

Donald Trump holds press conference in New York City | September 6, 2024

Auto-transcribed by <https://aliceapp.ai> on Friday, 06 Sep 2024.

Synced media and text playback available on this page:

https://aliceapp.ai/recordings/yl_9doIjmCLipjcFTAweGtVnr6x0vukQ.

Words	7,564
Duration	00:49:00
Recorded on	Unknown date
Uploaded on	2024-09-06 20:32:29 UTC
At	Unknown location
Using	Uploaded to aliceapp.ai

Speakers:

Donald Trump - 84.96%

Will Scharf - 11.17%

Alina Habba - 3.87%

Notes:

Summary by ChatGPT

- False Allegations: Trump claims that accusations against him, including those by E. Jean Carroll, are false and politically motivated.
- Judicial Bias: He criticizes several judges as being biased and unfair, suggesting that the legal system is rigged against him.
- Political Interference: Trump argues that the DOJ and legal challenges are part of a

strategy to interfere with his presidential campaign.

- Frustration with Legal Representation: He expresses dissatisfaction with his legal team's handling of his cases and their representation of him.

- Call for Fairness: Trump demands fairness in the judicial process and asserts that the cases against him are a form of political persecution.

Donald Trump

00:00:00

So thank you very much, everybody, for being here. This is a long and complicated web and story, but it all goes back to the DOJ and Kamala and sleepy Joe and all the rest of them. We have a whole rigged election system. Nobody's ever seen anything like what's happening now. I understand yesterday they're bringing up Russia, Russia, Russia again, uh, that they've done for years. Never found anything. Uh, but they should be looking at China, China, Iran. Iran, Iran and lots of other places. Uh, I haven't spoken to anybody from Russia in years. They know that, but it's a scam. But it all goes back to the DOJ because, uh, we had a trial today. It's an appeal of, uh, a ridiculous verdict of a woman I have never met. I don't know. I have no idea who she is. She wrote a book and she made a ridiculous story up. She put it in her book, and we're now appealing the decision. We had an extremely hostile judge appointed by Clinton, very good friends of Clinton, I guess. He married, uh, presided over the marriage ceremony of one of the lawyers on the case against us. And, uh, very sad. Judge Lewis Kaplan, angry man. He was so angry. I went to the trial. I've been in a lot of litigation over the years. I've never seen such anger or, uh, wanted to throw one of our attorneys in jail who threatened her with jail. Nobody's ever seen anything like it. Over. Over nothing. Nobody's ever. I've never seen such anger. But all of our judges, I, uh, mean, we had a brilliant judge, and I think a very fair judge in Florida. I think we have another judge who's very fair. I just asked for fair. I don't want anything different from anybody else. I just asked for fairness. We have another judge or a couple of judges that I think are fair. Then we have other judges that I think the whole thing is. I think the system is a, uh, disgrace. The case that we met on today. And then we're going to talk about job, uh, numbers, which are horrible, by the way. Horrible. Like really bad. And you know that, I'm sure you won't report on it, but the job numbers are terrible. Uh, we're going to talk about the appeal today. We had a great appellate lawyer go down representing us, and, uh, I think John did a very good job. You have a matter of minutes to speak. It's a very complex thing because it was a setup, a rig deal. Uh, they had two witnesses. And before I start, I have no idea who this woman is. They have a picture from, they say, about 40 years ago, a picture. And the picture depicts her and her husband on a celebrity line, where I was the celebrity. I been a celebrity for a long time, and they were shaking my hands along with hundreds of other people. Nobody even knows where it is. Uh, the problem is she doesn't know the date of this incident. She doesn't know when.

