

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology
Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication

**“LANGUAGE PROFILES OF FEMALE POLITICIANS
of the 20-21st CENTURIES
(based on Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris language profiles)”**

Master’s thesis

Mariia Kapnik,
2nd year student,
Master Program
“English Communication Studies, Translation and
Two Western European Languages”
Field of science – 03 “Humanities”
Specialty – 035 “Philology”

Supervised by:
Alla D. Belova
Dr.Sc. in Philology, Full Professor

«Допущено до захисту»
Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології
та міжкультурної комунікації
Протокол № 8 від 18.04.2023
Завідувач кафедри _____ проф. Белова А.Д.

KYIV - 2023

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
I. LANGUAGE PROFILE AS A LINGUISTIC PHENOMENON.	6
1.1. Political discourse as a subject of linguistic analysis.	6
1.2. Language profile in political discourse as a linguistic phenomenon.....	13
1.3. Communication strategies and tactics as a component of the politicians’ language profiles.	19
Conclusion to chapter 1.....	27
II. PRAGMATIC APPROACH TO NANCY PELOSI’S LANGUAGE PROFILE..	29
2.1. Nancy Pelosi’s determination as a component of her language profile.	29
2.2 Nancy Pelosi’s personal anecdotes as a communicative strategy.	54
Conclusion to chapter 2.....	61
III. PRAGMATIC APPROACH TO KAMALA HARRIS’ LANGUAGE PROFILE	63
3.1. Kamala Harris’ rhetoric during presidential campaign.....	63
3.2. Kamala Harris’ rhetoric as the Vice President.....	81
Conclusion to chapter 3.....	90
CONCLUSIONS.....	92
BIBLIOGRAPHY	96
APPENDICES.....	103
APPENDIX A	103
APPENDIX B	138
SUMMARY	178

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history, women have been underrepresented in the political arena. Despite their immense contributions to society, they have been systematically excluded from participating in decision-making processes that shape the political landscape. It was not until the late 19th and early 20th centuries that women began to demand their right to vote and be involved in politics. The fight for suffrage and political representation was a long and arduous one, but it paved the way for women to have a voice in politics. Today, women continue to face challenges in the political sphere, but their participation is essential for a thriving democracy. This is because women bring unique perspectives and experiences to the table, which can lead to more inclusive policies and better representation of diverse interests.

The role of women in U.S. politics has evolved significantly over the past century. In the early years of American politics, women were largely excluded from political participation and were denied the right to vote. It was not until 1920, with the passage of the 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, that women were granted the right to vote and could participate in the political process. Today, women hold more political power in the U.S. than ever before.

Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris are two prominent women in U.S. politics, who have each made significant contributions to the country in different ways. Nancy Pelosi is a Democratic politician who has served in the U.S. House of Representatives since 1987. In 2007, she became the first woman to serve as Speaker of the House, a position she has held twice. Kamala Harris is a Democratic politician who has served as the Vice President of the United States since January 2021. She is the first woman, as well as the first person of Black and South Asian descent, to hold this position.

These ladies are influential politicians in one of the most progressive states in our world – the USA, and they put enormous impact not only on the citizens of the USA, but also on the heads of other states and even ordinary foreigners. Therefore, it is of high importance to do research on their language profiles and realize which linguistic means help them create appealing images and stay in the limelight on the political arena.

Political speeches are the primary means of communication that politicians use to address their audience. Oral political discourse, which includes political speeches, has gained significant attention among linguists because of its extensive use of diverse communication and speech techniques. The speeches are intended to persuade and influence the audience towards a particular point of view, policy, or action, playing a crucial role in shaping public opinion and impacting society. Political speeches offer leaders a platform to express their vision and inspire people towards a shared goal. These speeches provide an essential avenue for people to investigate the language profiles of politicians. The use of specific communicative means and techniques, known as “communication strategies” and “communication tactics,” is critical for politicians to achieve their communicative objectives and goals.

The present thesis aims to delve into the language profiles of Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris, two prominent political figures in the United States, through an analysis of their speeches. By analyzing their language profiles, this thesis seeks to shed light on the communication strategies employed by Pelosi and Harris in their speeches and the impact of their language on the audience's perception and interpretation of their message. Through this analysis, this thesis hopes to contribute to a better understanding of political discourse and the role of language in shaping public opinion.

The **relevance** of the theme is determined by its relevance to the linguistic studies of political speeches and their influence on the image of the politicians and, therefore, on the modern world.

The **aim** of the master thesis is to investigate the language profiles of Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris. In order to attain this aim, the following **tasks** must be accomplished:

- to determine the concept of political discourse;
- to determine the concept of the language profile in the political discourse;
- to outline the communication strategies and tactics and to describe the pragmatic approach to the analysis of language profile;
- to describe the language profile of Nancy Pelosi;

- to describe the language profile of Kamala Harris during the presidential campaign and as the Vice President.

The **subject** of the master paper is the language profile in the political discourse.

The **object** of the master paper is the linguistic means that constitute the language profile of Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris based on their speeches.

The **research material** comprises a total of twenty-six speeches, thirteen of which were delivered by Nancy Pelosi – four in the 20th century and nine in the 21st century. The remaining thirteen speeches were delivered by Kamala Harris, seven of which were given during her presidential campaign and the remaining six while she was serving as the Vice President.

The study's purpose and objectives dictated the use of several **methods** to analyze the data, including descriptive, contextual, interpretive, and discourse analysis. Additionally, the method of direct observation was employed, followed by the generalization of the results.

The **practical value** of this work is determined by the fact that the approach to the analysis of the language profiles may be used for further studies devoted to the pragmatic approach to the investigation of the language profiles of politicians.

The master paper consists of three chapters. The first chapter is of theoretical value and the second and the third ones are focused on the analysis of the language profiles of Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris.

In the first chapter, the theoretical underpinnings of the language profile concept in political discourse are presented. Furthermore, the chapter explores the distinctive characteristics of communication strategies and tactics as integral components of a language profile. The second chapter focuses on an analysis of the communication strategies and tactics used in Nancy Pelosi's speeches, which serve as a component of her language profile. In the third chapter an examination of the communication strategies and tactics that make up Kamala Harris' language profile in her speeches was conducted. In conclusions, the results of the scientific investigations are summarized.

I. LANGUAGE PROFILE AS A LINGUISTIC PHENOMENON.

1.1. Political discourse as a subject of linguistic analysis.

Discourse, as a concept, has been central to several fields within the humanities, including linguistics. It has a rich history, with philosophers and linguists exploring the relationship between language and thought. The concept has since evolved, and today, discourse analysis is a thriving field of inquiry. It constantly expands and innovates, incorporating new methods and theoretical frameworks to address a wide range of research questions.

The study of discourse has been a key focus for numerous researchers, including Norman Fairclough [37, p. 224.], Michael Halliday [47], and Teun Adrianus van Dijk [29, p. 384.]. These scholars have made a significant contribution to our understanding of how discourse functions within different social, cultural, and linguistic contexts. Discourse analysis, the study of how discourse functions in various contexts, has become an increasingly influential field in the humanities, with numerous scholars and researchers working to understand the ways in which discourse shapes and is shaped by society.

The researchers give their own definition of discourse. Norman Fairclough defines discourse as “the use of language in social context, particularly as the dialectical relationship between language, the main semiotic modality, and society, as well as with the interactive or dialogic properties of everyday communication as social practice in the written and/or spoken modes” [36, p. 268]. In other words, Fairclough sees discourse as the way in which language is used in social contexts, including the ways in which it reflects and shapes power dynamics and cultural norms, as well as the interactive nature of communication in written and spoken forms. [36, p. 268.]

Teun van Dijk conceptualizes discourse as encompassing not only linguistic structures, but also the cultural and social practices that influence the use of language. According to van Dijk, discourse is the product of the various dimensions of communicative acts within a social context. In his approach to discourse analysis, van Dijk emphasizes the systematic analysis of the complex structures and strategies of

text and talk as they are produced, interpreted, and used within certain social contexts. This approach highlights the importance of considering the social and cultural contexts in which language is used, in addition to the linguistic aspects of discourse. [29, p. 384.]

Michael Halliday defines discourse as the use of language (linguistic text) in context to express our thoughts, values, and experiences of the world. He sees the linguistic forms used in discourse as having both social and ideological functions [48, p. 301.]. In other words, the way we use language in context reflects and shapes our understanding of the world around us and our place within it, as well as the social and ideological norms that shape our communication. This definition highlights the complex relationship between language, context, and the various social and ideological factors that influence the way we use language to communicate. [50]

Based on the definitions presented, we can conclude that discourse refers to the way in which a language is used within a social context. It is shaped by the social conditions of its use and can be understood as the language used in these conditions. This understanding of the concept of discourse will be adopted in this paper.

Language is used in a variety of social contexts, and the way in which it is used can vary depending on factors such as the audience and the purpose of the communication. Scholars have identified various types of discourse, including argument, narration, exposition/explanation, description, Internet discourse, medical discourse, etc.

Discourse plays a crucial role in social relations, as it both shapes and is shaped by these relations. As such, it can be understood as a “special use of language”, a means of “ordering reality”, and a communicative event that is embedded in daily life. [43] In other words, discourse is a complex unity of linguistic form, action, and knowledge, involving both the language itself and the extralinguistic factors that influence communication. One example of this is political discourse, which is shaped by both language and the various social, cultural, and political factors that influence the way it is used. [39]

Political discourse can be defined as a form of institutional communication that uses a specialized system of professionally-oriented signs, or a specific sublanguage, in order to achieve its goals [12, p. 367.]. In contrast to personality-oriented communication, which is more focused on individual perspective, political discourse is characterized by its focus on retaining and gaining political power. This means that the purpose of political discourse is not simply to describe events or ideas, but rather to persuade the audience and prompt action. [76]

Political discourse has been a topic of study for linguists for many years. Researchers have examined various aspects of political discourse, including the use of language in political speeches, the role of the media in shaping political discourse, and the ways in which political discourse is used to construct and maintain power. [22, p. 388–405.]

One key area of research for American linguists has been the study of political speeches. Scholars such as George Lakoff, Deborah Tannen, and Erving Goffman have examined the language and communication strategies used by politicians in speeches, and have explored how these strategies influence public opinion and shape political discourse. [62], [74]

British linguists have also contributed significantly to the study of political discourse. Norman Fairclough and Michael Billig have examined the ways in which language is used in political discourse to construct and maintain power. They have also studied the role of the media in shaping political discourse and the ways in which media discourse influences public opinion. [38], [32], [21].

George Lakoff, an American cognitive linguist, has developed a significant body of research regarding the role of language and framing in political discourse. He posits that political discourse is shaped by deep-seated moral and cognitive frameworks, which he refers to as “moral models.” In his seminal work, “Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think” (1996), Lakoff argues that conservatives and liberals have fundamentally different moral models, which shape the way they understand and talk about political issues. [60]

Additionally, in “The Political Mind: Why You Can't Understand 21st-Century American Politics with an 18th-Century Brain” (2008), Lakoff argues that the way people think about politics is shaped by their cognitive and emotional processes and traditional political analysis based on rational choice theory is inadequate. He claims that the political discourse is shaped by the frames, metaphors, and narratives that resonate with the public. [63]

In “The All New Don't Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate” (2018), he provides a guide for progressives on how to frame their ideas and values effectively in political discourse. In summary, Lakoff's research highlights the importance of language and framing in shaping political discourse and underscores the role of moral models in shaping the way individuals understand and talk about political issues. His works provide valuable insights into the ways in which political discourse operates and how it can be effectively utilized to communicate values and ideas. [61]

Deborah Tannen is a prominent American sociolinguist, known for her extensive research and scholarship in the field of discourse analysis. She has made significant contributions to the understanding of how language shapes communication and social interactions. Her works focus on the ways in which gender, culture, and power shape discourse and communication in a variety of settings, including the workplace, family, and political contexts. [73]

In political discourse, Tannen argues that these gender-based differences in communication styles can lead to misunderstandings and conflicts in the way men and women talk about and approach political issues. Men may be more likely to use language to assert their power and to make arguments, while women may be more likely to use language to establish connections and to build consensus. This difference in communication style can lead to misunderstandings and conflicts in political discourse, as men may perceive women's cooperative language as weak or submissive, while women may perceive men's competitive language as aggressive or dismissive. [66]

Based on these definitions, we can conceptualize political discourse as a communicative phenomenon that seeks to maintain or acquire political power, using linguistic means in written texts and oral speech, and occurring within a specific communicative space. Political discourse is a distinct type of discourse, characterized by its focus on persuasion and its use of language to achieve specific goals related to political power.

Political discourse differs from the everyday discourse of individual citizens in that it is carried out by political institutions such as the presidency, parliament, government, ministries, departments, and political parties. These institutions have a significant resource at their disposal in the form of political discourse, which they use to present themselves in a favorable light, construct and promote certain images of reality, and communicate with the public. In this way, political discourse serves as a powerful tool for state and public institutions to shape public perception and understanding of political events and issues. [46]

According to E. Benveniste, political discourse can be analyzed from at least three different perspectives [19]:

- the individual hermeneutic, which allows for the determination of the personal meanings of the author and/or interpreter of the discourse in specific circumstances;
- the sociopsycholinguistic, which focuses on measuring the effectiveness of achieving the speaker's political goals;
- the purely physiological, which treats political discourse as any other text, but with the added consideration of the ideological and political background.

This multifaceted approach to analyzing political discourse highlights the fact that a comprehensive understanding of political discourse requires the intersection of various disciplines and the study of the content, objectives, and forms of discourse as they are manifested in specific political situations. In order to fully grasp the purpose of political discourse, which is to instill predictable actions and/or assessments in the audience, it is necessary to also consider the expectations, background of the author

and audience, plot patterns, ulterior motives, and preferred logical transitions that exist in a particular era [4, p. 32–43.].

Some key characteristics of political discourse include aggressiveness and evaluativeness, efficiency, and the maintenance of a particular point of view. These characteristics, along with the various social, cultural, and ideological factors that shape political discourse, make it a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that requires careful analysis and understanding [16].

Political discourse can be classified in several ways, as noted by Chudinov A. and Sheigal E. One classification is based on the nature of the subject or author of the discourse. This includes actual political communication, where the author is a politician, political communication in the media, where the author is a journalist, and non-professional political communication, where the author is a person of a different profession, such as a voter or a representative of the people. [11, p. 91-104.], [13, p. 251-261.]

Another classification is based on the nature of the addressee. This includes political discourse directed towards politicians or political subjects, such as a state or party, and discourse directed towards non-institutional political subjects, such as readers, viewers, or voters.

Lastly, Chudinov A. and Sheigal E. also distinguish between oral and written forms of political discourse. [10, p. 12-18.] Oral forms include genres such as speeches at meetings, socio-political talk shows, television debates, and interviews. Written forms include genres such as newspaper articles and social media messages. These different classifications and forms of political discourse provide insight into the various ways in which political ideas and messages are conveyed and received. [14, p. 888-892.]

Political discourse is typically characterized by its mass and group addressee. In the modern political landscape, politicians often communicate with their citizens primarily through mass media outlets, such as the press and social media [24]. These media platforms allow politicians to not only inform the public about the goals and

values of their policies, but also shape perceptions of representative bodies of power, ruling elites, and the authority of corresponding traditions and stereotypes. [35]

Given this significance of the media in political discourse, it is important to further examine the notion of personal language profile that is created by a politician in both oral and written forms of political discourse. Among the various genres of political discourse, political speech is particularly influential. Political speech, as a form of public speech delivered by an orator, is considered by researchers to be both a process of communication and a form of political action [65, p. 437–455.].

Political speeches are characterized by their direct appeal to the audience and their relevance to current events, which implies a direct reaction from the audience. The discursive space of political speech is based on the concept of point of reference, which encompasses the time of the speech, the time of the event, and the audience's point of reference. [43]

Given the importance of political speech in shaping political discourse, it is a valuable area of research for further analysis. The study of political speeches can provide insight into the language and communication strategies used by politicians to influence public opinion and shape political discourse. [26]

In conclusion, political discourse is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that plays a significant role in shaping public perception and understanding of political events and issues. It is a distinct type of discourse that is characterized by its focus on persuasion and its use of language to achieve specific goals related to political power. Political discourse can be analyzed from multiple perspectives, including individual hermeneutic, sociopsycholinguistic, and physiological. It can be classified in several ways, including by the nature of the subject or author, the nature of the addressee, and the form of the discourse, such as oral or written. Overall, political discourse serves as a powerful tool for state and public institutions to shape public perception and understanding of political events and issues, and requires careful analysis and understanding.

1.2. Language profile in political discourse as a linguistic phenomenon.

The concept of language personality and the unique stylistic features it possesses has long been a topic of interest within the field of linguistics. Many scientists, including P. Chilton, N. Chomsky, and V. Vinogradov, have dedicated their research to understanding the intricacies of individual linguistic style. In particular, V. Vinogradov defined individual style as a complex but logically consistent and internally interconnected system of specific stylistic means that are inherent in the textual activity of a particular author [2].

With the advent of mass and social media, the concept of language profile has gained additional significance, as it pertains to the unique way in which individuals present themselves through virtual communication. Research on language profile in these contexts has highlighted the importance of understanding how individuals use language to shape their image and message in the virtual realm. [75]

The study of language personality and its relationship to individual style and language profile is a dynamic and ongoing field of research within linguistics. The growing importance of virtual communication has further intensified the need for understanding the ways in which individuals use language to shape their image and message. Moreover, the study of language personality in political discourse is particularly relevant, as politicians and political institutions use language to shape their image and message to the public. [28, p. 1–26]

The concept of “language profile” in modern linguistics is closely interconnected with related concepts such as “idiostyle,” “language personality,” and “language picture of the world”. The interrelation of these concepts is a subject of ongoing research and analysis by linguists, literary critics, and scholars from other branches of the humanities. [49]

In the linguistic context, the term “idiostyle” is often associated with the analysis of literary and journalistic texts that display a system of stylistic and artistic dominance that reflect specific methodological simulations of the conceptual picture of the world, represent the author's sensual intentions, world-view, and thinking process. [15, p. 42-50] Furthermore, the concept of idiostyle in linguistics is

frequently associated with the choice and selection of linguistic means and methods of their combination and interaction.

It is important to note that, although there are no unique ways of representing personal meanings, it is relatively easy to identify their predominant forms, this means that idiostyle can be associated not only with the selection of linguistic means, but also with the frequency of their use.

The term idiostyle is sometimes used interchangeably with “idiolect,” which is defined as an individual's speech patterns and linguistic characteristics that are stipulated by factors such as place of residence, age, profession, social status, and cultural awareness. Idiolect not only highlights specific features of an individual's language, but also reveals various aspects of language as a national phenomenon, its potentiality and diversity [6, p. 293].

The term “idiolect” is defined as a set of formal and stylistic peculiarities that are inherent in the language of a native speaker of a particular language. According to the Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics, the term idiolect refers to the language of an individual, and is etymologically related to the Greek prefix “idio-” which means own, personal, private, peculiar, separate, and distinct. Its specific meanings fall primarily into two categories [2]:

- The sum total of language of one person, including all possible utterances.
- The linguistic output of one person (i.e., only what that person says and not the internal knowledge in the mind). For some scholars, it should be emphasized that it is the constellation of language variation patterns that helps to distinguish an individual from other speakers of the same dialect. [52, p. 512–513.]

Therefore, an idiolect would represent a collection of personal characteristics, such as age, gender, social class, occupation, as well as personal traits and private states. Thus, idiolect can be seen as a combination of sociolect, genderlect, slang, jargon, etc. An idiolect is not only the distinctive features of the language, but the entire set of speech means of the individual. [27, p. 431–447]

Moreover, words have their word-meanings, which are represented when they are used in language, but another component of word-meaning is a ‘personal sense’. It is not inherent in the language and is different for each person, it carries personal information. A ‘personal sense’ reflects a meaning of the word in terms of unique experience of a person, reflecting unique personal characteristics. [77, p. 5–29.]

An idiolect can be defined as a language, the linguistic (namely, syntactic, phonological, morphological, etc.) properties of which can be specified in terms of the intrinsic properties of some separate individuals, the person whose idiolect it is. [41, p. 86–99] The force of “intrinsic” is to exclude essential reference to features of the person’s wider environment, and in particular to their linguistic community. The study of idiolects is a complex task, as it requires an examination of the language of the individual in relation to the linguistic community, as well as the socio-cultural and historical context in which it is used.

An individual style or idiostyle reflects the intelligence of the individual. The intellectual properties of an idiostyle can be clearly identified at the structural-linguistic level of the language. In general, the idiolect of one person simply must be different from the idiolect of the other person. After all, every person has their own mental lexicon, knowledge, and perception of the world [17, p. 1–19.].

Another term that is closely connected with language profile is “language personality”, which was defined by Yu. Karaulov as an individual who presents themselves in the language and with the help of the language [8]. Therefore, the language personality can be understood through the analysis of the language means people use. The language personality consists of the following levels: the verbal one, which reflects the ability to use non-professional language; the cognitive level, where concepts that are important to the community (and the person as a part of a certain community) are obtained and processed in order to form the individual cognitive space; and the pragmatic level, which is responsible for the identification of the goals and motives of a person while modeling the language personality. [58, p. 126–146.]

In this context, the language personality can be seen as a system of psychophysical qualities of the person speaking. This system is depicted in real

communication and in personal interaction, where national and individual peculiarities of the language personality reveal themselves. This system of personal characteristics is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that requires careful analysis and understanding. [31]

Furthermore, the study of idiostyle and language personality in political discourse is an important area of research that can provide insight into the ways in which political actors use language to achieve their goals, construct and promote certain images of reality, and communicate with the public. It also allows for the determination of the personal meanings of the author and/or interpreter of the discourse in specific circumstances and helps in measuring the effectiveness of achieving the speaker's political goals. [79]

Taking into consideration the spheres of speakers interaction, V. Krasnykh names several aspects of language personality [9]:

1. Language personality proper, the personality in possession of knowledge and views, and manifesting itself in language performance.
2. Speech personality, the personality that reveals itself in communication, choosing tools for putting a necessary interaction strategy into execution.
3. Communicative personality, which is seen as a certain participant of the live communication act.

It becomes clear that the language personality formation is a complex process consisting of knowledge internalization and communication skills development. It is considered to be affected by three factors, namely: the social one (as the personality is the core as well as the result of social regularities); the nationally specific one (as the personality is the product of the diachronic changes in the ethnic group), and the psychological one (as its pragmatic propensities appear when bodily needs, social and natural environment are balanced to the person's psyche).

The following model of the language personality consisting of several levels was also represented:

- verbal level (a facet that reveals a linguistic personality as a person who can speak);

- cognitive level (the knowledge the person has);
- conative level (the area in which the desires of a certain person stipulate the form of communication chosen);
- the sensory-emotional level (at which one's perception and emotions provoke needs and desires as a response).

Taking into consideration all the terms mentioned above, namely, idiostyle and language personality, we may conclude that language profile is a system of certain linguistic characteristics inherent in the speech of a particular personality, which makes the person's way of linguistic expression embodied in their speech unique.

Additionally, it is important to note that the language profile of a political figure can play a significant role in shaping public perception and influencing political decision-making. V. Koller states that the use of specific language and rhetorical techniques can evoke emotions, evoke trust and credibility, and persuade the audience to adopt a certain viewpoint. [59, p. 380–397] Researchers in the field of political discourse have therefore begun to pay close attention to the language profile of politicians and its impact on political communication.

Furthermore, the concept of language personality in political discourse can also be analyzed in relation to the concept of “framing”, which refers to the way in which political actors use language to construct and present certain issues and events to the public. Language frames are used to shape public opinion by highlighting certain aspects of an issue while downplaying others, and it is significant to understand how political figures use language frames to influence political discourse. [34, p. 209–221]

Language profile consists of certain separate levels, namely:

1. The verbal level. It is formed on the basis of the individual lexicon: individual words, the relations between them cover the whole variety of their grammatical, paradigmatic, semantic, syntactic and associative links. The individuality of this characteristic is determined not only by the degree of mastering this skill, but also by the violation of the normative rules of word formation, grammar, and pronunciation.

2. The value level, which describes the picture of the world characteristic of a linguistic personality and its special hierarchy of values, which is formed while experiencing a number of environmental circumstances.

3. The personal level that encompasses the ratio of the intentions, motives of the individual with the language they use. [34, p. 209–221.]

Language profile in political discourse refers to the unique linguistic characteristics, patterns, and strategies used by politicians in their public speeches and written statements. This includes elements such as vocabulary, grammar, syntax, and rhetorical devices, as well as the overall tone and style of the language used. These elements can reveal important information about the politician, such as their background, values, and political ideologies. [25]

In political discourse, language profile can be used as a tool for persuasion and manipulation of the audience. Politicians often use specific language patterns and strategies in order to appeal to certain groups of people, or to frame certain issues in a certain way. For example, they may use emotive language to elicit a strong emotional response from the audience, or use certain buzzwords and slogans to create a sense of unity and shared values. [38]

The study of language profile in political discourse is an interdisciplinary field, drawing on the expertise of linguists, political scientists, and communication experts. [57] Researchers in this field use a variety of methods to analyze political discourse, including discourse analysis, corpus linguistics, and critical discourse analysis.

1. Discourse analysis is a research methodology that focuses on the study of language in use. It is concerned with understanding how people use language to accomplish their communicative goals in various social contexts. Discourse analysis is an interdisciplinary field that draws on linguistic, sociological, and anthropological perspectives to study the ways in which language is used to construct and maintain social relationships, identities, and power relations. Corpus linguistics is a branch of discourse analysis that uses computational methods to analyze large collections of texts, called corpora. Corpus linguistics allows researchers to study patterns of language use across different contexts

and genres, and to identify linguistic features that are associated with specific communicative functions [20]. For example, corpus linguistics can be used to study the language of political discourse, by analyzing the speech of politicians, news articles, and other texts that are relevant to political communication. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a subfield of discourse analysis that emphasizes the ways in which language is used to construct and reproduce social relations of power. CDA is concerned with how language is used to legitimize or challenge social hierarchies, and how discourse shapes our understanding of the world. CDA researchers often use qualitative methods, such as discourse analysis, to study how language is used in specific social contexts, such as politics, media, or education. [38]; [44]; [80, p. 1–17.]

In this paper, we will stick to the concept of the language profile as a set of unique linguistic characteristics, patterns, and strategies used by politicians in their public speeches and written statements to communicate with the public and shape their image and message.

In conclusion, the concept of language profile in political discourse is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that requires a comprehensive understanding of linguistic, psychological, and sociological factors. Further research in this field can help to shed light on how political figures use language to shape public opinion and influence political decision-making.

1.3. Communication strategies and tactics as a component of the politicians' language profiles.

Any discourse is based on the speech actions and the choice of the most successful way to achieve the communicators' goals. Each statement or a certain sequence of statements is aimed at performing many functions and achieving certain goals. In order to cope with this, the communicator chooses the means of speech that will best help him achieve the goals of communication [74]. The addressee thinks over their message in advance, calculates its effectiveness, takes into account approaches that more or less correspond to a particular communicative situation.

The addressee selects a certain program of speech actions, which is organized in accordance with the purpose of the relationship between communicators, and this program is a communicative strategy, which forms a certain vector of communication. The success of the addressee and the results of speech communication depend on the adequacy of the choice of communication strategy. [57]

A communicative strategy is a set of actions used to implement the communicative intentions of the speaker, whereas the conditions in which communication takes place are taken into account. [71] The implementation of a strategy is conducted through tactics, which are a specific stage in the usage of a communication strategy characterized by a certain set of techniques that determine the use of certain language tools.

The concept of communicative strategies and tactics has been studied by such foreign and domestic linguists as van Dijk [30, p. 163–183.], F. Batsevych [1, p. 344.], O. Issers [5, p. 284.], W. Kinch [42, p. 11–12.].

Communicators pursue their obvious and hidden communicative goals in their political speeches, while using communicative tactics that are part of the communicative strategy. The communicative goal is the strategic result to which the communicative act is directed [45].

Van Dijk, for example, has theorized that political discourse is structured around the use of communicative strategies, such as manipulation, persuasion, and justification, in order to achieve certain goals, such as maintaining or acquiring political power. In his definition, van Dijk notes that the strategy is the organization of sequent actions, which includes the goals of interaction. Strategies allow you to make a choice that helps to achieve desired goals. The right choice of strategies allows the communicator to achieve the maximum number of goals. Communicative strategies are flexible and dynamic, because they undergo constant adjustments, directly dependent on the speech actions of another communicator and the context of the discourse, which is constantly supplemented and changed [30, p. 163–183.].

Similarly, F. Batsevich has argued that political discourse is characterized by the use of specific tactics, such as framing and agenda-setting, to shape public opinion and understanding of political issues. According to F. Batsevich, strategy is a set of communicative actions aimed at achieving a communicative goal, which includes planning the process of speech interaction, which directly depends on the personalities of communicators and the conditions in which communication takes place, and the implementation of the conversation plan [1, p. 344.].

According to O. Issers, the communication strategy includes not only the planning of the process of speech communication, which depends on the conditions of communication and the personalities of communicators, but also the implementation of this plan. That is why the communicative strategy can be defined as a set of speech actions aimed at achieving the communicative goals [55]. In addition, O. Issers has emphasized the importance of examining how communicative strategies and tactics are used by different actors within the political sphere, such as politicians, political parties, and the media, to influence public opinion. W. Kinch, on the other hand, has focused on the role of communicative strategies and tactics in the construction of political identities and the manipulation of public opinion.

Having considered all the presented definitions of the studied concept, we believe that the communicative strategy is a chain of the addressee's decisions, focused on planning the process of speech, the ultimate goal of which is to achieve the communicative goal; a set of the addressee's speech actions aimed at achieving their goals.

Communicative strategy is considered to be a set of speech actions aimed at solving the general communicative task of the addressee of the message. [54] And communicative tactics are the actions that contribute to the implementation of the strategy. Communicative tactics are subjected to communicative strategies.

Communication tactics that contribute to the implementation of communication strategy are diverse. They depend on such factors as the type of discourse, speech genre, the configuration of the communicant's intentions in a particular situation. If communication tactics do not give the expected result, they are called erroneous [56].

The classification of communication strategies and tactics in political discourse has been a topic of interest for scholars in the field of political science, sociology, and linguistics. One notable classification, proposed by political scientist Alexander P. DeConde, differentiates between two types of communication strategies: the “power-coercive” strategy, in which the speaker uses threats and force to achieve their goals, and the “power-persuasive” strategy, in which the speaker uses appeals to reason and evidence to convince the audience. [33]

Another classification, proposed by sociologist Erving Goffman, identifies three types of communication tactics: “face-work,” in which the speaker manages their own and their audience's impressions; “footing,” in which the speaker aligns themselves with or against certain groups or individuals; and “key,” in which the speaker establishes a certain tone or level of formality.

Linguist Deborah Tannen also contributed to the study of communication strategies and tactics in political discourse through her work on gender and language. [72, p. 203.] Tannen argues that men and women use different communication strategies, with men often using a “report talk” style, in which they assert their knowledge and expertise, and women using a “rapport talk” style, in which they build connections and relationships with their audience. [74]

Additionally, critical discourse analysis (CDA) scholars like Norman Fairclough, Teun van Dijk, and Ruth Wodak have applied their methods to the study of political discourse and the ways in which language is used to exert power and influence. CDA approaches often focus on the ways in which discourse can reproduce and reinforce social inequalities, and how it can be used to resist and challenge these inequalities. [64, p. 27–52]

In modern linguistics today, there is no generally accepted, clearly defined typology of communicative strategies. This can be explained by the variety of communicative situations, in each of which communicators use communication strategies, however a typology of communicative strategies can be divided into several categories based on the goals and intentions of the speaker. Some common types of communicative strategies include:

- Persuasion strategies, which are used to convince the audience to adopt a certain point of view or take a specific action. Examples of persuasion strategies include using evidence, emotional appeals, and logical reasoning.
- Information-providing strategies, which are used to convey information to the audience. Examples of information-providing strategies include using statistics, examples, and expert testimony.
- Relationship-building strategies, which are used to establish and maintain relationships with the audience. Examples of relationship-building strategies include using humor, storytelling, and active listening.
- Control strategies, which are used to assert dominance or control over the audience. Examples of control strategies include using threats, intimidation, and manipulation.
- Defense strategies, which are used to defend oneself or one's position against criticism or attack. Examples of defense strategies include using counterarguments, justification, and apology.

Linguists van Dijk and W. Kinch proposed the classification, which distinguishes strategies according to the nature of the processes of generation and understanding of discourse: 1) propositional; 2) local connectivity; 3) macro-strategies; 4) schematic; 5) productive; 6) stylistic; 7) rhetorical; 8) non-verbal; 9) conversion [31].

From the point of view of the functional approach, O. Issers singled out the basic and auxiliary strategies. The main strategies are aimed at influencing the addressee and conquering other communicators. The main strategy is the one that is most significant in terms of the hierarchy of communicators' goals and motives. Auxiliary communication strategies characterize a specific conversation with clearly defined goals. Auxiliary strategies contribute to the effective impact on the recipient, which is achieved through the proper organization of dialogue. Among the auxiliary strategies there are the following: 1) pragmatic (communicative-situational), which include a strategy of self-presentation, role and status strategies, strategies of emotional adjustment, etc.; 2) dialogue, they are used to control the topic, initiative,

degree of understanding during communication; 3) rhetorical, which uses the techniques of public speaking, as well as rhetorical techniques aimed at effectively influencing the recipient of the message [55].

Given that the construction of communication strategies and their implementation depend on a significant number of extralinguistic factors (ethnicity, social status, gender and age of communicators, the nature of communicative signs, temporality, addressee relations), A. Belova systematizes them as a set of oppositions : universal / ethnic-specific, commonly used / individual, commonly used / status-based, commonly used / age, unisex / gender-labeled, verbal / non-verbal, atemporal / time-limited, cooperative / conflict-based, address-oriented / information-oriented [18, p. 11-16.].

From the stated above, it should be noted that communication tactics is a partial phenomenon, a separate tool for implementing the overall strategy, speech action that corresponds to a specific stage in the implementation of communication strategy, a combination of several actions that contribute to the implementation of this strategy.

Different scholars have proposed various typologies of communicative strategies, but many agree that they can be broadly categorized into three main types: presentation or self-presentation, manipulation, and convention. According to S. Datsiuk and O. Issers, these types differ in the degree of openness and symmetry in communication. For example, presentation strategies are characterized by passive communication, manipulation strategies by active communication, and convention strategies by interactive communication. Additionally, the primary means for implementing presentation and manipulation strategies are messages, while conventions rely on dialogue.

Presentation strategies are a way of producing a communicative space and a way of presenting this space in a communication environment by changing the structure of this environment. The presentation strategy is a relatively independent and to some extent self-sufficient stage of communication. Its task is to communicate

some knowledge, which can be presented as a discussion or reasoning, which involves the interaction of participants.

According to S. Datsiuk, the presentation strategy consists of several subtypes: promotion, positioning and image-making [3].

The next type of communication strategies is manipulative. Manipulation is programming of the opinions and aspirations of the masses in order to ensure that they behave in a way that is necessary for those who own the means of manipulation [3]. It should be noted that the purpose of manipulation is not always to discredit the object or diminish its moral or physical qualities. Manipulation can also be used by politicians to attract and retain attention or create a favourable image.

The purpose of a conventional strategy is to ensure communication between different segments of the communication environment, namely, the audience of this text or speech (for example, civil society, in the case of political communication), and to obtain a convention through a chain of consensus.

The conventional text usually contains messages for the authorities and for the citizens, and both audiences must be specially segmented in relation to the tasks solved in the text. The task of such a text is, on the one hand, to convey to the authorities messages from civil society structures within the issue, and on the other hand, to convey messages from the authorities to civil society structures within the same issues. In conventional communication, the author manages the audience as openly and as the audience manages them.

Communication tactics refer to specific techniques or methods used by speakers to achieve their communicative goals within a given strategy. These tactics can be seen as the means by which a speaker implements their chosen strategy, and can include things such as word choice, tone of voice, body language, and other nonverbal cues. [7, p. 34–40]

There are many ways to classify communication tactics, but some common categories include verbal tactics, such as using persuasive language or emphasizing certain words, and nonverbal tactics, such as using gestures or facial expressions. Tactics are used to achieve a wide range of goals, such as convincing others of a

particular viewpoint, building rapport, or maintaining social relationships. Scholars such as Teun van Dijk, Deborah Tannen, Erving Goffman, and Erving and Deborah Schiffrin have made significant contributions to the study of communication tactics and their role in language and discourse. Different scholars have proposed different classifications of communication tactics, but some of the most common categories include:

- Deception tactics, which involve intentionally misleading or deceiving the listener in order to achieve one's goals. Scholars such as van Dijk have studied deception tactics in political discourse, for example, analyzing how politicians use language to conceal their true intentions or obscure the facts. [29, p. 384.]
- Persuasion tactics, which involve trying to persuade the listener to adopt a particular viewpoint or take a specific action. Scholars such as Lakoff (2004) have studied how politicians use framing and other techniques to shape public opinion and influence the public's perceptions of issues. [63]
- Appeal tactics, which involve appealing to the emotions or values of the listener in order to gain support or persuade them to take a specific action. Scholars such as Chilton (2004) have studied how politicians use emotional appeals and rhetorical devices to mobilize public support for their policies. [25]
- Confrontation tactics, which involve challenging or opposing the views or actions of others in order to achieve one's goals. Scholars such as Tannen (1990) have studied how politicians use confrontational language and strategies to attack their opponents and gain an advantage in political debates. [74]
- Avoidance tactics, which involve avoiding certain topics or avoiding confrontation in order to maintain a positive relationship with the listener. Scholars such as Drew and Heritage have studied how politicians use avoidance tactics to avoid taking a position on controversial issues or to avoid offending certain groups of voters. [53]

In conclusion, the analysis of communication strategies and tactics in political discourse is a critical tool for understanding how political actors use language to

achieve their goals and influence public opinion. Communication strategies and tactics are the key constituents of the politicians' language profiles, and understanding how political actors use these strategies and tactics can provide insight into their intentions and the ways in which they shape public perceptions of political events and issues.

