Mr. Vice President, I'm speaking – A rhetorical discourse analysis of Kamala Harris's argumentation in the vice-presidential debate in 2020

Master's thesis

Mari Juppi

University of Jyväskylä

Department of Languages and Communication Studies

English

Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy

Political Science

Spring 2023

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty **Humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellinen tiedekunta**	Laitos - Department **Kieli- ja viestintätieteiden laitos** **Yhteiskuntatieteiden ja filosofian laitos**
Tekijä - Author **Mari Juppi**	
Työn nimi – Title **Mr. Vice President, I'm speaking – A rhetorical discourse analysis of Kamala Harris's argumentation in the vice-presidential debate in 2020**	
Oppiaine – Subject **Englannin kieli / Valtio-oppi**	Työn laji – Level **Pro gradu –tutkielma**
Aika – Month and year **Tammikuu 2023**	Sivumäärä – Number of pages **65 + liite 33**

Tiivistelmä – Abstract

Kamala D. Harris vannoi valansa Yhdysvaltain varapresidentiksi 20. tammikuuta 2021 ja samalla hänestä tuli Yhdysvaltain ensimmäinen naisvarapresidentti, ensimmäinen afroamerikkalainen varapresidentti ja ensimmäinen aasialaisamerikkalainen varapresidentti. Tässä tutkielmassa tarkastellaan Harrisin retorisia keinoja varapresidenttiehdokkaiden välisessä vaaliväittelyssä syksyllä 2020. Harrisin retoriikkaa pyritään ymmärtämään useista näkökulmista ja analyysissä hyödynnetään Chaim Perelmanin retoriikan tutkimusta, William L. Benoit'n funktionaalista diskurssianalyysiä sekä tarkastellaan stereotypioita, joita naispoliitikkoihin usein liitetään.

Perelmanin mukaan parhaat argumentit vetoavat suuriin yleisöihin. Tämä on selvästi se, mitä myös Harris yrittää retoriikallaan saada aikaan. Harrisin argumentit liittyvät usein yleisesti hyväksyttyihin premisseihin, ja siten hän pystyy puhuttelemaan laajempaa yleisöä. Harris vetoaa usein yleisönsä tunteisiin ja olettaa argumentoinnissaan monesti, että on olemassa universaali näkemys, jota voidaan hyödyntää hänelle otollisten johtopäätösten tekemisessä. Perelmanin mukaan vetoava argumentaatio pyrkii voittamaan puolelleen jokaisen rationaalisen henkilön ja Harris pyrkii esittämään argumenttinsa tavoilla, joita on vaikeaa kyseenalaistaa.

Benoit jakoi poliittisen kampanjan funktiot kehuihin, hyökkäyksiin ja puolustukseen. Analysoitavassa väittelyssä kaikki nämä funktiot olivat näkyvissä, mutta usein myös päällekkäin ja yhtäaikaisesti. Aikaisemmat tutkimukset paljastavat, että varapresidenttiehdokkaat hyökkäävät useammin kuin puolustautuvat. Näin oli myös Harrisin kohdalla, sillä hänellä oli väittelyssä 25 vuoroa ja hän hyökkäsi näistä 15 kertaa. Useimmiten päällekkäisyyttä löytyi Harrisin argumenteista, joissa hän asettaa Bidenin ja Trumpin arvomaailmat vastakkain. Näissä argumenteissaan Harris assosioi Bidenin positiivisiin attribuutteihin ja Trumpin negatiivisiin.

Harris ei juurikaan osoita perinteisesti feminiiniseen puheeseen liittyviä piirteitä väittelyn aikana. Hän ei ota sovittelijan roolia tai anna itsensä tulla keskeytetyksi. Harris vaatii vuoroaan Penceltä, hän puhuu aikaisemmista saavutuksistaan syyttäjänä ja senaattorina eikä anna Pencen vähätellä saavutuksiaan. On kuitenkin huomionarvoista, että, kuten aikaisemmissa tutkimuksissa on todettu, naispoliitikkojen poliittiset tehtävät eroavat usein miesten tehtävistä. Miehille uskotaan usein ulkopolitiikkaan ja rahoitukseen liittyviä tehtäviä, ja naiset saavat usein hoidettavakseen "pehmeämpiä" poliittisia aiheita, kuten koulutus ja kulttuuri. Tämä on tämän opinnäytetyön kannalta tärkeää, sillä Harris puhuu väittelyssä paljon omista ansioistaan, mutta kun keskustelu kääntyy talouteen ja ulkopolitiikkaan, Harris keskustelee Bidenin ansioista ja asiantuntemuksesta.

