.
		85, 86	<i>We</i> desire peace, cooperation, and mutual gain with all.
		91	<i>We</i> must never allow this to happen.
		95	Following our withdrawal, <i>we</i> have implemented severe economic sanctions on the country.
		96, 97, 98	In response to Iran's recent attack on Saudi Arabian oil facilities, <i>we</i> just imposed the highest level of sanctions on Iran's central bank and sovereign wealth fund.
		120	<i>We</i> want partners, not adversaries.
		122	For this same reason, <i>we</i> have pursued bold diplomacy on the Korean Peninsula.
		128, 129, 130	And <i>we</i> will continue to work with our coalition of Afghan partners to stamp out terrorism, and <i>we</i> will never stop working to make peace a reality.
		131, 132	Here in the Western Hemisphere, <i>we</i> are joining with our partners to ensure stability and opportunity all across the region.
		149, 150, 151	Today, <i>we</i> must resolve to work together to end human smuggling, end human trafficking, and put these criminal networks out of business for good.

152, 153, 154	To our country, I can tell you sincerely: <i>We</i> are working closely with our friends in the region — including Mexico, Canada, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, and Panama — to uphold the integrity of borders and ensure safety and prosperity for our people.
154, 155, 156	I would like to thank President López Obrador of Mexico for the great cooperation <i>we</i> are receiving and for right now putting 27,000 troops on our southern border.
157	The U.S., <i>we</i> have taken very unprecedented action to stop the flow of illegal immigration.
161	As long as I am President of the United States, <i>we</i> will enforce our laws and protect our borders.
167, 168	<i>We</i> want every nation in our region to flourish and its people to thrive in freedom and peace.
169, 170	In that mission, <i>we</i> are also committed to supporting those people in the Western Hemisphere who live under brutal oppression, such as those in Cuba, Nicaragua, and Venezuela.
179, 180	<i>We</i> are watching the Venezuela situation very closely.
180, 181	<i>We</i> await the day when democracy will be restored, when Venezuela will be free, and when liberty will prevail throughout this hemisphere.
189, 190	Sadly, as <i>we</i> see in Venezuela, the death toll continues in this country.
193	<i>We</i> urge every nation present to do the same.
194, 195	<i>We</i> must always be skeptical of those who want conformity and control.
195, 196	Even in free nations, <i>we</i> see alarming signs and new challenges to liberty.
197, 198	A small number of social media platforms are acquiring immense power over what <i>we</i> can see and over what <i>we</i> are allowed to say.

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

	201, 202	In the United States, my administration has made clear to social media companies that <i>we</i> will uphold the right of free speech.
	205	As <i>we</i> defend American values, <i>we</i> affirm the right of all people to live in dignity.
	205, 206, 207, 208	For this reason, my administration is working with other nations to stop criminalizing of homosexuality, and <i>we</i> stand in solidarity with LGBTQ people who live in countries that punish, jail, or execute individuals based upon sexual orientation.
	209	<i>We</i> are also championing the role of women in our societies.
	220	<i>We</i> want and support religious liberty for all.
	221, 222, 223	<i>We</i> are aware that many United Nations projects have attempted to assert a global right to taxpayer-funded abortion on demand, right up until the moment of delivery.
	224, 225	Like many nations here today, <i>we</i> in America believe that every child — born and unborn — is a sacred gift from God.
	227, 228, 229	That is why, this year, I announced that <i>we</i> will never ratify the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty, which would threaten the liberties of law-abiding American citizens.
	229, 230	<i>We</i> will always uphold our Second Amendment.
	250	With God's help, together <i>we</i> will cast off the enemies of liberty and overcome the oppressors of dignity.
	250, 251	<i>We</i> will set new standards of living and reach new heights of human achievement.
	251, 252	<i>We</i> will rediscover old truths, unravel old mysteries, and make thrilling new breakthroughs.
	252, 253	And <i>we</i> will find more beautiful friendship and more harmony among nations than ever before.