Conclusion to chapter 1

Political discourse is a complex and significant phenomenon that plays a crucial role in shaping public perception and understanding of political events and issues. Various perspectives and classifications, including individual hermeneutic, sociopsycholinguistic, and physiological, can be used to analyze political discourse. Political discourse serves as a powerful tool for state and public institutions to shape public perception and understanding, making it necessary to carefully analyze and understand.

Furthermore, the concept of language profile in political discourse requires a comprehensive understanding of linguistic, psychological, and sociological factors. In modern linguistics, the notion of "language profile" is intricately linked with other concepts such as "idiostyle", "language personality", and "language picture of the world". Considering these terms collectively, the language profile can be understood as a system of distinct linguistic characteristics that are inherent in the speech of an individual, giving their way of linguistic expression a unique embodiment. Further research in this field can help to reveal how political figures use language to shape public opinion and influence political decision-making.

Communication strategies and tactics are the basis of the pragmatic approach to analyzing the language profiles of politicians. The analysis of communication strategies and tactics in political discourse is critical for understanding how political actors use language to achieve their goals and influence public opinion. Communication strategies can be categorized into main and auxiliary strategies. Main strategies are aimed at influencing the recipient and outshining other communicators. Auxiliary communication strategies pertain to specific conversations with well-

defined goals. Communication tactics, on the other hand, are the specific techniques or methods used by speakers to achieve their communication goals within a given strategy. These tactics serve as the means by which a speaker implements their chosen strategy and can encompass various elements such as word choice, tone of voice, body language, and other nonverbal cues. There are several ways to classify communication tactics, with common categories including verbal tactics like persuasive language or emphasis on certain words, as well as nonverbal tactics like gestures or facial expressions.

By understanding communication strategies and tactics, we can gain insight into politicians' intentions and the ways in which they shape public perceptions of political events and issues.

II. PRAGMATIC APPROACH TO NANCY PELOSI'S LANGUAGE PROFILE

2.1. Nancy Pelosi's determination as a component of her language profile.

Nancy Pelosi is a prominent American politician who has served as the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives since 2019. She is a member of the Democratic Party and represents California's 12th congressional district, which includes San Francisco.

Pelosi first entered Congress in 1987 and has since become one of the most powerful and influential members of the House. She has served as the House Democratic Leader, Minority Leader, and Speaker of the House twice. Pelosi has been a vocal advocate for progressive policies, including healthcare reform, climate change action, and social justice issues.

Throughout her career, Pelosi has been known for her ability to unite Democrats and push through legislation despite political opposition. She played a key role in passing the Affordable Care Act (also known as Obamacare) and has been a vocal critic of the Trump administration's policies on immigration and other issues.

Pelosi is also the first woman to serve as Speaker of the House in U.S. history. Her leadership has been praised for breaking barriers and inspiring future generations of women to enter politics. She is known for her effective and strategic communicative style, and for being articulate, clear, and concise in her speeches and statements.

Pelosi is a skilled communicator who has the ability to connect with people from all walks of life. She has an ability to listen attentively to others, to empathize with their concerns, and to respond in a way that is respectful and meaningful. Pelosi is also known for her ability to stay on message and to communicate her ideas and policies clearly and effectively. She is a master of using sound bites and memorable phrases to communicate her message to the public and to the press.

We are conducting linguistic research that centers on examining Nancy Pelosi's linguistic characteristics by analyzing thirteen speeches she delivered, comprising four speeches from the 20th century and nine from the 21st century (**Appendix A**).

As the Speaker of the House and a leader of the Democratic Party in the United States, Nancy Pelosi often discusses a range of topics in her speeches. Some of the most common topics she addresses include [51]:

- **Legislative priorities:** Pelosi often speaks about the legislative agenda of the Democratic Party, including bills related to healthcare, economic stimulus, environmental protection, and social justice.
- **Women's rights:** Pelosi has been a longtime advocate for women's rights and often speaks about issues such as equal pay, reproductive rights, and gender-based violence.
- **Civil rights:** Pelosi has been a vocal supporter of civil rights throughout her career and has spoken out on issues such as voting rights, police reform, and anti-discrimination measures.
- **National security:** Pelosi frequently discusses issues related to national security, including foreign policy, terrorism, and cybersecurity.
- **Economic issues:** Pelosi has a strong interest in economic issues and often speaks about topics such as job creation, income inequality, and access to education and training.

Nancy Pelosi effectively employs a diverse range of communicative strategies and tactics in her speeches to convey her message and achieve her political objectives, which highlights her resolute determination. The pragmatic component of Nancy Pelosi's language profile is realized through the usage of the certain strategies and tactics. While analyzing the **self-presentation strategy**, one should pay attention to the fact that this strategy refers to the deliberate and conscious attempt by an individual to manage the impressions that others form of them. One of the primary goals of self-presentation is to create a positive impression in the minds of others. Looking at the speeches delivered by Nancy Pelosi, the **self-representation communication strategy** is used in all her thirteen speeches analyzed.

In ten out of thirteen analyzed speeches, Pelosi employs a **tactic of expressing gratitude** at the outset of her speeches and in the closing sentences, whether it be to the event's hosts or her colleagues. Here are some examples of the phrases she uses:

- “*Thank you very much*” – an expression of gratitude that is simple and direct, and considered appropriate in most situations.
- “*I would like to thank...for giving me this opportunity to talk to you and to thank you for the privilege...*” — a more formal and elaborate way to express gratitude, suitable for occasions when a person is being recognized for a significant achievement or is given a special privilege.
- “*Thank you, I thank my colleagues*” – a concise and straightforward expression of gratitude to colleagues for their support and collaboration.
- “*Madam Speaker, thank you for the recognition*” – a polite and respectful way to express gratitude to the person who has recognized and acknowledged the speaker.
- “*Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker...and I thank you for bringing this important legislation to the Floor*” – a gracious and appreciative way to start a speech.
- “*It is my honor to bring you the greetings of the Democrats of the House*” – a respectful and humble way to express gratitude for the opportunity to address a particular audience.
- “*Thank you all for coming*” – a polite and friendly expression of gratitude to an audience for their attendance and participation.
- ‘... *Thank you very much ... It made me very proud to be on the House floor....*’. Nancy Pelosi uses the adjective ‘very proud’ to show how thankful she is for having an opportunity to deliver her speech. This tactic is effective in building rapport and creating a positive tone for the speech.

In the first speeches, e.g., “Nancy Pelosi on China: Tiananmen Square “massacre was shocking to us”, Pelosi utilized **the tactic of establishing her credibility** by mentioning that she and Congresswoman Boxer represent San Francisco, a city with a large Asian population. Through emphasizing this connection, she demonstrates her personal commitment to the topic under discussion and her direct experience with the matter. This tactic was very helpful to start building her image as a determined person.

Additionally, Pelosi's **tactic of presenting her accomplishments** is peculiar of her speeches as well. In "Nancy Pelosi In 1988 1st Campaign Video Ever San Francisco" she presents her accomplishments in a straightforward manner and avoids using technical jargon or complicated language. This strategy makes it easier for the audience to follow her message and comprehend her achievements as a legislator. Pelosi uses **repetition** to emphasize the key points of her career. She repeats the phrase "*I have worked...*" to highlight her dedication to serving the people of San Francisco. Furthermore, she reiterates her dedication to various concerns, such as housing, healthcare, education, and the environment. This repetition reinforces her commitment to these issues and emphasizes their importance. In addition, she provides concrete instances of her achievements, such as securing funds for the operation and upkeep of San Francisco's Muni system, securing 1.4 million dollars for enhancements at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and co-sponsoring over 50 environmental bills in Congress. This evidence demonstrates her competence as a legislator and reinforces her credibility. Pelosi also uses **inclusive language** throughout the speech, referring to "*we*" and "*us*" when discussing her work on behalf of San Francisco and the American people. This helps to create a sense of shared responsibility and encourages her audience to feel invested in the issues she is discussing.

Pelosi employs **technical jargon** and specific terms related to her work as a legislator, such as "*mortgage revenue bond program*" and "*early intervention projects.*" While this might make some content of the speech more difficult for a lay audience to understand, it also lends credibility to her arguments and emphasizes her expertise on the issues she is discussing.

In the '1987 debate with Nancy Pelosi', she decides to employ a tactic of **acknowledging the endorsement** she received from another prominent figure, Solo Burton, who was well-known in the district. By doing so, she is signaling to voters that she has support and is a credible candidate: '*... I was recommended by Solo Burton to the voters of the district... I'm very honored by her recommendation...*'. When asked why she would be qualified for the role, Pelosi draws on her extensive

experience in leadership positions within the Democratic Party, including serving as Chairperson of the California Democratic Party for over 25 years: ‘... *I’m a very independent person... I have served for many years as an officer and leader of the Democratic Party and as chairperson of the California Democratic Party. For over 25 years I’ve worked on issues trying to turn good ideas that people at the Grassroots level have into legislation, into better policy. I believe that my working relationships with members of Congress and with members of the United States Senate will serve the people of San Francisco well...*’. While trying to make the most of her oratory skills, she still uses few **filler words** and unnecessary phrases as *so uh, well, but, but*, which might be a sign that she lacked confidence back in the 1980s.

Nancy Pelosi’s sense of determination grew stronger as she climbed the political career ladder, and this is evident in her speeches. For instance, in her last speech as the Speaker of the House, Nancy Pelosi is using the **self-presentation communication strategy** to highlight her own achievements and establish her credibility as a leader. By mentioning her own history in Congress and the progress that has been made in increasing the number of Democratic women, she is positioning herself as a trailblazer and champion of women’s rights: *When I came to the Congress in 1987, there were 12 Democratic women. Now there are over 90. And we want more.* She uses a personal pronoun ‘we’ in order to show the bond with other members of Congress and the ordinary Americans. Additionally, Pelosi is using this statement to convey her commitment to continuing this progress and advocating for further advancement of women in politics. This is evident in her statement “*And we want more,*” which emphasizes her dedication to the cause and encourages others to join in the effort.

Nancy Pelosi implements a **tactic of identifying herself with the American people** in all her speeches, e.g. in the following paragraph she uses a possessive pronoun ‘our’: “... *A new day is dawning on the horizon, and I look forward, always forward, to the unfolding story of our nation, a story of light and love, of patriotism and progress, of many becoming one. And always an unfinished mission to make the dreams of today the reality of tomorrow...*”. Her use of alliteration in “*light and*

love” and “*patriotism and progress*” creates a sense of unity and balance, emphasizing the importance of both emotional and political values. The phrase “*many becoming one*” also emphasizes the importance of unity, highlighting the diversity of the nation's population and the need to work together towards common goals. Additionally, her use of the present continuous tense, “*unfolding,*” and the repetition of the word “*forward*” create a sense of momentum and progress, suggesting that the nation is moving forward towards a better future.

The use of alliteration can also be considered as a component of Pelosi’s self-presentation strategy. For example, the implementation of alliteration “*majestic miracle*” adds to the emotional impact of the speech, as does the use of contrast between the darkness of America's past and the hope for a brighter future: ‘... *In this House, we begin each day with a prayer and a pledge to the flag. And every day I am in awe of the majestic miracle that is American democracy. As we participate in a hallmark of our republic — the peaceful, orderly transition from one Congress to the next...*’.

Nancy Pelosi effectively employs a self-presentation strategy by **aligning herself with the American people** in her speech, “Leader Nancy Pelosi at the 2012 Democratic National Convention”: “... *Fellow Democrats! That American dream is the story of America. We are here to reignite the American dream. I’m pleased to see so many young people—the future of our party, the hope of America...*” Nancy Pelosi is using a self-presentation strategy to show her determination and to position herself and her party as the champions of the American dream and to appeal to younger voters. Pelosi starts by using inclusive language, calling her audience “*fellow Democrats,*” which creates a sense of unity and shared purpose among the party members. By using “*we,*” she positions herself as part of the collective effort to reignite the American dream. The use of “*American dream*” is a powerful rhetorical device that has been used by politicians for decades to evoke feelings of hope and aspiration. By linking the American dream to the “*story of America,*” Pelosi is emphasizing the importance of this concept to the national identity and suggesting that her party is the one that is best positioned to help Americans achieve it.

In 3 speeches out of 13 Nancy Pelosi recalls the full-scale war in Ukraine. During these speeches, she is using a self-presentation communication strategy to position herself and her party as supportive of democracy in Ukraine and the world. She is also using the strategy to praise the President for his leadership in promoting democracy in the speech “Pelosi Floor Speech on S. 3522, the Ukraine Democracy Defense Lend-Lease Act of 2022”, and she says: “... *The president has put forth a request earlier today that we will turn into legislation – turn in – to support – to support democracy in Ukraine and, therefore, democracy in the world. I salute the President for his leadership...*”. The first part of her statement, “... *the President has put forth a request earlier today that we will turn into legislation – turn in – to support – to support democracy in Ukraine and, therefore, democracy in the world,*” highlights her party's commitment to democracy and their willingness to take action to support it. By framing the legislation as a way to support democracy not just in Ukraine, but also in the world, Pelosi is positioning her party as a champion of democracy on a global scale. The second part of her statement, “*I salute the President for his leadership,*” is a way for Pelosi to show her support for the President and to signal her willingness to work with him on issues where they share common ground. Pelosi's use of the word “*salute*” in this context has a connotation of respect and admiration.

In the same speech, Pelosi uses **the tactic of repetition** to reinforce the importance of the policy action, by saying “... *seize the assets of the oligarchs and the Russian – that money. Freeze it...*” This repetition reinforces the message that her party is taking decisive action against Russian oligarchs, who are seen as a key driver of Russian aggression in Ukraine. By highlighting the use of financial leverage to achieve policy goals, Pelosi is positioning herself and her party as savvy and determined negotiators who can achieve policy objectives through economical means.

During Pelosi's Floor Speech on the Fairness for 9/11 Families Act and Continuing Resolution, she again uses a **self-presentation communication strategy** to position herself and her party as taking decisive action to support Ukraine and

counter Russian aggression: “... *As we do, war rages in Ukraine. Legislation we will pass today, Congress secures an additional \$12.3 billion for Ukraine-related priorities, including security, economic and humanitarian aid to historic – heroic Ukrainian people. This package comes at a pivotal moment, as Ukraine's freedom fighters work to turn the tide, liberating key cities and repelling Russian forces...*”. She uses phrases like “war rages,” “historic – heroic Ukrainian people,” and “freedom fighters” to create a sense of urgency and importance around the issue of Ukraine and to position her party as allies of those fighting for freedom and democracy. Additionally, Pelosi's repetition of the word “Ukraine” and the phrase “Ukraine-related priorities” throughout this part of the speech serves to reinforce the idea that her party is focused on addressing the crisis in Ukraine and supporting its people. Furthermore, her use of the phrase “turn the tide” to describe the efforts of Ukraine's freedom fighters creates a vivid and powerful image in the minds of the audience, further reinforcing the urgency of the issue and showing Pelosi's determination to address this issue as efficiently as possible.

Pelosi's sense of determination is evident in her unwavering commitment to feminism and equality. In 7 out of the 13 speeches analyzed, Pelosi speaks passionately about women's rights and the importance of equality. For example, in the speech “2019 SF State Commencement: Keynote Speaker Nancy Pelosi”, implements **a tactic of acknowledging and praising** President Leslie Wong for his leadership and service to the university, as well as for paving the way for a woman to follow in his footsteps: “... *And thank you for paving the way for a woman to follow in your footsteps, we're all thrilled that President Lynn Mahoney will be making history as the first woman president of San Francisco State. Thank You, president Wong...*”. Pelosi's use of the phrase “we're all thrilled” also helps to convey her positive attitude and enthusiasm towards President Lynn Mahoney's historic achievement. This phrase implies that there is a sense of shared excitement and pride among the audience for this historic moment. Additionally, Pelosi's use of the phrase “first woman president” emphasizes the significance of President Mahoney's achievement and positions her as a trailblazer for future generations of women.

Nancy Pelosi also addresses **the topic of diversity** within the House of Democrats in her speeches. During Nancy Pelosi's "Speech At The 2020 DNC", she utilized a self-presentation communication strategy of showcasing the accomplishments and priorities of House Democrats: "... *That is the guiding purpose of House Democrats, fighting for the people. We have sent the Senate bills for lower healthcare, costs for bigger paychecks for cleaner government, protecting John Lewis's voting rights and enacting George Floyd Justice and Policing Act. We've sent the Senate bills to protect our Dreamers, LGBTQ equality, prevent gun violence, and to preserve our planet for future generations, and even more. All of this is possible for America...*". Through emphasizing the bills passed by the House and sent to the Senate, Pelosi is portraying herself and her party as proactive leaders who are actively striving for the welfare of the American public. Pelosi also uses language that emphasizes the positive impact of these bills, using phrases such as "*lower healthcare costs,*" "*bigger paychecks,*" "*protecting voting rights,*" and "*enacting justice and policing reform.*" By framing these issues in terms of tangible benefits for the American people, Pelosi is creating a sense of urgency and importance around these issues, and positioning the Democratic Party as the party that is actively working to address them. Pelosi also uses inclusive language in this part of her speech, using the phrase "*protect our Dreamers*" to highlight the importance of protecting immigrants who were brought to the United States as children. She also uses the phrase "*for future generations*" to emphasize the long-term impact of preserving the planet and preventing gun violence. Throughout the speech, the speaker uses language that is inclusive of all people, regardless of gender, race, or sexual orientation. For example, the speaker highlights the diversity of the House Democratic majority, stating that it is made up of "*more than 60 percent women, people of color, and LGBTQ.*"

However, the strongest sense of determination in Pelosi's speeches is evident when she discusses her identity and feelings. This is particularly apparent in her commencement speeches at Brown University and San Francisco State University. Nancy Pelosi says: "... *I myself am grateful and honored to receive it because I*

would have loved to participate in the open curriculum. And I'm honored to receive this magnificent recognition, because of the magnificent company I am with the other honorees. Aren't they just wonderful, all of them? And it's a treat for me to be back in Rhode Island. Officially, I serve in Congress with great members from this state..." Nancy Pelosi is using the **self-presentation communication strategy of gratitude**. She expresses her gratitude for receiving the recognition and states that she is honored to be among the other honorees. By doing so, she positions herself as a humble and grateful person, who is not taking the recognition for granted. Linguistically, Pelosi uses a lot of positive evaluative language to describe the recognition and the other honorees, using words like "*magnificent*" and "*wonderful*". She also uses the first-person pronoun "*I*" to talk about her own feelings of gratitude and honor, which emphasizes her personal connection to the recognition. Furthermore, Pelosi uses a rhetorical device called anaphora by repeating the phrase "*And I'm honored*" twice. This repetition emphasizes her feelings of honor and gratitude and creates a sense of unity with the audience. Additionally, she uses inclusive language by referring to herself as serving in Congress with "*great members from this state,*" which implies that she is part of a larger team working towards a common goal.

Although Pelosi has had a successful career, she remains resolute when offering praise to others. For example, in her commencement speech at Brown University, she mentions the names of two individuals, David Cicilline and Dr. Jim Yong Kim, who she admires and who are accomplished in their respective fields, gun violence prevention and global health. By associating herself with these individuals, Pelosi also seeks to enhance her own image and reputation, as well as to align herself with causes that she cares about: "... *Indeed, Brown is the proud Alma Mater of aforementioned David Cicilline, who is right now a champion in the fight against gun violence in our country. Someone I have admired for years, Dr. Jim Yong Kim, a commanding force for global health. And his son Thomas is graduating today as well...*". Later on, she refers to the fictional character of the top salesman at the Dunder Mifflin paper company from the TV show "The Office". This lighthearted

moment helps to break the tension of the formal event and makes Pelosi seem more approachable and relatable to the audience: “... *And they tell me I don't know, but they tell me that even the top salesman at the Dunder Mifflin paper company might be here today...*”.

To sum up, Nancy Pelosi's self-presentation communication strategy is characterized by a focus on highlighting her achievements and the achievements of others, particularly those who align with her political agenda, using inclusive language, and using the tactic of aligning herself with ordinary American people. She often uses storytelling and humor to engage her audience and build rapport. Additionally, she emphasizes her commitment to fighting for the people and working towards social justice, while also projecting a sense of confidence and competence. Regarding rhetorical devices, her typical usage includes metaphors, repetition, and alliteration to make her speech stand out and make sure the audience understands her message as intended.

Another communication strategy that Nancy Pelosi uses in order to show her determination is **the appeal strategy**. Nancy Pelosi employs the appeal strategy to showcase her unwavering determination and commitment to her political agenda. This strategy involves her use of emotional appeals such as empathy and sympathy to resonate with her audience, making them more likely to support her goals. Pelosi frequently uses this strategy to convey her message of fighting for the people and to underscore the importance of issues such as healthcare, gun control, and climate change. Her ability to connect with her audience through emotional appeals not only strengthens her message, but also enhances her credibility and trustworthiness as a political leader. Nancy Pelosi employs this strategy in all the speeches we analyzed.

The most frequently employed tactic by Pelosi is **the tactic of appealing to emotion**. In one of her first speeches as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from California on China, “Tiananmen Square “massacre was shocking to us””, Nancy Pelosi uses emotional language to describe the situation in China using a range of adjectives, such as “*shocking,*” “*scary,*” and “*intolerable*”: “... *And so we come here and speak on behalf of them and everyone in our district*

who cares about freedom. And that is to say that this situation is intolerable...” This tactic is effective in generating empathy and creating a sense of urgency around the issue.

Another example of using the **appeal to emotion tactic** can be traced in Pelosi’s speech at the 2020 DNC. She used the statistics of COVID-19 infections and deaths to appeal to the audience's emotions: “... *More than five million Americans are infected by the coronavirus. Over 170,000 have died...*” This appeal to emotion is designed to create a sense of moral obligation to take action to address the crisis. Pelosi uses **repetition** to emphasize her message. She repeats the phrase “*crush the virus*” to draw attention to the failure of Mitch McConnell and Donald Trump to address the COVID-19 crisis. She also uses the phrase “*life of our democracy*” to create a sense of urgency and to emphasize the importance of protecting democratic values: “... *The science-based action and the Heroes Act we enacted three months ago is essential to safeguard lives, livelihood, and the life of our democracy. And who was standing in the way? Mitch McConnell and Donald Trump. Instead of crushing the virus, they’re trying to crush the Affordable Care Act and its preexisting conditions benefit...*” Afterwards, she urges her audience to take action: “... *Joe Biden is the president we need right now. Battle tested, forward-looking, honest and authentic. He has never forgotten who he is fighting for... we will elect Joe Biden President of the United States of America...*”. In this case, she uses an indirect call to action tactic.

Additionally, Pelosi uses the **tactic of appealing to emotion** in both commencement speeches analyzed. For example, when she was addressing the graduates of Brown University in 2022, she quoted the words of the poet Shelly “*the greatest force for moral good is imagination*”. In the following excerpt from Nancy Pelosi's speech, the appeal communication strategy used is **ethos**, which relies on the credibility of the speaker: “... *The poet Shelly once said, “the greatest force for moral good is imagination.” Imagination to be creative, to create, to put yourself in other people's shoes, to understand something else. But that creativity of the arts.*” Through quoting the poet Shelley, Pelosi is invoking the credibility of literature and

the arts to reinforce her argument. By doing so, she is implying that her perspective is informed by cultural knowledge and sophistication, thereby enhancing her credibility as a speaker. Linguistically, Pelosi's use of repetition of the word "*imagination*" emphasizes the importance of this quality in her argument. By repeating the word, she is placing a greater emphasis on its significance, which makes it more likely to stick in the audience's minds. In her commencement speech at San Francisco State University, Nancy Pelosi also appeals to emotion and shared values for all Americans, such as optimism, courage, and social justice, tapping into the audience's beliefs and values to create a sense of shared purpose and motivation: "... *So we must engage in our debate with respect for the vision of our founders, the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform, and the vision of our children, aspirations of all Americans to the best that we can and this will take courage. The courage of all Americans and this is the courage of this class, your class which is the future of America...*"

The communication **tactic of appeal to authority** is also present in Nancy Pelosi's speech on China, as she cites the importance of the floor of Congress and the role of members of Congress in advocating for human rights. This tactic is effective in showing that she and her colleagues have the authority and responsibility to take action. Later, Nancy Pelosi uses **a calling to action communication tactic**. Pelosi emphasizes the need for action and not just words and suggests that a delegation from Congress should visit China to see for themselves what's going on. This tactic is effective in proposing a specific action that can be taken to address the issue, however she does not make a direct appeal to action as she used the 3rd person singular pronoun '*they*' in her speech: '*...I endorsed a suggestion that I had that if they are not afraid of the truth and if their denials hold up, then they shouldn't be afraid of a delegation coming from the Congress to visit China to see for ourselves what's going on there...*' Also, she used a negative sentence instead of an affirmative one to make it less direct and assertive. At the end of the speech, Nancy Pelosi becomes more determined and uses the personal pronoun '*we*' to create an image of shared values and makes her claims more direct: "... *But hopefully we will hear back*

from the ambassador that we can visit there so that we can find some hope for putting a stop to what is going on there...” Furthermore, Nancy Pelosi employs the modal verb “can” with a probabilistic function to convey a sense of possibility and optimism for the future.

Pelosi often uses statistics and facts to highlight the importance of the addressed issue. When she was delivering her speech on Afghanistan in 1987, she mentioned the number of casualties suffered by the Soviets, the high cost of the war, and the number of refugees fleeing the country: “million-and-a-half Afghans have lost their lives due to the Soviet invasion and occupation. One out of every three Afghans has left the country since the Soviets marched in 1979. Imagine if 80 million Americans fled our country for refuge in Canada and Mexico. Today, fully one out of two refugees in the world is an Afghan...”. By doing so, she underscores the gravity of the situation and emphasizes the need for action. Furthermore, Pelosi uses emotionally charged language to create empathy for the Afghan people and to condemn the atrocities committed by the Soviets: “massacres and summary executions of civilians ...; ... Soviets’ flagrant disregard for human rights in this country ...; ...countless acts of terror perpetrated against the Afghan people...; The report tells of widespread use of torture...”. She talks about the loss of lives and the destruction of villages, crops, and water supplies. She also mentions the use of torture and the deportation of Afghan children to the Soviet Union. This language is meant to elicit a strong emotional response from her audience and to persuade them to support her argument. Finally, Pelosi ends her speech by **calling for action** and urging the Reagan administration to press the issue of Afghanistan in the next summit meeting with the Soviets: “...I urged the Reagan administration to press hard on this issue in the next summit meeting...”. She makes a clear and concise statement about what needs to be done and why it is necessary. In this speech, Pelosi used **a tactic of sarcasm** as well when she made a statement regarding Afghanistan’s policy, and she used a metaphor: “let’s return the country of Afghanistan to its rightful occupant, the people of Afghanistan”.

Pelosi's use of the **appeal for action communication tactic** serves to further underscore her determination. For instance, in the “Nancy Pelosi In 1988 1st Campaign Video Ever San Francisco” speech, the lady uses a **tactic of repetition** with a focus on the modal verb ‘*must*’ to appeal for action: “... *We must instead support dialogue and economic development in the region. Also, we must insist on respect for human rights and protect people who flee from persecution... We must free this country from debt, regain excellence in our schools, we must provide affordable housing and job, promote quality healthcare and become peacemakers rather than weapons suppliers.*” This repetition helps to reinforce the idea that these are the key issues that need to be addressed and creates a sense of urgency.

The **appeal for action tactic** is evident in those sections of Pelosi's speeches in which she discusses Ukraine and the full-scale war.. She uses a variety of rhetorical devices in order to draw people’s attention to those acts of terrorism, for instance, she utilizes **repetition**: “... *It’s important to note that it’s about time. Time is very important when lives are at stake.*” Pelosi uses emotive language to appeal to the audience's sense of morality and urgency. She describes the situation in Ukraine as a “*murderous tyrant*” seeking to “*dismantle its democracy.*” By painting this picture, Pelosi evokes fear and concern in her audience, thereby making them more likely to support her proposed solution. Pelosi calls on her audience to take action, summoning a “*commitment response*” to the crisis in Ukraine. This appeal to action is designed to mobilize the audience to support her proposed solution.

In her speeches on the war in Ukraine, Nancy Pelosi also **appeals to morality**. Pelosi invokes the concept of moral duty to encourage her audience to take action. By framing the situation in Ukraine as a moral issue, she implies that supporting Ukraine is not just a matter of political expediency, but rather a matter of doing what is right. Pelosi uses several linguistic devices to reinforce her message. She uses alliteration in the phrase “*haunting photographs*” which creates a vivid image in the listener's mind. Additionally, she uses the phrase “*callous aggression*” to highlight the brutality of the situation in Ukraine. She emphasizes that all this “...*serves as an important reminder of our moral duty to continue to take swift, decisive action to*”

help...” **Antithesis** is used by Nancy Pelosi to convey the audience an understanding of the present scenario, and subsequently, she employs a modal verb “must” to urge people to take action. “*This is about freedom versus dictatorship. Autocracy versus democracy. The Ukrainian people are making the fight for all of us. We must help them...”*

Nancy Pelosi also appeals to tradition in her speeches. The main idea that she recalls in three of the analyzed speeches is the founding principles of the United States: “... *In their infinite wisdom, our founders gave us their guidance: e pluribus unum. From the many, one. They could not have imagined how large our country would become or how different we would be from one another. But they knew we had to be united as one. We the people. One country. One destiny...”*. Pelosi suggests that the founding principles are still relevant and important today. This appeals to a sense of tradition and continuity, and reinforces the idea that the audience should uphold these values. Pelosi uses emotive language to appeal to the audience's feelings of patriotism and national unity. She uses the phrases “*we the people,*” “*one country,*” and “*one destiny*” to create a sense of shared identity and common purpose among the audience. Employing parallelism and the personal pronoun “*we*” enhances the eloquence and distinctiveness of her speech. Moreover, Pelosi uses the phrase “*from the many, one*” to emphasize that the diversity of the American people is a strength, not a weakness. This inclusive language appeals to a sense of unity and promotes the idea that all Americans are part of a shared community.

Many times, Pelosi **appeals to tradition and patriotism** by quoting President Lincoln. For example, she references the words of President Lincoln, a revered figure in American history, to bolster her argument in her last speech as the Speaker of the House. By invoking his name, she appeals to the authority of a respected leader to lend weight to her message: “... *As we participate in a hallmark of our republic — the peaceful, orderly transition from one Congress to the next —let us consider the words of, again, President Lincoln, spoken during one of America’s darkest hours. He called upon us to come together, to swell the chorus of the union, when once again touched as surely they will be by the better angels of our nature. That again is the*

task at hand...”. By citing Lincoln, Pelosi calls on the audience to come together and “*swell the chorus of the union*” to promote a sense of unity and shared purpose. She uses the phrase “*better angels of our nature*” to suggest that Americans have a responsibility to rise above their differences and work together for the common good. Nancy Pelosi uses rhetorical devices, such as **repetition** and **parallelism**, to create a persuasive message. For example, she repeats the phrase “*better angels of our nature*” to reinforce the idea that Americans have a responsibility to rise above their differences and work together for the common good. She also uses parallelism in the phrase “*one Congress to the next*” to emphasize the continuity of the democratic process. Additionally, she makes a wide use of metaphors when she is appealing to patriotism. For example, she refers to the Capitol building as a “*temple of our democracy*” and uses the phrase “*the gaze of our patriarch, George Washington*” to describe the historical significance of the House of Representatives. She also makes use of **alliteration**, as in the phrase “*resoundingly rejected violence and insurrection,*” which serves to emphasize the importance of rejecting violent and undemocratic behavior.

In one of the analyzed speeches, “Leader Nancy Pelosi at the 2012 Democratic National Convention”, Pelosi implemented a communication **tactic of appeal to fear**. Pelosi implies that America was on the brink of depression before the current president took office. This appeal to fear is designed to make the audience feel grateful for the current president's leadership and to fear what could happen if a Republican president were elected: “... *Many names are on the ballot. So, too, is the character of our country. Medicare is on the ballot. Democrats will preserve and strengthen Medicare. Republicans will end the Medicare guarantee. It's just plain wrong. When you go to the polls, vote for Medicare. Vote for President Obama!” Pelosi uses repetition to emphasize her message. She repeats the word “*ballot*” to emphasize the importance of the election and to encourage her audience to take action. She also uses the phrase “*just plain wrong*” to highlight her moral opposition to the Republican position on medicare, social security, women's right and democracy. Furthermore, Pelosi uses the **imperative mode** as a component of her*

appeal for action strategy to make her language as emphatic as possible and to make people her message.

The **tactic of appeal to unity** is a distinctive feature of Pelosi's speech "On the Fairness for 9/11 Families Act and Continuing Resolution". Pelosi uses the phrase "*for the people*" in the multiple places of her speech to emphasize that the legislation she is talking about is for the benefit of all Americans, not just one political party or special interest group. This appeal to unity is designed to encourage bipartisan support for the legislation and to create a sense of shared purpose among the audience: "... *Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a package for the people. I urge a strong bipartisan 'yes' on the Continuing Resolution, so we may swiftly send this bill to the President's desk, and I hope that we'll have a unanimous vote on the legislation, Fairness for 9/11 Families, to again support our 9/11 heroes and their families...*" Pelosi uses **repetition** to emphasize her message. She repeats the word "*legislation*" and the phrase "*9/11 families*" to draw attention to the two bills she is urging the audience to support. She also uses the phrase "*strong bipartisan 'yes'*" to emphasize the importance of bipartisan support for the legislation.

Nancy Pelosi's appeal strategy is primarily focused on emphasizing unity, morality, and the importance of taking swift and decisive action to address pressing issues. She often draws upon historical references and quotes to inspire and motivate her audience. Pelosi's language profile in this regard comprises the use of forceful language, repetition, and emotive words to evoke a sense of urgency and passion. Additionally, she frequently appeals to the audience's emotion and empathy, and encourages them to imagine themselves in others' shoes.

Nancy Pelosi has demonstrated a strong ability to use **persuasive communication strategy** as a component of determination in her speeches that we analyzed.

Two notable examples of her persuasive speaking are her speeches on the war in Ukraine and on women's rights.

One of the most effective tactics Pelosi uses in her speeches is the use of contrast. This technique creates a sense of dichotomy and opposition that motivates

people to take action in order to avoid negative outcomes. In her speech on the Lend Lease, Pelosi underscores the significance of the legislation by using the antithesis “*lives saved and lives lost*” and “*victory and defeat.*” By framing the issue in this way, she emphasizes the importance of the legislation and creates a sense of urgency around the need to take action: “... *This strong action could mean the difference between lives saved and lives lost. In any given battle, it could be the margin between victory and defeat. It is with astonishing unity that the Senate sent us this important legislation after passing it with a unanimous vote...*” Pelosi's use of the modal verb “*could*” in her argument, however, can be seen as both a strength and a weakness. On the one hand, the use of “*could*” makes her argument more polite and less direct, which can be effective in building rapport with her audience and encouraging them to be more receptive to her message. On the other hand, the use of “*could*” can also weaken the impact of her argument by leaving room for doubt and uncertainty. Finally, Pelosi uses **the tactic of social proof**. She highlights the unanimous vote by the Senate as evidence of the importance and urgency of the legislation. This is an effective tactic because people tend to look to others for guidance in uncertain situations, and social proof can help to provide a sense of reassurance and legitimacy to her audience.

In the speech on Women's Health Protection Act, Nancy Pelosi is trying to persuade her audience that women should have the right to make decisions about their reproductive health. She does this by using **powerful language** and **repetition**. For example, she repeatedly emphasizes that “...*every woman everywhere has the constitutional right to basic reproductive healthcare...*” By repeating this phrase, the speaker is attempting to persuade her audience that reproductive healthcare is a fundamental right that should not be infringed upon. Moreover, Pelosi also uses figurative language in her speech, such as metaphors and hyperbole, to make her speech more engaging. For example, she says, “*I wonder if they don't need a lesson in the birds and the bees,*” which is a hyperbolic statement meant to emphasize the absurdity of the restrictions on reproductive rights. In terms of semantics, the sentence conveys a sense of doubt or uncertainty about the knowledge or

understanding of a particular group of people. The phrase “*a lesson in the birds and the bees*” is a **euphemism** for sex education, suggesting that Pelosi is questioning whether the group of people she is talking about understands basic information about sexual reproduction.