She doesn't know. Was it in the nineties? Could it have been further than that? She has no idea when. And people do that because you don't want to give a specific date. And then you find out that Trump, or whoever it was, was in Europe. So they tend to do that. They take long periods, so that, this way, hopefully, he was in New York at that time. But this is a disgraceful case, and disgraceful in particular, because it's about a former president of the United States who is now leading in the polls to be the president again. And this is being worked with the DOJ, Department of Justice, as are all of these cases. They all come out. Atlanta, Fonny, uh, that is all Department of Justice. Nobody knew that, uh, case with Judge Angoran, the most overturned judge in the state. That is very close, because they sent their team from the, uh, DOJ to help him. The district attorney, Alvin Bragg, that was all worked with. Again, they sent a top operative from the department, from the DOJ, Department of, I call it the Department of Injustice, because they're using the Department of Justice to rig the campaign. These cases are disgraceful. Now, they're brought, for the most part, in front of very hostile areas where republicans get three or 4%, like downtown Manhattan, in front of very hostile judges. Like, hostile like you wouldn't believe. Judge Mershon, Judge Ngoran, uh, and Judge Kaplan. All of them, hostile areas and very, uh, very hostile judges. I've never seen anything like it. And very bad thing in this case, New York. Very bad thing for New York. Businesses won't come to New York because of what took place with Judge Angoran, I can tell you that. And probably the rest of them also. But this case involved a woman who wrote a book, and I guess she said something in the book. That's when I first heard about it. I first heard about it in the White House. And of course, I denied the story because it's not true. I have no idea who the woman is, and I never met her. Now, I don't know about a picture that was taken 40 years ago with her husband on a celebrity line, so I don't think that counts. But as far as I know. I never met her. Uh, I never touched her. Uh, I have. I would have had no interest in meeting her in any way, shape, or form. Uh, her husband was a news anchor, actually, John Johnson, a very nice guy. She called him horrible things. We weren't allowed to say that in the trial. She said horrible things about him. I guess they're since divorced. Uh, he's a very nice guy, african American. And she said very bad things. We weren't allowed to use that in the trial, which surprised a lot of people. But she made up a story and fabricated 100% that I attacked her at Bergdorf Goodman. You know, it's very interesting. I don't think they were allowed to use this either. Her favorite show is law and order, and there's an, uh, almost exact story as her story in law and order about being attacked in the dressing room of a department store. I don't know if they used the name of the store, but that's her favorite show, law and order. She said that. And anyway, this evolved into a defamation case against me because I disputed her words, because I, uh, told the truth. We were called. I was in the white house, and I said, no, it never happened. I didn't even know what they were talking about. This was, I think I was in the Oval Office. Sir, do you know anything about this? And, uh, this had to do with the book. And she had a few pages in a book making this claim, by the way. There was never a claim. There was never a police report. There was never anything mentioned. There was never publicity. 30 or 40 years ago, whenever it took place, nobody knows. She doesn't know when it took place. When did it take place? She has no idea. She

thinks it was in the 1990s. She thinks it was in the 1990s. And the judge, we had two trials. We asked for a consolidation. He said no. The reason he said no is he'd rather have double the publicity, because that's bad for me. Very bad, because I'm running for president, and this is not the kind of publicity you like. And whether it's true or not, it's horrible. And in this case, it's so false. It's a, uh, made up, fabricated story by somebody, I think, initially just looking to promote a book. And when they called me, I denied the story. I got sued, essentially, for defamation because I'm denying a story where I'm right. I should be suing her for defamation. So that's where it is now. There were two witnesses. One is a woman who's followed me for years. Uh, she said in 1979, I was in an airplane with her, commercial flight, and we became very intimate. I just sat down. Uh, I think I had the book the art of the deal. I was famous then, too. I've been famous for a long time. Were sitting in first class, according to her. Never happened, by the way. Totally made up story. She's a Clinton person, too, by the way, big Clinton person. She made up the story, and so many years ago, and I think it would be 1979, one of my many people behind me could correct it, but I think she said 1970. That's a long time ago. And I sat down. I, uh, believe I had some pretty big success then, and I was being talked about a lot. Maybe the art of the deal was out, uh, you know, some time after that, I'm not sure, but I was well known, and passengers are coming into the plane, and she said I was making out with her. And then after 15 minutes, and then she changed her story a couple of times, maybe it was quicker that I grabbed her at a certain part, and that was when she had enough. So think of the impracticality of this. I'm famous. I'm in a plane, people are coming into the plane, and I'm looking at a woman, and I grab her and I start kissing her and making out with her. What are the chances of that happening? What are the chances? And frankly, I know you're going to say it's a terrible thing to say, but it couldn't have happened. It didn't happen, and she would not have been the chosen one. She would not have been the chosen one. She has gone around for years saying this story. Everywhere I go, she says this story, and it's a total lie. Now, I assume she'll sue me now for defamation. Like I got sued by Eugene Carroll, who, interestingly said she's been hurt, damaged, but she's made more money since she did this than she ever made in her life. She gets paid a lot of money to go talk bad things about me. So remember this. This whole thing started along with just about every other case I'm involved with, with the political campaign of Harris and who's having a bad time because he can't talk of Harris and Joe Biden. This was election interference. It all is. It's all fabricated, but fabricated in front of very friendly judges for them and in very friendly areas for them. If you get a jury, it's very hard to win in a jury where you have three or four or 5% republican votes. Very, very tough. Actually, two witnesses, one is named Jessica Leeds. So she. She was up again. She can't get rid of her. She was up. She said, I was in an airplane doing that. A couple of things. You have, uh, an armrest in planes back in those days. Oh, by the way, she didn't know anything about the flight, where we were going, where I was in very few flights. I was a New York guy building, New York building. I was in very few airplanes. I will tell you, in those days, 1979, I think. It's a long time ago, but you had the armrest, and in the old days, they didn't move. Okay, but she said she then got out and she went to the back of the plane, and that was the end of the