P1b(ii)	you	22, 23	If <i>you</i> want freedom, take pride in your country.
		23	If <i>you</i> want democracy, hold on to your sovereignty.
		23, 24	And if <i>you</i> want peace, love your nation.
		144, 145	<i>You</i> are empowering criminal organizations that prey on innocent men, women, and children.
		145, 146	<i>You</i> put your own false sense of virtue before the lives, wellbeing, and [of] countless innocent people.
		146, 147	When <i>you</i> undermine border security, <i>you</i> are undermining human rights and human dignity.
		148, 149	Each of <i>you</i> has the absolute right to protect your borders, and so, of course, does our country.
		159, 160	Because if <i>you</i> make it here, <i>you</i> will not be allowed in; <i>you</i> will be promptly returned home.
		160, 161	<i>You</i> will not be released into our country.
P1c	they	9, 10, 11	It is the divide between those whose thirst for control deludes them into thinking <i>they</i> are destined to rule over others and those people and nations who want only to rule themselves.
		103, 104	For 40 years, the world has listened to Iran's rulers as <i>they</i> lash out at everyone else for the problems <i>they</i> alone have created.
		104, 105	<i>They</i> conduct ritual chants of "Death to America" and traffic in monstrous anti-Semitism.
		135, 136	And <i>they</i> become depleted very fast, but their youth is not taken care of and human capital goes to waste.
		137	The receiving countries are overburdened with more migrants than <i>they</i> can responsibly accept.
		164	And <i>they</i> are waiting also to be pursued.
		184, 185, 186	Events in Venezuela remind us all that socialism and communism are not about justice, <i>they</i> are not about equality, <i>they</i> are not about lifting up

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

			the poor, and <i>they</i> are certainly not about the good of the nation.
		231, 232, 233	Our nation's Founders understood that there will always be those who believe <i>they</i> are entitled to wield power and control over others.
		235, 236	<i>They</i> chose to entrust American power to those most invested in the fate of our nation: a proud and fiercely independent people.

Appendix F

Types of Personal Pronouns as Objects Used in the American Leader’s Speech

Coding Scheme	Pronoun	Line	Sentence
P2a(ii)	us	5, 6, 7	We have beheld saints who inspired <i>us</i> with hope, rebels who stirred <i>us</i> with passion, and heroes who emboldened <i>us</i> with courage — all here to share plans, proposals, visions, and ideas on the world’s biggest stage.
		8	Like those who met <i>us</i> before, our time is one of great contests, high stakes, and clear choices.
		17, 18	That is why the United States vigorously defends the traditions and customs that have made <i>us</i> who we are.
		19, 20	Like my beloved country, each nation represented in this hall has a cherished history, culture, and heritage that is worth defending and celebrating, and which gives <i>us</i> our singular potential and strength.
		55, 56, 57	Our leaders then argued that this decision would compel China to liberalize its economy and strengthen protections to provide things that were unacceptable to <i>us</i> , and for private property and for the rule of law.
		87, 88	The regime’s record of death and destruction is well known to <i>us</i> all.
		156	Mexico is showing <i>us</i> great respect, and I respect them in return.
		184, 185, 186	Events in Venezuela remind <i>us</i> all that socialism and communism are not about justice, they are not about equality, they are not about lifting up the poor, and they are certainly not about the good of the nation.
		235	Our Founders gave <i>us</i> a system designed to restrain this dangerous impulse.

Examining the Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches by Tun Dr. Mahathir and President Trump

		244, 245	So to all the leaders here today, join <i>us</i> in the most fulfilling mission a person could have, the most profound contribution anyone can make:
P2b(ii)	you	1	Thank <i>you</i> very much.
		12, 13	I have the immense privilege of addressing <i>you</i> today as the elected leader of a nation that prizes liberty, independence, and self-government above all.
		152	To our country, I can tell <i>you</i> sincerely:
		178	Please know that all of America is united behind <i>you</i> .
		256	Thank <i>you</i> .
		256	God bless <i>you</i> .
		256, 257	Thank <i>you</i> very much.
P2c	them	9, 10, 11	It is the divide between those whose thirst for control deludes <i>them</i> into thinking they are destined to rule over others and those people and nations who want only to rule themselves.
		21	It must not attempt to erase <i>them</i> or replace <i>them</i> .
		71, 72	Globalism exerted a religious pull over past leaders, causing <i>them</i> to ignore their own national interests.
		90, 91	At the same time, the regime is squandering the nation's wealth and future in a fanatical quest for nuclear weapons and the means to deliver <i>them</i> .
		156	Mexico is showing us great respect, and I respect <i>them</i> in return.