Asiasanat – Keywords
Kamala Harris, vice president, debate, discourse analysis, rhetoric, rhetorical analysis, female politician

Säilytyspaikka – Depository
Jyväskylän yliopiston kirjasto, JYX-julkaisuarkisto

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

January 20, 2021 Joseph R. Biden Jr. was inaugurated as the 46th President of the United States of America. This also marks the date when Kamala D. Harris became the first female, first African American, and first Asian American vice president. As Harris is a woman of many firsts, I wanted to be one of the first people to investigate her rhetorical means. In this thesis I aim to understand her rhetoric from multiple point of views. This is partly because I am writing a thesis that combines two subjects, political science and English language and partly because I want to get a diverse picture of her rhetoric. I will be examining Harris's rhetorical means during the vice-presidential debate between Harris and Mike Pence. I will start by clarifying some of the points that I make and terms that I use. I believe this is needed because issues of gender and sex as well as race are neither straightforward nor simple.

In terms of this thesis, I believe it is also important to discuss the stereotypes often affiliated with male and female politicians and their professional abilities. This is important in order to establish if Harris's rhetoric contain any of these stereotypes and expectations and also historically because women have been kept within the home and away from public places. There have been various studies that have described historical and classical depictions of women being silenced and removed from public discourse. Just one of the many examples dates back to as far as ancient Greek, when Telemachus chastises his mother Penelope in the Odyssey by asserting that "public speech shall be the concern of men" (Homer 1980: 9, as quoted by Shaw, 2020: 9). The socially desirable characteristics that have been most frequently attributed to women have been those that contribute to creating a nurturing environment in the private sphere, such as kindness, calmness, awareness of others' feelings, and the ability to communicate soft emotions. Women's speech was stigmatised as ineffective and unable to address issues of general interest by language studies conducted in the 1970s. Men, on the other hand, have historically been socially rewarded for having characteristics that are deemed suitable for public settings such as being aggressive, ambitious, domineering, unemotional, rational, and worldly. Although these studies and their findings are now considered rather outdated, they do provide a starting point for today's research as well as more recent studies have established that there still is a very deeply rooted bias against women in the public sphere.

In this thesis I will not only be examining Harris rhetoric but explore the discourses that are can be identified from her argumentation. A method of exchanging, receiving, and distributing information that affects a society's political discourse and, as a result, the electorate is known as political

communication (Tuman, 2008). Political debates are one example of a persuasive process between candidates and voters that emphasises the significance of political communication. How the candidates and voters converse about issues relevant to the campaign is influenced by this discursive process between them. Although the candidates' main objective is to win over voters, they must also consider how the electorate perceives their communication strategies and language during the campaign. There is no other activity that is as closely tied to the founding principles of a democracy as an open discussion where the candidates can address the electorate directly and the electorate can listen to and compare their views (Blais and Perrella 2008: 451) and as such, the debates have become a very important part of political campaigns. However, the accuracy with which candidates portray their issue positions or the state of the nation, as Maurer and Reinemann (2006: 492) note, is not under investigation. Thus, it should be recognised that politicians who participate in televised debates are more interested with winning elections than educating their audience. The claims are either unquestionably accepted as accurate or disregarded as irrelevant. They could thus use false rhetoric to disprove unpopular theories or to reinterpret data that defies their own assertions. (Ibid.).