story, I think. And this story has followed me for years. But just to finish with her, Jessica Leeds. No police reports, no witnesses, no corroboration of any kind, no criminal suggestions, no nothing. Then you have another one, and this one is a writer for People magazine who I actually thought was very nice. She came to Mar a Lago, and she wrote the most beautiful story you've ever seen. It was a love story about Melania and myself. A love story in People magazine. And that was it. It was a cover, I think, but it was a beautiful story. You would. Everybody would love to have that marriage. She said the nicest things about me, about Melania. You have the story. I mean, you can read the story. And her name was whoever, let's see, her name was who? Swornoff? Yeah, I don't have it. Whatever her name was. I don't know the lady, so perhaps it's much better that way. But I really don't know the lady. So she wrote this beautiful story and about, I don't know, years later, no police reports, no anything. Years later, the same person they called up, did you attack at Mar a Lago? This woman, this writer, whatever her name is, and she was a witness in a case. Her and Leeds were the two witnesses. Only two witnesses. Did you attack her? I said, who is she? And they said, she writes for People magazine. I said, I don't know anything about the lady. Uh, I had a story long ago, years before, about people. But it was very nice story. So I don't know. It has to be made up because I don't know what you're talking about. It turned out that the same lady that wrote this beautiful story years later said, I attacked her. Now think of this. Oh. And she said, the butler knew everything. The old expression, the butler did it, right? Very famous in crime stories. Well, the butler was. Tony Senecal. Worked for me for a long time. He was at. He was retired at that time. That was years later. He retired. He was, uh, retired when this hoax came out. And what happened is he totally confirmed my story and he didn't even work for me anymore. He passed away a couple of years ago. A good man. He said the woman was crazy. It never happened. I was the one that served her. Whatever she was drinking. I was there and nothing ever happened. But you don't need the butler. All you have to do is read the story. Think of this. A woman comes into Mar a Lago, interviews me about a love story, about my wife and myself, and during that interview, I attacked her and pushed her up against the wall, violently, okay? And then she leaves and she writes a perfect story. A perfect story. She doesn't mention the event again. There's nothing on file at all. Zero. There was no complaints. There were no complaints to people magazine. There was no witness. There was nothing. Yeah, well, there was a witness, the butler, and he's already said everything. He's already told this story because this story likewise, like Leeds, this story has followed me around. I could go through many, many other stories outside of this. You know, it's very funny. When you're rich and famous, you get a lot of people come up with a lot of stories, but, uh, you're writers, and some of you are legitimate writers, and some of you aren't. Some of you are fake news, and some of you are real news. But put yourself in my position. I'm running for president and I have all these cases all of a sudden come, come out and they have fake cases and they report back to DOJ. And you have Lisa Monaco, one of the people at DOJ, who I saw the other day talking about the Russia, Russia, Russia hoax, and yet she's friends with Andrew Weissman and that whole group and crew who should be sued, by the way, because they're not a charity. All they are is a political