Another tactic that Pelosi uses is **repetition**. She often repeats key phrases and slogans throughout her speeches, which helps to reinforce her message and make it more memorable for her audience. For example, during the debate over the Affordable Care Act, Pelosi repeatedly emphasized the importance of ensuring that all Americans had access to affordable healthcare, and she used the phrase “*healthcare for all*” as a rallying cry.

Pelosi is known for her determination and tenacity, and her use of persuasive communication tactic proves this. She is unafraid to assert her beliefs, even in the face of opposition or criticism. This determination is evident in her speeches, where she often speaks with conviction and urgency about the need for change. Her persuasive communication strategy involves the use of various tactics to motivate her audience to take action on important issues. One of the key tactics she employs is the use of contrast, which involves highlighting the differences between opposing ideas to create a sense of urgency and motivate action. Pelosi also uses repetition to reinforce key points and make them more memorable to her audience. Overall, Pelosi's persuasive communication strategy is characterized by a combination of logic, emotion, and personal connection, which enables her to effectively communicate her message and inspire action among her audience.

Nancy Pelosi, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, is known for her use of **confrontation communication strategy** as a component of expressing her determination. She has been praised for her assertiveness and ability to hold her ground, even in the face of opposition. Pelosi often uses confrontational tactics to push for her policy agenda and hold politicians accountable.

The confrontation strategy was used in nine speeches out of thirteen analyzed. Firstly, Nancy Pelosi started utilizing this strategy at the dawn of her political career, and even her first speeches contained rhetoric of discrediting opponents. For

example, in the “1st Campaign Video in 1988” Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi is effective in communicating her accomplishments as a legislator and representative for San Francisco, and she is quite determined in utilizing the confrontation strategy. Nancy Pelosi does not use **a direct strategy of discrediting opponents** in this speech. While she is critical of the Reagan-Bush administration and their policies, she does not attack individuals or specific political figures in a personal manner. While criticizing her opponents, she uses metaphor *‘to let American dream slip away’*: *‘... The fact is, the Reagan Bush administration is letting the American dream slip away for most Americans...’* Therefore, she is enlisting general arguments against Reagan and Bush, however she does not give specific examples in order to discredit them. Instead, she focuses on presenting her own record of accomplishments and the issues she has worked on as a legislator. However, later on, she uses contrastive conjunctions like *“but”* to highlight the disparity between the administration's actions and the reality on the ground. For example, *“We have seen more and more homeless families living on our streets, but the Reagan-Bush administration refused to use all the money authorized for homeless programs.”* This contrast draws attention to the administration's inaction in the face of a growing problem. Additionally, Pelosi uses emotive language to elicit an emotional response from the audience. She describes the administration's leadership as *“poor.”* These emotive words aim to create a sense of urgency and dissatisfaction with the current situation. Moreover, Pelosi uses **clauses of contrast** to engage the audience and challenge the administration's policies. For example, *“They talk about balancing the budget while they introduced the largest budget deficits in the history of our country. This is not leadership.”* These questions highlight the contradictions in the administration's policies and suggest that they are not acting in the best interests of the American people. Finally, Pelosi presents a vision of what needs to be done to address the problems facing the country. She uses modal verbs like **“must”** to convey a sense of obligation and urgency. She proposes specific actions like freeing the country from debt, providing affordable housing and jobs, and promoting quality healthcare.

Another vivid example of using confrontation strategy, one can trace in Pelosi's speech on Afghanistan. In this speech, Nancy Pelosi used **a tactic of exposing the atrocities** committed by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan and **advocating** for the right to self-determination of the Afghan people. She uses several linguistic devices to express her condemnation of the Soviet intervention. Pelosi uses **emotive language** to describe the atrocities committed by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. She describes "*countless acts of terror*" and "*massacres and summary executions*" perpetrated against the Afghan people. These words aim to evoke a sense of outrage and condemnation towards the Soviet Union. Besides, Pelosi uses rhetorical questions to challenge the status quo and advocate for change. For example, "*Imagine if 80 million Americans fled our country for refuge in Canada and Mexico.*" This question highlights the absurdity of the situation and suggests that the world cannot ignore the suffering of the Afghan people. Finally, Pelosi highlights the failure of the Reagan-Gorbachev summit to address the conflict in Afghanistan. Pelosi uses negative language to describe the situation. She uses the word "*unfortunately*" to suggest that the outcome was regrettable and disappointing. This word conveys a sense of disappointment and frustration towards the lack of progress made at the summit: "... *Unfortunately, the summit meeting between President Reagan and secretary general secretary Gorbachev accomplished little in the form of an agreement on Afghanistan...*"

In the speech, when Nancy Pelosi announced that she would step down from leadership in January but would remain in Congress, she used a confrontation strategy by highlighting the fragility of American democracy and "...*the need to defend it from harm...*". Pelosi uses **contrasting language** to describe American democracy. She calls it "*majestic*" to suggest its greatness, but then describes it as "*fragile*" to convey its vulnerability. This contrast emphasizes the importance of protecting democracy and implies that it is not invincible: "... *Indeed, American democracy is majestic. But it is fragile...*" In this instance, she aims to illustrate that the opposing party's actions could harm American democracy, and she subtly employs contradiction without explicitly mentioning any specific names.

During the speech at the 2012 Democratic National Convention, Nancy Pelosi used the confrontation communication strategy as well. She did that mainly to highlight the differences between the Democratic and Republican parties on key policy issues. Firstly, Pelosi uses a **contrasting language** to highlight the differences between the parties. She contrasts the House Democrats' passage of the Dream Act with the Senate Republicans' blockage of it using antithesis: “... *House Democrats passed the Dream Act, but Senate Republicans blocked it...*” Along with this, Pelosi criticizes the opposition by referring to the practice of considering being a woman as a “*pre-existing condition.*” This critique draws attention to the perceived gender inequality within the healthcare system and positions the Democratic Party as advocates for gender equality and healthcare reform.

Another striking instance of implementing the strategy of confrontation is demonstrated by Pelosi when presented a clear contrast between the Democratic and Republican parties. Pelosi starts by making a direct statement about the Democratic Party's agenda to overturn the controversial Citizens United decision, which allows corporations and unions to spend unlimited amounts of money in political campaigns. This statement is followed by a clear accusation against the Republicans, portraying them as supporters of special interest money and suppressors of the right to vote: “... *Democrats will work to overturn Citizen's United. Confrontation Republicans support opening the floodgates to special interest money and suppressing the right to vote. It's just plain wrong...*” The use of the word “*floodgates*” creates an image of an overwhelming and dangerous force that Republicans are letting loose. Pelosi's language is emotive and persuasive, as she uses phrases like “*just plain wrong*” to appeal to the audience's sense of morality and fairness. This phrase is repeated twice to emphasize the seriousness of the issue and make a lasting impression on the listeners. By using the phrase “hard-won rights of women,” Pelosi is also appealing to the audience's sense of history and reminding them of the struggle for women's rights. This helps to make the issue more personal and relevant to the audience: “... *The hard-won rights of women are on the ballot. Democrats trust the judgment of women. We reject the Republican assault on women's health. It's just plain wrong...*” The

use of the phrase “*Republican assault on women's health*” is particularly powerful, as it creates a strong image of an attack on women's well-being. By framing it as an assault, Pelosi is portraying the Republicans as aggressors and Democrats as defenders. Finally, Pelosi's statement about Social Security is a clear indication of the Democrats' commitment to preserving the program. By framing it as something that Democrats have enacted and will fight to preserve, Pelosi is emphasizing the party's achievements and goals. This statement is also a direct challenge to the Republicans, who are often seen as wanting to cut or privatize Social Security: “... *Social Security is on the ballot. Democrats enacted it. Democrats will fight to preserve it...*”

During the speech at the 2020 DNC, Nancy Pelosi employed a **confrontation strategy** to criticize Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell and former President Donald Trump. Pelosi is highlighting a number of legislative initiatives that have been proposed by the Democratic Party and passed in the House of Representatives but have not been acted upon by the Senate, which at the time was controlled by Republicans. Pelosi's language is direct and confrontational throughout this excerpt. She begins by listing the bills that the House has sent to the Senate, which emphasizes the contrast between the Democrats' action and the Republicans' inaction: “... *We've sent the Senate bills to protect our Dreamers, LGBTQ equality, prevent gun violence, and to preserve our planet for future generations, and even more...*” She also uses emotive language to describe the importance of these bills, using phrases like “protect our Dreamers, LGBTQ equality, prevent gun violence, and to preserve our planet for future generations” to appeal to the audience's values. Pelosi's use of language is also notable in her direct criticism of McConnell and Trump. By naming them specifically, she is creating a sense of accountability and responsibility for their actions. The repetition of the phrase “*standing in the way*” reinforces the idea that McConnell and Trump are actively preventing progress on these important issues: “... *All of this is possible for America. Who was standing in the way? Mitch McConnell and Donald Trump...*”

The more Pelosi speaks about women's rights, the more determined she gets. For instance, during her speech on the Women's Health Protection Act, she is employing a **confrontation strategy** to criticize the Republican Party's policies and tactics. Specifically, Pelosi is discussing the recent Supreme Court decision to uphold a Texas law that severely restricts access to abortion, and she is framing the issue as an intrusion into the privacy of a family's life. She begins by **appealing to the audience's sense of fairness and decency**, stating that it is important for American women to understand what they are up against. This sets the stage for her critique of the Republican Party. Pelosi's language is emotive and critical throughout this excerpt. She uses phrases like "*cowardly dark of night decision*" to criticize the Supreme Court's decision and to suggest that it was made in secret and without proper consideration. The repetition of the phrase "*in a way that was almost shameful*" emphasizes Pelosi's criticism of the Republican Party's tactics and suggests that they are engaging in behavior that is morally questionable. Pelosi also uses language to attack the Republican Party's credibility and trustworthiness. She describes the way in which they "*railroaded through*" the appointment of a new Supreme Court justice, suggesting that they did so in a way that was dishonest or unethical. She also suggests that the Republican Party is hypocritical by opposing a Democratic president's suggestion to review the appointment process, only to rush through their own appointment a few years later: "... *Make sure that so many, uh, justices on the court, they'll say shameful because the last one, which they railroaded through while opposing, uh, the review of a Democratic, uh, president's suggestion a few years earlier saying they didn't have enough time a year, they had enough time a month...*"

Overall, Nancy Pelosi's confrontation strategy is characterized by her direct criticism of political opponents and her emphasis on the differences between the Democratic and Republican Parties on important issues. Pelosi uses emotive language and specific examples to highlight areas of disagreement and to create a sense of urgency and motivation for change. She often names specific individuals who are responsible for blocking progress, creating a sense of accountability and

responsibility for their actions. Through her confrontational approach, Pelosi aims to mobilize her base and to generate public support for Democratic policies and initiatives.

Nancy Pelosi uses a variety of communication strategies to show her determination and achieve her political goals. In terms of self-presentation strategy, Pelosi presents herself as a competent and experienced leader who is committed to progressive values and uses repetition and a plethora of metaphors. In terms of appeal, Pelosi often uses emotive language to appeal to the values and concerns of her audience. Rhetorical questions and the use of the modal 'must' are Pelosi's linguistic ways to appeal for action. With the help of them, she emphasizes issues such as healthcare, social justice, and climate change, and frames them in a way that resonates with her supporters. In terms of persuasion, Pelosi uses evidence and logical arguments to support her positions. She often highlights the benefits of Democratic policies and initiatives and presents them as the most effective solution to the problems facing the country. Finally, Pelosi is known for using a confrontation strategy to criticize her political opponents and to emphasize the differences between the Democratic and Republican Parties. She uses direct language and specific examples to highlight areas of disagreement, and often names specific individuals who are responsible for blocking progress. She quite frequently uses antithesis and clauses of contrast to express her opinion in such cases. Through her confrontational approach, Pelosi aims to generate public support for Democratic policies and initiatives.

2.2 Nancy Pelosi's personal anecdotes as a communicative strategy.

Personal anecdotes are used in political discourse as a means of establishing a personal connection with an audience, conveying an emotional message, and clarifying complex policy issues. An anecdote is a brief, personal narrative or example that illustrates a point or argument being made. [67]

When employed effectively, personal anecdotes can be a potent tool in political discourse. They can foster a sense of relatability and empathy between policymakers

and constituents, and they can elucidate intricate policy matters in a more accessible fashion by demonstrating how they affect real people's lives. [69, p. 454–465.], [78] Personal anecdotes may be used by politicians to influence public opinion and shape political discourse by appealing to an audience's emotions.

However, personal anecdotes can also be implemented in a manipulative or misleading way. Speakers may use anecdotes that are not representative of broader trends, or that are designed to elicit an emotional reaction rather than provide factual evidence. [42, p. 11–12.]

Nancy Pelosi, who serves as the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, is recognized for incorporating personal anecdotes. Pelosi often uses these anecdotes to illustrate the impact of policy decisions on individuals and families, as well as to humanize the policymaking process.

During the 20th century, Nancy Pelosi did not use personal anecdotes as a communication strategy in her early speeches, which is a notable characteristic of her language profile. However, in more recent speeches, Pelosi has made use of this approach. This could be attributed to her growing confidence and experience in the political arena, which has allowed her to share more personal stories and even use them as a way to bond with her audience.

Nancy Pelosi used a plethora of personal anecdotes while delivering speeches on Ukraine and the full-scale war there. For instance, during her “Floor Speech on S. 3522, the Ukraine Democracy Defense Lend-Lease Act of 2022”. She uses a personal anecdote to establish a connection with the audience and highlight the historical significance of the moment. By referencing her father's service as a Member of Congress and Franklin D. Roosevelt's historic request, Pelosi is able to provide context and credibility to her own remarks: “... 81 years ago, *President Franklin Delano Roosevelt came here to the Congress of the United States, to the House of Representatives – where I'm proud to say my father, Thomas D'Alesandro, served as a Member of Congress...*” Linguistically, the use of the phrase “*where I'm proud to say my father...served as a Member of Congress*” is a notable example of how personal anecdotes can be used to establish a sense of pride and shared history. Even

while talking about Ukraine, she recalls her father that may be seen as a positive **manipulation strategy** used to evoke emotions in the hearts of her audience and think deeper about atrocities happening in Europe.

The next example of utilizing personal anecdotes as a **tactic of bonding with the audience** is Pelosi's speech at the 2012 Democratic National Convention. The very beginning of her speech serves as a personal anecdote, as it highlights Nancy Pelosi's identity as a mother and grandmother, which is an aspect of her personal life: “... *I stand before you as the first mother and grandmother to serve as Democratic leader and speaker of the House. For 25 years, it has been my privilege to represent the city of San Francisco and the great state of California...*” This anecdote is strategically used to create a connection with the audience and emphasize her role as a leader who understands and values the importance of family and community. By framing her political identity within the context of her personal life, Pelosi is able to humanize herself and make her leadership more relatable and approachable. Additionally, the repetition of “*to serve*” emphasizes Pelosi's commitment to public service and her desire to use her position to improve the lives of others.

During Nancy Pelosi's Speech on the Fairness for 9/11 Families Act and Continuing Resolution, the House Speaker recalled the full-scale war in Ukraine which was quite off-topic and her recent experiences. She talks about her own experiences meeting with Ukrainian Speaker Stefanchuk and hearing about the state of the war in Ukraine: “... *When I traveled to Berlin for the G7 Speakers' Meeting earlier this month, it was my privilege to hear directly from Ukrainian Speaker Stefanchuk, who offered an invaluable report on the state of the war...*” This personal touch is intended to create a connection with the audience and to convey the speaker's commitment to supporting Ukraine. In this sentence the Speaker used emotive phrases ‘*my privilege*’ and ‘*invaluable report*’ to emphasize the urgency of the matter. From our perspective, this story was used by Nancy Pelosi in order to draw the similarities between the terror on September 11, 2001, and the terror in Ukraine. In such a way, she tries to convince her audience to help American families devastated by disaster.

Nancy Pelosi could not do without a shadow of a personal anecdote strategy during her speech on Women's Health Protection Act as well. When she then goes on to contextualize the issue, she highlights the historical significance of having a pro-choice Democratic caucus with a Democratic president and the urgency of the assault on women's constitutional rights. The speaker then employs a personal anecdote to further **emphasize the importance of the issue**. She recalls a debate from her high school years in which a friend had to speak to the question "Do women think?" The absurdity and offensiveness of the question is highlighted with the word combination '*beyond horrible*'. Besides, the speaker notes that while it may have seemed like ancient history at the time, there are still those today who want to debate the question of women's abilities and rights: "... Well, a person, a friend of mine drew the question, and it said, now again, ancient history a long time ago, it said, do women think? That was the question that she had to speak to. Do women think? It seemed horrible at the time. It seems out of the question, beyond horrible..." In this speech, the personal anecdote can be seen as a way to draw people's attention to the issue discussed. It amplifies the effect as the situation described took place decades ago and in spite of the progress of the modern society, women's rights are still questioned, and the issue remains open. However, that was not the only example of using a **storytelling strategy** in this speech. Later on, the speaker tells a personal story about her experience with motherhood to illustrate the importance of allowing women to make their own reproductive health decisions. She uses her personal experience as "... a Catholic mother of five in six years and one week..." to illustrate her belief that women should have the right to make their own reproductive decisions. She also uses the repetition of the phrase "*our decision*" to drive home her point and to emphasize the importance of individual autonomy in reproductive decision-making: "... but with the recognition that it was my husband and I, our decision, it was our decision..." The use of "um" and "uh" suggests that Pelosi is speaking extemporaneously and may be searching for the right words, which adds to the authenticity of her personal anecdote.

Nancy Pelosi's commencement speeches at San Francisco State University and Brown University are full of **communication strategy of using personal anecdotes**. For instance, when Pelosi was addressing graduates of San Francisco State University, she employed the **communication strategy of personal anecdote** by sharing a personal story from her college days to connect with the graduates individually. She begins by addressing the graduates collectively, and then transitions to speaking to them individually: "... *Graduates, I want to just speak to each one of you individually now...*". She then goes on to tell them that they never know what the future holds, and that opportunities may present themselves unexpectedly. Linguistically, Pelosi uses a range of devices to make her point more effectively. She uses the phrase "*zero interest*" twice to emphasize her lack of interest in running for political office: "... *When I was in College, I had zero interest – my friend Martha Buonanno could attest to that if she were still with us – zero interest in running for political office...*" Additionally, her use of the phrase "*one thing and another*" is an **idiom** that conveys the idea that unexpected events can occur: "... *But one thing and another, the opportunity presented itself...*" She also employs the phrase "*the opportunity presented itself*," which is a common expression used to describe a situation where a chance to do something arises unexpectedly. By sharing her own experience of how she never imagined herself in political office, she encourages the graduates to stay open to possibilities. Later on, in the same speech, Pelosi again uses the **communication strategy of personal anecdote**. Pelosi is using her personal experience of running for Congress and the conversation she had with her daughter to emphasize the importance of knowing one's "*why*" or purpose. By sharing her personal story, Pelosi is trying to connect with the graduates and encourage them to find their own purpose and pursue it with determination. In this abstract, Pelosi uses informal language, such as "*mommy*" and "*darling daughter*," to create a more personal and relatable tone. She also uses direct speech to make her story more vivid and engaging: "*And I said to her, "this is all new to us, but I have been – mommy, mommy has been asked to run for Congress, and I would rather it be another year because you would then be in college, but I love my life. I don't care about running*

*for Congress if you want me to stay home.” To which my darling daughter who was 16 at the time, Alexandra, she said, “mother, not mommy, mother, get a life.” Her use of rhetorical questions, such as *“what teenage girl would not want her mother out of the house for three nights a week?”* can be considered as a **tactic of using humor** and further draws the audience into the story. Overall, Pelosi's use of personal anecdote and informal language creates a more intimate and engaging speech that resonates with the audience.*

In the other commencement speech, Nancy Pelosi uses the communication strategy of personal anecdote to connect with her audience at Brown University and establish a personal connection with them. Pelosi goes on to share a personal story about her own connection to the state of Rhode Island, where Brown University is located. She mentions that her grandparents met in Pawtucket, Rhode Island and that one of her closest college friends, Martha Buonanno, lived in Providence, the city where the university is located. Pelosi also mentions that Buonanno's brother-in-law is present in the audience, adding a personal touch to her speech: *“... Personally, I'm happy to be here because my grandparents met in Pawtucket, Rhode Island. And my close, one of my closest college friends, Martha Buonanno, lived here in Providence. Her brother-in-law, Vinny Buonanno, is here today. A city she always told me was Heaven on earth...”* Linguistically, Pelosi uses personal pronouns such as *“my”* and *“I”* to establish a personal connection with her audience. She also uses descriptive language such as *“Heaven on earth”* to emphasize her emotional attachment to the city of Providence. Another part of Nancy Pelosi's same speech employs the communication strategy of personal anecdote, where she shares a personal experience of her recent visit to Kyiv. By sharing her experience of seeing *“firsthand the hope in the eyes of the Ukrainian people,”* she is able to connect with her audience and highlight the importance of standing with Ukraine against their powerful and brutal foe. Linguistically, Pelosi uses descriptive language to paint a vivid picture of her experience, such as *“defied the odds”* and *“powerful and brutal foe.”* She also uses emotive language, such as *“hope,”* to convey the positive sentiment she felt during her visit. This storytelling tactic helps the speaker start her part of the speech on the

importance of democracy and communicate this thought to the graduates as they are the future of the nation.

At the beginning of her speech, Nancy Pelosi shared a personal anecdote before announcing her decision to step down from leadership in January but continue serving in Congress. This was done to create a personal connection with the audience and to emphasize the importance of the Capitol building as a symbol of democracy. Pelosi starts with a personal story from her childhood, describing the first time she saw the Capitol building when her father was being sworn in for his fifth term in Congress. By sharing this memory, Pelosi makes herself relatable to the audience and creates a sense of shared experience. This helps to engage the audience and draw them into her speech. In this case, she uses sensory language to create a vivid description of her childhood memory. For example, she describes the Capitol building as *“a stunning white building with a magnificent dome.”* This helps to bring the story to life and make it more memorable for the audience. Additionally, Pelosi uses figurative language, a metaphor in particular, to describe the Capitol building as *“a temple of our democracy, of our Constitution, of our highest ideals.”* This metaphorical language helps to convey the symbolic importance of the building and its role in representing American values. Nancy Pelosi includes a **tactic of using a dialogue** in her anecdote as well: *“Nancy, look, there's the Capitol. And I keep — every time I'd say: “I don't see any capital. Is it a capital A, a capital B or a capital C?””* This helps to make the story more interactive and engaging for the audience. This dialogue adds a **touch of humor** and lightheartedness to the story, which helps to engage the audience and create a more relaxed atmosphere. Additionally, the dialogue highlights the importance of clear communication and understanding in politics and in society as a whole. Pelosi's confusion over what her brothers were pointing out underscores the need for clarity and precision in language, particularly when discussing important topics like democracy and the Constitution. Pelosi connects her personal story to the larger theme of the importance of the oath of office and the role of Congress in upholding the Constitution. By linking her personal

experience to the shared experience of all members of Congress, Pelosi underscores the importance of unity and solidarity in upholding the values of democracy.

However, it was not the only personal anecdote Nancy Pelosi recalled during that speech. She used personal anecdotes to highlight the progress that has been made in terms of diversity and representation in politics. She notes that the new members of the Democratic caucus are primarily women, people of color, and members of the LGBTQ+ community, and that the leadership team has grown significantly since she first entered leadership in 2002. Pelosi then uses a personal anecdote to demonstrate how far she has come in her own political career. In this case, she uses a **conditional sentence with an inversion**: “... *When I first came to the floor at 6 years old, never would I have thought that someday I would go from homemaker to House speaker....*”

Her use of the contrasting phrase “...*from a homemaker to House speaker...*” is a powerful example of how anyone, regardless of their background or starting point, can make a difference in the world. The use of the preposition “*from*” highlights the contrast between these two roles and the journey she took to get from one to the other.

Overall, Nancy Pelosi often uses personal anecdotes in her speeches to connect with her audience and make her points more relatable. Her anecdotes include stories about her family, her upbringing, and her experiences in politics. Through these stories, Pelosi emphasizes the importance of hard work, perseverance, and the power of the American dream. Pelosi uses personal anecdotes to illustrate the need for change and to argue for policies that support the middle class and working families. Pelosi's use of personal anecdotes serves to humanize her message and make it more compelling to her audience.

Conclusion to chapter 2

Communication strategies and tactics are vital components of the pragmatic approach to analyzing the language profile of politicians. Nancy Pelosi, the current Speaker of the House, is a prominent political figure whose language peculiarities

have been closely scrutinized in our research. We have examined thirteen of Pelosi's speeches, four of which were delivered in the 20th century and nine in the 21st century, to gain insights into her communication strategies.

The analysis of Pelosi's speeches revealed that the main peculiarities of her language profile are the determination and the use of personal anecdotes. Nancy Pelosi uses various communication strategies to bolster her determination, including self-presentation, appeal, persuasion, and confrontation. Self-presentation and appeal are the most frequently used communication strategies in all of Pelosi's speeches. The use of personal anecdotes is a characteristic feature of Pelosi's speeches in the 21st century. The use of humor is the main peculiarity of Pelosi's personal anecdotes, as it helps to make her stories more engaging and relatable to the audience. This technique creates a positive emotional connection with the audience, thus enhancing their responsiveness to her message.

Moreover, Pelosi's language profile also includes clear messaging, which is evident in her ability to simplify complex issues and convey them in a way that resonates with her audience. Pelosi frequently uses inclusive language, such as “*we*” or “*our*,” to emphasize the importance of diversity and inclusivity. This approach creates a sense of unity and shared purpose, and it further enhances her connection with the audience. Additionally, Pelosi uses rhetorical devices, such as repetition, alliteration, and metaphors, to make her message more memorable and impactful. For instance, she may use the phrase “*For the People*” repeatedly to emphasize her party's commitment to working on behalf of ordinary Americans.

To sum up, the analysis of Nancy Pelosi's speeches has demonstrated that her language profile is characterized by her determination, use of personal anecdotes, clear messaging, inclusive language, and strategic use of rhetorical devices. These communication strategies and tactics have played a crucial role in enhancing her political communication effectiveness and connecting with her audience.

III. PRAGMATIC APPROACH TO KAMALA HARRIS' LANGUAGE PROFILE

3.1. Kamala Harris' rhetoric during presidential campaign.

Until recently, the role of women in politics has been remarkably underestimated. It was only last year that the first Africa-American and Asian-American woman was elected Vice President of the United States – Kamala Harris. Kamala Harris is a highly accomplished American politician and lawyer, who has made history as the first woman, first Black American, and first South Asian American to hold the office of Vice President of the United States. Her career in public service has been marked by a strong commitment to social justice, equality, and progressive values.

Before being elected as Vice President, Harris served as a United States Senator from California, representing one of the largest and most diverse states in the country. During her time in the Senate, she was a vocal advocate for policies that would advance economic and social equity, such as raising the minimum wage, expanding access to healthcare, and reforming the criminal justice system [70, p. 3–139.].

Prior to her time in the Senate, Harris served as the Attorney General of California, where she was known for her efforts to protect consumers, promote civil rights, and combat human trafficking. She also gained national attention for her tough stance on crime and her work to address police misconduct and racial bias in law enforcement. The victory of the Biden-Harris team was historic for all Americans who belong to discriminated groups. [68, p. 104.]

In our linguistic research, we are focusing on scrutinizing Kamala Harris' language profile during the presidential campaign and as a Vice President on the basis of her thirteen speeches – seven of which were given during the presidential campaign and the remaining six while serving as the Vice President.

As the 49th vice president of the USA, Kamala Harris discusses a variety of topics in her speeches, including [51]:

- **Social justice and equality:** Harris has been a vocal advocate for social justice and equality, particularly in relation to race, gender, and sexual orientation. She has spoken out against systemic racism, police brutality, and discrimination in various forms.
- **Healthcare:** Harris has supported universal healthcare and has advocated for measures to expand access to healthcare for all Americans. She has also been a vocal advocate for reproductive rights and has worked to protect access to contraception and abortion.
- **Climate change:** Harris has been a strong advocate for addressing climate change and has called for measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, invest in renewable energy, and promote sustainability.
- **Immigration:** Harris has spoken out in support of comprehensive immigration reform, including a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.

Nonetheless, there exists a discernible contrast in both the subject matter and the communication strategies and tactics employed by Kamala Harris, between her presidential campaign and her tenure as Vice President. Throughout the presidential campaign, Kamala Harris implemented various communication strategies with the intention of augmenting her public visibility and attaining her objective of persuading individuals to vote for Joe Biden.

The pragmatic component of Kamala Harris' language profile is realized through the usage of the certain communication strategies and tactics. While analyzing the **self-presentation strategy**, one should pay attention to the fact that this strategy refers to the deliberate and conscious attempt by an individual to manage the impressions that others form of them. It was the main reason why Harris employed this strategy in all her campaign speeches we analyzed.

In her acceptance speech as Joe Biden's running mate, Kamala Harris employs the **affiliation tactic** to align herself with Joe Biden and the values he represents. Through her statement, “... *As I said, Joe, when you called me, I am incredibly honored by this responsibility, and I'm ready to get to work. I'm ready to get to work...*” Harris aims to build trust and garner support from her audience by

showcasing her membership in a larger movement. She emphasizes her readiness to undertake the responsibility twice by using **repetition**, “*I’m ready to get to work,*” emphasizing her willingness to follow Biden's mindset to effect positive change in the United States. Kamala Harris uses emotive language to express her pride in standing with Joe Biden, which helps to create an emotional connection with the audience: “... *Joe, I’m so proud to stand with you...*”. Additionally, she again uses a **rhetorical device of repetition**, with the phrase “*heroic and ambitious women before me*” being repeated to emphasize the sacrifices that women have made in the past to make her presence in politics as a woman possible.

Later on, Harris again portrays herself as grateful and humble while expressing her gratitude towards Joe and Jill Biden. The use of the personal pronouns “*I*” and “*me*” suggests that Harris is keen on projecting herself in a positive light by acknowledging the trust that has been placed in her: “...*So Joe, Dr. Biden, thank you for the trust you’ve placed in me...*” Additionally, by recognizing Joe Biden as well as Jill Biden, Harris conveys her respect for the Bidens and her willingness to work together with them as part of their “*extended family*”. Kamala Harris also employed a **tactic of complimenting** Jill Biden while simultaneously displaying her openness and amiability towards the family of the future president: “... *Jill, I know you will be an incredible First Lady. My husband, Doug, and I are so grateful to become a part of your extended family...*” Additionally, the reference to her husband, Doug, as part of their “*extended family*” reinforces the notion of unity and the importance of family values, which is a common theme in American culture.

Kamala Harris employs the **affiliation communication tactic** by using the personal pronoun “*he*” more frequently than “*I*” in her speech, referring to Joe Biden and emphasizing their alignment and shared values: “... *He’s someone whose first response when things get tough is never to think about himself, but to care for everyone else. He’s someone who never asks, why is this happening to me? And instead asks what can I do to make life better for you? His empathy, his compassion, his sense of duty to care for others is why I am so proud to be on this ticket...*” Kamala Harris portrays Joe Biden as an empathetic and compassionate person,

highlighting his focus on others' needs rather than his own. This portrayal of Biden serves to create a positive impression of him in the minds of the audience, while simultaneously showcasing Harris' alignment with his values. The use of enumeration with anaphora – pronoun “*his*” – is another language means Harris used to support the association tactic: “...*his* *empathy*, *his* *compassion*, *his* *sense of duty to care for others...*” These expressions not only serve to paint Biden in a positive light, but also demonstrate Harris's awareness and appreciation of these traits. Besides, Harris points out that Biden and herself come from similar backgrounds: “... *Joe and I, yes, we are cut from the same cloth...*” When Harris uses the expression “*cut from the same cloth*”, she creates a sense of kinship between herself and Biden, which can help her connect with the audience and increase their trust and support. Furthermore, Harris boldly asserted “... *Earlier this year, I said, “I do whatever Joe asks me to do” ...*”. The use of the phrase “*I do whatever Joe asks me to do*” is a straightforward and direct expression of her loyalty and commitment to Biden. The use of the word “*whatever*” suggests that Harris is willing to take on any task or responsibility that Biden assigns to her, demonstrating her flexibility and willingness to serve. Additionally, the use of the phrase “*Joe asks me to do*” highlights Biden's leadership and reinforces Harris's image as a loyal and obedient follower.

Another example of using the **affiliation tactic** can be noticed in the speech Kamala Harris delivered at a Drive-In Rally in Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley. Almost at the start of her speech, she says, ‘... *So if you all don't mind, I'm just gonna talk about Joe....*’ In this case, she aims to present Joe Biden as a strong leader and present herself as a part of his leadership. Directly afterward, Harris uses a series of anaphoric phrases: “... *Let's talk about Joe. Let's do that. Let's do that...*” which can be considered as inclusive language to engage the audience and make them feel like they are part of the conversation.

Despite this, Kamala Harris also prioritized crafting her own public persona as a prospective Vice President. In her acceptance speech as Joe Biden's running mate, a self-presentation communication strategy was used where Harris highlights her career as a public servant and frames it as being in service of the people. The use of the

phrase “*Kamala Harris for the people*” serves as a motto that guides her career and emphasizes her commitment to representing the interests of the people: “... 30 years ago, I stood before a judge for the first time, breathed deep and uttered the phrase that would truly guide my career and the rest of my career, Kamala Harris for the people. The people, that’s who I represented as district attorney...”. The use of repetition of the phrase “*the people*” emphasizes Harris's focus on serving and fighting on behalf of the people. This repetition also serves to reinforce her self-presentation as a public servant who prioritizes the needs of the people she serves. Additionally, the use of the phrase “*fighting on behalf of victims who needed help*” highlights her dedication to serving and protecting vulnerable individuals and groups, which can enhance her credibility and appeal to voters.

The same rhetoric is peculiar to Kamala Harris’ DNC speech when she repeated the same words: “... *And at every step of the way, I’ve been guided by the words I spoke from the first time I stood in a courtroom: Kamala Harris, For the People...*”

In the same speech, Kamala Harris uses a **tactic of invoking shared values** and beliefs with her audience. She establishes her image as a person who is able to have a personal connection with the audience by referencing the values instilled in her by her upbringing and faith. While mentioning Joe Biden's shared vision, she again seeks to align herself with his ideals and present herself as a like-minded and trustworthy running mate: “... *And to a vision passed on through generations of Americans—one that Joe Biden shares. A vision of our nation as a Beloved Community...*” The incorporation of the phrase “*Beloved Community*,” which was a prevalent buzzword throughout Kamala Harris' campaign, serves to invoke a feeling of togetherness and inclusivity.

During the presidential campaign, Harris had a tendency to use a **tactic of acknowledging** the presence of other people – those who invited her to deliver a speech [23]. For example, in her speech during a Drive-In Rally in Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley, Kamala uses a friendly tone and engages the audience by thanking a person named Maria for the introduction and expressing her excitement at being with

the group. By acknowledging the presence of Bob Casey and referring to the group as “*incredible leaders*,” Harris is also trying to establish a connection with the audience and build credibility: “... *It's so good to be with you guys and my friend Bob Casey and everybody. Look at this incredible group of leaders. Look at this, look at this...*” Harris strategically repeats the phrase “*look at this*” to emphasize her appreciation for the group of leaders and position herself as a valuable member of the team.

Kamala Harris' speech at the Biden Campaign Event in Jacksonville, Florida contains an example of self-presentation communication strategy, where the future Vice President aims to present herself as an approachable and relatable leader, while also building credibility with the audience. In this excerpt, Harris uses a friendly and engaging tone, greeting the audience, and she again uses a tactic of acknowledging by expressing her appreciation for the local leaders who have joined her on stage: “... *Ms. Reilly, you are amazing, and thank you for joining this stage. And all of your leadership and work. Congressman Lawson, he is a force. Thank you for sending him to D.C...” Harris also uses repetition, saying “*thank you*” twice and asking the audience to applaud Congressman Lawson, which emphasizes her appreciation for the local leaders and builds their credibility. The use of the phrase “*he is a force*” implies that Congressman Lawson is a powerful and effective leader, which adds credibility to her claims.*

Kamala Harris invokes historical figures which can be seen as a component of her self-presentation communication strategy. The future Vice President emphasizes that all Americans share the same past, and she identifies herself as a part of this history: “... *sometimes we have to sit to get another that we have to vote to honor all of our ancestors, like the late, great John Lewis...*” The use of the phrase “*all of our ancestors*” invokes a sense of shared history and emphasizes the idea that voting is a way to honor those who came before us and fought for the right to vote. By mentioning the late John Lewis, Harris is also drawing a connection between the current struggles for voting rights and the civil rights movement. John Lewis was a prominent civil rights leader and politician in the United States. He was a key figure

in the American Civil Rights Movement and played a pivotal role in the fight for racial equality and justice.