Persuasion and rhetorical strategies are very closely related to political communication, and it is challenging to separate the skill of persuasion from the underlying persuasiveness of a discourse since studying rhetoric can imply learning about the abilities of persuasion or finding the persuasive element in a discourse. Rhetorical strategy refers to the deliberate assembling of arguments for a particular occasion and context considering its anticipated effects and using the strategies available (Martin, 2014: 2). As I will explain, given the necessity for situational awareness, modern rhetoric puts more effort into modelling and analysing rhetorical circumstances. An effective appeal must draw the audience's attention, hide the opposition, and persuade the audience to follow along even if they do not agree with the argument entirely (Killingsworth, 2005: 36). According to Perelman, values are included into every debate at some point (Jørgensen, 2009: 3). This is because values act as a foundation for argument in the disciplines of law, politics, and philosophy at all stages of development (ibid). To promote audience commitment, argumentation must be grounded in an understanding shared by the speaker and the audience (Lewiski & Mohammed, 2016: 6). As well as choosing facts, truths, and presumptions that their audience can accept, the speaker must also choose ideas that are consistent with their audience's values and hierarchies (ibid).

As I will declare, vice-presidential debates have not been studied as much as presidential debates, and thus, I think it is important to discuss their meaning and importance in political campaigns. As this debate was televised, I will also examine televised debates as a medium. This topic has been very broadly studied and it has been asserted that these debates have many advantages for the candidates

as well as the viewers. Analysis of televised debates is important in understanding some of the choices the candidates make during the debate. And as such, it is relevant to examine the previous studies conducted on televised debates.

In this thesis I will apply Chaim Perelman's New Rhetoric, William L. Benoit's functional theory of political campaign discourse and investigate the gendered view of female rhetoric. My research questions for the thesis are as follows:

1. What kind of rhetorical strategies can be identified from Senator Harris's argumentation and how do they function?

2. Can any stereotypically female features be identified from Senator Harris's rhetoric?

1.1. On intersectionality and gender

The indissoluble overlap between the problems of racism and sexism is known as intersectionality. A notion known as "intersectionality" shows how various oppressive systems interact. (Weldon, 2008: 193). The idea came about as a result of attempts to explain how racial and gender dynamics influence social and political life. Black feminists maintained that their experiences and issues could not be summed up as the problems of white women and black men. According to the concept of intersectionality, black women encounter a variety of issues unique to themselves, and as a result, their perspectives, identities, and experiences cannot be inferred from an analysis of the circumstances and positions of either black males or white women. (Weldon, 2008: 193-194.). Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989: 149), who first coined the term intersectionality suggests that discrimination against Black women can manifest itself in ways that are both comparable to and dissimilar from those faced by white women and black males. According to Crenshaw (1989: 149) black women occasionally encounter discrimination in ways akin to those encountered by white women, and occasionally they have encounters that are strikingly comparable to those of black men. However, they frequently endure double discrimination, or the combined consequences of racial and sexually discriminatory policies. Additionally, they occasionally encounter prejudice based solely on being black women. (Ibid.). The experiences black women face are not all encompassed by the usual definitions of race or gender discrimination, and the impact of racism and sexism on Black women's lives cannot be fully comprehended by examining the race or gender dimensions of those experiences separately (Crenshaw, 1991: 1224).

While I acknowledge that intersectionality exists and race and gender should not be separated when discussing a woman of colour, I will not be discussing race. Yount and Sharma (2020) studied patterns of behaviour by race and gender in the vice-presidential debate between the incumbent vice president

Pence and the challenger senator Harris. As this study was conducted rather recently, I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat similar research and thus, I will limit my analysis to consider the stereotypes affiliated with women's rhetoric. In their study Yount and Sharma examined how candidates used the moderator's narrative as well as three explicit dominance behaviours: interruption, prolonged speaking time, and digression. In their research, they found that white men's dominance in discourse and white fragility can limit a Black woman's ability to speak up in a disagreement. The "white majority" may have had a greater impact on conversational norms in this dispute involving a mixed gender and racial triad than the "women's majority." Harris used rhetoric that implied dominance and rights-claiming to reclaim her speaking time in this situation while minimising criticism of herself as a woman of colour. (Ibid.).

In this thesis I will focus on gender for the basis of stereotypes linked to female speech and professional qualities. For the purposes of this study, I believe it is important to establish the definition of this concept. Sex refers to a person's biological maleness or femaleness and gender refers to the non-physiological aspects of being male or female, such as cultural expectations and the societal roles of men and women (Lips, 2020: 7).