organization that goes after Trump for the last eight years. I mean, he's a sick person that runs that, too. But Lisa Monaco is in the department of justice, but she's an, uh, Andrew Weissman person who's been after me for years. So far he's failed and he's having a heart attack because I'm leading in the polls. I guess if you look at the, uh, Nate Silver, very respected guy, I don't know him, but he has me up by a lot. So let's say we're leading, or let's say we're tied, or let's say, what difference? I'm in the race. It's between two people. But I think we're leading by a lot because the opponent refuses to do an interview because she can't talk. Uh, they're not going to skate through it. We're not going to have a marxist president. The people are getting it. So we go down to court today to talk about this case is a scam. And all I can say is that I never met the woman other than this picture, which could have been AI generated. I don't know. Showed up out of nowhere, but it's fine. Nice picture with her. Her husband and lots of other people are online. So celebrity line, but never met her, never touched her, never had anything to do with her. Uh, the other thing is, I was very famous then. If I would have walked into Bergdorf Goodman, the department store that she said, everybody would have said, oh, there's Trump. And it would have been, at that time, on page six. Page six was the equivalent of today's Internet, and it would have been a big story if I would have walked into that store, gone into a dressing room, and supposedly, you know what? To her, never happened. Never happened. Total phony story. And I feel sad that I have to come up here and explain it. I have all this legal talent, but legal talent cannot overcome rigged judges. They can't overcome a 4% republican area. And I'm disappointed in my legal talent. I'll be honest with you. They're good. They're good people. They're talented people. Today at the, uh, trial, they didn't mention the dress. So the Monica Lewinsky type dress was a big part of the trial. Big, big part of the trial. I said, why didn't you mention that? And I heard there was a dress involved, and I wasn't frightened at all because I did nothing with her. Uh, never. Never touched this woman, saw this woman, had no idea who she was. But they have a dress, sir. I said, so what? Well, sir, it's very. Sir, they used that dress to try and intimidate me. They used that dress with the public. That dress was such a famous dress. It was Monica Lewinsky part two. The dress. And the judge wanted it for trial, and it was going to go into trial, and then they found out there was nothing on the dress, which I knew. And then the judge wouldn't allow it to be used. So they used it as a cudgel. They used it as a hammer over my head. And then the judge, when he heard that it was. It showed totally negative. Totally negative. The judge wouldn't allow us to use it at trial. Then there was an Anderson Cooper interview where she said, essentially, no, he didn't rape me. She was selling her book. She wrote a book. The book would have been a total failure. Probably was anywhere, although probably sold more recently. Again, this is a woman that wasn't doing well until she came out with this stuff about me. And that's happened to others, too, by the way. Um, she's not the only one, but they have the Anderson Cooper tape. And in the Anderson Cooper tape, it's an interview of her. And Cooper says something to the effect, did he rape you? Did he rape you? He was so happy. Oh, did he rape you? And she gave a very good answer from me, but a bad answer for CNN, for Anderson. And he said, we're going to commercial break right now. We're going. Then she came back from commercial break, and she was