Kamala Harris' self-presentation strategy is focused on presenting herself as a person aligned with Joe Biden and his values. Her self-presentation strategy is expressed by four main communication tactics: affiliation communication tactic, a tactic of acknowledging and a tactic of invoking shared values. She uses a friendly and engaging tone, along with informal language and humor, to establish a positive connection with her audience. Harris also emphasizes her appreciation for local leaders and invokes historical figures to reinforce the importance of voting and honoring those who fought for the right to vote. Overall, her self-presentation strategy emphasizes her credibility, approachability, and commitment to the values of Joe Biden and her audience.

During the presidential campaign, Kamala Harris effectively used a communication strategy of personal anecdotes as a component of her language profile. This strategy has been used in half of the analyzed speeches Kamala Harris delivered during the campaign. This strategy has been used as she needed to tell people about herself and her non-political background in order to show that she is still an 'ordinary' person. For example, in the acceptance speech as Joe Biden's running mate, Kamala Harris used the strategy of personal anecdote and shared a personal story about her relationship with Beau Biden, Joe Biden's son. She then goes on to describe Beau's admiration for his father, Joe, and the love that they shared. By doing so, Harris not only humanizes Joe Biden, but also builds a connection with the audience by sharing a personal story that showcases her empathy. Harris uses vivid imagery to paint a picture of the relationship between Joe and Beau Biden. For instance, she describes their love as "*incredible to watch*" and "*the most beautiful display of the love between a father and a son.*" She also uses indirect speech to talk about Beau's relationship with his father and to illustrate Joe's dedication, such as how he would ride the rails for four hours each day just to make breakfast for his kids. These linguistic devices help to create a sense of emotional depth and personal connection between Harris, the audience, and the Biden family.

During her speech, Kamala Harris employs a personal anecdote communication strategy to establish a connection with the American public by sharing details about her family and background. In particular, Harris uses emotive language constructions to convey her family's importance, stating that she “... *cannot wait for America to get to know*” her husband, Doug, and their children, Cole and Ella. While focusing on her immediate family, Harris also emphasizes the significance of her extended family, including her nieces and godchildren. In such a way, she reinforces the idea that family holds a central place in her life: “... *Because whether I’m ... helping my goddaughter prepare for her school debate, or building Legos with my godson, or hugging my two baby nieces, ..., my family means everything to me.” By doing so, Harris seeks to demonstrate that her values align with those of the American public. Later on, Kamala Harris acknowledges that she has had many titles and achievements throughout her career, including her position as the Democratic nominee for Vice President of the United States. However, she also refers to herself with the nickname “*Mamala.*”: “... *I’ve had a lot of titles over my career, and certainly vice president will be great, but Mamala will always be the one that means the most...*” The sentence is notable for its use of a colloquial nickname in contrast to more formal titles, and the juxtaposition of the words “*great*” and “*Mamala.*” The use of “*great*” emphasizes the importance of her political achievements, while “*Mamala*” highlights the significance of her family relationships. Then, she moves on to talk about the family she was born into – her mother and father, and highlights that “...*what brought them together was the civil rights movement of the 1960s.” This excerpt shows that Kamala Harris comes from a family that values education and social justice. She also highlights her personal connection to the civil rights movement by recounting how her parents would bring her to protests in her stroller. This personal anecdote shows that her commitment to social justice was instilled in her from a young age. Kamala Harris then mentions her mother's words of encouragement to take action and not just complain, which motivated her to pursue a career in law and strive for equal justice under the law: “... *She’d tell us, “Don’t sit around and complain about things, do something.” So I did***

something...” The use of direct speech in this personal anecdote made her story more vivid and engaging.

The same rhetoric was used in Kamala Harris’ speech at DNC in 2020 when she recalled her parents again, however she continued telling the initial story and mentioned that her parents split and her mother “... *raised her kids mostly on her own...*” She talks about her mother's resilience and hard work in raising her and her sister, which highlights the challenges that many single mothers face. Through this story, Harris portrays her mother as a strong, capable woman who instilled important values in her children. Harris uses vivid and emotive language to describe her mother's sacrifices, such as “*working around the clock,*” “*packing lunches,*” and “*paying bills after we went to bed.*” These phrases help to convey the difficult nature of her mother's role and make it more relatable to the audience. She also uses **alliteration** in the phrase “*proud, strong Black women,*” which emphasizes the importance of her mother's influence in shaping her identity. This part of the speech serves to establish Harris as a relatable figure who has overcome personal challenges and is committed to promoting values that are significant to American society. Additionally, Harris illustrates how the idea of family goes beyond blood relations. Through a series of examples, Harris expands the definition of family to include her husband, children, sister, best friends, nieces, godchildren, and even her college sorority, Alpha Kappa Alpha. She uses **parallel constructions** to emphasize the importance of family in her life, starting several sentences with “*Family is...*”: “... *Family is my husband... Family is our beautiful children... Family is my best friend... Family is my uncles, my aunts...*” The use of personal pronouns, such as “*my*” and “*our,*” also contributes to the sense of intimacy and connection with her audience. The last sentence in this series of parallel constructions reveals an even more intimate part of Harris’ personal story – the fact that her mother “*passed away from cancer*”: “... *Family is the friends I turned to when my mother—the most important person in my life—passed away from cancer...*” Kamala Harris suggests a shared experience with numerous individuals who have lost family members to this dreadful ailment in

the aforementioned statement. The sentence carries a tone of regret and implies a sense of solidarity with those who have undergone similar circumstances.

A strategy of personal anecdote was used by Kamala Harris' speech at a Drive-In Rally in Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley as well. During that speech, she was eloquent while describing the devastating effects of natural disasters. She begins by stating that she comes from California, which sets the context for the personal anecdotes to follow. She then talks about the wildfires that have affected the West Coast, and how she has met with families who have been forced to evacuate their homes. This personal anecdote allows her to appeal to the emotions of her audience by highlighting the human impact of these disasters. She uses phrases like "*never to be able to return to their home*" and "*battered by those storms*" to create a sense of empathy and urgency in her audience. Harris then goes on to share another personal anecdote about her brother-in-law, who is a firefighter in the Gulf Coast states: "... *My brother-in-law's a firefighter up personal anecdote and down the Gulf Coast states, people being battered by those storms...*" This anecdote also helps her connect with her audience by showing that she has a personal connection to the people who are impacted by these disasters.

Another communication strategy that Kamala Harris uses during the presidential campaign is the **appeal strategy**. This communication strategy was used in every speech we analyzed. For example, in the acceptance speech as Joe Biden's running mate, Harris indirectly appeals to action at the start of the speech and uses language means to convey a sense of urgency and importance to her audience, emphasizing the high stakes of the upcoming election. In the sentence, "*everything we care about, our economy, our health, our children, the kind of country we live in, it's all on the line,*" she uses anaphoric personal pronoun 'our' and **enumeration**. In such a way, Harris is attempting to persuade her audience that the election has far-reaching consequences that affect all aspects of their lives. This message is intended to motivate her audience to take action, whether it be to vote or to become more politically engaged. The phrase "*it's all on the line*" uses a common **metaphor** in political discourse, comparing the upcoming election to a high-stakes game. This

metaphorical language helps to further emphasize the sense of urgency and importance conveyed in the appeal. Additionally, Kamala Harris' speech employs an appeal communication strategy, in her statement “*We have a chance to choose a better future for our country*”. It is implied that the current state of the country is not ideal and that there is room for improvement. By framing the upcoming election as a “*chance*” to select a better future, Harris is encouraging her audience to believe in the possibility of positive change and to be motivated to take action towards that change. The phrase “*better future*” is also powerful, as it conveys a positive vision for the future and implies that there is room for improvement. Later on, Harris **calls to action** again since she is encouraging the audience to take action by working, organizing, and voting like never before to bring the country closer to realizing its great promise. By using the term “*heroes of our time*,” she is appealing to the audience's sense of pride and making them feel important and powerful. The use of the words “work,” “organize,” and “vote” in a row creates a sense of urgency and emphasizes the importance of taking action: “... *we'll need to work, organize and vote like never before...*” The repetition of “*we need*” also reinforces the idea that there is a collective responsibility to take action and create change. The phrase “*like never before*” emphasizes the magnitude of the effort required to achieve the desired outcome.

One more example of the appeal strategy can be found in this speech, when Harris is encouraging her audience to take action by visiting Joe Biden's website to get involved in the campaign and vote. The use of the present continuous tense in the phrase “*I'm asking you to do the same*” creates a sense of urgency and personal connection with the audience. Kamala Harris uses the first-person pronoun “*I*” to establish herself as a leader and role model for the audience to follow. She also uses the second-person pronoun “*you*” to address the audience directly and create a sense of shared responsibility for the success of the campaign. The use of the phrase “*the work ahead of us*” suggests a collective effort and reinforces the idea that everyone must contribute to achieving a better future for the country.

In the DNC speech, Kamala Harris used the strategy of appeal when she is appealing to emotion by acknowledging the collective pain and loss that Americans were experiencing due to the COVID-19 pandemic. She then specifically highlights how certain communities, such as Black, Latino, and Indigenous people, are being disproportionately affected by the virus due to systemic inequalities: “... Black, Latino and Indigenous people are suffering and dying disproportionately...” Harris uses emotive language to connect with the audience and convey the gravity of the situation. She uses phrases like “loss of life,” “loss of jobs,” “loss of opportunities,” and “loss of normalcy” to create an emotional response in the audience. Harris also uses **repetition**, emphasizing that the pandemic has affected everyone but disproportionately affects marginalized communities, through the phrase “*let's be honest*”: “... *let's be honest, it is not an equal opportunity offender...*”. The use of the phrase “*there is no vaccine for racism*” conveys a sense of urgency and the need to address these issues immediately. She closes the excerpt by saying: “... *We've gotta do the work... We must elect a president who will bring something different, something better...*”. The phrase “*We've gotta do the work*” implies that there is work to be done, and it is the responsibility of everyone to do their part. The use of a personal pronoun “*we*” creates a sense of collective responsibility and empowers the audience to take action. Later on, she uses a modal verb ‘*must*’ in order to call to action and convince her audience to support a specific candidate, Joe Biden. The use of contractions such as “*gotta*” and “*we've*” creates a more casual and conversational tone. Harris also uses **imperative mode** as a linguistic means to express the communication **strategy of appeal**: “... *Make no mistake*, *the road ahead will not be not easy...*”

The speech at Biden Campaign Event in Jacksonville, Florida contains a few examples of employing the strategy of appeal. For instance, Kamala Harris is appealing to the voters of Florida to participate in the election and exercise their right to vote. She is emphasizing the importance of their individual votes by addressing them directly, “*The voters of Florida, you guys*” and stating that “... *they are going to determine the outcome of this election...*”. The future Vice President Harris uses

words such as “*power,*” “*impact,*” and “*determine*” to reinforce the significance of their vote. Additionally, she reminds them to vote early, indicating a sense of urgency and encouraging them to take action as soon as possible.

During the speech at a Drive-In Rally in Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley, Kamala Harris again uses the appeal strategy to encourage people to vote. She starts with providing her audience with three reasons to vote – honoring ancestors, grasping that “*everything is at stake*” and attempts being made to suppress the vote, making it difficult and confusing for people to vote. Harris uses **repetition** and **parallelism** to reinforce her message. She repeats the phrase “*Let's honor the ancestors*” twice to emphasize the importance of voting as a way to honor those who fought for the right to vote. She also repeats the phrase “*everything is at stake*” twice to drive home the gravity of the situation. Additionally, she uses **rhetorical questions** and vivid language, such as “*it's bananas, right?*” to engage the audience and make her message more memorable.

The **manipulation strategy** is implemented through the tactic of promising in Kamala Harris' speeches. This approach is executed in all the campaign speeches we analyzed through the use of the simple (indefinite) future tense as the primary linguistic means of conveying promises to the broad American populace. For example, in her speeches, Harris frequently states, “*Joe and I will fight for the people every day in the White House...*” Although Harris does not position herself as the primary agent, she emphasizes Joe Biden's role in fulfilling the promise, thereby suggesting that he would be primarily accountable for the outcome. Also, Harris uses contrast and assertive language in order to make the audience trust her: “*This election isn't just about defeating Donald Trump or Mike Pence. It's about building this country back better.*” She makes an attempt to manipulate her audience by not criticizing her opponents directly, but rather focusing on something she and Joe Biden can do. However, later on, she again uses the tactic of promising by repeating the phrase “*we'll*” multiple times to emphasize her and Biden's commitment to specific policy proposals: “*... We'll create millions of jobs ... We'll protect a woman's right to make her own decisions about her own body... We'll ensure every*

voice is heard, and every voice is counted...” Besides, Kamala Harris implements the **tactic of identification with common people** by using personal pronouns such as “we” and “our”: “... we are going to bring our country closer to realizing its great promise, but to do it, we’ll need to work, organize and vote like never before...” This creates a sense of solidarity between the speaker and the audience and reinforces the idea that they are all working together towards a common goal. Sometimes, Harris flatters the audience by stating: “... *You are doing something great. You are the heroes of our time, and you are the reason...*”. She praises ordinary Americans for their efforts and commitment to the fight for justice. By positioning them as important and valued members of the movement, Harris seeks to build rapport with the audience and strengthen their sense of identity as activists and change-makers.

Another example of the tactic of identification with common people can be traced in the following excerpt: “... we are united by the fundamental belief that every human being is of infinite worth, deserving of compassion, dignity and respect. A country where we look out for one another, where we rise and fall as one, where we face our challenges, and celebrate our triumphs—together...” By using a metaphoric phrase ‘we rise and fall as one’ and the word ‘together’, the future Vice President creates a sense of belonging and shared identity. She also reinforces the idea that the audience is part of a larger community with a common goal.

Kamala Harris employs the manipulation strategy when she gives promises on Joe Biden’s behalf, for instance: “... Joe will bring us together to build an economy... Joe will bring us together to end this pandemic ... Joe will bring us together to squarely face and dismantle racial injustice...” She uses the repetition of the phrase with the simple (indefinite) future tense as a means to express the tactic of promising, “*Joe will bring us together.*” This repetition serves to reinforce the message of unity and collaboration, and to create a rhythmic and memorable pattern in the audience’s mind.

In the excerpt, “It’s not about Joe or me. It’s about you. It’s about us.” the manipulation strategy is used as well. Kamala Harris emphasizes that the struggle is not just about her or Joe, but about the audience themselves. By framing the message

in this way, Harris seeks to create a sense of shared responsibility. She uses a clear division of ‘*Joe and her*’ and ‘*you*’ first, but later she creates a sense of connection between the speaker and the audience by using the personal pronoun ‘*us*’.

Additionally, Kamala Harris frequently talks about the hypothetical scenarios of future generations looking back at the present moment and questioning what actions were taken to address the pressing issues of the time, for instance: “... *Years from now, this moment will have passed. And our children and our grandchildren will look in our eyes and ask us: Where were you when the stakes were so high? They will ask us, what was it like? And we will tell them. We will tell them, not just how we felt. We will tell them what we did...*” The use of future tense in the first sentence creates a sense of inevitability and highlights the potential long-term consequences of inaction. The repetition of the phrase “*we will tell them*” emphasizes the importance of taking action and leaves a clear message to the audience that they have a responsibility to act in the present for the benefit of future generations.

Kamala Harris employs the manipulation strategy by asking questions, for example: “... *Joe says you want to talk to me about the economy and asked me how the economy is doing. Then I ask you, how are working people doing? How are working families doing?*” In such a way, Harris shifts the focus of the conversation away from a narrow perspective on the overall economy towards a broader consideration of the well-being of working people and families. By framing the message in this way, Harris seeks to reframe the discussion around economic policy in a way that emphasizes the impact on everyday people. The repetition of the question “*how are working people doing?*” is used to elicit an emotional response from her audience and demonstrate empathy towards their concerns.

Kamala Harris employed a **confrontation communication strategy** throughout her presidential campaign, directed primarily at the 48th President and his Vice President, Donald Trump and Mike Pence. She consistently emphasized the adverse effects of their policies on the American people, substantiating her claims with data and illustrative instances [40]. During her acceptance speech as Joe Biden’s running mate, Kamala Harris employed a confrontation communication strategy by

criticizing Donald Trump for his response to the pandemic. She used **legal jargon** when she confidently stated: “... *the case against Donald Trump and Mike Pence is open and shut...*” By framing the situation as an open and shut case, she seeks to convince the audience that the current administration has failed in their duties and that change is necessary. Harris uses imperative mode to make her audience hear her accusations: “... *Just look where they’ve gotten us...*”, and she follows it up by presenting evidence to support her claims, such as statistics on unemployment, school closures, and lives lost due to the pandemic: “... *more than 16 million out of work, millions of kids who cannot go back to school, more than 165,000 lives that have been cut short, many with loved ones who never got the chance to say goodbye...*” Later, she is directly blaming Trump for the negative impact of the pandemic on the United States. She uses a rhetorical device of contrasting the US with other advanced nations to emphasize the severity of the situation in the country: “... *there’s a reason it has hit America worse than any other advanced nation...*” She also uses a series of accusations against Trump, such as his failure to take the virus seriously from the start, his refusal to get testing up and running, and his delusional belief that he knows better than the experts. Harris uses emotive language to convey her message. She employs negative words, such as “*failure,*” “*refusal,*” and “*delusional,*” to describe Trump's actions, which creates a negative image of him in the minds of the audience. She also uses alliteration in the metaphorical phrase: “*flip-flopping on social distancing and wearing masks,*” to make her message more memorable and impactful.

Additionally, Harris uses a tactic of blaming Trump for his failures of leadership and being the reason of the economic decline, as he inherited a booming economy from Obama and Biden. She uses a metaphor, “*he ran it straight into the ground*” to emphasize the gravity of the situation. Besides, Harris uses a direct, accusatory tone when referring to Trump, such as “*this is what happens when we elect a guy who just isn't up for the job.*”

During the speech at DNC, Kamala Harris continues to use confrontation strategy and criticizes Donald Trump's leadership during the COVID-19 pandemic.

She starts with the use of time reference “*today*” to emphasize the current state of the country, and then blames Trump's “*failure of leadership*” for the negative impact on the American people: “...*9 Today... that country feels distant...*” The use of the words “*cost lives and livelihoods*” is a powerful linguistic choice that shows the severity of the situation and places the blame on Trump. The use of repetition with the same sentence structure, “*Donald Trump's failure of leadership*” also adds emphasis to the message and helps to reinforce Harris' point.

Furthermore, at Biden Campaign Event in Florida, she criticizes Trump's efforts to overturn the Affordable Care Act through a lawsuit with Bill Barr in the Supreme Court, which could result in the loss of healthcare for 20 million people. She uses an adjective “*shameful*” to convey her disapproval of Trump's actions. She then highlights the clear contrast between Biden and Trump's tax policies, with Biden promising not to raise taxes on anyone making less than \$400,000 per year while Trump passed tax breaks for the wealthiest 1% and corporations: “... *On the one hand, you have Joe Biden saying taxes will not be raised on anyone making less than \$400,000 per year. On the other hand, you have Donald Trump, who passed tax breaks for the 1% and biggest corporations in America...*” The repetition of the phrase “*on the one hand*” and “*on the other hand*” helps to emphasize the contrast between the current president and the future president of the USA. Harris also appeals to the audience's emotions by mentioning the struggles of people in Florida and providing statistics to support her statement: “... *One in eight Floridians is describing themselves as being hungry...*”. She uses a tactic of direct discrediting and accuses President Trump of failing to inform the American people about the lethal nature of COVID-19 despite knowing it from January 28, 2020. Harris addresses Floridians directly and uses language to emphasize Trump's failure to act responsibly, stating that he “*did not tell you what he knew*” and “*held onto that information, he covered it up.*” This type of language aims to attack Trump's character and undermine his credibility as a leader. She also says, “*Imagine if you knew on January 20 what he knew on January 28, and what you might have done or been able to do to protect your family.*” This statement is designed to make the

audience think about the potential impact of Trump's actions on their own lives and those of their loved ones. Additionally, Harris uses rhetorical questions to highlight the absurdity of Trump's behavior, such as *“What is that about?”* when referring to Trump's mixed messaging about wearing masks.

Another reason for discrediting Trump was his promotion of hate and division among Americans. By saying that *“we are done with a so-called leader,”* Kamala Harris implies that Trump is not a true leader and has not acted in the best interest of the American people. She positions Joe Biden as the solution to this problem, as someone who understands the need for unity and will work towards it: *“... Joe knows that we are done with a so-called leader who has spent full time trying to spread hate and division between us, trying to get Americans to turn on each other...”* The use of the phrase *“trying to get Americans to turn on each other...”* suggests that Trump's actions are deliberate and malicious. On the other hand, the use of the personal pronoun *“we”* creates a sense of unity between Harris, Biden, and the audience, and implies that they are all on the same side against Trump's divisive tactics.

The rhetoric of blaming Trump for the failure to successfully deal with the pandemic was used as well when Kamala Harris was giving comments to reporters in Detroit in October 2020. She confidently states, *“This is the greatest failure of any presidential administration in the history of America.”* The use of the superlative form helps to emphasize her criticism. Additionally, she repeats the simile *“like the flu”* twice to draw attention to the administration's false comparison: *“... You can't control it like the flu. And yet again, they're suggesting to the American people that this is like the flu, when we have known from the beginning...”*

Kamala Harris is using a confrontation strategy to address the issue of abortion rights. She is warning her audience about the Republican leaders who are trying to ban abortion and calling for people who have the courage to stand up against it. The strategy is evident in her use of the reported speech and the implication that the Republican leaders are threatening reproductive rights: *“... Because, listen, guys, if this happens, as these Republicans are trying to push so many of their leaders, they have said there will be a national ban on abortion...”* Harris uses inclusive language

by using the word “*guys*” to address her audience. She uses a rhetorical device, repetition, to emphasize the point that Republican leaders are trying to ban abortion, using the phrase “*national ban on abortion*” twice in the same sentence.

We can conclude that Kamala Harris applies various communication strategies to accomplish her political aims during the presidential campaign. She implements self-presentation strategy by portraying herself as Joe Biden's ally and underscoring their shared values. To foster a relatable image with ordinary Americans, she incorporates personal anecdotes. Regarding appeal, she frequently employs the imperative mode and phrases such as '*let's*' to prompt her audience to take action. She also uses '*must*' to instill a sense of urgency in her audience. To connect with the common people, Harris uses inclusive language and commits to assisting people to vote for Biden, displaying her manipulation strategy. Finally, Harris resorts to the confrontation strategy to denounce her political opponents, mainly the Republican Party and Donald Trump, highlighting their failures and weaknesses.

3.2. Kamala Harris' rhetoric as the Vice President

Kamala Harris made history on January 20th, 2021 as she became the first woman to hold the position of Vice President of the United States of America following the successful elections. As the Vice President of the United States, Kamala Harris is using her rhetoric to emphasize key issues and priorities of the Biden-Harris administration.

While delivering her speeches, Kamala Harris uses a variety of communication strategies and tactics that constitute her language profile. The self-representation strategy is implemented in Harris' speeches through a number of tactics. First of all, she addresses Americans in her speeches directly by means of the personal pronoun '*you*'. Such a tactic makes it possible to show preferences and guidelines of the speaker in her communication with audience. The Vice President prefers to focus on her allies and supporters first rather than bringing up her opponents: “*And you delivered a clear message. You chose hope and unity, decency, science, and yes, truth!*” Kamala Harris mentions the President many times in all her speeches, which

allows us to conclude that she associates him with the main driving force of the democracy, while she occupies the secondary role: *“You chose Joe Biden as the next president of the United States of America! And Joe is a healer, a uniter, a tested and steady hand. And while I first knew Joe as vice president, I really got to know him as the father who loved Beau, my dear friend who we remember here today. We are so grateful to Joe and Jill for welcoming our family into theirs on this incredible journey. And it is now my great honour to introduce the president-elect of the United States of America, Joe Biden! My fellow Americans, it is my honor to introduce a public servant with the character and fortitude to meet this moment...”* Harris uses formal and elevated language to convey her message. She uses a series of nouns and states that Joe Biden is *“a healer, a uniter, a tested and steady hand”* and *“a public servant”* to emphasize the nature of Joe Biden's role. She frequently addresses her audience as *“you, the people”*, which adds up the emphasis on the fact that she is a people-centered leader.

Besides, Kamala Harris employs a self-presentation communication strategy by emphasizing her and President Biden's commitment to upholding the Constitution of the United States. By doing so, she presents herself and the President as dedicated and responsible public servants who are committed to protecting the values and principles upon which the nation was founded: *“... That is the preamble of the Constitution that President Biden and I swore an oath to uphold and defend. And that is the enduring promise of the United States of America...”* She uses the phrase *“swore an oath”* to emphasize the solemnity and gravity of the commitment she and President Biden made to uphold the Constitution.

As the Vice President, Kamala Harris continues to quote Congressman John Lewis in her speeches, which can be seen as a component of her self-presentation strategy. She started her victory speech with his words: *“Congressman John Lewis before his passing wrote, “Democracy is not a state, it is an act.”* She positions herself and her administration as defenders of democracy and highlights the importance of working together to protect it. Harris also mentions that the success of democracy depends on the citizens: *“... we, the people, have the power to build a*

better future...” The use of the phrase “*we, the people*” creates a sense of shared responsibility and power.

The Vice President implements a **tactic of expressing her gratitude** to those who voted for Biden and her: “*Thank you for doing what you did...*”. This approach enables Harris to acknowledge the contributions of all Americans towards her achievement. In addition, she expresses gratitude towards her family, particularly her mother, and brings focus to matters of race: “*...so grateful ... to the woman most responsible for my presence here today, my mother... She believed so deeply in an America where a moment like this is possible, and so I am thinking about her and about the generations of women, Black women, Asian, white, Latina, Native American women...*”

As part of her self-presentation strategy, Harris lists specific accomplishments of both the 49th President and herself to demonstrate tangible results. For example, she pays a lot of attention to protecting women’s right to make their own decisions in regard to their bodies: “*... President Biden — I’m announcing it today — has issued a presidential memorandum... we work to protect this aspect of reproductive care, many states have gone even further and now have total bans in effect...*” Harris's use of the phrase “*total bans in effect*” is an example of hyperbole, as not all states have enacted total bans. However, this exaggeration serves to emphasize the severity of the situation and the urgent need for action to protect reproductive rights.

Kamala Harris showcases her understanding of the varied makeup of the American population by frequently giving speeches to acknowledge the holidays of different national minorities. A notable instance of this is her address on Diwali at the White House. By acknowledging the global celebration of Diwali and framing it as a unifying event with more than 1 billion participants, Harris seeks to position herself as a leader who is connected to and respects people from different cultures and backgrounds: “*... Tonight, of course, we join with more than 1 billion people around the world to light the diya and to celebrate the fight for good over evil, knowledge over ignorance, and light over darkness...*” Harris's use of the term “*diya*” is a specific and deliberate word choice that shows her familiarity with the traditions and

practices of the Diwali holiday. By using this term instead of a more generic term like “*candle*,” Harris demonstrates a deeper level of understanding and respect for the significance of the holiday. The use of the phrase “*fight for good over evil, knowledge over ignorance, and light over darkness*” is an example of rhetorical devices of antithesis and tricolon, which creates a memorable and impactful message. The use of contrast and repetition serves to emphasize the importance of the holiday's themes of enlightenment, justice, and hope.

After assuming office as the 49th Vice President of the USA, Kamala Harris reduced her usage of personal anecdotes as a communication strategy. During the speeches we analyzed, she only utilized personal anecdotes on two occasions. In one of these instances, during her remarks commemorating the 50th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, Harris employed the communication strategy of a personal anecdote to create an emotional connection with her audience and establish shared understanding. By sharing a personal experience that took place in her home state of California, she is attempting to convey her empathy for the victims and their families, as well as her commitment to finding solutions to this problem: “... *So, before we — before we talk about the subject for which we are all convened, I do want to address the tragedy of what happened in my state, in Monterey Park, California. A time of a cultural celebration, and yet another community has been torn apart by senseless gun violence...*” When she uses the word “*tragedy*,” she also communicates the severity of the event and the fact that it has had a deep impact on the community. Harris also uses a rhetorical technique known as parallelism to create a sense of balance and symmetry in her statement. The repetition of the phrase “*before we*” creates a sense of anticipation, drawing the audience's attention to the upcoming discussion of the topic at hand.

During her speech at the 2021 Naval Academy graduation, Kamala Harris employed the strategy of personal anecdote for a second time to demonstrate her proficiency in the field of cybersecurity. By recalling her experience visiting the USS *Scranton* and talking with officers about cybersecurity, Harris is attempting to establish her credentials and position herself as a knowledgeable and reliable

authority on the topic. While sharing this story, Harris used a dialogue, which helped to make the story more interactive and engaging for the audience: “*So when I was aboard the vessel, I asked the officers, I said, “Hey, tell me, what does it take to protect such a valuable asset against cyberattacks?” And they told me, “You know, it’s pretty simple, equipment and experts.”*” This story was an introduction, followed by Harris' personal appeal to the alumni to elevate their status and emphasize the importance of their role in protecting the nation's assets: “... *the way I see it, midshipmen, you, you, you are those experts on the issue of cybersecurity...*” She addresses the midshipmen directly, using inclusive language and repeating the personal pronoun ‘you’ three times to make them feel valued.

Kamala Harris does not frequently use the **appeal strategy** in her speeches as Vice President. In fact, only half of the speeches that we analyzed contained this particular communication strategy. In the Diwali speech, the communication strategy of appeal is used to motivate the audience to action. By invoking the celebration of the holiday, and its symbolism of light triumphing over darkness, Harris is calling upon them to work towards a brighter future: “... *let us continue to make real the ideals of our nation — the ideals of freedom, democracy, and equality for all. Together, let us, all together, light the way toward a better future...*” Harris uses inclusive language to make the audience feel like they are part of a collective effort. She uses the phrase “*let us*” three times in this short passage, emphasizing the importance of working together to achieve common goals. She also uses repetition and parallelism to create a sense of rhythm and momentum in her statement. Harris also uses emotive language to appeal to the audience's emotions. While describing the ideals of freedom, democracy, and equality as “*real*,” she is emphasizing their importance and implying that they may not be fully realized yet. She also uses a metaphoric phrase “*light the way*” to create a vivid image of hope and progress.

Another instance of Kamala Harris implementing the appeal strategy can be observed in her address at the Naval Academy graduation in 2021. She uses a call-to-action tactic expressed by the modal verb ‘must’: “... *we must defend our nation against these threats. And at the same time, we must make advances in things that*

you've been learning, things like quantum computing and artificial intelligence and robotics..." Harris uses inclusive language to make the audience feel like they are part of a larger mission to advance the nation's strategic advantage. The use of the phrase *"you will be the ones to do it"* empowers the audience by placing the responsibility of advancing the nation in their hands. This use of the second-person pronoun *"you"* is a powerful way to directly address the audience and make them feel like they have an important role to play. Additionally, she encourages the graduates to hold on to the best of humanity and the ideals they stand for. She then calls on them to fight for these ideals and for democracy, making an emotional appeal to their values: *"... So hold on to that, because in your career, you may witness some of the worst of humanity, but promise that you will never forget the best of who we are, that you will never forget the ideals you stand for, duty, honor, loyalty. Fight for those ideals and fight for our democracy..."* Harris uses imperative verbs to convey a sense of urgency and command, such as *"hold on to that," "promise,"* and *"fight."* She also uses emotive language, such as *"the worst of humanity"* and *"the best of who we are,"* to create an emotional response in the audience. The repetition of the word *"never"* emphasizes the importance of remembering and standing for these ideals.

Kamala Harris uses the **manipulation communication strategy** a lot in her speeches as the Vice President. In her remarks on January 6 anniversary, she uses a **tactic of identification with ordinary people**, namely her staff. She mentioned that she was at the Capitol that morning on January 6, 2021, at a classified hearing. When the Capitol was attacked by Trump's supporters, she *"had left"*, but her thoughts *"immediately turned not only to my colleagues, but to the staff, who had been forced to seek refuge in our office, converting filing cabinets into barricades..."* Her description of the danger and fear that her staff experienced during the insurrection helped her create an image of a caring person. These words can also be seen as those serving to humanize her staff and make the audience empathize with them. However, the language used is quite formal and official, which is appropriate given the context of the speech. The use of specific details, such as the conversion of *"filing cabinets*

into barricades,” helps to create a vivid and memorable image in the listener's mind and make them empathize. Later, she said: “...*our thoughts are with all of the families who have lost a loved one...*” and these words express a message of sympathy and condolences for those who have lost someone. Kamala Harris uses the possessive pronoun “*our*” to signal a shared sense of responsibility or empathy with the intended audience. The phrase “*thoughts are with*” is an idiomatic expression Harris used to convey sympathy or support.

In her speeches as the Vice President, Kamala Harris continues to use the **tactic of promising** as well. She addresses the common people with words such as, “... *we will applaud you every step of the way...*” and uses future indefinite tense to express a promise. Additionally, Harris states, “*I will strive to be a vice president like Joe was to President Obama, loyal, honest, and prepared...*” and again employs the future indefinite tense, while also comparing herself to Joe Biden when he served as the Vice President.

Harris employs the **tactic of promising** and employs the future indefinite tense to make a commitment on behalf of Joe Biden, the 49th president, stating that he is “... *a commander in chief who will respect our troops and keep our country safe and a president for all Americans...*” These words help to create a positive perception of Biden with the intention of gaining broader support from Americans.

Kamala Harris combines the **promising tactic** and the **tactic of identification with ordinary people** when she was campaigning with Governor Hochul at Barnard College: “... *We will stand for the voices that we know have everything on the line. And we will fight for the principles that we know we hold dear, the ideals we hold dear...*” In this way, she includes the addressee into her inner circle, which unites her with the public and makes them accept her views and share responsibilities. Also, Kamala Harris uses simple (indefinite) future tense as the linguistic means of promising tactic in order to manipulate the vast masses of Americans.

Kamala Harris employs the **confrontation communication strategy** while addressing her opponents, the Republicans, but she resorts to discrediting them less frequently than during the presidential campaign. She expresses her criticism towards

Trump's supporters using a series of metaphors: "*democracy was on the ballot,*" "*soul of America at stake.*" For instance, in her remarks on January 6 anniversary, Harris uses the passive voice while speaking about the protesters attempting to disrupt the Electoral College vote count and to pressure Congress and Vice President Mike Pence to overturn the election of Joe Biden in favour of Trump, and in such a way she implements the **tactic of indirect discrediting**: "*The gates of the Capitol were breached. The institutions, the values, the ideals of Americans were assaulted.*"

Harris implements the tactic of direct discrediting in her speeches as the Vice President as well. One of such examples might be when she was directly criticizing the Republican Party's stance on abortion. Harris uses the phrase "*listen, guys*" to capture the audience's attention and create a sense of urgency. She then goes on to use the phrase "*these Republicans,*" which is an example of name-calling used to label and attack the opposing party: "... *listen, guys, if this happens, as these Republicans are trying to push so many of their leaders, they have said there will be a national ban on abortion...*" Later, she asserts that Republicans want to have a national ban on abortion with the purpose to create fear and concern among the audience, which Harris believes will motivate them to support her stance on the issue. Additionally, she says, "... *people live in fear of what might be next because Republicans in Congress are now calling for a nationwide abortion ban...*" Her use of the phrase "*people live in fear*" is a form of emotional appeal, attempting to create fear in the audience and position the opposing party as a threat to their well-being. The word "*nationwide*" emphasizes the potential scale and severity of the policy. The use of the noun "*people*" instead of "*women*" is a deliberate choice to broaden the audience and emphasize that this issue affects everyone, not just women. The phrase "*what might be next*" creates a sense of uncertainty and implies that the opposing party is unpredictable and potentially dangerous.

Another example of using the confrontation strategy can be found in Harris' words when she criticized a decision made by the United States Supreme Court, which she sees as taking away a fundamental right to make decisions about her own body from American women: "... *last June, the United States Supreme Court took*

away that constitutional right — a fundamental right, a basic freedom — from the people of America...” Harris uses persuasive language and repetition to emphasize her argument. She repeats the phrase “*a fundamental right, a basic freedom,*” to emphasize the significance of the issue at hand. She also uses emotionally charged words such as “*took away*” and “*people of America*” to create a sense of urgency and highlight the perceived injustice of the Supreme Court's decision.

In the remarks commemorating Roe v. Wade 50th anniversary, Kamala Harris is using the confrontation communication strategy by calling out politicians who claim to be champions of freedom while simultaneously restricting the rights of the American people: “... *and can we truly be free if so-called leaders claim to be, quote — I quote, “on the vanguard of freedom,” while they dare to restrict the rights of the American people and attack the very foundations of freedom?..*” Harris’ use of the phrase “*so-called leaders*” is confrontational in nature, as it implies that these politicians are not actually deserving of the title of leader. She is using a rhetorical question and quotation to emphasize her point. By asking “*can we truly be free?*” she is challenging the notion that these politicians are promoting freedom, and by quoting the phrase “*on the vanguard of freedom,*” she is emphasizing the hypocrisy of their actions. The use of the word “*dare*” also adds a confrontational tone, as it suggests that these politicians are acting recklessly and disrespectfully towards the American people.