much more hostile. But this man wouldn't let us use the tape or the proper questions, uh, having to do with the tape wouldn't let us. The judge, Judge Kaplan, wouldn't let it be used. We wanted to get the outtakes. In other words, what did Anderson Cooper talk to her about during that intermission? For a commercial that he called for immediately. Where do you see this? I mean, some of you have seen it, some of you haven't. We're going to commercial break right now. And so what happened is we weren't able to use it. The other thing is, we had not one trial. We had two trials. Nobody understands why. We asked for a consolidation, and I wanted to show up to the trial, to the first trial. My lawyer, who's not up here, not with us any longer, sir, you should not show up. You're the former president, or the president. I don't even know when the trial was, but you're the president of the United States, sir. Uh, this is beneath you. I've got this 100%. The dress is negative. But he wasn't able to use it, sir, it's beneath you to show up. I said, but wouldn't that be bad for a jury? Wouldn't that be sort of bad for a jury if I don't show up? He said, sir, you don't have to show up. I've got this. You shouldn't do it. It's beneath you. It's beneath the office of the president. I understood what he meant by that, and so I didn't show up. And I was found guilty of something that I didn't do with a woman that I have never seen touched or in any way was involved with, nor would I want to be. I would not want to be. My people say, please don't say that. I would not want to be involved with her. And that's where we are. So we're appealing it. Uh, and people would say, it's not a friendly panel based on the appointments, but you'll look that up yourself. I hope they understand. This is the office of the president of the United States, and there has to be fairness shown. Um, our court system is looking so bad if you're a Democrat. These are all Democrat appointed people. Biden, Clinton, I think others, three people. They seem very good today, and, I mean, they seem absolutely fine, but, uh, I've read and I've heard it's not a friendly panel, but I wasn't surprised because I don't get friendly panels. I don't get friendly panels. But where we've had fair judges, where we've had brilliant judges, frankly, I don't know the judge in Florida, Judge Cannon, don't know her at all. But, um, I think she's a brilliant woman. I think she handled a scam. It's a scam case. That's the documents case. That's the case where Biden, who had ten times more documents, took all this stuff for years, 50 years, and he was exonerated. Of course, they said he was incompetent, so he wasn't fit, so he was exonerated based on that. But me, I don't get exonerated so easily. And I had a thing called the presidential Records act, which exonerates me. But we won that trial. And the other side plays the ref crew and Weissman, uh, and all these people. And again, Lisa Monaco should not be involved in this because she's been after Trump for years, and now she's like the second person at the DOJ, but she's with all these people, and they're playing the ref, and they say terrible things about judges. They do it with the Supreme Court justices because they think they're going to intimidate them. I think it should be illegal. That's what the DOJ should look into, the legality of these people. Taking a brilliant judge and demeaning her and taking other people that are fair and solid and demeaning them. It's called playing the ref. Nobody did it better than the late, great Bobby Knight, basketball coach. He would play, he would scream at those refs and everything. They'd say, bobby, you're not going to get the decision overturned. Yep. But the next one I will.

And he was right. He was a great basketball coach. Last coach to have an undefeated season, last coach in basketball to have, um, many years ago. He also endorsed me. But he played the ref. These people are playing the ref when they are allowed to call for recusal impeachment of a judge because they're not getting their way. And for some reason, the other side doesn't do that. They don't do that. The other side is much softer. Republicans, uh, play it a lot softer. Uh, but they play it legitimately. So I'm going to ask, uh, if I might, will sheriff, to come up, just say a couple of words about what took place today. One of our attorneys working on this ridiculous. It's a ridiculous case. Remember, it never happened. It was made up for political reasons. And the DOJ is behind everything. Every one of these cases, it's political interference. It's a, uh, witch hunt. Just like the fake Russia, Russia, Russia scam was a witch hunt. And just like they want to start that scam all over again by announcing that Russia, Russia, Russia, we're talking about. And you know what they do when they do that? They intimidate people from having a fair election. They intimidate poll workers from speaking up when they see crooked things take place in the election. And it's a disgrace. Our country is in serious trouble. Our judicial system is in very serious trouble. Uh, will, please come up. Thank you. Mister President.

Will Scharf

00:28:51

Good morning, y'all. My name is Will Sharf. I'm one of President Trump's attorneys. Today we presented oral argument before the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in one of two cases brought against President Trump by Eugene Carroll. Now, it's really important to remember that Eugene Carroll's story, at its heart, is an utterly implausible, he said, she said story. There is no corroboration for anything she has ever claimed about President Trump. There are no corroborating witnesses, as President Trump alluded to. There is not confirmatory DNA. No police report was filed at the time of this alleged incident. She was unable to identify when this incident occurred. Until quite recently, no surveillance, evidence or witnesses have ever, uh, been found or come forward confirming any aspect of Eugene Carroll's story. In light of that, in light of the utter implausibility of the story that Eugene Carroll was attempting to sell to the jury in this case, her attorneys introduced evidence that should have never seen the inside of a courtroom. Utterly, uh, insane, uh, efforts to introduce propensity, witnesses Jessica Leeds and Natasha Steinhoff, uh, most notably, in an unfair and improper effort to buttress Eugene Carroll's failed attempt, uh, to assault President Trump. Jessica Leeds story is instructive here. This is a woman who claims, uh, in the middle of a crowded airliner in 1979, uh, President Trump assaulted her. Leeds has never been able to identify where this plane departed from, where it went to, uh, the date of the flight in question, uh, making our efforts to disprove her testimony extremely difficult. Under the federal rules of evidence, uh, this story should have never been allowed to be presented, uh, to the jury in this case. The same is true of Natasha Steinhoff's story, which, again, lacks any indicia of reliability, uh, any sort of credibility, any sort of, uh, confirmatory, uh, testimony from other witnesses, uh, or anything else that would make you believe that this actually

happened. So, on the one hand, you have a judge who allowed in, uh, this improper propensity evidence that should not have been allowed in, in our view, that polluted the jury's deliberations in this case, that presented a story to the jury of, uh, a series of. A pattern of conduct that the jury should not have been considering. Uh, and we think that absent that propensity evidence, no fair jury could have reached the verdict that was reached in this case. And as a result, we believe that, uh, this verdict needs to be overturned. But there's more than that. In addition to this improper propensity evidence, President Trump and his trial team were prevented from cross examining Eugene Carroll and other witnesses on crucial issues. Crucial issues in particular, relating, uh, to political coordination and the political motivation behind this entire lawsuit. This is a lawsuit that was instigated in large part by George Conway, a longtime political foe and adversary of President Trump. This is a lawsuit that was funded by Reed Hoffman, a key political ally of the Biden Harris administration and a major Democrat donor. We were limited in the evidence we were allowed to present at trial about these crucial facts. We were prevented from cross examining Eugene Carroll on aspects of that dynamic that underlies this entire lawsuit, and that too, unfairly corrupted the jury's deliberations in this case and requires reversal of the jury verdict. I think this political coordination point is particularly important, though it's important to emphasize, because what we have seen in the last few years is a weaponization by the Biden administration and by their political allies of our legal system and of our courts to unlawfully, unconstitutionally interfere with President Trump's core first amendment right to run for president. That is a right guaranteed to him by the Constitution. That is the right that his political opponents are attempting to strip away from him. We have seen this in case after case after case, where unfair political motives, uh, have underlay what should be serious legal proceedings. And I think when you look at this situation in today, when you look at what the left, when you look at what the Biden Harris administration is attempting to do to President Trump, this is insane. This is an absolute abuse of our legal system. It's an absolute abuse of the rule of law. It should be deeply offensive, not just to political supporters of President Trump, uh, but to each and every American. With respect to today's appeal, we are hopeful that the second Circuit understands what's at stake here. We are hopeful that the second Circuit, uh, understands what occurred during this trial, which was an improper use of evidence to buttress Eugene Carroll's entirely meritless claims, on the one hand, and an improper exclusion of evidence that would have informed the jury about the true motivation behind this lawsuit and that we believe, would have resulted in a very different verdict. Thank you.

Donald Trump

00:33:56

Thank you very much.

Alina Habba

00:34:00

Good afternoon. I've done this one too many times, actually, too many times for the last three and a half years while President Trump has been trying to fight to get this country

back. And I want to speak to the american women, and I want to speak to the people that need to get out and vote on November 5. I have sat with President Trump for years now. While he has been targeted with lies and with judges, AG's, NDAs, who have specifically run in this city, and others on getting Trump, the Trump administration will fix this problem. We will stop Kamala Harris regime because she was there. Let's not forget that. And she still is. Of using officials from the White House, putting them in DA's offices, in AG's offices, and attacking your political opponent. And this country deserves better than this. We do. We should not be sitting here at a press conference talking about this. We did this in 2016, and every woman had no reports. They come out when it's election time. And as a woman who has stood with President Trump, who has spent extensive time with President Trump and with his beautiful family, I will tell you that is not President Trump. And I completely am disgusted by what I have seen happen to this person, his family, and the Trump organization that we stand in right now. You must vote Donald Trump back in, because as an attorney, as a woman, as a mother, our future of this country depends on it, and we need to stop this from happening. The DOJ is supposed to help our country and protect us, not attack us. Because you cannot win in the polls. Thank you.