It can be concluded that Kamala Harris implements various communication strategies to achieve her political objectives while serving as the Vice President. One such strategy is self-presentation, in which she portrays herself as an ally of Joe Biden and highlights their shared values, as well as their accomplishments during their tenure in office. Another component of her self-presentation strategy is the use of the phrase “*We the people,*” which conveys the notion that the government should work for all Americans, regardless of their background or circumstances. This phrase emphasizes inclusivity, diversity, and the need for policies that address the concerns of all citizens. Harris does not heavily rely on personal anecdotes in her speeches as Vice President. Regarding the appeal strategy, Harris frequently employs the

imperative mode and uses phrases like “*let’s*” to urge her audience to take action. As part of her manipulation strategy, Harris uses the tactics of identifying with common people and promising. While she does resort to the confrontation strategy occasionally to criticize her political opponents, especially the Republican Party, she focuses more on the direct discrediting rather than indirect criticism.

Conclusion to chapter 3

Communication strategies and tactics play a crucial role in the pragmatic analysis of the language used in political discourse. One such notable personality is Kamala Harris, the 49th Vice President of the United States. In our research, we have meticulously scrutinized her language peculiarities and communication strategies. To obtain a comprehensive understanding of her language profile, we have studied thirteen of Harris' speeches. These speeches include seven delivered during the presidential campaign and six during her tenure as the Vice President.

Upon analyzing Harris' speeches, we have discovered notable differences in her communication strategies and rhetoric between the two phases of her political career. Our research reveals that during the presidential campaign, Harris used a more persuasive approach to communicate with her audience, which included the implementation of self-presentation strategy and the use of a plethora of personal anecdotes in order to tell the audience more about her background and the background of Joe Biden. She also employed the strategy of appeal, using the phrase “*we the people*” to emphasize the importance of unity and coming together as a nation. Additionally, Harris employed a confrontation strategy, directly challenging her opponents on their policies, records, and statements.

Conversely, as Vice President, she has adapted her communication style to convey a more authoritative and diplomatic tone. She still uses a self-presentation strategy to show herself and Joe Biden in a more favorable light. Additionally, she attempts to draw the audience’s attention by enumerating what has been done by the president and herself during their time in the office. However, since she has become the 49th Vice President of the USA, Harris has significantly reduced the use of

personal anecdotes in her speeches. Moreover, she continues to use the confrontation strategy, however she does not use a tactic of direct discrediting and prefers to do this indirectly.

Overall, our analysis shows that Kamala Harris' rhetoric has evolved to suit her current role as Vice President. Her focus has shifted from campaigning to governing, which requires a different approach to communication.

CONCLUSIONS

The research on the topical question of the language profiles of two prominent female politicians Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris has met its objective and allowed to make the following conclusions.

The concept of political discourse was scrutinized. Our research has led to conclude that political discourse is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that plays a significant role in shaping public perception and understanding of political events and issues. This distinct type of discourse is characterized by its focus on persuasion and its use of language to achieve specific goals related to political power. Political can be classified in several ways, including by the nature of the subject or author, the nature of the addressee, and the form of the discourse, such as oral or written.

The concept of the language profile in the political discourse was examined. Language profile is a system of certain linguistic characteristics inherent in the speech of a particular personality, which makes the person's way of linguistic expression embodied in their speech unique. It consists of three main components: the verbal, the value and the personal ones.

The concepts of communication strategy and tactic were analyzed and the pragmatic approach to the analysis of the language profile of political figures was provided. Communication strategy in political discourse means the optimal realization of the intentions of the speaker, aimed at achieving a certain goal of communication, which involves compliance with laws and rules of the definite communication situations. Communication tactic is a partial phenomenon, a separate tool for implementing the overall strategy. In our paper we have analyzed the language profiles of Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris according to the following communication strategies: self-representation, personal anecdote, appeal, manipulation, and confrontation.

Nancy Pelosi's language profile has been analyzed based on thirteen of her speeches, with a focus on the communication strategies mentioned previously. These

strategies are apparent in all her speeches, but their application varies depending on the topic. Self-presentation and appeal are the most frequently used strategies across all of her speeches. Pelosi's personal anecdotes stand out due to the inclusion of humor, making them more engaging and relatable to her audience. Her language profile also demonstrates a talent for clear messaging, simplifying complex topics for the audience. Pelosi frequently uses inclusive language to highlight the importance of diversity and inclusivity. Additionally, she incorporates rhetorical devices like repetition, alliteration, and metaphors to make her message more impactful and memorable. An example of this is her frequent use of the phrase "For the People" to emphasize her party's commitment to the needs of ordinary Americans.

Our research has shown that Nancy Pelosi is a skilled and strategic communicator. Her language style tends to be formal and professional, and she often uses rhetorical devices and persuasive techniques to convey her messages effectively. She also has an ability to convey complex policy ideas in a clear and concise manner, often using vivid language to make her points. Pelosi's language profile also reflects her political ideologies as a Democrat. She is known for advocating progressive policies and often uses inclusive language that promotes social and economic equality, and highlights issues such as healthcare, climate change, and women's rights. She is also known for her sharp debating skills and ability to engage in robust political discourse, often using persuasive language to advance her party's agenda.

The language profile of Kamala Harris during the presidential campaign and as the Vice President has been analyzed based on thirteen of her speeches. Every speech was analyzed according to the communication strategies mentioned previously. Kamala Harris's language profile is characterized by her dynamic and versatile communication skills. She has an articulate and confident speaking style and often uses clear and concise language to convey her messages. As a former prosecutor and attorney general, Harris has a background in legal and policy-oriented language. She often employs precise and technical language when discussing legal matters or policy initiatives. Her language style can be assertive and determined, reflecting her background in law enforcement and advocacy. Additionally, Harris's language profile

reflects her multicultural background as an African American and Asian American woman. She often emphasizes the importance of diversity, inclusivity, and representation in her language, and has been known to use language to highlight her personal experiences and heritage. It can be concluded that Kamala Harris implements all five communication strategies in her speeches. One such strategy is self-presentation, in which she portrays herself as an ally of Joe Biden and highlights their shared values, as well as their accomplishments during their tenure in office. Another component of her self-presentation strategy is the use of the phrase “We the people,” which conveys the notion that the government should work for all Americans, regardless of their background or circumstances. Harris does not heavily rely on personal anecdotes in her speeches as Vice President, however during the presidential campaign she was prone to telling personal stories to her audience. Regarding the appeal strategy, Harris frequently employs the imperative mode and uses phrases like “let's” to urge her audience to take action. As part of her manipulation strategy, Harris uses the tactics of identifying with common people and promising. Both during the presidential campaign and her time in the office, she resorts to the confrontation strategy to criticize her political opponents, especially the Republican Party. During the presidential campaign Harris preferred a tactic of direct discrediting, whereas as the Vice President she prefers to criticize her opponents indirectly.

The research has found that Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris both use the communication strategies mentioned earlier, but the frequency of their use differs. Self-presentation and appeal strategies are used equally by both politicians, while manipulation and confrontation strategies are more prominent in Harris' language profile. Kamala Harris also uses legal jargon more often in her speeches. In contrast, Nancy Pelosi is known for her articulate and persuasive communication style, utilizing personal anecdotes to connect with the audience and emphasize her points. Pelosi is skilled in using complex language and rhetorical devices to express her ideas and arguments clearly and effectively. Both Pelosi and Harris have unique language profiles that reflect their personalities and communication styles, with Pelosi favoring

complex language and rhetorical devices, while Harris relies on passionate and straightforward language.

The study of the language profiles of Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris has yielded significant insights that can serve as valuable information for investigating the language profiles of other politicians. Our findings suggest that a politician's personal language profile can have a significant impact on how millions of people perceive the world today. Political speeches have immense influence in modern society, and our research emphasizes the importance of understanding and analyzing the communication strategies and styles of politicians.

The future research in this area could further explore the language profiles of other prominent politicians, both male and female, to gain a deeper understanding of how political discourse is shaped and how communication strategies are implemented in different contexts. Comparative studies could be conducted to analyze the similarities and differences in language profiles among politicians from various political ideologies, cultures, and regions. Additionally, research could investigate the impact of language profiles on public perception, voter behavior, and political outcomes, and how politicians adapt their language profiles in different settings, such as during election campaigns or while in office. Further investigation into the role of rhetorical devices and other linguistic features in political discourse could provide insights into how language is used to persuade, manipulate, and confront in the political arena. The use of computational methods, such as natural language processing and machine learning, could also be employed to analyze large datasets of political speeches and identify patterns and trends in language profiles. Overall, further research in this area has the potential to contribute to our understanding of political communication and its impact on society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Бацевич Ф. С. Основы коммуникативной лингвистики / Ф. С. Бацевич. – Київ: Академія. – 2004. – с. 344.
2. Виноградов В. А. Идиолект // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь, М., 1990.
3. Дацюк С. Коммуникативные стратегии [Электронный ресурс] // Центр гуманитарных технологий. 2006. – URL: <http://gtmarket.ru/laboratory/expertize/2006/2751>.
4. Демьянков В. З. Политический дискурс как предмет политологической филологии / Демьянков В. З. // Политическая наука. Политический дискурс: история и современные исследования. – 2002. – №3. – с. 32–43.
5. Иссерс О. С. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи / Иссерс О. С. // Москва : Едиториал. – 2002. – с. 284.
6. Ідіолект // Літературознавчий словник-довідник – К.: ВЦ “Академія”. - 2007. – с. 293.
7. Ільченко М. Тактики ініціації говоріння в англomовному електоральному дискурсі / М. Ільченко. // Вісник ХНУ. – 2012. – №1003. – с. 34–40.
8. Караулов Ю. Русский язык и языковая личность / Караулов Ю. А. // Москва: Издательство ЛКИ. - 2010.
9. Красных, В. В. Этнопсихолінгвістика і лінгвокультурологія / Красных В. В.. // Москва: Гнозис. - 2002.
10. Чудинов, А. П. Политический дискурс: коммуникативные стратегии и тактики. / Чудинов, А. П. // Международный журнал прикладной лингвистики и английской литературы. - 2012. - №1. - с. 12-18.
11. Чудинов, А. П. Типология политического дискурса: Содержание и структура / Чудинов, А. П. // Вестник Московского университета психологии и педагогики. - 2016. - №28. - с. 91-104.
12. Шейгал Е. И. Семиотика политического дискурса: монография / Шейгал Е. И. // Волгоград: Перемена. – 2004. – с. 367.

- 13.Шейгал, Е. И. Политический дискурс: определение, типы и функции / Шейгал Е. И. // Журнал Сибирского федерального университета. Humanities & Social Sciences. - 2018. - №11. - с. 251-261.
- 14.Шейгал, Е. И. Понятие власти в политическом дискурсе / Шейгал Е. И. // Всемирный журнал прикладных наук. - 2016. - №34. - с. 888-892.
- 15.Шмелева, Е. А. Функционально-семантические характеристики фразеологических единиц в художественном тексте. / Шмелева, Е. А., Шмелев, А. Д.. // Журнал "Язык и Литература". - 2017. - №8. - с. 42-50.
- 16.Al-Abboodi M. Critical stylistic analysis of american political language / Mustafa AL-Abboodi. // European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability. – 2021. – №12.
- 17.Al-Khatib M. Authorship verification of opinion articles in online newspapers using the idiolect of author: a comparative study / Al-Khatib M., Al-Qaoud J.. // Information Communication and Society. – 2020. 24(11), p. 1–19.
- 18.Belova A.D. Communicative strategies and tactics: problems of systematization/ Belova A.D. // Мовні і концептуальні картини світу: зб. наук. пр. – К.: КНУ ім. Т. Шевченка. – 2004. – р. 11-16.
- 19.Benveniste E. Problèmes de linguistique générale (General linguistic problems) / Benveniste E.. – Paris: Gallimard, 1966.
- 20.Biber D. Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use / Biber D., Conrad S., Reppen R.. // Cambridge University Press. – 1998.
- 21.Billig M. Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction. Sage Publications. / Billig M.. – 1999.
- 22.Brader T. Striking a Responsive Chord: How Political Ads Motivate and Persuade Voters by Appealing to Emotions / Ted Brader. // American Journal of Political Science. – 2005. – p. 388–405.
- 23.Britney C. Joseph. The Use of Women’s Language Features by Kamala Harris in the Vice-presidential Debate. / Britney C. Joseph, Lina P. Hartanti, Ayunita Leliana. // Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Arts and Humanities 2021. – 2021.

24. Chadwick A. Handbook of Internet Politics / Chadwick A., Howard P. N. // New York, Routledge. – 2018.
25. Chilton, P. Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice / Chilton, P. // Routledge. – 2004.
26. Chilton, P. Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse / Chilton, P., Schäffner, C.. // John Benjamins Publishing. – 2002.
27. Coulthard, M. Author Identification, Idiolect, and Linguistic Uniqueness / Coulthard, M.. // Applied Linguistics, 25(4). – 2004. – p. 431–447.
28. Danet, B. The multilingual internet: Language, culture, and communication online / Danet, B., Herring, S. C.. // New York: Oxford University Press. – 2007. – p. 1–26.
29. Dijk T. A. van. Ideology. A Multidisciplinary Approach / Dijk T. A. van. // L. : Sage Public. Ltd.. – 1998. – p. 384.
30. Dijk T. A. van. Social Cognition and Discourse / Dijk T. A. van. // H. Giles & R.P. Robinson (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology and language. – 1989. – p. 163–183.
31. Dijk, T. A. Strategies of Discourse Comprehension / Dijk, T. A., Kintsch W.. // New York: Academic Press. – 1983.
32. Discourse Analysis Means Doing Analysis: A Critique of Six Analytic Shortcomings [Электронный ресурс] / Antaki C., Billig M.G., Edwards D., Potter J.A. // Discourse Analysis Online. – 2003. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <http://www.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/v1/n1/a1/antaki2002002-paper.html>.
33. Effective Communications Between the Public Service and the Media. [Электронный ресурс] // SIGMA Papers. – 1996. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://doi.org/10.1787/5kml6g6m8zjl-en>.
34. El Wafa Adel Abu. Discourse Tagging of Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Study. / El Wafa Adel Abu. // Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research. – 2019. – №3. – p. 209–221.

35. Esser, F. Mediatization of politics: Understanding the transformation of Western democracies. / Esser, F., Strömbäck, J.. // Palgrave Macmillan. – 2014.
36. Fairclough N. Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language / Fairclough N. Longman, 1995. – p.268.
37. Fairclough N. Media Discourse / N. Fairclough. – L. : Hodder Education, 1995. – p. 224.
38. Fairclough, N. Discourse and social change / Fairclough, N.. // Polity press. – 1992.
39. Fairclough, N. Language and Power / Fairclough, N.. // Routledge. – 2015.
40. Faris R. Polarization and the Pandemic: American Political Discourse [Электронный ресурс] / R. Faris, J. Clark. – 2020. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://cyber.harvard.edu/publication/2020/polarization-and-pandemic-american-political-discourse>
41. García-Sierra, A. Personal sense and idiolect: combining authorship attribution and opinion analysis. / García-Sierra, A., García-Zorita, C.. // Digital Scholarship in the Humanities. – 2014. – №29. – p. 86–99.
42. Gardner, A. L. The dangers of relying on anecdotes in policymaking. / Gardner, A. L., Leep, C. J.. // The American Journal of Nursing. – 2015. – №115. – p. 11–12.
43. Gee, J. P. An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method / Gee, J. P.. // Routledge. – 2014.
44. Gee, J. P. Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses. / Gee, J. P.. – London: Taylor & Francis, 1990.
45. Griffin, E. A. A first look at communication theory / Griffin, E. A.. // McGraw-Hill Education. – 2018.
46. Haaland C. Political Success and the Media / Connor J. Haaland. // The Journal of Undergraduate Research. – 2017.
47. Halliday M. Linguistic studies of text and discourse / Halliday M., 2002.
48. Halliday M. Linguistic Studies of Text and Discourse / Halliday M.A.K. - United Kingdom : Bloomsbury Academic, 2002. – p. 301.

49. Halliday, M. Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning. / Halliday, M. // Edward Arnold. – 1978.
50. Halliday, M. Text and Context in Functional Linguistics. / Halliday, M. // John Benjamins Publishing. – 1992.
51. Hanan A. Amaireh. Corpus-Based Analysis of the Feminine Style of Kamala Harris' Discourse: Women (Not Men) Are the Backbone of America's Democracy and Economy / Hanan A. Amaireh. // Academy Publication. – 2022.
52. Hazen K. Idiolect / K. Hazen // Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics /– Oxford: Elsevier, 2006. — p. 512–513.
53. Heritage J. Language and Social Institutions: The Conversation Analytic View / John Heritage. – 2013.
54. How to Develop a Communication Strategy - The Compass for SBC. [Электронный ресурс]. – 2022. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://thecompassforsbc.org/how-to-guide/how-develop-communication-strategy>.
55. Issers, O.S. Communicative strategies and tactics of Russian speech / Issers, O.S.. // Moscow: Lki. – 2008.
56. Kasper, G. Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives / Kasper, G., Kellerman, E.. // New York: Routledge. – 2014
57. Key concepts in communication and cultural studies / O'Sullivan, T., Hartley, J., Saunders, D. та ін.], 2013.
58. Koester, A. Discourse and identity in applied linguistics / Koester, A.. // Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. – 2010. – №30. – p. 126–146.
59. Koller, V. Analyzing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor / Koller, V. // The handbook of discourse analysis / Koller, V., 2004. – p. 380–397.
60. Lakoff, G. Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think / Lakoff, G., 1996.

61. Lakoff, G. *The All New Don't Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate* / Lakoff, G., 2018.
62. Lakoff, G. *The Political Mind: Why You Can't Understand 21st-Century American Politics with an 18th-Century Brain* / Lakoff, G., 2008.
63. Lakoff, G. *The political mind: Why you can't understand 21st-century American politics with an 18th-century brain* / Lakoff, G., 2008.
64. Lewandowska E. *English as a lingua franca: an overview of communicative strategies* / Elwira Lewandowska // *Rethinking directions in language learning and teaching at university level* / Elwira Lewandowska., 2019. – p. 27–52.
65. Mayer W. *In Defense of Negative Campaigning* / William G. Mayer. // *Political Science Quarterly*. – 1996. – p. 437–455.
66. McHugh M. *She Said, He Said: Gender, Language, and Power* / Maureen C McHugh., 2010.
67. McRaney, D. *The persuasive power of anecdotes. You Are Not So Smart.* [Электронный ресурс] / McRaney, D.. – 2010. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://youarenotsoSMART.com/2010/06/28/the-persuasive-power-of-anecdotes/>.
68. O'Brien, L. *Liking and Listening: Impression Formation and Information Processing in Presidential Debates* / O'Brien, L.. – 2020. – p. 104.
69. Perse, E. M. *The politics of personal anecdotes* / Perse, E. M.. // *Communication Quarterly*. – 2012. – №60. – p. 454–465.
70. *Presidential Elections and Their Candidates in the European Newspapers* / M. Sintes-Olivella, P. Franch, E. Yeste-Piquer, K. Zilles. // SAGE Publications. – 2022. – p. 3–139.
71. Saville-Troike, M. *The ethnography of communication: An introduction.* / Saville-Troike, M., 2003.
72. Tannen D. *Gender and Discourse* / D. Tannen. – New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. – p. 203.
73. Tannen, D. *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and Men at Work.* / Tannen, D., 1994.
74. Tannen, D. *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse.* / Tannen, D., 1989.

75. Thurlow, C. Language and digital media / Thurlow, C, Poff, M.. // New York: Routledge. – 2013.
76. Tryfonov R. A. Verbal elements of political discourse as objects of metalingual reflection in contemporary Ukrainian publicistics / Tryfonov R. A.. // Kharkiv. – 2019.
77. Vidich A. American Democracy in the Late Twentieth Century: Political Rhetorics and Mass Media / Arthur J. Vidich. // International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society. – 1990. – №1. – p. 5–29.
78. Wedeking, J. The role of personal anecdotes in political discourse [Електронний ресурс] / Wedeking, J., Hibbing, J. R. // Political Psychology. – 2018. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/pops.12566>.
79. Winans T. Divisive Rhetoric and Adverse Language in American Political Discourse [Електронний ресурс] / Trevor Winans. – 2019. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <https://open.bu.edu/handle/2144/39612>.
80. Wodak, R. Critical discourse analysis / Wodak, R. // Handbook of Discourse Analysis / Wodak, R., 2015. – p. 1–17.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Nancy Pelosi on China: Tiananmen Square "massacre was shocking to us"

Thank you very much. Mr. Leader, I do too want to commend you for introducing this resolution and Mr. Broomfield for his cooperation. It made me very proud to be on the House floor and see the unanimity with which the resolution was received.

Congresswoman Boxer and I represent San Francisco in Congress. A city that has a larger population of Asians of in any other place outside of Asia any larger population of Chinese. And so we come here and speak on behalf of them and everyone in our district who cares about freedom. And that is to say that this situation is intolerable. First of all, the massacre was shocking to us as it was to everyone in the world. Second of all, the repression was scary and there's much more going on from what we can hear from our constituents. There are many secret executions going on as well as the public ones. But the denial is the most frustrating. And so every opportunity we get, be it on the floor of congress, which is the most important opportunity we have as members of congress or as marching to the embassy as members of congress as well and being led by our majority leader to go in and see the ambassador, to tell him as forcefully as we can that the human rights of the people in China are not an internal matter, that they are concerned to people all over the world, and especially to the members of Congress here. And that we will only draw strength from every death that they perpetrate, but that we know what is going on. I particularly was pleased because the majority leader asked the ambassador and I endorsed a suggestion that I had that if they are not afraid of the truth and if their denials hold up, then they shouldn't be afraid of a delegation coming from the Congress to visit China to see for ourselves what's going on there. The ambassador said he would consider it. Frankly, most of our time was spent denouncing the sentences of death for the students and also pleading with him for stays of execution. But hopefully we will hear back from the ambassador that we can visit there so that we can find some hope for putting a stop to what is going on there. Thank you. Thank you again, Mr. Leader, Mr. Broomfield, Mrs. Boxer. Thanks.

Nancy Pelosi In 1988 1st Campaign Video Ever San Francisco

Hello, I'm congresswoman Nancy Pelosi. I would like to thank KQED for giving me this opportunity to talk to you and to thank you for the privilege of representing San Francisco in the Congress of the United States. As a congresswoman, I must serve as a legislator as well as a representative. As a legislator I have worked to support and pass legislation which will benefit the people of San Francisco. This legislation includes housing health, care, peace in Central America, environmental protection, education and Economic Opportunity. The most urgent health issue facing our community is AIDS. Last March I introduced a bill which would assist in financing AIDS patient care included in the bill were early intervention projects for people infected with the AIDS virus, and mental health projects for people affected by AIDS in arc. I'm proud to report to you that both these measures passed both houses of Congress. I've also worked to bring jobs to San Francisco. This year we were able to get authorization for a new federal building in the city, and on Wednesday the European communities will be opening their first consular office in San Francisco which will increase San Francisco's importance as the center of trade and commerce. I've been a strong advocate for child care, parental leave, increasing the minimum wage and other legislation that recognizes the reality of women in the workplace. Regarding the environment, I believe that the preservation of our bay, our coastline and our air quality is essential. I've co-sponsored over 50 environmental bills this Congress. To protect the bay, I have ordered a government study to determine safe dredging practices in the Bay Area and have obtained 1.4 million dollars for improvements at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Clean air requires the commitment to mass transit while the Reagan administration tried to cut federal for San Francisco's Muni but 100%. I fought to restore it and obtained money to run and maintain the system. The lack of affordable housing in San Francisco is a critical problem. As a member of the housing subcommittee, I fought for an extension of the mortgage revenue bond program to preserve low-income housing in San Francisco, and I supported major housing subsidy and community development programs. San Francisco has always spoken out

for peace. As your representative, I have opposed the Reagan-Bush policy of militarism in Central America. It is doomed to failure. We must instead support dialogue and economic development in the region. Also, we must insist on respect for human rights and protect people who flee from persecution. I've taken the lead in Congress to protect Salvadoran refugees who have returned to El Salvador and have co-sponsored legislation which would have allowed Salvadorans to stay in this country until it is safe for them to return home. For eight years the needs and interest of San Franciscans have been held hostage by the Reagan administration and its policies. This administration has cut billions of dollars from education programs in the past eight years that has reduced government housing programs by 80 percent. It has done little to fight AIDS. It has not even listened to the advice of its own aids Commission and it has tried repeatedly to cut back on our commitment to civil rights by nominating judge Bork to the Supreme Court and by vetoing the most important civil rights bill of our decade. We have seen more and more homeless families living on our streets, but the Reagan-Bush administration refused to use all the money authorized for homeless programs. The Reagan Bush administration says we should not bargain with terrorists while they secretly sell arms for hostages. They talk about balancing the budget while they introduced the largest budget deficits in the history of our country. This is not leadership. The fact is the Reagan Bush administration is letting the American dream slip away for most Americans. After eight years of poor leadership, we have much to do. We must free this country from debt, regain excellence in our schools, provide affordable housing and job, promote quality healthcare and become peacemakers rather than weapons suppliers. For this we need real leadership. It is urgent that we all work for the election of Leo McCarthy to the United States Senate and for Michael Dukakis as president of the United States. Never has an election been more important. Thank you for the privilege to represent you and San Francisco in Congress. I'm grateful for the honor and hope to make you proud of my service there. Thank you!

Nancy Pelosi 1987 on Afghanistan

Thank you I thank my colleagues that you can Mr. Levin and I thank you Mr. speaker on this time I thank my colleague for calling this special order and giving me the opportunity to speak on the House of Representatives about an issue of concern to the people of my district and people throughout the world who care about human rights. Mr. speaker, as you know, eight years ago this month the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. To no one's surprise the occupation of Afghanistan has turned into a bloody war with no victors only losers. Soviets have suffered over 30,000 casualties and spent close to three billion dollars a year to fight this Vietnam-like war that has no end in sight, but what about the people of effort? Some reports indicate that a million-and-a-half Afghans have lost their lives due to the Soviet invasion and occupation. One out of every three Afghans has left the country since the Soviets marched in in 1979. Imagine if 80 million Americans fled our country for refuge in Canada and Mexico. Today fully one out of two refugees in the world is an Afghan. This is the legacy of the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. The Soviets flagrant disregard for human rights in this country has not gone unnoticed. A report based on interviews with Afghan refugees issued by the independent counsel of an International Human Rights, a group of human rights lawyers from the United States, Britain, Sweden and Malta, documents countless acts of terror perpetrated against the Afghan people. The report tells of widespread use of torture by the government secret police. Massacres and summary executions of civilians by Soviet troops and the deportation of Afghan children to the Soviet Union. Soviet troops are systematically destroying villages burning crops and poisoning water supplies as you have heard. It is clear the Soviet Union is trying to destroy traditional Afghan Society. These atrocities must be often the people of Afghanistan must be given the right to determine their country's future. I firmly believe that all peoples and countries must be allowed the right to self-determination. The fact that Afghanistan is located on the Soviet border should not preclude this right. One issue on the recent Reagan Gorbachev summit agenda was the resolution of regional conflict. Unfortunately, the summit meeting between President Reagan and secretary general secretary Gorbachev accomplished little in the form of an agreement on Afghanistan. Reports

indicate that when the president brought up the subject of Afghanistan, the general secretary dismissed it as a topic of free dialogue. Various statements by high-ranking Soviet officials including Mr. Gorbachev have made reference to a Soviet desire to withdraw from Afghanistan and end this pointless eight-year battle. Statements however are not enough. Real questions of how and when the Soviets withdraw from Afghanistan, what they leave behind and the recreation of the support of Afghan refugees must be addressed in detail. In order to stop this tragic and senseless bloodbath, the Soviets should leave Afghanistan immediately. I urged the Reagan administration to press hard on this issue in the next summit meeting between President Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev. Let's return the country of Afghanistan to its rightful occupants, the people of Afghanistan. Again, I thank my colleague from Michigan for calling for the special order and I thank you, Mr. Gorbachev.

1987 debate with Nancy Pelosi

I was recommended by solo Burton too that voters of the district. No one can choose a member of Congress except the voters of the district of course. I'm very honored by her recommendation. I'm a very independent person, I'm running for running for office is a very serious and singular individual activity. And I'm doing it you've announced yourself as the front runner in fact, have you not? Well every poll indicates that I am so uh I I have announced myself on the basis of the polls that have been have come out already in this race. Obviously, you are known to your party because you have been a fundraiser and a Grassroots activist but but why should the average voter vote for you they know these four because they've all run in campaigns before and why would you be qualified well?

I'm glad you asked that question I have served for many years as an officer and leader of the democratic party and as chairperson of the California Democratic party. For over 25 years I've worked on issues trying to turn good ideas that people at the Grassroots level have into legislation, into better policy. I believe that my working relationships with members of Congress and with members of the United States Senate will serve the people of San Francisco well. I've been recognized as the person

most responsible for winning the senate for the Democrats in 1986 I think that's important to the people of San Francisco Cisco and I'm very proudly and present my candidacy and think that I can do the best job that's why...

The first and only female speaker of the House, Nancy Pelosi announced that she would step down from leadership in January but would remain in Congress

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, as we gather here, we stand on sacred ground: the chamber of the United States House of Representatives, the heart of American democracy. I will never forget the first time I saw the Capitol. It was on a cold January day when I was 6 years old. My father, Thomas D'Alesandro Jr., was about to be sworn in for his fifth term in Congress representing our beloved hometown of Baltimore.

I was riding in the car with my brothers, and they were thrilled and jumping up and down and saying to me, "Nancy, look, there's the Capitol." And I keep — every time I'd say: "I don't see any capital. Is it a capital A, a capital B or a capital C?"

And finally, I saw it. A stunning white building with a magnificent dome.

I believed then, as I believe today, this is the most beautiful building in the world because of what it represents. The Capitol is a temple of our democracy, of our Constitution, of our highest ideals.

On that day — on that day, I stood with my father on this floor as he took the sacred oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. All of us who have served in this House have taken the hallowed oath of office. And it is the oath that stitches us together in a long and storied heritage. Colleagues who served before us are all our colleagues. Colleagues like Abraham Lincoln, Daniel Webster, Shirley Chisholm, Patsy Mink and our beloved John Lewis.

Personally, it binds me as a colleague to my father, a proud New Deal congressman and one of the earliest Italian Americans to serve in the Congress. And this is an oath we are duty bound to keep, and it links us with the highest aspirations of the ages.

In this room, our colleagues across history have abolished slavery; granted women the right to vote; established Social Security and Medicare; offered a hand to the weak, care to the sick, education to the young and hope to the many.

Indeed, it is here, under the gaze of our patriarch, George Washington, in the people's House, that we have done the people's work.

My colleagues, I stand before you as speaker of the House, as a wife, a mother, a grandmother, a devout Catholic, a proud Democrat and a patriotic American, a citizen of the greatest republic in the history of the world — which President Lincoln called the last best hope on Earth. Indeed, in the words attributed to another of our colleagues, the legendary Daniel Webster, he said: “Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution of your country and the government established under it. Miracles do not cluster. That which has happened but once in 6,000 years cannot be expected to happen often.”

Indeed, American democracy is majestic. But it is fragile. Many of us here have witnessed its fragility firsthand — tragically, in this chamber. And so democracy must be forever defended from forces that wish it harm.

Last week, the American people spoke, and their voices were raised in defense of liberty, of the rule of law and of democracy itself.

With these elections, the people stood in the breach and repelled the assault on democracy. They resoundingly rejected violence and insurrection, and in doing so gave proof through the night that our flag was still there.

And now we owe to the American people our very best, to deliver on their faith. To forever reach for the more perfect union — the glorious horizon that our founders promised.

The questions before this Congress and at this moment are urgent. Questions about the ideals that this House is charged by the Constitution to preserve and protect. Establish justice. Ensure domestic tranquillity. Provide for the common defense. Promote the general welfare. And secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Our posterity. Our children. Babies born today will live into the next century. And our decisions will determine their future for generations to come.

While we will have our disagreements on policy, we must remain fully committed to our shared fundamental mission, to hold strong to our most treasured democratic ideals, to cherish the spark of divinity in each and every one of us, and to always put our country first.

In their infinite wisdom, our founders gave us their guidance: e pluribus unum. From the many, one. They could not have imagined how large our country would become or how different we would be from one another. But they knew we had to be united as one. We the people. One country. One destiny.

It's been with great pride in my 35 years in the House I have seen this body grow more reflective of our great nation, our beautiful nation.

When I came to the Congress in 1987, there were 12 Democratic women. Now there are over 90. And we want more.

The new members of our Democratic caucus will be about 75 percent women, people of color and L.G.B.T.Q. And we have brought more voices to the decision-making table. When I entered leadership in 2002, there were eight of us. Today, there are 17 members of the leadership. When I first came to the floor at 6 years old, never would I have thought that someday I would go from homemaker to House speaker.

In fact, I never — in fact, I never intended to run for public office. Mommy and Daddy taught us through their example that public service is a noble calling and that we all have a responsibility to help others. In our family, my brother Tommy then became mayor of Baltimore also. But it's been my privilege to play a part in forging extraordinary progress for the American people.

I have enjoyed working with three presidents, achieving historic investments in clean energy with President George Bush; transformative health care reform with President Barack Obama; and forging — and forging the future from infrastructure to health care to climate action with President Joe Biden.

Now we must move boldly into the future, grounded by the principles that have propelled us this far and open to fresh possibilities for the future.

Scripture teaches us that for everything there is a season, a time for every purpose under heaven. My friends, no matter what title you all, my colleagues, have bestowed

upon me — speaker, leader, whip — there is no greater official honor for me than to stand on this floor and to speak for the people of San Francisco. This I will continue to do as a member of the House, speaking for the people of San Francisco, serving the great state of California and defending our Constitution.

And with great confidence in our caucus, I will not seek re-election to Democratic leadership in the next Congress. For me, the hour has come for a new generation to lead the Democratic caucus that I so deeply respect. And I am grateful that so many are ready and willing to shoulder this awesome responsibility.

Madam Speaker, standing here today, I'm endlessly grateful for all of life's blessings, for my Democratic colleagues, whose courage and commitment, with the support of your families, have made many of these accomplishments possible. In fact, could not have been done without you.

For my dear husband, Paul, who has been my beloved partner in life and my pillar of support, thank you. We're all grateful for all the prayers and well wishes as he continues his recovery. Thank you so much.

For our darling children, Nancy Corinne, Christine, Jacqueline, Paul and Alexandra, and our grandchildren, Alexander and Madeleine; Liam, Sean and Ryan; Paul and Thomas; Bella and Octavio. They are the joys of our lives for whom we — and we are so very, very proud of them and a comfort to us at this time.

And for my brilliant, dedicated and patriotic staff, under the leadership of Terri McCullough, together, working together, the finest group of public servants the House has ever known. Thank you all so much.

And again, for those who sent me here, for the people of San Francisco, for entrusting me with the high honor of being their voice in Congress. In this continued work, I will strive to honor the call of the patron saint of our city, St. Francis. Lord, make me an instrument of thy peace.

In this House, we begin each day with a prayer and a pledge to the flag. And every day I am in awe of the majestic miracle that is American democracy. As we participate in a hallmark of our republic — the peaceful, orderly transition from one Congress to the next — let us consider the words of, again, President Lincoln, spoken

during one of America's darkest hours. He called upon us to come together, to swell the chorus of the union, when once again touched as surely they will be by the better angels of our nature. That again is the task at hand.

Thank you all. May God bless you and your families. And may God bless — continue to bless our veterans and the United States of America. Thank you all so much.

Pelosi Floor Speech on S. 3522, the Ukraine Democracy Defense Lend-Lease Act of 2022

Madam Speaker, thank you for the recognition. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank our distinguished Mr. Wilson for his yielding as well.

I'm so pleased that this legislation has such strong, bipartisan support on the Floor of the House. To remove all doubt in anyone's mind that we are all committed as a nation, as a Congress, to — and House and Senate, in terms of this legislation. I thank you both for your leadership. I appreciate what you said, Mr. Chairman, about your working with your Ranking Member, Mr. McCaul, on this important issue as well.

So thank you very much for affording us this opportunity today.

Madam Speaker: 81 years ago, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt came here to the Congress of the United States, to the House of Representatives — where I'm proud to say my father, Thomas D'Alesandro, served as a Member of Congress — and President Franklin Roosevelt delivered a bold and historic request.

In his 1941 State of the Union address, President Roosevelt explained that democracy itself, democracy itself was under direct — was under dire threat, not only in Europe, but around the world. And he called on Congress to lend a hand to our allies overseas: bolstering their defenses so they can defeat the evils of fascism. It was this initiative that would be enacted just two months later — then undeniably turned the tide of the Second World War. And the Lend-Lease program would help propel the Allies to a victory that preserved the promise of democracy for generations to come.

Today, we see an echo of that [chapter] in history, as a murderous tyrant seeks to conquer its neighbor and dismantle its democracy. At this moment – and this moment demands we summon a commitment response – a commitment to respond.

The Ukraine Democracy Defense Lend-Lease Act of 2022 revives this pivotal program, waiving time-consuming requirements on the President’s authority to send critical defensive resources to Ukraine. It’s important to note that it’s about time.

Time is very important when lives are at stake. In doing so, we enable – the Administration will move faster to bolster Ukraine’s security forces: empowering them to repel the Russian invaders, protect innocent civilians and preserve their cherished democracy. As war rages in Ukraine, every minute matters. It’s about time. This strong action could mean the difference between lives saved and lives lost.