Donald Trump

00:35:40

Thank you very much. Both. And, uh, just in finishing this, uh, we have numerous other trials that are also, uh, very much in coordination with the DOJ. They actually took just about their top person and they put them into the offices of the attorney general of New York and then also the office of the DA, DA Bragg's office, to make sure the case is brought, and brought viciously, uh, against their political opponent. And it's a shame. It's a shame businesses will not come to New York because of it. They actually, in the case of, uh, Angoran, they used a consumer frauds case, never used before for a thing like this. And not only were my numbers correct, and again, this was a generality. All you need is a general. But I had really good numbers, but they were very conservative, very much on the low side, and the judge knew that. And the judge ruled a fine against me, the likes of which has never even been heard of. Businesses will never come to this state as long as that is able to be held up, uh, because we won that trial so conclusively. We had an expert witness said that President Trump's financial. This was an expert witness from the stern school business, one of the most, uh, highly respected people in the country as an expert witness. He said, to the best of my remembering, it's a big statement, but he said, this is perhaps the best financial statement I've ever seen. But the judge made me pay like a \$400 million fine. This is a consumer fraud statement. Think of it, consumer fraudster case, uh, that they made it in. The judge refused to give it over to the commercial division where they could understand things, and they would have dismissed it immediately because this case had no merit whatsoever. The judge wanted to settle the case for a very much smaller amount. And I said, I'm not going to settle. I didn't do anything wrong. But he would have settled the case for a much smaller amount. He wanted to settle it for a much more. We had numerous meetings in his office for a fraction of the number that he gave. That was

one of the interesting things. I figured that the worst that you could do is what he wanted to settle for, which was a very small number by comparison. And then he just came out with this number. This, uh, was a coordination with the DOJ and the other case that you know about and you've been hearing about, which is same kind of a thing. Also incoordination is the Bragg case. And they actually wanted to put them together in New York. They wanted to put the DA case together with the attorney general case. But they both wanted credit. They couldn't understand, you know, they, they both wanted credit. So they had their own cases. And it's very corrupt in New York and very, very corrupt. It's a very corrupt place and doing very badly. But when people see what happened and when they see, oh, I've had so many calls from business people saying, this is just terrible. Uh, today there was a story about somebody in southern district who's highly respected, knocking the hell out of both of those cases, say it's an embarrassment they were allowed to be brought. And I'm going to write out a list of things from Alan Dershowitz, Andrew McCarthy, uh, Greg Jarrett, some of the greatest, uh, people, uh, all legal scholars, great people, uh, Jonathan Turley, like, ten highly respected. The most highly respected people that quote Calabresi, judge Calabresi, that quote on cases. And they, I mean, shockingly, they can't even believe it. They said this case should not have been allowed to be brought. And that's about pretty much both cases. But it's about the case that we have in front of Judge Mershon. That, uh, case is a disgrace. It should have never been allowed. I did nothing wrong. And he took a non existent, expired, long expired by the statute of limitations, misdemeanor. He made it into 34 or something more than that, counts of felony. Nobody can even believe it over nothing. And if you look at that case, he wouldn't allow it. That whole thing was done by an attorney. I had nothing to do with it. That was done by an attorney, a sleazebag named Michael Cohen, and he did the whole thing. And you're allowed to have reliance on attorney. It's called reliance on attorney. You have a reliance on attorney. Attorneys allowed to do things. And all it was is a non disclosure agreement with somebody that said nothing happened. By the way, I might add that, uh, you don't mind. I'll add, ah, that we have a statement. Nothing happened. And he got a non disclosure agreement. He did it on his own. And this judge refused to allow us to use that as a defense, the attorney client defense, which is very standard. Other people have never heard that you're not allowed to use it, but he's the one that did it. Because I was running for president and running the country, he's the one that did it. So all of these cases are a disgrace. But the case that we had today, uh, downtown, uh, I wish we could have mentioned the dress again. Got the idea from Monica Lewinsky. But it was negative, wasn't allowed to be used. I wish we could have mentioned many of the other things, and I certainly wish we could have gone to CNN and got the outtakes, what's called the outtakes. What did Anderson Cooper tell her during the commercial? I'd love to find that out. So that's where we are. We have a very corrupt system of laws, but in that system, we have some very good judges also. And I think in the end, the good judges will prevail. And I hope Democrat appointed judges can see a scam like this where somebody just makes up a story, probably out of law and order. I don't know. She made it up out of somewhere. But check out the law and order episode that we're talking about. Make up a story, and I