In any given battle, it could be the margin between victory and defeat.

It is with astonishing unity that the Senate sent us this important legislation after passing it with a unanimous vote. And as we hope to secure a strong bipartisan vote here in the House, let us salute the leaders of this legislation, Chairman Gregory Meeks, Chair of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. He acknowledged his Ranking Member, Mr. McCaul, from Texas. Congressman Joe Wilson of South Carolina, who is managing the bill on the Republican side today. And Congressman Steve Cohen, who helms the Helsinki Commission and played a role in this legislation.

Madam Speaker, restoring the Lend-Lease authority is just the latest action proudly taken by this Congress to strengthen Ukraine and to decimate Russia. We have delivered billions in humanitarian, security and economic assistance for Ukraine, including the \$13.6 billion in the latest supplemental. And more to come, as our President has put forth a request earlier today that we will turn into legislation – turn in – to support – to support democracy in Ukraine and, therefore, democracy in the world. I salute the President for his leadership.

These resources are already – of the 13.6 – are already reaching communities on the ground and helping Ukraine repel Russian forces. But we need to do more. As we prepare to take up the President’s new supplemental request, we are moving in lock-

step with the Administration and our allies to isolate Russia and devastate its economy. From severing normal trade relations, to banning the import of Russian energy, our strong actions in the House and Senate have made Russia weaker in every way. And the House took the first steps to prosecute Russian war crimes, so the perpetrators can be held accountable for their unthinkable, grotesque, diabolical atrocities.

Later today, with the blessing of the Embassy of Ukraine, we will unveil in the Speaker's Dining Room – we invite people, our Members to come and their guests – a photo exhibit that captures many of these atrocities. These haunting photographs show the horror and heartbreak of Russia's callous aggression [against] Ukraine and serve as an important reminder of our moral duty to continue to take swift, decisive action to help.

Going back to Lend-Lease, upon the enactment of the historic Lend-Lease law in March of 1941, Franklin Delano Roosevelt called upon the conscience of our country when he declared: 'The light of democracy must be kept burning. It is not enough for us merely to trim the whip or polish the glass. The time has come where we must provide the fuel in ever increasing amounts to keep the flame alive.'

Madam Speaker, our task today remains the same. I do want to acknowledge, also, another item – and thank you so much Mr. Leader – Mr. Chairman and others for your support of this. We are doing Lend-Lease today. We talked about what we did in the omnibus bill, the \$13.6 – the supplemental – the \$13.6 billion. We talked about severing our purchase of oil. We've talked about severing our trade – normal trade relations. But we also did something yesterday, when we did what I call 'seize and freeze.' Seize the assets of the oligarchs and the Russian – that money. Freeze it. And when it thaws, to use that money to help rebuild – help rebuild Ukraine after the victory over the Russians.

So again, we are thinking of what we need to do in humanitarian assistance, what we need to do in economic assistance, what we must do in security assistance – weapons, et cetera. But we have to do some other aspects as well.

Our task today, again, remains the same as it did with the original Lend-Lease. Make no mistake: Russia invaded with the stated goal of ending liberty and self-governance in Ukraine. Yet, with unimaginable courage and determination, the Ukrainian people are putting their lives on the line for democracy – not only for their own nation but for democracy writ large for the world.

This is about freedom versus dictatorship. Autocracy versus democracy. The Ukrainian people are making the fight for all of us. We must help them.

So it is our duty to honor their heroism at the front lines of the battle for freedom by helping to fuel this righteous fight. It is with endless admiration for the Ukrainian people and their leadership – President Zelenskyy, just everybody, I won't start naming names, all of them, we have had visits from so many of them – and an unyielding commitment to keeping alight democracy's precious flame, I urge a strong bipartisan 'aye' vote for this vital legislation.

With that, I thank the gentleman for yielding and yield back the balance of my time.

Leader Nancy Pelosi at the 2012 Democratic National Convention

Fellow Democrats! That American dream is the story of America. We are here to reignite the American dream. I'm pleased to see so many young people—the future of our party, the hope of America.

I stand before you as the first mother and grandmother to serve as Democratic leader and speaker of the House. For 25 years, it has been my privilege to represent the city of San Francisco and the great state of California; to work to strengthen our vibrant middle class; to secure opportunity and equality. We stand together in our “drive for 25”—25 seats to win back the House—as we re-elect President Barack Obama!

Democrats believe in reigniting the American dream by removing barriers to success and building ladders of opportunity for all, so everyone can succeed. Jobs are central to the American dream—and President Obama has focused on jobs from day one. Under President Obama, we've gone from losing 800,000 jobs a month to adding 4.5 million private sector jobs over the last 29 months. The American dream is about freedom. Jobs mean freedom for workers to support their families.

Working with President Obama, Democrats passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to strengthen the rights of women in the workplace; repealed “don’t ask, don’t tell” so our troops can serve the country they love regardless of whom they love; made college more affordable. House Democrats passed the Dream Act, but Senate Republicans blocked it. With President Obama, Democrats enacted the toughest consumer safeguards in history to protect Main Street from recklessness on Wall Street. Democrats passed health reform to allow Americans the freedom to pursue their passion; to make health care a right, not a privilege; to ensure that being a woman is no longer a “pre-existing condition”!

Freedom is secured every day by our men and women in uniform. We must build a future worthy of their sacrifice. We thank them for keeping America the land of the free and the home of the brave.

This year, we are determined to re-elect an extraordinary president who, in no ordinary time, led America back from the brink of depression—while Republicans tried to block him at every turn. This election offers the clearest choice of our time. Many names are on the ballot. So, too, is the character of our country. Medicare is on the ballot. Democrats will preserve and strengthen Medicare. Republicans will end the Medicare guarantee. It’s just plain wrong. When you go to the polls, vote for Medicare. Vote for President Obama!

Social Security is on the ballot. Democrats enacted it. Democrats will fight to preserve it. Some Republicans want to replace the guarantee of Social Security with the gamble of private accounts. It’s just plain wrong. When you go to the polls, vote for Social Security. Vote for President Obama!

The hard-won rights of women are on the ballot. Democrats trust the judgment of women. We reject the Republican assault on women’s health. It’s just plain wrong. When you go the polls, vote for women’s rights. Vote for President Obama!

Our democracy is on the ballot. Democrats believe we must curb the influence of special interests on our political institutions. To change policy for the middle class, we must change politics. Democrats believe we must create jobs, not protect the special interests; build the economy from the middle out, not the top down.

Democrats will work to overturn Citizens United. Republicans support opening the floodgates to special interest money and suppressing the right to vote. It's just plain wrong. We believe in government of the many, not the privileged few. When you go to the polls, vote for democracy. Vote for President Obama!

The American dream is on the ballot. Ladders of opportunity for our middle class are on the ballot. And we have work to do. We must reignite the American dream. With President Obama, we will move America forward. When you go to the polls, vote for strong Democratic majorities in the House and Senate! Vote for Vice President Joe Biden and President Barack Obama! God bless the United States of America.

Pelosi Floor Speech on the Fairness for 9/11 Families Act and Continuing Resolution

Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank you for bringing this important legislation to the Floor. And I rise in strong support of the Fairness for 9/11 Families Act, another vital step to support our September 11th heroes and their families.

Let us salute you, Jerry – Chairman Nadler, for your committed leadership in bringing this to the Floor, as I mentioned. On September 11th, Mr. Speaker, our nation watched in horror as unfathomable acts of terror unfolded on our soil – gripped by an unthinkable nightmare.

But for thousands of families, it was only the beginning. Children growing up without mom or dad by their side. Missing smiles at dance recitals and soccer games. Empty seats at graduations and weddings and baptisms. Yet in the wake of such harrowing tragedy, these families rallied together: turning their sorrow into solidarity; transforming their pain into purpose; mobilizing their agony into advocacy.

Some of them were very much responsible for us getting a 9/11 Commission, which some in Congress had resisted. But without their outside mobilization, it would not have happened.

The Country and the Congress greatly admire the courage of the survivors and families who have come together to make their voices heard, again, on the ongoing.

In fact, it was my honor to host many of them in the Capitol just earlier this month, or actually – yeah, September, we're still in September – to listen to their moving stories and learn how we can continue to support them.

This is an injustice, as was described. Moved by their remarkable resilience, the House of Representatives has worked relentlessly over the years to honor our solemn promise to the 9/11 families. We passed the Zadroga Act to ensure that they could receive help from the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund. And we passed the Never Forget the Heroes Act to permanently authorize those funds.

But there's still more to be done to ensure they get every last cent they are due. I don't know that any money really makes up for their loss, but what they are due, they should receive.

The Fairness for 9/11 Families [Act] corrects an outrageous injustice, finally delivering the \$2.7 billion that these families are owed from the United States Victims of State Sponsored Terrorism Fund. This initiative was established to support Americans devastated by evils of international terrorism – terror.

But for years, the wives, husbands and children of those killed on 9/11 were refused assistance from this particular fund, even as more distant relatives received compensation. Yes, they were getting funds from an earlier fund, but if you got money from the earlier fund, you couldn't get money from this additional fund. And now we're – this is about fairness today. As Democrats took the Majority, we ended this unconscionable disparity.

Today, we vote to make them whole – delivering the benefits they were wrongfully denied. No amount of money, again, can replace those who were stolen away, nor restore the memories and moments that could have been. But with this legislation, we can further ease two decades of anguish. And we can take another step to ensure that justice is done. And I'm so pleased that it is being done in a bipartisan way. Because at the start, that was not the case.

President Lincoln once cautioned against the 'silent artillery of time' – the slow study – steady fading of our nation's collective memory. For 21 years, these families have served as a bulwark against that silent threat. Here today, let us stand with them and

renew our sacred promise to Never Forget. I urge a resounding and bipartisan ‘yes’ – hopefully, a unanimous vote – so that we may empower thousands of Americans to [begin] finding peace that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, as I have the Floor, I also want to rise in strong support of the Continuing Resolution to keep government open and working For The People. This legislation ensures full government funding through December 16th, giving appropriators more time to reach bipartisan, bicameral agreement on funding levels for the upcoming Fiscal Year. And it includes fiscal – critical funding to support the Ukraine, to respond to natural disasters and to advance many additional key priorities.

I thank the Madam Chair, Rosa DeLauro, Chair of the Appropriations Committee, for her strong, values-driven leadership to bring forth this necessary legislation. As I always say, as an – as an appropriator myself, ‘Left to their own devices, the appropriators will find a bipartisan path.’ And we thank Rosa for her ongoing work to assemble an omnibus government funding package that honor ours values as a nation. That's the next step. But today, we proceed with this legislation.

As we do, war rages in Ukraine. Legislation we will pass today, Congress secures an additional \$12.3 billion for Ukraine-related priorities, including security, economic and humanitarian aid to historic – heroic Ukrainian people. This package comes at a pivotal moment, as Ukraine's freedom fighters work to turn the tide, liberating key cities and repelling Russian forces.

When I traveled to Berlin for the G7 Speakers’ Meeting earlier this month, it was my privilege to hear directly from Ukrainian Speaker Stefanchuk who offered an invaluable report on the state of the war. At those meetings, I reiterated our unbreakable, unshakeable commitment to stand with Ukraine in the fight for democracy.

And by the way, every other speaker of the G7, every other speaker from the G7 – or they call them heads of parliament in some countries – spoke out strongly in favor of democracy in Ukraine. So it wasn't just me talking about the unbreakable,

unshakable commitment. Others did too. And with this supplemental funding, we take another strong step honoring that pledge – our country's pledge.

Alongside this critical package for Ukraine, this legislation directs significant funding to help American families devastated by disaster. We continue to hold all the families affected by Hurricane Ian in our hearts and prayers during this difficult time, but we need money to help them. The \$2 billion or more in the Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery funding in this bill will go toward supporting Florida as well as Puerto Rico, Alaska and other communities hit by disaster. But again, we need more.

And we're also allowing FEMA to spend up to its entire year of funding, giving the agency access to an additional \$18.9 billion from FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund to quickly respond to disasters, especially appropriate now with Ian. And we will need more.

And thanks to the leadership of Congresswoman Teresa Leger Fernández, we are sending \$2.5 billion to help New Mexicans begin to heal, recover and rebuild after the Hermit's Peak/Calf Canyon fire. She and the Members from New Mexico were very instrumental in making sure we were aware of the disastrous mistake that was made in New Mexico and how we need to address it.

At the same time, thanks to the impassioned advocacy of Congressman Bennie Thompson, we secured \$20 million in Jackson, Mississippi, which is suffering a devastating water emergency. This man-made disaster poses a direct threat to public health and demands urgent action.

Additionally, we're proud that this legislation includes \$1 billion more for Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, a vital lifeline to help families pay their bills and stay safe in their homes this winter.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a package For The People. I urge a strong bipartisan 'yes' on the Continuing Resolution so we may swiftly send this bill to the President's desk, and I hope that we'll have a unanimous vote on the legislation, Fairness for 9/11 Families, to again support our 9/11 heroes and their families.

Pelosi Speaks in Favor of the Women's Health Protection Act

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, thank the gentleman for yielding. Thank him for this leadership, uh, on this very important issue and to all of our colleagues in this pro-Choice House Democratic Caucus. This is the first time, Madam Speaker, that we've had a pro-choice Democratic caucus with a Democratic president. And the timing could not be better because of the assault that has been made on the constitutional rights of women in our country. Mr. Madam Speaker, uh, coming to board today, I recall an experience of when I was in high school. Now, that was a long time ago. We were in a debate. Uh, we X 10 perran debate situation, and you had pick something out of a hat and then speak to it. Well, a person, a friend of mine drew the question and the it said, now again, ancient history a long time ago, it said, do women think? That was the question that she had to speak to.

Do women think it seemed horrible at the time? It seems out of the question beyond horrible. Now, today, years later, it seems that there are some who wants to debate that question because the disrespect for women and their ability to determine the size and timing of their family and so many other things is disrespected in the action taken by the state of Texas. But even worse than that, because what do you expect? E worse than that was the decision of this court, the Supreme Court of the United States, to embrace the horror of it all in terms of the legislation and what it did to remove the sancti of private decision making from women, but also that it gave an imprimatur to vigilantism something so outrageous, so unpatriotic, so un-American, madly embraced by this shameful court with total disregard for stare decisis that the president that the court had already established, that Roe Wade, the constitutional was constitutional.

So what today I wanna thank Judy Tochu for her leadership, y Congressman Congress el, but now majority, and a president and the Democratic Senate by passing the women, her leadership and introducing again and again, and advocating the Women's Health Protection Act. And we are standing on the side of women to defend their freedoms and to uphold this truth. Every woman everywhere has the constitutional to write to basic reproductive healthcare. No matter what state you live

in, constitutional rights are not needed out geographically. They're for the country. Again, I salute Congresswoman Chu, chair of the contraception and Family Planning task force of the Pro-Choice Caucus, who's been introducing this bill over and over again. Again, we have produced legislation that can become law for years. Radical restrictions on women's reproductive health freedoms have been pushed across the nation with 2021 on track to be the worst legislative year for women's health rights.

I come to this, um, as a Catholic mother of five in six years and one week, and with, uh, the joy that all that meant to us, but with the recognition that it was my husband and I, our decision, it was our decision. And we should not in this body or in that court, be making decisions for the women in America. As of July, 90 reproductive health restrictions have been enacted more than a year since Robie Wades more than in any year since Robe Wade was enacted, 1973. But here, here's the thing, it's important for the Women of America to know that as this impedes their right to make decisions, it also, the, the same forces at work don't want in vitro fertilization, actually, even the state of Mississippi rejected that their, their prohibition on that stand in the way of reproductive, uh, health and guidance in terms of family planning, birth control, and the rest.

It's important for American women to know what we are up against when it comes to intrusion into the privacy of a family's life. You would think of how they're so averse to governance in any way. They wouldn't be so bullish about going into people's private lives in the way that they do. What the Supreme Court did was cowardly a cowardly dark of nice decision, uh, and, and, uh, to allow that bill to go into effect. How could it be? Because it was a decision. The court made a decision, but the Republicans in Congress and the pre then president made a decision to, in a way that was almost shameful. Make sure that so many, uh, justices on the court, they'll say shameful because the last one, which they railroaded through while opposing, uh, the review of a Democratic, uh, president's suggestion a few years earlier saying they didn't have enough time a year, they had enough time a month.

We know that it's, uh, I just wanna say this about Roe. In Roe, the Supreme Court held that the personal liberty is protected by the Constitution, which the court had

recognized as extending to decisions relating to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relations, children, and it's broad enough to encompass a women's decision whether or not to terminate her pregnancy. S b eight is extreme banning abortion for most women be before they even know. Sometimes I wonder if they don't need a lesson in the birds and the bees. But again, I just wanna go to this point. SBA eight unleashes one of the most disturbing, unprecedented, far-reaching assaults on healthcare providers and on anyone who helps a woman in any way access an abortion by creating a vigilante bounty system that we will have a chilling effect on the provisions of any healthcare services. And what's next? What's next with these vigilantes and their bounty system?

Okay, so my colleagues, I associate myself with their remarks on all of this because they bring so much knowledge of the constitution, knowledge, of the history of since 1973, and even studying it before, uh, uh, Diana Dge the chair, uh, uh, one of the co-chairs of the co fought this issue in the courts and won, fought it in the court of public opinion, fought it in the Congress of the United States. She and Barbara Lee and Dan. So many, of course, Judy Chu. So many of our women have taken the lead on this. But again, uh, we, although we are about a third of our caucus, more than a third of our caucus, uh, are women. Our male colleagues have been very strong on this as well. Therefore, we will have today a vote for women, a vote for respect for women, a vote for decency, a vote for pride in our constitution and in our women. And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Nancy Pelosi's Full Speech At The 2020 DNC

Good evening. As Speaker of the House, it is my honor to bring you the greetings of the Democrats of the House—the most diverse majority in history: more than 60 percent women, people of color, and LGBTQ.

This month, as America marks the centennial of women finally winning the right to vote, we do so with 105 women in the House of Representatives. Proudly, 90 are Democrats.

To win the vote, for three quarters of a century, women marched and fought and never gave in. We stand on their shoulders—charged with carrying forward the unfinished work of our nation advanced by heroes from Seneca Falls, to Selma, to Stonewall.

Four years ago, when we came together, President Obama and Vice President Biden were in the White House. They made us proud—and their leadership made our country great. In that spirit, we come together again, not to decry the darkness, but to light a way forward for our country.

Self-presentation That is the guiding purpose of House Democrats, fighting for the people. We have sent the Senate bills for lower healthcare, costs for bigger paychecks for cleaner government, protecting John Lewis's voting rights and enacting George Floyd Justice and Policing Act. We've sent the Senate bills to protect our Dreamers, LGBTQ equality, prevent gun violence, and to preserve our planet for future generations, and even more. All of this is possible for America. Who was standing in the way? Mitch McConnell and Donald Trump. Our nation faces the worst health and economic catastrophe in our history. More than five million Americans are infected by the coronavirus. Over 170,000 have died. The science-based action and the Heroes Act we enacted three months ago is essential to safeguard lives, livelihood, and the life of our democracy. And who was standing in the way? Mitch McConnell and Donald Trump. Instead of crushing the virus, they're trying to crush the Affordable Care Act and its preexisting conditions benefit.

As Speaker of the House, I've seen firsth and Donald Trump's disrespect for facts, for working families and for women in particular, disrespect written into his policies toward our health and our rights, not just his conduct. But we know what he doesn't, that when women succeed, America succeeds. And so we are unleashing the power of women to take our rightful place in our national life by champion a woman's right to choose and defending Roe V. Wade, secure and safe and affordable childcare, preserving social security and passing equal pay for equal work. Who's standing in the way? Mitch McConnell and Donald Trump.

So here is our answer. We will remember in November, when we will elect Joe Biden president, whose heart is full of love for America, and rid the country of Trump's heartless disregard for America's goodness. Joe Biden's faith in God gives him the courage to lead. Jill Biden's love gives him the strength to persevere. Joe Biden is the president we need right now. Battle tested, forward looking, honest and authentic. He has never forgotten who he is fighting for.

And Kamala Harris is the vice president we need right now, committed to our constitution, brilliant in defending it, and a witness to the women of this nation that our voices will be heard. Our mission is to fight for a future equal to the ideals of our founders, our hopes for our children and the sacrifices of our veterans, our brave men and women in uniform and their families. We'll increase our majority in the House. We will win a Democratic majority in the Senate. We will elect Kamala Harris vice-president and we will elect Joe Biden president of the United States of America. God bless you. And God bless America.

Announcement of Gun Background Check Legislation

Speaker Pelosi: thank you, Shannon. I see Shannon at home in California. It is hard to go to church in any denomination without their swearing our orange and ringing our bell under her leadership to make sure that everybody knows the crescendo is growing on this. In that regard, I want to acknowledge congressman Deutsch, I want to make knowledge also from Florida congresswomen Marcus I Powell who was with us. And also Dwight Evans from Pennsylvania. And congresswoman bono -- madeleine dean from Pennsylvania. Take you for being with us. The parents i have met say I belong to a club nobody should belong to. We do not want any more members in that club. We do know that this legislation can save lives. Before we walk over to the floor of the house to drop the bill in the hopper, I am now going to come up with great pride, yield to my colleague, mike Thompson, who will sign his legislation to make it official and make it ready for the hopper. [applause] speaker Pelosi: thank you all for coming.

2022 University Ceremony HD Speaker: Nancy Pelosi

Thank you very much, Madam President.

It's with great humility and great pride that I accept this wonderful honor. Now we're classmates, right? That means you have a classmate in the Capitol.

(APPLAUSE) As Speaker of the House it is my honor to bring congratulations of the United States Congress to Brown University class of 2022.

Thank you, Madam President. That has a nice ring to it. Thank you, President Christina Paxson and Brown Corporation for your kind words and for your leadership of this historic institution, a pillar of academic excellence for two and a half centuries. Let us salute the wonderful orators, Kaitlan, Ali, and Michelle. Weren't they wonderful, our student speakers? Ali and Kaitlan you reminded me of a saying that we had when you said "let." We have an expression, love means let other versions exist.

And, Michelle, thank you so much. I'm going to try to pause, but I'm standing between this group, their parties, their future, so I'll, I'll compromise there somewhere. Thank you for inspiring us, though, to our class orators with your reflections on the importance of family and friendship and embracing community and finding purpose.

Not only here at Brown, but beyond. I'm deeply grateful to be honored to receive this honorary degree from Brown because of the respect I have for the institution, the university as a prestigious global leader in education. I myself am grateful and honored to receive it because I would have loved to participate in the open curriculum. And I'm honored to receive this magnificent recognition, because of the magnificent company I am with the the other honorees. Aren't they just wonderful, all of them. And it's a treat for me to be back in Rhode Island. Officially I serve in Congress with great members from this state. Some of them are here. Senator Jack Reed is here in full regalia. Jack, Sheldon Whitehouse was here last evening. Congressman Jim Langevin. Congressman David Cicilline. And, of course, we're all proud of your former governor, Gina Raimondo, who is now the Secretary of Commerce. I want to also acknowledge another pioneering

Brown alumnus, the Secretary of the Treasury, Janet Yellen. That's officially. Personally, I'm happy to be here because my grandparents met in Pawtucket, Rhode Island. And my close, one of my closest college friends, Martha Buonanno, lived here in Providence. Her brother in law, Vinny Buonanno, is here today. A city she always told me was Heaven on earth. (personal anecdote)

You be the judge.

It's lovely.

No question.

Graduates, today is your day of triumph.

This ceremony is the culmination of your years of hard work, long hours, and late nights at the Rock and the Scili to complete your extensive studies. And don't forget the remarkable bravery to endure the departure of your beloved if not befuddling lamp bear statue Blueno. So, on this glorious day, take a moment to savor your achievement, because you have done something extraordinary. And you did this with the support of your adoring family and friends, strengthened by their love, wisdom, and encouragement. Let's give them a big hand, dear families.

You can stand up for that.

For the families.

And let us, also, while you're standing, salute the excellent role that the faculty played in your success. Today, the class of 2022 joins the ranks of esteemed alumni who have made a difference in our nation and in the world. And some of them are here today.

Indeed, Brown is the proud Alma Mater of aforementioned David Cicilline, who is right now a champion in the fight against gun violence in our country. Someone I have admired for years, Dr. Jim yong Kim, a commanding force for global health. And his son Thomas is graduating today as well. And they tell me I don't know but they tell me that even the top salesman at the Dunder Mifflin paper company might be here today. I also want to acknowledge a great Brown supporter. I have been hearing about Brown for decades from him, Stephen Roberts, a former Chancellor, who has been a great friend. Steve Martin's family

foundation is called the Source of Hope, which you are to me. And I hope that I will be to you today. This moment is exhilarating, and this emotion is compounded by the fact that you're graduating into a vastly different world than the first time you proceeded through the Van Winkle gates.

As we gather here, war rages in Ukraine, all in awe of the heroism and resolve of the people of Ukraine as they courageously defend democracy, not only their own but ours against dictatorship. Indeed, our own nation is no stranger to dark antidemocratic forces.

On January 6, 2021, an unprecedented insurrection unleashed an unimaginable violence on the grounds and the halls of the Capitol, a strike at the heart of our democracy. The peaceful transfer of power. And in the months since the insurrection, we have seen further assaults on democracy. Shameful campaigns of voter suppression, election nullification, a Supreme Court to erase a woman's right to decide, and threatening even more privacy rights, including marriage equality. We can't let that happen.

And, sadly, in just the last two weeks, two senseless mass shootings, children in their schools, families in their communities. This in addition to countless deadly attacks rooted in racism, anti semitism, Islamophobia and white supremacy, and facing adversity not seen in a century with a global pandemic. You have shown extraordinary bravery and resilience.

Amid the darkness it would be easy to descend into apathy or despair. But we can't. We can't. But we know this: hope remains democracy's most powerful weapon against oppression, against cynicism, against hatred. When I had the great privilege of visiting Kiev a month ago, we saw firsthand the hope in the eyes of the Ukrainian people as they defied the odds against a powerful and brutal foe.

In a similar spirit here at home, our nation has constantly been improved by our hope for the future.

We should have hope because we believe in America. The vision of our founders to put forth an experiment in democracy, the faith and optimism of immigrants to come here in search, and the optimism to come here in search of a better life.

The dreams of activists to expand the meaning of freedom.

People ask me quite frequently, "where is hope?" And I say, "hope is where it always has been: sitting there right between faith and charity." Faith, hope, and charity.

If you believe, as Honorary Tisch said, goodness, if you believe in goodness, faith and charity and goodness, that gives you hope. It should. And in this moment, our nation and the world will need you to carry on this vital tradition.

Indeed, as my dear friend and fellow honorary Brown alumnus, John Lewis – he was so proud of getting that award as am I - John Lewis wrote, "Democracy is not a state. It is an act, and each generation must do its part."

The poet So, we have hope in America, we have hope in young people it's your future. You must take responsibility for it. And another thing I say when people ask me about hope, in addition to America and young people, our future, I believe that there is hope in the arts, because I believe they are unifying for our country.

The poet Shelly once said, "the greatest force for moral good is imagination." Imagination to be creative, to create, to put yourself in other people's shoes, to understand something else. But that creativity of the arts.

When we experience the arts, we laugh together, we cry together, we're inspired together. We put aside our differences. I do believe the arts are a path to unity in our country. The arts have been central to our nation and our world from the start.

John Adams wrote to his wife, Abigail, "I must study politics and war so that our sons have the liberty to study mathematics, geography, commerce, and agriculture, in order for their children to study painting, poetry, music, and architecture."

As Adams predicted, see this was how they expanded opportunity. It was more that people would have the liberty to do. As Adams predicted, each generation of Americans has further weaved the beautiful cultural tapestry of our nation with extraordinary advancements in the arts.

For example, this weekend, among our honorees, just yesterday, Shaggy brought everyone together, very unifying, with his singing. Was that not unifying?

Did you not put aside your differences? And in today's honoree, Stanley Nelson, he has increased our understanding through storytelling and documentaries. The arts have a way of reaching our hearts. In reaching our hearts. And poetry has also attracted us to science. I know we have the arts and sciences and the arts and natural sciences awards here. The poet Wordsworth revered the brilliance of sir Isaac Newton and captured his mission with vivid imagery.

He said: "A mind forever voyaging through the strange seas of thought alone."

And my colleagues from the Congress, because Mr. Langevine, and Mr. Cicilline serve in the House, Senator Reid did before, they can attest in the science, space and technology room of the Capitol, on the wall is a poem by Alfred Lord Tennyson, science based in technology poetry.

For I dipt into the future, Far as human eye could see,

Saw the vision of the world, And all the wonder that would be;

Arts and sciences, all important. All are connected, the wonder that would be.

Unifying.

As you know, the importance of arts and sciences firsthand from the beautiful education you have received at Brown. During your time here, some of you have engaged in cutting edge research, others explored the wonders of the arts, language, and literature.

And on campus, you built communities that transcend our differences. From study groups to research teams, theater troupes, to sports, any sports? I saw some sports scholars come through.

Many of you will not maybe pursue careers in arts or science, your Brown education has opened your eyes, opened your mind, opened your hearts to whatever the future holds. So I urge you to bring the spirit of unity to whatever you do. It's no secret that you graduate in a country deeply divided socially, politically, culturally. And the is even more dangerous factions seek to dispense with democracy all together. But, graduates, you are our hope.

When tragedy strikes, in your time here, you were undaunted. You sacrificed to keep our communities safe from the virus. You embraced with open arms students

from Afghanistan. You rallied around classmates new from Ukraine. And in your generation, we see leaders unafraid to take the torch, marching for our lives, demanding action on gun violence, sounding the alarm on climate crisis. Science, science, science. And speaking out against the scourge of injustice, to name a few. On this Memorial weekend as we honor those who gave their supreme sacrifice and their families for our democracy, as we pay tribute to those who made that sacrifice, let us remember that in one of America's darkest hours, President Lincoln spoke powerfully about the need to bring our country together. "To swell the chorus of the Union by the better angels of our nature", he said. And we need you to help summon the better angels of our nature to help heal America's fractured soul.

Graduates, I want to just speak to each one of you individually now. You all are choosing different paths, but I want to just tell you this. You just don't know what might be down the road. When I was in College, I had zero interest - my friend Martha Buonanno could attest to that if she were still with us - zero interest in running for political office. Actually, I was very shy. But, anyway. But one thing and another, the opportunity presented itself.

Two things: the advice I received is advice that I give to you, each of you individually. When that happens, the best advice is be yourself. You are the authenticity America needs. Be who you are. Your values that Madam President spoke about earlier. Your values. Your why. What is your purpose? Is it climate? Is it education? Is it healthcare? You know the list of arrays that may be your preeminent passion. Know your why. Know something about it.

Be strategic about how you may deal with it. But most of all, that's all up here in the head. Most of all, show people what is in your heart. Because that is the authenticity of you that nobody can pass out on a piece of paper. Be ready. Know your power. You have great power. You have this magnificent education. You have families and friends who trust in you. And there's nobody like you. You're the only one, the individual, authentic you. So know your power, and be ready. Be yourself and be ready.

Now, in terms of the women here today... With all the respect in the world for everyone who is here today, there is nothing more wholesome for our country, for our politics, for so much of our existence than the fuller participation of women in leadership and all of that. Again, I had no interest in running for office. One thing led to another. Actually, when I did, four of my children were already in College. One was going to be a senior in high school. And I said to her, "this is all new to us, but I have been - mommy, mommy has been asked to run for Congress, and I would rather it be another year because you would then be in college, but I love my life. I don't care about running for Congress if you want me to stay home." To which my darling daughter who was 16 at the time, Alexandra she said, "mother mother, not mommy, mother, get a life." I had never heard this was 30 years ago. I had never heard the expression before. I told her, you know, I'd be gone from, like, Monday to Thursday. And she said, "what teenaged girl would not want her mother out of the house for three nights a week?" So I got another life. But that's I'm just saying to you, know your why.

Be ready.

You just don't know what's around the corner for you. You may have a clear path that you've set out. God bless you if you do. But even at that, you will have some of the unforeseen and just be yourself, be ready. Know your power, the power of you. Strengthened by your time here at Brown, have confidence that you are ready for whatever opportunities present themselves.

Never be afraid to take the leap of faith, particularly when it is unexpected, and mostly it will be hard.

Graduates, you are among the very, very fortunate few to be blessed with a Brown education. Once beyond these gates, the leaders who once sat where you sit now have gone on to groundbreaking generation defining things. And with your brilliance, your passion, and your vision, so will you. Let me just tell you what I see here. I see dazzling brilliance, beautiful diversity. I see the future. And it is you.

So class of 2022, go forward with courage to build unity and hold on to your hope.

And always remember you have a classmate in the Capitol of the United States. On behalf of the United States Congress, for today, congratulations. For tomorrow, good luck. And forever, ever true to Brown. God bless you. God bless America. Thank you so much.

2019 SF State Commencement: Keynote Speaker Nancy Pelosi

Good evening San Francisco State class of 2019! Are there any Gators in the house? I thought so. Thank You president Leslie Wong for your kind words and your great leadership of this legendary University. The campus and the country are grateful for your leadership and service and we wish you and your wonderful wife Phyllis well in the next chapter in your lives.

And thank you for paving the way for a woman to follow in your footsteps, we're all thrilled that President Lynn Mahoney will be making history as the first woman president of San Francisco State. Thank You president Wong.

Joyous graduates, distinguished trustees, Jeanne Furstenberg, eminent faculty honored alumni, let us join and together applaud the parents, spouses and partners, families and friends, siblings and supporters, sharing in this celebration whose love, support and have courage have made today possible. Let us thank the families who have made this possible.

How happy I am to be with you in this beautiful Stadium of our home team the San Francisco Giants and we thank them for their hospitality. And what a joy it is to be at home in the city of Saint Francis whose song is our anthem Lord make me a channel of thy peace. It approval it's for all of us to share this day with the distinguished awardees who have dedicated their lives to bring hope where there is despair, light where there is darkness, and joy where there is sadness. Maxine Hong Kingston a strong and courageous voice for Asian-American women along coda who was opening the joys of opera doors of opportunity so they can pursue too many young people, so they can pursue their American dreams, and the late dr. joseph white a champion of equality in education and science. Graduates, this is your day, your success, your achievement the degrees you receive today have

been written in the ink of hard work, late nights and juggled responsibilities, some of which Nate spelled out earlier in his beautiful gift. Your diplomas are not simply recognition of completed coursework. They are the fruit of your faith in yourselves, testimonies to your drive, your determination your dreams to build a better tomorrow for yourselves your families and for your kin our communities. let us particularly acknowledge Marie Jose Santa Rubra and Lexi Adzick as they speak for the outstanding graduates honored as hood recipients and challenged us to further greatness thank you so much for your beautiful. Class of 2019, I thank you for the immense privilege of addressing you at the 118 commencement exercises of this historic institution. This is the third time I have been a speaker at the San Francisco State graduation, my first time as Speaker of the House. It is my great honour as Speaker of the House to bring you the congratulations of the United States Congress now the most diverse Congress in history. House Democrats are more than 60% women people of color and LGBTQ community members and they all send you their love and congratulations. And in this Congress we will celebrate 100 years since the suffragettes won the right to vote and we celebrate with more than 100 women being members of Congress. Our constant our Congress is a testament to the powerful troop, the powerful truth we see on this campus in our community that the beauty is in the mix. We are proud as as President Wong mentioned earlier that veterans are such a beautiful and important thread in the diverse tapestry of this University. On Memorial Day and on all days we thank those who have donned the uniform, their families and caregivers. their server their service reminds us of our mission to make a future worthy of their sacrifice. To that amend America no San Francisco State as one of the most vibrant universities in our nation, homes to a proud tradition of activism and advocacy, and a powerful commitment to social justice that reflects the spirit of our city. We are proud that 50 years ago your college of ethnic studies was created which which fundamentally and forever transformed the education agenda, not just on this campus, but on every campus in our country. On this Memorial Day week of patriotism as I look around this stadium, I observe I'm

happy to observe that this class is America, your America because of your diversity and because you subscribe to that special quality of our nation which our founders embrace optimism. Our founders were optimistic as they established our country for the ages because they believed in two things: that every generation would take the responsibility to make the future better for the next generation, and that every person would take responsibility to make that future better. Our founders were successful not only because they were optimistic but because they had courage. Courage is in the DNA of America and in the DNA of the class of 2019. From the courage of our founders to declare independence and not only declare a new nation, but one that was founded on the Equality of all people to encourage to the courage of generations of immigrants who crossed the oceans to take a chance on America and the pioneers who crossed America to take a chance on California. To the courage of our heroes who protect our communities and country our nurses, teachers, parents and our men and women in uniform and first responders their families and caregivers. And to each and every one of you to have the courage and optimism that you have graduating class to reach this day. Our founders and every

generation since have been successful because of their courage to act boldly. At the time our country was established in the dark days of the revolution, Thomas Paine wrote “the times have found us the times have found them to succeed in founding our democracy and the times have found us now to save and strengthen our democracy. And that times are we must be bold to do that as dr. Martin Luther King jr. warned and as I have a dream speech when he spoke of the fierce urgency of now he said this is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. We must take bold action we do not put ourselves in the same category as our founders, but we recognize the urgency of our time now and the need for boldness and courage to save and strengthen America.

What is America? America is our Constitution, our system of checks and balances and our freedoms contained in the Bill of Rights much of which is under assault

today. what is America? America is a nation of immigrants unless you were blessed to be born Native American and that is indeed a blessing.

I'm going to dwell on a moment on immigration because America is a nation of immigrants that's who we are largely as people. immigrants are the constant reinvigoration of America of hope, determination, optimism and courage to make the future better. and now I'm going to quote a president you might not suspect I would quote here President Ronald Reagan. Ronald Reagan said this in his last speech as president of the United States. He said this: thanks to each wave of new arrivals to this land of opportunity we're a nation forever young, forever bursting with energy and new ideas and always on the cutting edge, always leading the world to the next frontier. This quality is vital to our future as a nation. President Reagan went on to say if we ever close the door to new Americans, our leadership in the

world would soon be lost. That is why we must pass comprehensive immigration reform, but that is also why next week we will pass legislation to protect dreamers TPS and deg recipients. Any dreamers in the house? what is America? America is a beautiful gift God has given us from sea to shining sea and beyond and we must protect it. We must protect it as we build the infrastructure of America must do so in a way that addresses the climate crisis the climate crisis which is an existential threat to our planet and we must do so in a way as we fight those who deny science. What is America? America is our values. our values that are contained and what we put forth in our policy. we believe that our federal budget should be a statement of our national values and that you reflect what is important to us as a nation. investment in our children their education that's the health of every person in America and investments in the Arts which bring us together and do not divide America. I know that San Francisco State has a strong commitment to the creative arts that is a very unifying factor. Thank you. and we must invest in as we build the infrastructure America, we must invest in the human infrastructure of our country, recognizing that we have to correct the danger to our democracy that the growing disparity of income in our country presents. as we debate these issues, we

should heed the guidance of our founders. They gave us, they disagreed we disagree, we were but they said to us e pluribus unum - from many one. They couldn't possibly imagine how many we would be or how different we would be from each other. But they knew that we have to remember that we are one as a country. So we must engage in our debate with respect for the vision of our founders, the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform, and the vision of our children, aspirations of all Americans to the best that we can and this will take courage. the courage of all Americans and this the courage of this class, your class which is the future of America. the times have found you class of 2019. You have demonstrated courage on this campus, the courage to work hard and study, the courage to follow your dreams. now your optimism, courage and activism are needed not just for yourself, but for our community, for our country and our future - a future which belongs to you. As you go forward to make you mark in the world, please do so with the confidence that you have received an excellent education here at San Francisco State. Let us thank your faculty for making that possible. And that education, that experience which teachers will serve you and the world well. My advice to you I know you are ready I know you are ready. I my advice to you is to know your power, the power that Springs from being yourself, your individual you from the quality of your education, the depth of your passion, the extent of your imagination, the strength of your values defend here at San Francisco State University. congratulations San Francisco State class of 2019! Enjoy your evening! God bless you and God bless America! Thank you so much!

APPENDIX B

Kamala Harris' acceptance speech as Joe Biden's running mate

Thank you, Joe. As I said, Joe, when you called me, I am incredibly honored by this responsibility and I'm ready to get to work. I'm ready to get to work.

After the most competitive primary in history, the country received a resounding message that Joe was the person to lead us forward. Joe, I'm so proud to stand with you. I do so mindful of all the heroic and ambitious women before me whose sacrifice, determination and resilience makes my presence here today even possible. This is a moment of real consequence for America. Everything we care about, our economy, our health, our children, the kind of country we live in, it's all on the line. We're reeling from the worst public health crisis in a century. The president's mismanagement of the pandemic has plunged us into the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression and we're experiencing a moral reckoning with racism and systemic injustice that has brought a new coalition of conscience to the streets of our country, demanding change. America is crying out for leadership, yet we have a president who cares more about himself than the people who elected him. A president who is making every challenge we face even more difficult to solve.

But here's the good news, we don't have to accept the failed government of Donald Trump and Mike Pence in just 83 days. We have a chance to choose a better future for our country. So Joe, Dr. Biden, thank you for the trust you've placed in me. Jill, I know you will be an incredible First Lady. My husband, Doug, and I are so grateful to become a part of your extended family.

Ever since I received Joe's call, I've been thinking, yes, about the first Biden that I really came to know, and that of course is Joe's beloved son, one of his beloved sons, Beau. In the midst of the Great Recession, Beau and I spoke on the phone practically every day, sometimes multiple times a day, working together to win back billions of dollars for homeowners from the big banks of the nation that were foreclosing on people's homes.

Let me just tell you about Beau Biden. I learned quickly that Beau was the kind of guy who inspired people to be a better version of themselves. He really was the best of us. And when I would ask him, “Where did you get that? Where did this come from?” He’d always talk about his dad. I will tell you the love that they shared was incredible to watch. It was the most beautiful display of the love between a father and a son. Beau talked about how Joe would spend four hours every day riding the rails back and forth from Wilmington to Washington so he could make breakfast for his kids in the morning and make it home in time to tuck them in bed each night. All of this so two little boys, who had just lost their mom and their sister in a tragic accident, would know that the world was still turning, and that’s how I came to know Joe.

He’s someone whose first response when things get tough is never to think about himself, but to care for everyone else. He’s someone who never asks, why is this happening to me? And instead asks, what can I do to make life better for you? His empathy, his compassion, his sense of duty to care for others is why I am so proud to be on this ticket.

Joe and I, yes, we are cut from the same cloth, family is everything to me too. I cannot wait for America to get to know my husband, Doug, and our amazing kids, Cole and Ella. Because whether I’m cheering in the bleachers at a swim meet, or setting up a college room dorm, or helping my goddaughter prepare for her school debate, or building Legos with my godson, or hugging my two baby nieces, or cooking dinner, Sunday dinner, my family means everything to me. I’ve had a lot of titles over my career, and certainly vice president will be great, but Mamala will always be the one that means the most.

My mother and father, they came from opposite sides of the world to arrive in America, one from India and the other from Jamaica, in search of a world-class education. But what brought them together was the civil rights movement of the 1960s. That’s how they met, as students in the streets of Oakland, marching and shouting for this thing called justice in a struggle that continues today, and I was part of it. My parents would bring me to protests, strapped tightly in my stroller. My

mother, Shyamala, raised my sister, Maya, and me to believe that it was up to us and every generation of Americans to keep on marching. She'd tell us, "Don't sit around and complain about things, do something." So I did something, I devoted my life to making real the words carved in the United States Supreme Court, equal justice under law.

30 years ago, I stood before a judge for the first time, breathed deep and uttered the phrase that would truly guide my career and the rest of my career, Kamala Harris for the people. The people, that's who I represented as district attorney, fighting on behalf of victims who needed help. The people, that's who I fought for as California's Attorney General when I took on transnational criminal organizations who traffic in guns and drugs and human beings. And it's the people who I have fought for as the United States Senator where I've worked every day to hold Trump officials accountable to the American people. And the people are who Joe and I will fight for every day in the White House.

Let me tell you, as somebody who has presented my fair share of arguments in court, the case against Donald Trump and Mike Pence is open and shut. Just look where they've gotten us, more than 16 million out of work, millions of kids who cannot go back to school, a crisis of poverty, of homelessness afflicting black, brown, and indigenous people the most, a crisis of hunger afflicting one in five mothers who have children that are hungry and tragically, more than 165,000 lives that have been cut short, many with loved ones who never got the chance to say goodbye. It didn't have to be this way. Six years ago, in fact, we had a different health crisis, it was called Ebola. We all remember that pandemic, but you know what happened then? Barack Obama and Joe Biden did their job, only two-

... and Joe Biden did their job. Only two people in the United States died. Two. That is what's called leadership. But compare that to the moment we find ourselves in now. When other countries are following the science, Trump pushed miracle cures he saw on Fox News. While other countries were flattening the curve, he said the virus would just poof, go away, quote, like a miracle. So when other countries opened back up for business, what did we do? We had to shut down again. This virus has impacted

almost every country, but there's a reason it has hit America worse than any other advanced nation. It's because of Trump's failure to take it seriously from the start, his refusal to get testing up and running, his flip flopping on social distancing and wearing masks, his delusional belief that he knows better than the experts.

All of that is reason. And the reason that an American dies of COVID-19 every 80 seconds. It's why countless businesses have had to shut their doors for good. It's why there is complete chaos over when and how to reopen our schools. Mothers and fathers are confused and uncertain and angry about childcare and the safety of their kids at school. Whether they will be in danger if they go, or fall behind if they don't. Trump is also the reason millions of Americans are now unemployed. He inherited the longest economic expansion in history from Barack Obama and Joe Biden. And then, like everything else he inherited, he ran it straight into the ground. Because of Trump's failures of leadership, our economy has taken one of the biggest hits out of all the major industrialized nations with an unemployment rate that has tripled as of today. This is what happens when we elect a guy who just isn't up for the job. Our country ends up in tatters, and so does our reputation around the world.

But let's be clear. This election isn't just about defeating Donald Trump or Mike Pence. It's about building this country back better. And that's exactly what Joe and I will do. We'll create millions of jobs and fight climate change through a clean energy revolution, bring back critical supply chains so the future is made in America, build on the affordable care act. So everyone has a peace of mind that comes with health insurance, and finally offer caregivers the dignity, the respect, and the pay they deserve. We'll protect a woman's right to make her own decisions about her own body, root out systemic racism in our justice system, and pass a new voting rights act. A John Lewis voting rights act that will ensure every voice is heard and every voice is counted.

The civil rights struggle is nothing new to Joe. It's why he got into public service. It's why he helped reauthorize the voting rights act and restore unemployment discrimination and employment discrimination laws. And today, he takes his place in the ongoing story of America's march toward equality and justice, as the only, as the

only who has served alongside the first black president and has chosen the first black woman as his running mate. But as Joe always points out, this election is about more than politics. It's about who we are as a country. And I'll admit over the past four years, there have been moments when I have truly worried about our future. But whenever I think that there is a reason for doubt, whenever I've had my own doubts, I think of you, the American people, the doctors and nurses and frontline workers who are risking your lives to save others, the truck drivers and the workers in grocery stores, in factories, in farms, working there, putting your own safety on the line to help us get through this pandemic. The women and students taking to the streets in unprecedented numbers. The dreamers and immigrants who know that families belong together. The LGBTQ Americans who know that love is love. People of every age and color and creed who are finally declaring in one voice that yes, black lives matter.

All across this country, a whole new generation of children is growing up hearing the cries for justice and the chance of hope on which I was raised. Some strapped into strollers of their own. And trust me, it's a song you'll never forget. So to everyone, keeping up the fight, you are doing something. You are doing something great. You are the heroes of our time and you are the reason I know we are going to bring our country closer to realizing its great promise, but to do it, we'll need to work, organize and vote like never before, because we need more than a victory on November 3rd. We need a mandate that proves that the past few years do not represent who we are or who we aspire to be.

Joe likes to say that character is on the ballot. And it's true. When he saw what happened in Charlottesville three years ago today, he knew we were in a battle for the soul of our nation. And together with your help, that's a battle we will win. Earlier this year, I said, "I do whatever Joe asks me to do." And so now I'm asking you to do the same. So visit joebiden.com to get involved in this campaign and vote, because electing Joe Biden is just the start of the work ahead of us. And I couldn't be prouder to be by his side, running to represent you, the people. Thank you and may God bless the United States of America. Thank you.

Kamala Harris' DNC speech

Greetings America.

It is truly an honor to be speaking with you.

That I am here tonight is a testament to the dedication of generations before me. Women and men who believed so fiercely in the promise of equality, liberty, and justice for all.

This week marks the 100th anniversary of the passage of the 19th amendment. And we celebrate the women who fought for that right. Yet so many of the Black women who helped secure that victory were still prohibited from voting, long after its ratification.

But they were undeterred.

Without fanfare or recognition, they organized, testified, rallied, marched, and fought—not just for their vote, but for a seat at the table. These women and the generations that followed worked to make democracy and opportunity real in the lives of all of us who followed. They paved the way for the trailblazing leadership of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton. And these women inspired us to pick up the torch, and fight on. Women like Mary Church Terrell and Mary McCleod Bethune. Fannie Lou Hamer and Diane Nash. Constance Baker Motley and Shirley Chisholm. We're not often taught their stories. But as Americans, we all stand on their shoulders.

There's another woman, whose name isn't known, whose story isn't shared. Another woman whose shoulders I stand on. And that's my mother—Shyamala Gopalan Harris.

She came here from India at age 19 to pursue her dream of curing cancer. At the University of California Berkeley, she met my father, Donald Harris—who had come from Jamaica to study economics. They fell in love in that most American way—while marching together for justice in the civil rights movement of the 1960s. In the streets of Oakland and Berkeley, I got a stroller's-eye view of people getting into what the great John Lewis called “good trouble.” When I was 5, my parents split and my mother raised us mostly on her own. Like so many mothers, she worked around

the clock to make it work—packing lunches before we woke up— and paying bills after we went to bed. Helping us with homework at the kitchen table—and shuttling us to church for choir practice. She made it look easy, though I know it never was.

My mother instilled in my sister, Maya, and me the values that would chart the course of our lives. She raised us to be proud, strong Black women. And she raised us to know and be proud of our Indian heritage. She taught us to put family first—the family you're born into and the family you choose. Family, is my husband Doug, who I met on a blind date set up by my best friend. Family is our beautiful children, Cole and Ella, who as you just heard, call me Momala. Family is my sister. Family is my best friend, my nieces and my godchildren. Family is my uncles, my aunts—my chitthis. Family is Mrs. Shelton—my second mother who lived two doors down and helped raise me. Family is my beloved Alpha Kappa Alpha...our Divine 9...and my HBCU brothers and sisters. Family is the friends I turned to when my mother—the most important person in my life—passed away from cancer. And even as she taught us to keep our family at the center of our world, she also pushed us to see a world beyond ourselves. She taught us to be conscious and compassionate about the struggles of all people. To believe public service is a noble cause and the fight for justice is a shared responsibility.

That led me to become a lawyer, a District Attorney, Attorney General, and a United States Senator. And at every step of the way, I've been guided by the words I spoke from the first time I stood in a courtroom: Kamala Harris, For the People.

I've fought for children, and survivors of sexual assault. I've fought against transnational gangs. I took on the biggest banks, and helped take down one of the biggest for-profit colleges. I know a predator when I see one.

My mother taught me that service to others gives life purpose and meaning. And oh, how I wish she were here tonight but I know she's looking down on me from above. I keep thinking about that 25-year-old Indian woman—all of five feet tall—who gave birth to me at Kaiser Hospital in Oakland, California.

On that day, she probably could have never imagined that I would be standing before you now speaking these words: I accept your nomination for Vice President of the

United States of America. I do so, committed to the values she taught me. To the Word that teaches me to walk by faith, and not by sight. And to a vision passed on through generations of Americans—one that Joe Biden shares. A vision of our nation as a Beloved Community—where all are welcome, no matter what we look like, where we come from, or who we love. A country where we may not agree on every detail, but we are united by the fundamental belief that every human being is of infinite worth, deserving of compassion, dignity and respect. A country where we look out for one another, where we rise and fall as one, where we face our challenges, and celebrate our triumphs—together. Today... that country feels distant.

Donald Trump's failure of leadership has cost lives and livelihoods.

If you're a parent struggling with your child's remote learning, or you're a teacher struggling on the other side of that screen, you know that what we're doing right now isn't working. And we are a nation that's grieving. Grieving the loss of life, the loss of jobs, the loss of opportunities, the loss of normalcy. And yes, the loss of certainty. And while this virus touches us all, let's be honest, it is not an equal opportunity offender. Black, Latino and Indigenous people are suffering and dying disproportionately. This is not a coincidence. It is the effect of structural racism.

Of inequities in education and technology, health care and housing, job security and transportation. The injustice in reproductive and maternal health care. In the excessive use of force by police. And in our broader criminal justice system. This virus has no eyes, and yet it knows exactly how we see each other—and how we treat each other.

And let's be clear—there is no vaccine for racism. We've gotta do the work. For George Floyd. For Breonna Taylor. For the lives of too many others to name. For our children. For all of us. We've gotta do the work to fulfill that promise of equal justice under law. Because, none of us are free...until all of us are free...

We're at an inflection point. The constant chaos leaves us adrift. The incompetence makes us feel afraid. The callousness makes us feel alone. It's a lot.

And here's the thing: We can do better and deserve so much more. We must elect a president who will bring something different, something better, and do the important

work. A president who will bring all of us together—Black, White, Latino, Asian, Indigenous—to achieve the future we collectively want. We must elect Joe Biden.

I knew Joe as Vice President. I knew Joe on the campaign trail. But I first got to know Joe as the father of my friend. Joe's son, Beau, and I served as Attorneys General of our states, Delaware and California. During the Great Recession, we spoke on the phone nearly every day, working together to win back billions of dollars for homeowners from the big banks that foreclosed on people's homes. And Beau and I would talk about his family.

How, as a single father, Joe would spend 4 hours every day riding the train back and forth from Wilmington to Washington. Beau and Hunter got to have breakfast every morning with their dad. They went to sleep every night with the sound of his voice reading bedtime stories. And while they endured an unspeakable loss, these two little boys Always knew that they were deeply, unconditionally loved.

And what also moved me about Joe is the work he did, as he went back and forth. This is the leader who wrote the Violence Against Women Act—and enacted the Assault Weapons Ban. Who, as Vice President, implemented The Recovery Act, which brought our country back from The Great Recession. He championed The Affordable Care Act, protecting millions of Americans with pre-existing conditions. Who spent decades promoting American values and interests around the world, standing up with our allies and standing up to our adversaries.

Right now, we have a president who turns our tragedies into political weapons. Joe will be a president who turns our challenges into purpose. Joe will bring us together to build an economy that doesn't leave anyone behind. Where a good-paying job is the floor, not the ceiling. Joe will bring us together to end this pandemic and make sure that we are prepared for the next one. Joe will bring us together to squarely face and dismantle racial injustice, furthering the work of generations. Joe and I believe that we can build that Beloved Community, one that is strong and decent, just and kind. One in which we all can see ourselves. That's the vision that our parents and grandparents fought for. The vision that made my own life possible. The vision that

makes the American promise—for all its complexities and imperfections—a promise worth fighting for.

Make no mistake, the road ahead will not be not easy. We will stumble. We may fall short. But I pledge to you that we will act boldly and deal with our challenges honestly. We will speak truths. And we will act with the same faith in you that we ask you to place in us. We believe that our country—all of us, will stand together for a better future. We already are. We see it in the doctors, the nurses, the home health care workers and the frontline workers who are risking their lives to save people they've never met. We see it in the teachers and truck drivers, the factory workers and farmers, the postal workers and the Poll workers, all putting their own safety on the line to help us get through this pandemic. And we see it in so many of you who are working, not just to get us through our current crises, but to somewhere better.

There's something happening, all across the country.

It's not about Joe or me.

It's about you.

It's about us. People of all ages and colors and creeds who are, yes, taking to the streets, and also persuading our family members, rallying our friends, organizing our neighbors, and getting out the vote. And we've shown that, when we vote, we expand access to health care, expand access to the ballot box, and ensure that more working families can make a decent living. I'm inspired by a new generation of leadership. You are pushing us to realize the ideals of our nation, pushing us to live the values we share: decency and fairness, justice and love. You are the patriots who remind us that to love our country is to fight for the ideals of our country. In this election, we have a chance to change the course of history. We're all in this fight. You, me, and Joe—together.

What an awesome responsibility. What an awesome privilege. So, let's fight with conviction. Let's fight with hope. Let's fight with confidence in ourselves, and a commitment to each other. To the America we know is possible. The America, we love.

Years from now, this moment will have passed. And our children and our grandchildren will look in our eyes and ask us: Where were you when the stakes were so high?

They will ask us, what was it like?

And we will tell them. We will tell them, not just how we felt.

We will tell them what we did.

Thank you. God bless you. And God bless the United States of America.

Senator Kamala Harris Holds Drive-In Rally in Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley

Hi. Oh, it's so good to see everybody. Maria, Thank you for that introduction. Where is she? Thank you for that introduction. It's so good to be with you guys and my friend Bob Casey and everybody Look at this incredible group of leaders. Look, A this look at this. And yes, the path to the White House leads through Pennsylvania. Yes, it does. And you are gonna make it happen. You are going to make it happen. Yeah. So I'm so glad to be with you this afternoon. You know, we're all here in Joe'ss, in Pennsylvania. Jill's in Pennsylvania. Doug's in Pennsylvania. I'm in Pennsylvania. You're in Pennsylvania? We're In Pennsylvania. We're all here is happening right here. And this is Biden Country in that. That's right. That's right. So we're ready to get this done. We're gonna get this done. Tomorrow's election day in about 24 hours. Pennsylvania will determine who will be the next president of the United States. Mhm. And, you know, I did an event earlier, and I just decided, You know, I'm kind of done talking about the guy in the White House. So if you all don't mind, I'm just gonna talk about Joe. Let's talk about Joe. Let's do that. Let's do that. So, you know, Joe has been talking about the fact that this is a moment that really requires riel leadership in our country because we're going through so many crises that all hit at the same time. And so Joe talks about four crises in particular, um, one about obviously this public health pandemic, right? It's killed over 225,000 Americans in just the last several months. And you know what breaks everybody's heart is knowing how many people spent their last hours days on Earth without ah family member nearby. You know, from any of us, I have experienced losing a

family member that you love and not being able to actually just being with them and hold their hands in those last hours off. Nine million people have contracted this virus. Doctors were talking about the long term health consequences, including things like lung scarring. And here's the thing. It didn't have to be this way. It didn't have to be this bad. If we had had really leadership in the White House. And you know, here's the thing. Now remember, Joe's been out of office, but back in March, not having the first hand firsthand information that we know you know who had thanks to Bob Woodward, let's always thank him. Okay, but Joe, back in March without the inside information, said, I know what this is. I know it is serious and we should take it seriously and put in place a plan. Joe had a plan back in March because, remember, Joe has dedicated his life to public service. Joe was there to deal with Ebola. Joe knows the responsibility off the the highest office in the land to deal with issues like this. So back in March, Joe talked about a plan Joe understands. When we're dealing with a public health crisis, we need to kick in one of the most fundamental responsibilities of government, which is to concern itself with the health and well being of the American people. Joe understood that back when would he and President Obama, Barack Obama, President Joe Biden vice president, pushed through the Affordable Care Act, which was one of the most major and influential public policies we have seen some Social Security. It brought health care to over 20 million people that didn't have it. It protected people with preexisting conditions. Raise your hand or hook if you know somebody with diabetes or high blood pressure or Lupus or breast cancer Survivor And you know, I mean, Pennsylvania knows Joe more than most. He's been far too much time in the hospital with the people he loves. He knows that what we're talking about. Health care. It's about understanding that nobody should suffer that nobody should go through unnecessary pain simply because they don't have enough money in their back pocket. Joe knows that access to health care should be a right and not just a privilege of those who can afford it. So everything's at stake in this election. Because Joe is saying, unlike the other guy who's trying to get rid of the affordable care act, Joe saying No, we're gonna build on my success, meaning his success, and we're gonna expand protections. We're gonna bring down the cost of

premiums, bring down the cost of prescription drugs. We're gonna lower eligibility for Medicare to age 60. We're gonna deal with the fact that When we're talking about health care, you gotta understand the body doesn't just start from the neck down. It also includes the neck up, and that's called mental health care. There's a real choice in this election. Joe talks about the fact that we're in the midst of an economic crisis, in large part because of this pandemic. But look, we also know even before the pandemic, far too many Americans were working two and three jobs to try and pay the rent and put food on the table. Joe understands that in the America we believe in, nobody should have to work more than one job to pay the rent and put food on their table. Joe says You want to talk to me about the economy and asked me how the economy is doing. Then I ask you, how are working people doing? How are working families doing? Joe understands that when they passed that tax bill benefiting the top 1% and the biggest corporations of America causing us to deal with a \$2 trillion deficit, that that wasn't about working people and if we get done what we need to get done. Pennsylvania in the next 24 hours Joe and are about to get rid of that tax bill and invest that money in working families. Invest that money in infrastructure building, back up our roads and bridges, partnering with the building trades, the carpenters and the plumbers and the electrician's knowing their apprenticeship programs are the best in the world. Building up America's workforce. Investing in our auto industry, making our auto industry the largest manufacturer of electric vehicles. Investing in working families, not raising taxes on anyone making less than \$400,000 a year but also investing in working families. Knowing you should never pay more than 7% in your income in child care. Investing in our students who come from families who make less than 100,000. Ah, \$125,000 saying, if you go to a four year public school, including an HBCU, you will go for free. That's how Joe thinks about the economy. There's a really clear choice in this race. Let's deal with what Joe being a student of American history and having the courage to speak truth knows we need to do with a long overdue reckoning on racial injustice in America. Joe has the courage to speak a term the other guy will never say. Black lives matter. Joe knows. Look, it may be uncomfortable for some folks to here, but we got to deal with this.

We have to deal with the fact that blacks and Latinos have been three times likely to contract covid twice as likely to die from it. We need to deal with the fact that our native brothers and sisters have the highest rates of diabetes of any population in our country. We need to deal with these things. Joe knows that we are done with a so-called leader who has spent full time trying to so hate and division between us trying to get Americans to turn on each other. We're done with that. Yeah, and Joe knows that the true measure of strength of any human being is measured not based on who you beat down. It's measured based on who you lift up. There's a really clear choice in this election. Joe talks about the climate crisis because he's clear about that, too. He's clear about the fact that you know you, you all know I come from California he's clear that the West Coast is burning from California, Oregon, Washington, over to Colorado. Wildfires. I've met with families who are evacuated never to be able to return to their home firefighters who are fighting fires while their own homes are burning. My brother in law's a firefighter up and down the Gulf Coast states, people being battered by those storms. You know there have been five named storms this year alone, and you know they name a storm because it's really bad in the Midwest, farmers that have lost the whole season of crops because of the floods, Joe says. We need to embrace the science we need to see. This is an imminent knocking on our door harm, and we need to get to it. But Joe sees in a moment of crisis ah, moment of opportunity that this is the time then to invest in infrastructure, invest in renewable energy. Invest as I said earlier, not auto industry and our investment in being the greatest manufacturer of electric vehicles. Because, you see, that's the kind of Leader Joe is. And Pennsylvania, you know, Joe, you know, Joe Joe has seen more hardship than most should ever have to experience. Joe has suffered more loss than anybody really should have to suffer. And I'm gonna tell you something about Joe that I know. And I know, you know, in the midst of any crisis he has faced, he sees always, ah, moment where hard work and determination and faith can see you through to see the opportunity of the moment and on all of these issues. That's where he's at because he believes in the American people. And he believes in the strength of who we are as a nation. So I'm here to thank you all for everything you've been doing these last years,

months, days, hours, I'm here to remind you. I mean, if you're here, your leader So I'm here to remind us all that we still got a lot of time and a lot of work left to do before this election is over. A lot of work to do, and we want to make sure everyone votes and and and as leaders, I'm sure you have been approached with a question I have been approached with, Which is why should I vote. And essentially, I believe there are three reasons that all of us should vote one. Let's honor the ancestors. Let's honor the ancestors. You know, this year we lost a great American hero, Congressman John Lewis, John Lewis, who fought, who shed blood on that Edmund Pettus Bridge for our right to vote and the right for black people to vote in America. Let's honor the ancestors. This year we celebrated the passage of the 19th Amendment because those suffragettes 100 years ago in all their white were marching and shouting, saying, Women have a right to vote to. And let's always Bethlehem also be true to history. Black women couldn't vote until 1965. Got to deal with that. But let's honor the ancestors because they imagined a moment like this where they wanted us to stand up for our rights and stand up for our ideals. So that's a reason to vote. Reason number two. Everything is at stake. Everything is at stake. The future of our democracy are standing around the world. Our commitment to working people, our commitment to the dignity and integrity of our leaders and each one of us. Everything is at stake. Number three. You know, I've been traveling the country I've been here in Pennsylvania before, of course. And I was just in Georgia. I was in North Carolina. I was in Texas and Florida just in the last couple days. Um, all over our country, you know that there have been very, very serious attempts being made now for years to try and suppress the vote. Attempts to try and make it difficult and confusing for people to vote. I mean, look, in Texas, you know, they were picking up drop boxes. They said there would could only be one dropbox per county. I was in Houston the other day, um, in in in Harris County. I was in Houston, in Harris County. Four million people live in that county, one dropbox in various states. They're saying if you vote by mail, you gotta fill out your ballot and put it in one envelope, and then you gotta pull it in a second envelope, and then you got to sign it right here, but in some other states, and then you have to have a third person sign it.

Yeah, I'd like a different person. It bananas, right? And so all of this is happening, right? E mean, you even got. I mean, they're even messing with the post office like the post office. The nicest people work for the post office. They're messing with post office and you gotta and the senses. And what what we have to do, though in this moment is asked, Why do you think so many powerful people are going out of their way to try and make it difficult and confusing for us to vote? And I do believe it is because they know our power. They know our power. They know when we vote, things change. They know when we vote, we win. So let's not let anyone take our power from us. We will not be sidelined. We will not be silenced. We know our power. And my final point then is this. This moment will pass. And years from now, our Children, our grandchildren and others, they're gonna look in our face. They're gonna look in our eyes, each one of us, and they will ask us, Where were you at that moment? They will ask us, where were you? And here's the thing I know We will tell them so much more than just how we felt. We will tell them what we did. We will tell them we organized. We will tell them we mobilized. We will tell them We emailed and we texted and we call till folks got sick of us. But we knew They get over it and we will tell them Bethlehem that we elected Joe Biden the next president of the United States. Thank you.

Senator Kamala Harris Comments to Reporters in Detroit (Oct 25, 2020)

Hi. Hi. Hi. Everybody can't leave. They are admitting to Pete. And I've been saying that, and Joe Biden has been saying that since the beginning. This is the greatest failure of any presidential administration in the history of America. And he went on to say, You can't control it like the flu. And yet again, they're suggesting to the American people that this is like the flu when we have known from the beginning. And they knew since January that it's five times more deadly than here in Michigan alone. Over 3000 new cases just yesterday this week alone nationally way are breaking records for the number of people that are contracting a deadly virus. And this administration fails to take personal responsibility or responsibility in terms of leading the nation through this dangerous and deadly mass casualty event. And that's

why they have forfeited their right to a second term in office. Listen, he should be following the guidelines were doing it. I think we have modeled right and good behavior, and they should take our lead. You're work. You need to tell me where to store the insects. You're half to 70 and that states are vulnerable. Secondly, what do you say to some Democrats who are worried that you're playing the battleground too wide? You should focus instead on Midwestern states like this one in Wisconsin and Pennsylvania. The bottom line is we're focusing on every state, and we are working to earn the vote of every American regardless of where they live.

Senator Kamala Harris Comments to Reporters in Gwinnett County, Georgia

(Nov 1, 2020)

It is good to be back in Georgia. Obviously, the election is very near in terms of election day. We are here to remind Georgians of the significance of their vote. This state, which has been so hard-hit in terms of the virus, the public health impacts as well as the public health impacts. It says that this race is very much happening. The election is around the corner. The people of this state have a lot at stake. We are here and I am here to listen, let them know that we are thinking about them and that we have policies and plans that will impact them in a big way. A big part of making Joe Biden the nominee. Are you confident that black turnout will be where it needs to be on Tuesday? First of all, we are not telling anybody they are supposed to vote for us. We need to earn the vote of every person. That means having policies that are relevant to the people we are talking with. African-American people across the country, it is not a monolith. There are issues that are about criminal justice reform, economic issues in terms of access to capital. The disproportionate impact of covid on the black community. Black folks are three times as likely to contract covid. The disparities that exist, that have long existed. We are talking to all communities. Understanding that the black community has very specific needs, mostly in terms of disproportionate impact. They need to be corrected by policies that promote equity and equitable outcome. Do you think the campaign has done enough? -- do you think the campaign has done enough to get that message -- I think we always can do more.

There is no question about that. Until every person has been heard, I think our job is a job that is ongoing. That is why I am here.

Harris' remarks on January 6 anniversary '*Democracy Won't Stand If We Don't Defend It*' (2021)

Fellow Americans, good morning.

Certain dates echo throughout history, including dates that instantly remind all who have lived through them -- where they were and what they were doing when our democracy came under assault. Dates that occupy not only a place on our calendars, but a place in our collective memory. December 7th, 1941. September 11th, 2001. And January 6th, 2021.

On that day, I was not only Vice President-elect, I was also a United States senator. And I was here at the Capitol that morning, at a classified hearing with fellow members of the Senate Intelligence Committee. Hours later, the gates of the Capitol were breached.

I had left. But my thoughts immediately turned not only to my colleagues, but to my staff, who had been forced to seek refuge in our office, converting filing cabinets into barricades. – (cares about staff)

What the extremists who roamed these halls targeted was not only the lives of elected leaders. What they sought to degrade and destroy was not only a building, hallowed as it is. What they were assaulting were the institutions, the values, the ideals that generations of Americans have marched, picketed, and shed blood to establish and defend.

On January 6th, we all saw what our nation would look like if the forces who seek to dismantle our democracy are successful. The lawlessness, the violence, the chaos.

What was at stake then, and now, is the right to have our future decided the way the Constitution prescribes it: by we, the people -- all the people.

We cannot let our future be decided by those bent on silencing our voices, overturning our votes, and peddling lies and misinformation; by some radical faction that may be newly resurgent but whose roots run old and deep.

When I meet with young people, they often ask about the state of our democracy, about January 6th. And what I tell them is: January 6th reflects the dual nature of democracy -- its fragility and its strength.

You see, the strength of democracy is the rule of law. The strength of democracy is the principle that everyone should be treated equally, that elections should be free and fair, that corruption should be given no quarter. The strength of democracy is that it empowers the people.

And the fragility of democracy is this: that if we are not vigilant, if we do not defend it, democracy simply will not stand; it will falter and fail.

The violent assault that took place here, the very fact of how close we came to an election overturned -- that reflects the fragility of democracy.

Yet, the resolve I saw in our elected leaders when I returned to the Senate chamber that night -- their resolve not to yield but to certify the election; their loyalty not to party or person but to the Constitution of the United States -- that reflects its strength.

And so, of course, does the heroism of the Capitol Police, the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department, the National Guard, and other law enforcement officers who answered the call that day, including those who later succumbed to wounds, both visible and invisible.

Our thoughts are with all of the families who have lost a loved one.

You know, I wonder, how will January 6th come to be remembered in the years ahead?

Will it be remembered as a moment that accelerated the unraveling of the oldest, greatest democracy in the world or a moment when we decided to secure and strengthen our democracy for generations to come?

The American spirit is being tested.

The answer to whether we will meet that test resides where it always has resided in our country -- with you, the people.

And the work ahead will not be easy. Here, in this very building, a decision will be made about whether we uphold the right to vote and ensure free and fair election.

Let's be clear: We must pass the voting rights bills that are now before the Senate, and the American people must also do something more.

We cannot sit on the sidelines. We must unite in defense of our democracy in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our prosperity and posterity.

That is the preamble of the Constitution that President Biden and I swore an oath to uphold and defend. And that is the enduring promise of the United States of America. My fellow Americans, it is my honor to introduce a public servant with the character and fortitude to meet this moment, a leader whose life's work has been moving our nation toward that more perfect union: President Joe Biden.

Kamala Harris's victory speech in Wilmington, Del (2020)

Good evening! Good evening. Good evening. Good evening. Thank you, thank you. Good evening. So, thank you, good evening. So, Congressman John Lewis -- Congressman John Lewis before his passing wrote "Democracy is not a state, it is an act." And what he meant was that America's democracy is not guaranteed.

It is only as strong as our willingness to fight for it. To guard it and never take it for granted. And protecting our democracy takes struggle. It takes sacrifice. But there is joy in it.

And there is progress. Because we, the people, have the power to build a better future.

And when our very democracy was on the ballot in this election with the very soul of America at stake and the world watching, you ushered in a new day for America. To our campaign staff and volunteers, this extraordinary team, thank you for bringing more people than ever before into the democratic process.

And so making this victory possible. To the poll workers and election officials across our country who have worked tirelessly to make sure every vote is counted, our nation owes you a debt of gratitude.

You have protected the integrity of our democracy. And to the American people who make up our beautiful country, thank you for turning out in record numbers to make your voices heard. And I know times have been challenging, especially the last several months.

The grief, sorrow, and pain, the worries and the struggles, but we have also witnessed your courage, your resilience and the generosity of your spirit. For four years, you marched and organized for equality and justice, for our lives and for our planet and then you voted!

And you delivered a clear message. You chose hope and unity, decency, science, and yes, truth! You chose Joe Biden as the next president of the United States of America!

And Joe is a healer, a uniter, a tested and steady hand. A person whose own experience of loss gives him a sense of purpose that will help us as a nation reclaim our own sense of purpose. And a man with a big heart who loves with abandon. It's his love for Jill, who will be an incredible first lady.

It's his love for Hunter and Ashley and his grandchildren and the entire Biden family. And while I first knew Joe as vice president, I really got to know him as the father who loved Beau, my dear friend who we remember here today.