end up getting sued. And by the way, the punishment is like \$89 million and wouldn't have two cases. It should have been one case. But two cases is better because you get double bad publicity. We asked the judge, could you consolidate the cases, same case? And he refused to do so. He wanted two cases. So two cases, two sets of lawyers, two everything. It's really, really very disgraceful. Let me talk about, uh, job numbers, because, as you know, they just came out, and they're a basic disaster. They are really. They are really bad. You had numbers that are shocking. Native born Americans. We lost 1.3 million jobs while foreign born Americans were able to take all of those jobs. So foreigners coming in illegally, largely illegally, into our country took the jobs of native born Americans. And I've been telling you, that's what's going to happen, because we have millions and millions of people pouring into our country, many from prisons and jails and mental institutions and insane asylums. Traffickers, human traffickers, women traffickers, sex traffickers, which, by the way, that's the kind of thing that people should be looking at because it's horrible. And it's turning out that migrant crime is far worse than any crime that we've ever experienced. If you look at Aurora, Colorado, they're taking over the place. They took over buildings, and, uh, this is just the beginning. You haven't seen anything yet. You haven't seen any. They've allowed well over 20 million people, in my opinion. Other people say, well, it's only 13. No, no, it's much more than 20. I think it's much more than 20. Our country is being invaded because of incompetent people like Kamala that doesn't want to do one interview. She m does one softball interview with CNN couldn't have been nicer. Dana Bash. You know what? I gained respect for Dana Bash and for Jake Tapper, because in my interview with Sleepy Joe, I thought they were very fair. Actually, I was surprised. They were very fair. I'm going into very hostile territory shortly on a debate with ABC, George Slapadopoulos and that group. And ABC, I think, is the worst of everybody. I think they're the worst. They're the nastiest. They're as bad as you can be. They're worse than NBC, which is saying a lot. And we have something coming. And the reason I'm doing it is because that's the only one that she would do it with, because her best friend is the head of ABC or ABC News, and her husband's best friend is married to that one. So. And Donna Brazile is there. You remember the famous Donna Brazile. She gave Hillary Clinton the questions. You remember that? That was a little embarrassing. She got fired, I assume, for that. But now she's working at ABC. So I said, I'll do it anyway. Because even if she knows the answers and knows the questions, I don't think she'll be very good. And this is not what our country wants, and I feel I have an obligation to do it. And she'd never stand up here like this and give a, uh, news conference and speak about what's happening with the weaponization of our justice system. This is the weaponization of justice at a level that nobody's ever seen in this country before. We've never seen it. You see it in third world countries, you see it in banana republics, but you don't see it in the United States of America. And it's a very sad thing. And I think I'm doing a great service by having gone through it and revealing it because, you know, it came out with an indictment from the district attorney, which, again, just revealed today. And I hope you're going to do a story because it's a big story. The southern district of New York was, and this is a very highly respected group of people. Uh, he said it was a disgrace that that case was brought. It was

a disgrace that the case was brought in front of Mershon. The case is a disgrace. Should have never been brought. Should have never been brought. And the case in front of Judge Ngoran, just in terms of the case itself, we had four or five overturns in the appellate division. I only hope the appellate division for the good of New York. Other words, you just say, God save the state for the good of New York. I hope that the appellate division will do what's right on that case because that case was a scam. But every single one of these cases that I'm mentioning, they're all hoaxes and scams, no different than Russia, Russia, Russia, Ukraine, Ukraine, Ukraine. The impeachment hoax, number one, impeachment hoax number two. All these things that we won, we won them all. But it takes time, it takes effort, and they're at it again. But this time, what they're doing is they're hitting us, uh, as hard as possible. You know, it's very interesting. It just brings to light, uh, the lawyer on the hoax that we're talking about now having to do with Eugene Carroll. She said the way to defeat Trump is go after him civilly as often as possible, make his life miserable, sue him all the time, keep him in court, and let him spend a fortune. That's the lawyer I have in the Eugene Carroll case, and that's exactly what they've done. The only thing I can say that's good about it is the public understands. And my poll numbers, I believe, are higher now than they would have been without it, because the public understands. It's a hoax, it's a scam, it's a political witch hunt. And some of you should be ashamed of yourselves. Thank you very much, everybody.