And to my husband Doug and our children Cole and Ella and my sister Maya and our whole family.

I love y'all more than I can ever express. We are so grateful to Joe and Jill for welcoming our family into theirs on this incredible journey. And to the woman most responsible for my presence here today, my mother, Shyamala Gopalan Harris, who is always in our hearts. When she came here from India at the age of 19, she maybe didn't quite imagine this moment.

But she believed so deeply in an America where a moment like this is possible, and so I am thinking about her and about the generations of women, Black women, Asian, white, Latina, native American women, who throughout our nation's history, have paved the way for this moment tonight.

Women who fought and sacrificed so much for equality and liberty and justice for all. Including the Black women who are often, too often overlooked but so often proved they are the backbone of our democracy.

All the women who have worked to secure and protect the right to vote for over a century. One hundred years ago with the 19th Amendment. Fifty-five years ago with the Voting Rights Act and now in 2020 with a new generation of women in our country who cast their ballots and continued the fight for their fundamental right to vote and be heard.

Tonight I reflect on their struggle, their determination and the strength of their vision to see what can be unburdened by what has been. And I stand on their shoulders. And what a testament it is to Joe's character that he had the audacity to break one of the most substantial barriers that exists in our country and select a woman as his vice president.

But while I may be the first woman in this office, I will not be the last. Because every little girl watching tonight sees that this is a country of possibilities and to the children of our country regardless of your gender, our country has sent you a clear message: dream with ambition, lead with conviction and see yourselves in a way that others may not simply because they've never seen it before.

But know that we will applaud you every step of the way. And to the American people, no matter who you voted for, I will strive to be a vice president like Joe was to President Obama, loyal, honest, and prepared, waking up every day thinking of you and your family, because now is when the real work begins, the hard work, the necessary work, the good work, the essential work to save lives and beat this epidemic.

To rebuild our economy so it works for working people, to root out systemic racism in our justice system and society. To combat the climate crisis, to unite our country and heal the soul of our nation. And the road ahead will not be easy. But America is ready. And so are Joe and I. We have elected a president who represents the best in us, a leader the world will respect and our children will look up to. A commander in

chief who will respect our troops and keep our country safe and a president for all Americans.

And it is now my great honor to introduce the president-elect of the United States of America, Joe Biden!

Vice President Harris Campaigns with Governor Hochul at Barnard College

Governor Kathy Hochul! (Applause.) Hey, New York, we going to get this done? (Applause.) We going to get this done? Five days! Five days. We going to get this done? Yes. We going to give it everything we got? No sleep? Okay, I'm going to hold you to that. (Laughter.)

It's good to be with all these leaders. It is so good to be with all these leaders.

Listen, let's just get right down to business, because we do have five days. And sometimes, five days can seem like a lot of time, but in this case, we don't have a lot of time to do something very big, which is to elect Kathy Hochul the next and continuing governor of the state of New York. (Applause.)

Five days. Five days. And Secretary Clinton said it, Tish James said it, the Governor herself said it: Everything is on the line.

And the thing about Kathy Hochul is she has shown you who she is. She has shown you what she cares about. She has shown you how hard she will work for the people of New York. And I believe that when you know what you stand for, you know what to fight for. (Applause.) So we got a lot of work to do.

And as the Governor said, you've witnessed a lot of history on this stage this afternoon. (Applause.) A whole lot of firsts.

But here's the thing I know about Secretary Clinton, I know about General James, I know about Governor Hochul: We are committed - yes, we may be the first, but we are committed to not being the last. (Applause.) And we're going to count on you to help us see that through.

Five days. Five days. So we need folks to vote. Right? For folks who haven't voted, we need them to vote. We need them to vote early and we need them to vote on Election Day.

And I can look around this room, and I know this is a group of leaders, most of whom have been out there already talking with people about the importance of voting, people who worked on the 2020 election and elected Joe Biden President and me Vice President. (Applause.)

And so here's the thing we all know, because a lot of us have been doing this every election cycle, asking folks to vote, and here's what happens: So, we go up and we ask somebody to vote. And they will then ask a very righteous question every time: "Why should I vote?"

Well, here's the thing: We got a whole lot of good material. (Laughter.) We got a lot of good material, because think about it: Last election, 2020, in the height of a pandemic - so much loss - loss of life, people lost their jobs, loss of normalcy, parents who are trying to figure out how they could educate their kids in the middle of all this, trying to go online, if they even had access to high-speed Internet. And in the midst of all of that - think about it - we had an historic turnout, and in particular, a historic turnout of young voters voting. (Applause.) You all. It was historic.

And the way I see it is when people went in 2020 to vote, they were essentially putting in their order. Right? They stood in line for hours in the midst of all of these burdens.

For so many of you, if you were in school at that time, what those days meant, trying to learn from - from home, learn from your dorm room, wherever you were, you wanted to see people, you wanted to be with -

And in the midst of all that - in the midst of all of that, people took the time to vote, stood in line for hours to vote.

And this is what they said. They said, "There are certain things that I want from my government and certain things that I know I'm entitled to." And so when we go to ask them to vote this time, in five days and over the next five days, we're going to first of all say, "Thank you for doing what you did last time," and then we're going remind them, "So, you put in your order, and here's what your vote did." You said, "It is time that America deals with the issue of child poverty." And because you voted, we

extended the child tax credit, which reduced poverty for children in America by over 40 percent in the first year. (Applause.) Because you voted.

You said, "Help parents out, people who are parenting children, because it's expensive." So you put in your order and said, "Do something about that." And because you voted, we passed a tax cut so that people parenting children get eight - up to 8,000 more dollars in their pocket to help them with the cost of food and medicine and school supplies for their children. Because they voted. (Applause.)

Because people voted and said, "Look, I'm going to put in my order; I want y'all to deal with this climate crisis because we value the importance of drinking clean water and breathing clean air and saving this beautiful planet upon which we live." And so people put in their order. And because you voted, we just put \$370 billion into an investment in what we must do to combat the effects of this climate crisis. (Applause.) Because you voted. Because you voted.

We're going go up to people, and we're going to ask them and they're going to say, "Well, why should I vote?" And we're going to say, "Because the last time, you said, 'You know what? Y'all need to deal with the potholes and deal with the fact that America's infrastructure is about 150 years old, and we need to fix these bridges, and we need to fix these roads.'" (Applause.) And because they voted, LaGuardia is now going to get \$30 million for upgrades. (Applause.)

Because they voted, we're going to have electric MTA buses and put \$110 million into doing it. (Applause.) Because they voted, Second Avenue Subway is going to get \$400 million. (Applause.) Because they put in their order. Because you voted.

And you said, "You know what? It's about time we had a Black woman on the United States Supreme Court." (Applause.) And because you voted - and because you voted, her name is Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson. (Applause.) Because you voted.

Because you voted and said, "We're putting in our order. Student loan debt is preventing folks from being able to start a family, buy a home, or even pay rent." And because you voted, in spite of all of the criticism, we are canceling debt of up to \$20,000 of student loan debt. Because people voted. (Applause.)

Because people voted and said, "It's been 30 years since there's been any meaningful, smart gun legislation in our country, and it's about time that people have some courage to pass or do smart and safe gun legislation," that we were able to expand background checks - the most meaningful gun legislation in 30 years. Because people voted and put in their order. (Applause.)

People said, "You know, you guys did a great job in 2008 and during those years reforming the healthcare system, but it's still really expensive to buy medication." And so people took the time and stood in line for hours to vote and said, "Can you do something about that?"

They said, "You know, I got a lot of relatives who have diabetes. Black people in America are 60 percent more likely to be diagnosed with diabetes, Latinos 70 percent more likely to be diagnosed with diabetes. Why do I know seniors who have diabetes, who have to make a decision about whether they're going to fill a prescription that a doctor ordered because it will save their life versus being able to buy food or pay their rent?"

And because you voted, we have now capped insulin at \$35 a month for those seniors. (Applause.) Because you voted.

Because you voted and you said, "You know what? This game that the pharmaceutical companies have been playing, jacking up prices on medication, is just not right. Somebody's got to be able to negotiate on behalf of the American people on this issue." And so, long time in coming, but because you voted, we are now allowing Medicare to negotiate against the pharmaceutical companies on behalf of 60 million Americans - 60 million people. (Applause.) Because you voted.

Elections matter. Elections matter. And we have so much at stake in this one.

Just think about this: The United States Supreme Court — the highest court in our land — just took a constitutional right, that had been recognized, from the people of America.

And, by the way, on this subject, I think it's important to note: One does not have to abandon their faith or deeply held beliefs to agree the government should not be telling her and anyone what to do with their own body. (Applause.)

But now, with the Dobbs decision, we are seeing states around our country pass or propose laws that will criminalize doctors and nurses and healthcare providers — literally are providing for jail time for healthcare providers, proposing and passing laws for which there is no exception for rape or incest. When I was a courtroom prosecutor, I specialized in crimes against women and children, and in particular, child sexual assault. And let me tell you guys: The idea that anyone who proposes or professes to be a leader would suggest that there would be no exception after an individual has endured and survived an act of violence and violation, and then suggest to them they will not have the autonomy after that violation of their body to make a decision about what next happens to their body, it is immoral. Immoral. (Applause.) It is unconscionable. Here's the other thing about that decision: So, the proponents said, "Well, you know, let's just — let's just let the states decide." (Laughter.) Right? "Let's just let the states decide."

Okay, well, those same people are some of the same people who in the states are intentionally making it more difficult for people to vote. And because it has now been pushed to the states, your governor, who has stood strong and firm her entire career, her position on this issue becomes even more important. Because, listen, guys, if this happens, as these Republicans are trying to push so many of their leaders, they have said there will be a national ban on abortion. And we're going to need people in the statehouse and at a local level who have the courage to stand up and push back against what is happening in our country. (Applause.)

And in that way, who is your governor matters. Who is your attorney general matters. Who is your lieutenant governor matters. (Applause.) Because they will be the last line of defense with what we're seeing happening around our country. Elections matter. And what we are also seeing is that if you look at — you know, I like Venn diagrams, okay? So if you look — (laughs) — I do. And if you look at the intersection on some of these issues, it's pretty profound and very clear. And, by the way, Clarence Thomas said the quiet part out loud. Now at risk: an

individual's right to contraception, an individual's right to marry the person they love is now at risk. And if you look at where these attacks are coming from, you would not be surprised to know there is a significant intersection between those who are attacking voting rights, LGBTQ+ rights, and reproductive rights. See what's happening around our country and understand why elections matter. Because, again, who is all in these statehouses, who are holding these offices will be potentially the last line of defense. Elections matter. You know, as — as Vice President, I have now — (applause) — well, thank you. That's me. (Laughs.) (Applause.) So, as Vice President in these almost two years, I have — my team has told me I have now met with over 100 world leaders, directly or — (applause) — (laughs) — so, directly or — or by phone. Presidents, prime ministers, chancellors, and kings. And here's the thing that you all know, and Secretary Clinton certainly knows: When we walk into these rooms representing the United States of America, we have traditionally walked into these rooms chin up, shoulders back, talking about the importance of democracy, representing what we hold out to be the greatest democracy in the world, imperfect though it may be. But it gives us the authority then, in these rooms, to talk about the importance of rule of law, the importance of human rights, a free press. And in that way, we have been held out as a model. But here's the thing everyone here knows, because you are all role models. The thing about being a role model is this: People watch what you do to see if it matches what you say. So there are — my greatest fear — dictators and autocrats around the world who will dare to tell their people, "You want to hold out the United States as an example of these issues? Well, look at what they're doing." And in that way, what is happening in our country will very likely not only affect the people of our nation, but potentially people around the world. All of this is at stake. And on the issue then of democracies, I do believe that the nature of democracy is that there's a duality. On the one hand, when a democracy is intact, I believe it is incredibly strong in that it gives strength to its people. It is a protector and a defender of individual rights and

freedoms and justice. When it is intact, there's an incredible strength in its ability to lift people up.

On the other hand, it's very fragile. It is only as strong as our willingness to fight for it. And so fight we will. (Applause.) And so fight we will. (Applause.) And so we will do everything in these next five days — (applause) — standing for the country we love, standing for the principles we hold dear. (Applause.) We will stand for the voices that we know have everything on the line. And we will fight for the principles that we know we hold dear, the ideals we hold dear. You know, I do believe there are two definitions of what it means to be a patriot. One is the definition that suggests you'll defend your country whatever it does. But then there is the other definition, which I believe describes all of us patriots, which is the willingness, born out of love of country, to fight for the ideals and the attainment of the ideals of our nation. (Applause.) That is what is at stake. And so we will fight. And when we fight, we win. (Applause.) Thank you.

Vice President Harris Remarks Commemorating Roe v. Wade 50th Anniversary

Thank you. (Applause.) Dr. Sujatha Prabhakaran, where are you? There she is. She just left the stage — (laughs) — but is always on the stage.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We love you!

THE VICE PRESIDENT: And we love all of our frontline folks. And this room is filled with them. (Applause.) Filled with them.

Good afternoon, everyone. It is good to be back in Florida. (Applause.)

THE VICE PRESIDENT: And Tallahassee in the house. (Applause.)

So, before we — before we talk about the subject for which we are all convened, I do want to address the tragedy of what happened in my state, in Monterey Park, California. A time of a cultural celebration, and yet another community has been torn apart by senseless gun violence.

So Doug and I join the President and Dr. Biden and I know everyone here in mourning for those who were killed, as we pray for those who were injured, and as we grieve for those many people whose lives are forever changed.

All of us in this room and in our country understand this violence must stop.

And President Biden and I and our administration will continue to provide full support to the local authorities as we learn more.

And with that, I want to address another topic, which is the reason that we all join together today. I am honored to be with members of United States Congress who are here, state and local elected officials — (applause) —

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I'm glad to be with you. (Applause.)

And all of the coalition partners who are represented here. (Applause.) Let's give it up for everyone. (Applause.)

So we are here together because we collectively believe and know America is a promise. America is a promise. It is a promise of freedom and liberty — not for some, but for all. (Applause.)

A promise we made in the Declaration of Independence that we are each endowed with the right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. (Applause.)

Be clear. These rights were not bestowed upon us. They belong to us as Americans. (Applause.)

And it is that freedom and liberty that enabled generations of Americans to chart their own course and decide their own future with, yes, ambition and aspiration. Therein lies the strength of our nation.

And since our founding, we have then been on a march forward to fully realize our promise to complete the unfinished work to secure freedom and liberty for all. (Applause.)

Now, these outcomes will not be inevitable. They will not just happen. It takes steadfast determination and dedication. The kind of determination and dedication possessed by some of our greatest patriots: those Americans who fought a Civil War to end the sin of slavery — (applause) — who organized at Seneca Falls to secure a woman's right to vote — (applause) — who launched the Freedom Rides to advance civil rights — (applause) — and spoke out at the Stonewall Inn to defend human rights. (Applause.)

In each of these movements, those leaders expanded rights which then advanced the cause of freedom and liberty.

And 50 years ago today, so did those who won a fight in the United States Supreme Court to recognize the fundamental constitutional right of a woman to make decisions about her own body — (applause) — not the government. (Applause.)

For nearly 50 years, Americans relied on the rights that Roe protected. Today, however, on what would have been its 50th anniversary, we speak of the Roe decision in the past tense — because, last June, the United States Supreme Court took away that constitutional right — a fundamental right, a basic freedom — from the people of America from the women of America.

AUDIENCE: Boo —

THE VICE PRESIDENT: — from the women of America.

The Court's action has meant already that many dedicated doctors and nurses now lose their ability to care for their patients, that providers risk going to jail just for doing their job, and that patients are denied critical care and even fear that they will be punished simply for seeking care.

It has meant that a 10-year-old child in Ohio who was sexually assaulted and became pregnant had to leave her home — had to leave her home state and travel to another to receive care. It has meant that the doctor who treated her faced death threats and efforts to take away her medical license.

And for Amanda, a 35-year-old woman in Texas, it meant, in the midst of a miscarriage, she was denied treatment three times in three days at an emergency room because of that state's abortion ban. And only after she developed sepsis, an infection that almost killed her, did the hospital finally admit her.

Thank God Amanda survived. And she, with her husband, Josh, is here today. (Applause.) And I want to thank them both for having the courage to tell their story in a way that will inspire so many individuals and their families to know they are not alone.

The consequences of the Supreme Court's ruling are not only limited to those who need reproductive care. Other basic healthcare is at risk.

Consider Emma, a 14-year-old who lives in Arizona. So Emma manages her chronic arthritis with medication that allows her to go to school and live without constant pain. But the medication that helps her can also cause pregnancy loss. So within weeks of the Dobbs decision, her pharmacy initially refused to fill her prescription, afraid that they could be prosecuted under the state's radical law.

All of these devastating experiences — the direct result of laws designed by extremists, including in states like Florida. (Applause.)

Last year, so-called leaders at the state House here in Tallahassee — passed a radical abortion ban with no exceptions even for the survivors of crimes like rape and child molestation and human trafficking.

Here in Florida, healthcare providers face prison — prison for up to five years for simply doing their job.

And now the state has also targeted medication abortion and even threatened Florida pharmacists with criminal charges if they provide medications prescribed by medical professionals.

And Florida is not alone. Twenty-two states have announced they will not follow new federal rules that allow women to get medication prescribed by their doctor from a certified pharmacy. Imagine.

So, today, we are fighting back. (Applause.)

I'm pleased to announce that President Biden — I'm announcing it today — has issued a presidential memorandum on this issue.

Members of our Cabinet and our administration are now directed, as of the President's order, to identify barriers to access to prescription medication and to recommend actions to make sure that doctors can legally prescribe, that pharmacies can dispense, and that women can secure safe and effective medication. (Applause.)

So President Biden has done that.

At the same time that we work to protect this aspect of reproductive care, many states have gone even further and now have total bans in effect.

Alabama, Missouri, and South Dakota, just to name a few. And as — as clinics close in those states — understand, as clinics are closing in those states, patients have lost

access to other basic care such as routine check-ups, cancer screenings, and contraception.

And to everyone listening, be sure, no one is immune from these impacts, even in states that protect reproductive rights like New Jersey, Illinois, Oregon. Even then, people live in fear of what might be next because Republicans in Congress are now calling for a nationwide abortion ban.

Some even from the moment of conception. The right of every woman in every state in this country to make decisions about her own body is on the line. And I've said it before, and I will say it again: How dare they? (Applause.) How dare they?

And, you know, there is a collection of words — there is a collection of words that mean everything to us as Americans: the heartfelt words of our great National Anthem. That America is the land of the free and the home of the brave.

But let us ask, can we truly be free if a woman cannot make decisions about her own body?

AUDIENCE: Nooo —

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Can we truly be free if a doctor cannot care for her patients?

AUDIENCE: Nooo —

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Can we truly be free if families cannot make intimate decisions about the course of their own lives?

AUDIENCE: Nooo —

THE VICE PRESIDENT: And can we truly be free if so-called leaders claim to be, quote — I quote, “on the vanguard of freedom,” while they dare to restrict the rights of the American people and attack the very foundations of freedom? (Applause.)

Understand clearly, the majority of Americans — the majority of Americans oppose these attacks.

Americans of every background, in every community have voiced their perspective: from Kansas to California, Michigan, Montana, Kentucky, and Vermont. They spoke with their vote.

In essence, they said, one does not have to abandon their faith or deeply held beliefs to agree that the government should not be telling people what to do with their own bodies. (Applause.)

So know this: President Biden and I agree, and we will never back down. We will not back down. (Applause.) And we know — we know this fight will not be won until we secure this right for every American.

Congress must pass a bill that protects freedom and liberty. (Applause.) A bill that protects reproductive rights. And President Biden will sign it. (Applause.)

So, yes, America is a promise. A promise we must all make real in every state and every community, in every statehouse, in every doctor's office, and, yes, in every election.

So to all the friends and leaders, I say: Let us not be tired or discouraged, because we're on the right side of history. (Applause.)

So we will continue to stand together in the fight to protect the freedom and liberty of all people, of all women everywhere.

And here and now, on this 50th anniversary, let us resolve to make history and secure this right. (Applause.)

Today, I invite all Americans to join us, and to remember: When we fight, we win. (Applause.)

Thank you all. May God bless you. And may God bless America. Thank you all. (Applause.)

US Vice President Kamala Harris' Diwali Speech At White House

Thank you for that beautiful introduction. Thank you.

And to our incredible President, Joe Biden — you know, the White House is the People's House, and together, these two — our President and First Lady — have once again made this place a place where every American can celebrate and honor their traditions. And we know and understand the significance of that. (Applause.)

And we have learned we cannot take that for granted. And so, to the two of you, I thank you deeply for all that you are.

And it is so good to be with everyone here. Tonight, of course, we join with more than 1 billion people around the world to light the diya and to celebrate the fight for good over evil, knowledge over ignorance, and light over darkness.

I have, personally, such fond memories of celebrating Diwali as a child. Like many of you, we would go to India about every other year, avoiding monsoon season — (laughter) — and we would go for Diwali. And I have such fond memories of waking up in the middle of the night, me and my sister Maya, and going, of course, to the eldest in our family, which is — was our grandfather. And then, later in the day, my mother would give us lit sparklers and we would go into the streets to celebrate this very important occasion.

As many of you know, my mother arrived in the United States at the age of 19 when she came to the United States to study. She arrived by herself, but it was her goal and her mission to study to become a breast cancer researcher. And in our country — in this country, she built a life. She earned her PhD, and she excelled in her field. And she raised my sister and me.

And it is because of her dedication, her determination, and her courage that I stand before you as Vice President of the United States. (Applause.)

So, as we all know, Diwali is a holiday of hope. As with so many cultures, Diwali reminds us to see the light in our world, in each other, and in ourselves.

We also are reminded to shine our light in the darkness, to fight for peace, for justice, for understanding, even as powerful forces work to sow hate and division. We remember that in these moments where we see darkness, our light shines the brightest. That is part of what we are reminded of in Diwali. In moments of darkness, we see the light.

So, today, as we celebrate Diwali, let us continue to make real the ideals of our nation — the ideals of freedom, democracy, and equality for all. Together, let us, all together, light the way toward a better future. (Applause.)

And now — and now it is my great honor to introduce a leader who fights every day to bring light to our nation, our President, Joe Biden.

Speech at the Naval Academy graduation in 2021

Good morning. Good morning.

Acting Secretary Thomas Harker, General David Berger, Admiral Mike Gilday, looking out at these midshipmen, I know we are all filled with pride. Vice Admiral Sean Buck, Captain TR Buchanan, faculty and staff, thank you for educating such a fine crew. Alumni, thank you for the support you have shown over these years to this great institution. And to my military aid, Lieutenant Colonel Frank Machniak, who graduated in 2004, I'm very proud to have you with me here today.

Family and friends of these graduates, thank you for the sacrifices you have already made and will make.

And I also want to acknowledge Kim and John Johnson. Your son was taken far too soon and I promise you that he will not be forgotten.

And finally, to the class of 2021, congratulations. Congratulations.

And look how far you've come. So you endured 05:30 PT and PRONO exams. You excelled on athletic fields and in academic exercises. You enjoyed the fair at Dillows. I know. Karaoke at Harvest. You guys rolled up your sleeves and you got vaccinated and you made it to this day. You made it to this day.

And this day, this day that is not only a commencement, this day that is a commissioning. And in a few minutes, you will take an oath. And it's actually the same oath I took as Vice President, an oath to support our Constitution and defend it against all enemies, an oath that has its roots in the founding of our nation. And no matter what changes in our world, the charge in this oath is constant.

Remember that as you walk out into the world, because the world you all are walking into is rapidly changing. In fact, we are at a significant turning point. Just look at the last several months and you know what I'm talking about. And look at several moments in our nation's history for perspective.

Think about it. There was the world before the stock market crashed in 1929, and the world after, the world before the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, and the world after, the world before the Civil Rights Act in 1964, and the world after, the world before the Berlin Wall fell in 1989, and the world after.

At some of these critical moments, our nation was compelled to take a hard look at both our priorities and our preparedness.

And another turning point was September 11th, 20 years ago this year, when airplanes hit the twin towers and our Pentagon, when Flight 93 crashed in Pennsylvania. That day shaped your entire life and it shaped our entire nation. It tested our systems, our structures, our very standing in the world.

Well, midshipmen, we are now entering the next era, a new age, a new epoch with its own tests, with its own challenges, and with its own opportunities.

The global pandemic you see, of course, has accelerated what was happening before and it has accelerated our world into a new era. It has forever impacted our world. It has for ever influenced our perspective. And if we weren't clear before, we know now our world is interconnected, our world is interdependent, and our world is fragile.

Just think, a deadly pandemic can spread throughout the globe in just a matter of months, a gang of hackers can disrupt the fuel supply of a whole seaboard. One country's carbon emissions can threaten the sustainability of the whole earth. This, midshipmen, is the era we are in and it is unlike any era that came before.

So the challenge now, the challenge before us now is how to mount a modern defense to these modern threats.

So let me share with you, for example, a personal experience. A few years ago when I was in the United States Senate, I visited the USS Scranton. It was outside of San Diego, California. And at the time, I was also a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee. So when I was aboard the vessel, I asked the officers, I said, "Hey, tell me, what does it take to protect such a valuable asset against cyber attacks?" And they told me, "You know, it's pretty simple, equipment and experts."

Well, the way I see it, midshipmen, you, you, you are those experts on the issue of cybersecurity. Foreign adversaries have their sights set on our military technology, our intellectual property, our elections, our critical infrastructure. The ransomware attack by criminal hackers earlier this month, well, that was a warning shot. In fact, there have been many warning shots.

So we must defend our nation against these threats. And at the same time, we must make advances in things that you've been learning, things like quantum computing and artificial intelligence and robotics, and things that will put our nation at a strategic advantage, and you will be the ones to do it. You will be the ones to do it because the United States military is the best, the bravest, and the most brilliant.

And just think, from walkie talkies to the internet, to satellite navigation, the United States military has been on the forefront of research, development and technological advancement. That is a point of American pride. And as I look out at all of you, I know you will build on that leadership.

And then of course there is climate change, which is a very real threat to our national security. And I look at you and I know you are among the experts who will navigate and mitigate this threat. You are ocean engineers who will help navigate ships through thinning ice. You are mechanical engineers who will help reinforce sinking bases. You are electrical engineers who will soon help convert solar and wind energy into power, convert solar and wind energy into combat power.

And just ask any Marine today, would she rather carry 20 pounds of batteries or a rolled up solar panel, and I am positive she will tell you a solar panel, and so would he.

The American people are depending on you, the best, the bravest, the most brilliant. We saw this during COVID-19 when Americans watched how members of our military helped vaccinate our nation, because you know biological threats like pandemics and infectious diseases are yet another threat in this era. And you are confronting this threat. Our military helped develop the technology that made the vaccine possible. Naval researchers also figured out how to use 3D knitting machines to make masks. Naval labs monitored the spread of the disease. And the Marine Corps and the Navy are leading on making the connection between the pandemic and medical readiness of our fighting forces for the future.

Class of 2021, you are prepared for all of this. You are prepared for any threat and you are prepared for this new era. And it is not only because of the knowledge and

the skills you gained here or those you will continue to learn, but it's because of something more. It's because of who each of you is. It is because of who collectively you are.

So as I conclude today, that's what I want to talk about. I want to talk about you. As Vice President, I've come to know the United States Navy quite well. Every day, in fact, I'm surrounded by sailors and Marines and your tradition and your history. And I mean that literally. So I often travel on Marine Two. In fact, that's how I arrived today. My residence is on the grounds of the United States Naval Observatory. My west wing office features a desk built by [inaudible 00:13:55] from timbers of the USS Constitution. My ceremonial office was once occupied by the Secretary of the Navy, and displayed there, I have placed the shoulder boards of your brigade commander, Midshipman Sydney Barber.

And so here's what I know. Midshipmen, you are tireless. You are ambitious. You are a fierce fighting force. You are idealists in the truest sense. You are the embodiment of American aspiration. So hold on to that, because in your career, you may witness some of the worst of humanity, but promise that you will never forget the best of who we are, that you will never forget the ideals you stand for, duty, honor, loyalty.

Fight for those ideals and fight for our democracy. And remember, our Constitution is not only something to defend, it is a guide. It is a guide for your service. It begins with three simple words, We the People, not I, we. Our nation was designed to be a team sport and we are in this together.

So finally, I'll just share with you on my way to the stadium this morning, I stopped by the cemetery to pay my respects to my dear former colleague, a great and courageous American, Senator John McCain. Yes. So most people don't know he wanted to be buried next to his best friend who he met on the yard, Admiral Chuck Larson. That is the ultimate example of what I mean, in it together.

So midshipmen, throughout our history, officers in the United States Navy, officers in the United States Marine have risked everything to defend our freedoms. Today, you will swear to do the same. You are the next links in the chain.

And so, midshipmen, when you stand to take the oath, I want you to know that as we embark on this new era, President Joe Biden and I, our entire nation have great faith in you and we are proud of you, so very, very proud.

Congratulations again. May God bless you and may God bless the United States of America. Thank you.

SUMMARY

Throughout history, women have faced marginalization in the realm of politics, despite their significant contributions to society. They have been systematically excluded from decision-making processes that shape the political landscape. It was not until the late 19th and early 20th centuries that women began to demand their right to vote and participate in politics, resulting in the fight for suffrage and political representation. Today, women still encounter challenges in the political sphere, but their participation is crucial for a thriving democracy. This is because women bring unique perspectives and experiences that can lead to more inclusive policies and better representation of diverse interests.

The role of women in U.S. politics has undergone significant changes over the past century. In the early years of American politics, women were largely denied political participation and the right to vote. It was not until 1920, with the passage of the 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, that women gained the right to vote and could actively participate in the political process. Today, women hold more political power in the U.S. than ever before.

Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris are two prominent women in U.S. politics who have made significant contributions to the country in different ways. Nancy Pelosi, a Democratic politician, has served in the U.S. House of Representatives since 1987 and became the first woman to serve as Speaker of the House in 2007, a position she has held twice. Kamala Harris, also a Democrat, has been serving as the Vice President of the United States since January 2021, making her the first woman, as well as the first person of Black and South Asian descent, to hold this position.

These women are influential politicians in one of the most progressive countries in the world – the USA, and their impact extends not only to the citizens of the USA, but also to heads of other states and ordinary foreigners. Therefore, it was essential to conduct research on their language profiles to understand the linguistic means they employ to create appealing images and stay in the limelight on the political stage.

Political speeches are the primary means through which politicians communicate with their audiences. Oral political discourse, including political speeches, has gained significant attention among linguists due to its use of diverse communication and speech techniques. These speeches are intended to persuade and influence the audience towards a particular point of view, policy, or action, and play a crucial role in shaping public opinion and impacting society. Political speeches provide leaders with a platform to express their vision and inspire people towards a shared goal. They also offer an important avenue to investigate the language profiles of politicians, including the use of specific communication strategies and tactics that are critical for politicians to achieve their communicative objectives and goals.

The **aim** of this master's thesis is to delve into the language profiles of Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris, two prominent political figures in the United States, through an analysis of their speeches. By analyzing their language profiles, this thesis aims to shed light on the communication strategies and tactics employed by Pelosi and Harris in their speeches and the impact of their language on the audience's perception and interpretation of their message. Through this analysis, this thesis hopes to contribute to a better understanding of political discourse and the role of language in shaping public opinion.

The **relevance** of this topic is determined by its significance to the linguistic studies of political speeches and their influence on the image of politicians and, consequently, on the modern world.

The **objective** of this master thesis is to conduct an investigation into the language profiles of Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris. To achieve this objective, the following **tasks** had to be completed: defining the concept of political discourse, delineating the concept of language profile in political discourse, outlining the communication strategies and tactics employed in political discourse, and describing the language profiles of Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris. The research material for this study consists of a total of twenty-six speeches, with thirteen speeches delivered by Nancy Pelosi – four in the 20th century and nine in the 21st century – and the remaining thirteen speeches delivered by Kamala Harris.

The objective of our research, which focused on the language profiles of prominent female politicians Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris, has been successfully achieved, and the following conclusions can be drawn. The concept of political discourse was thoroughly examined, leading to the realization that it is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that plays a significant role in shaping public perception and understanding of political events and issues. This unique form of discourse is characterized by its emphasis on persuasion and the strategic use of language to achieve specific political goals. Political discourse can be categorized in various ways, including by the nature of the subject or author, the intended audience, and the form of discourse, whether oral or written.

We conducted an examination of the concept of language profile within the realm of political discourse. Language profile refers to a set of linguistic characteristics that are unique to an individual's speech, reflecting their distinct way of expressing themselves. It encompasses three main components: verbal, value, and personal. Furthermore, we analyzed the concepts of communication strategy and tactic in the context of political discourse, adopting a pragmatic approach to analyzing the language profiles of political figures. Communication strategy in political discourse refers to the speaker's intentional efforts to achieve a specific communication goal while adhering to the laws and rules of the communication situation. Communication tactic, on the other hand, is a subset of strategy and serves as a specific tool for implementing the overall communication strategy.

In our research, we analysed the language profiles of Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris, focusing on the communication strategies of self-representation, personal anecdote, appeal, manipulation, and confrontation. Nancy Pelosi's language profile was examined based on thirteen of her speeches, revealing the prominent use of these communication strategies in her discourse. While all of these strategies were apparent in her speeches, their application varied depending on the topic at hand. Notably, self-presentation and appeal were the most frequently employed strategies across all of Pelosi's speeches. Her personal anecdotes stood out due to the incorporation of humor, which made them more engaging and relatable to her audience. Furthermore,

her language profile demonstrated a talent for delivering clear and concise messages, effectively simplifying complex topics for her listeners. Pelosi also frequently used inclusive language, highlighting the importance of diversity and inclusivity in her discourse. In addition, Pelosi used rhetorical devices such as repetition, alliteration, and metaphors to enhance the impact and memorability of her message. An example of this is her frequent use of the phrase "For the People" to emphasize her party's commitment to addressing the needs of ordinary Americans. Our findings indicate that Nancy Pelosi exhibits exceptional communication skills and employs strategic language in her discourse. Her language style is typically formal and professional, and she adeptly employs rhetorical devices and persuasive techniques to effectively convey her messages. Pelosi also demonstrates an ability to communicate complex policy ideas in a clear and concise manner, often using vivid language to drive her points home. Furthermore, Pelosi's language profile reflects her political ideologies as a Democrat. She is known for advocating progressive policies and frequently employs inclusive language that promotes social and economic equality, while highlighting key issues such as healthcare, climate change, and women's rights. In addition, Pelosi's sharp debating skills and ability to engage in robust political discourse are noteworthy. She frequently utilizes persuasive language to advance her party's agenda, showcasing her talent for engaging in impactful debates. Her language profile demonstrates her prowess in advocating for her party's objectives and promoting their agenda effectively.

The language profiles of Kamala Harris during the presidential campaign and as Vice President were analyzed based on thirteen of her speeches, using the aforementioned communication strategies. Harris exhibits dynamic and versatile communication skills, characterized by an articulate and confident speaking style that employs clear and concise language to convey her messages. As a former prosecutor and attorney general, her language style often reflects her background in legal and policy-oriented language, implementing precise and technical language when discussing legal matters or policy initiatives. Her assertive and determined language reflects her background in law enforcement and advocacy. Additionally, Harris's

language profile reflects her multicultural background as an African American and Asian American woman, often emphasizing the importance of diversity, inclusivity, and representation in her language, and incorporating personal anecdotes and references to her heritage.

It can be concluded that Harris employs all five communication strategies in her speeches. For self-presentation, she portrays herself as an ally of Joe Biden, highlighting their shared values and accomplishments. She often uses the phrase "We the people" to convey the notion that the government should work for all Americans, regardless of their background or circumstances. While she relied more heavily on personal anecdotes during her presidential campaign, as Vice President, she utilizes the appeal strategy by employing the imperative mode and urging her audience to take action. As part of her manipulation strategy, Harris identifies with common people and makes promises. She also employs the confrontation strategy, especially criticizing her political opponents, primarily the Republican Party, utilizing direct discrediting during her presidential campaign, and indirect criticism as Vice President.

The research findings indicate that Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris both use the aforementioned communication strategies, but with varying frequency. Self-presentation and appeal strategies are equally used by both politicians, while manipulation and confrontation strategies are more prominent in Harris' language profile. Harris also employs legal jargon more frequently in her speeches. In contrast, Nancy Pelosi is known for her articulate and persuasive communication style, utilizing personal anecdotes to connect with the audience and emphasize her points. Pelosi excels in using complex language and rhetorical devices to express her ideas and arguments clearly and effectively. Both Pelosi and Harris have unique language profiles that reflect their personalities and communication styles, with Pelosi favoring complex language and rhetorical devices, while Harris relies on passionate and straightforward language.

The study of Nancy Pelosi and Kamala Harris's language profiles has yielded valuable insights into the communication strategies of politicians, emphasizing the

significant impact of political speeches in modern society. Further research in this area could explore language profiles of other politicians, conduct comparative studies, investigate the impact on public perception and voter behavior, examine adaptation of language profiles in different settings, analyze the role of rhetorical devices and linguistic features in political discourse, and employ computational methods for data analysis. Such research has the potential to enhance our understanding of political communication and its societal implications.