This thesis focuses partly on Vice President Harris's rhetoric as a female politician and the terms "woman" and "female" as well as "man" and "male" will apply to those who are identified as such through public perception. Although I am aware that transgender people fall under this description, I will not be discussing these issues. I also understand that there are more than just two genders and that there are many different spectrums within the area of gender studies. However, the male/female dichotomy will be my main point of emphasis in this thesis and in order to distinguish between genders for the sake of the analysis, this language is required.

2. Language and gender

Research into personality, behavioural, and communication stereotypes has repeatedly reported significant differentiation by gender (Robson, 2009: 207). Traditionally, socially desirable attributes for men have included traits related to issues of control and that functioned in public spaces, such as aggressive, ambitious, domineering, unemotional, rational, and worldly. The socially desirable traits most typically associated with women have included qualities linked with establishing a nurturing atmosphere in the private sphere, such as gentleness, quietness, awareness of others' feelings, and expressing tender feelings. Language studies conducted in the 1970s branded women's speech as both ineffectual and incapable of dealing with topics of public relevance. Female speech was recognised as gentle, friendly, and emotive, making it unsuitable for politics. Masculine speech, on the other

hand, was appropriate for the job, as experts cited boastfulness, loud speech, shouting, rage, and aggressive speaking as examples of male speech. (Robson, 2009: 207-208.).

According to Shaw (2020: 7) viewing men's and women's language as having fixed styles, or essentialised sets of differences, is now regarded as an early phase of research into language and gender. This is because of invented notions such as 'genderlect' were used to provide general characterisations of sex differences in speech. Shaw (2020: 7) continues that the genderlect depiction seems too speculative and exaggerated, suggesting that there are differences in the basic codes used by women and men, rather than unpredictably occurring differences, and similarities. Genderlect denotes more homogeneity among women, and among men and implies that there are more differences between the sexes than there actually is. Thus, theoretical models of gender should consider various intersections of gender with other characteristics such as race, social class, sexuality, national identity, age, to name a few. (Shaw, 2020: 7.). These factors can be understood as "multiple axes where each aspect of identity redefines and modifies all others" (Pavlenko & Blackedge, 2004: 15 as quoted by Shaw, 2020: 7). Several ways of talking are culturally coded to indirectly index gender (Shaw, 2020: 7). The relation between language and gender is seldom direct and only a few forms directly and solely index gender. Examples of these few would be pronouns, such as., he/she, and some address forms, such as, Mr and Mrs. More commonly, gender is indexed indirectly, and this means it is non-exclusive as varying features of a language can be used by/for/with both women and men. Thus, in addition to gender, linguistic forms also index other social information. (Ibid.).

However, the notion of indirect indexicality of gender and language nor the absence of empirical evidence for monolithic male and female styles of speech diminishes the ideological significance of gender and difference when it comes to language (Shaw, 2020: 7). Although earlier findings in language and gender are theoretically contradictory with indexicality and the flexibility of gender as a category, they are able to provide information about the deeply ingrained stereotypical norms of women's and men's speech styles. A stereotype, here, can be defined as one visible form of behaviour that is given a typical status through a process of simplification and generalisation. (Ibid.).

2.1. Stereotypes and the female politician

Regardless of the notable shift in the way gender and language are understood in present research, some stereotypes are very much present in our everyday lives. Research into personality, behavioural, and communication stereotypes has repeatedly reported significant differentiation by gender (Robson, 2009: 207). Socially desirable traits for men have traditionally included traits that are related to issues of control and functioned in the public spheres, such as aggressive, ambitious, dominant,

unemotional, logical, and worldly. The socially desirable traits most often associated with women have included characteristics consonant with providing a nurturing environment in the private sphere, such as gentle, quiet, aware of the feelings of others and expressing tender feelings. Studies published in the 1970s focused largely on language use and reported women's speech stereotyped as both ineffective and incapable of dealing with issues of public importance. Female speech was identified as being soft, friendly, and emotional and therefore not suitable for politics. Male speech, however, was fitting for the role as scholars identified boastfulness, loud speech, swearing, anger, and speaking aggressively as representative of male speech. (Robson, 2009: 207-208.).

Women in politics are expected to bear the burden of the civilising difference, which is one of the most important ways that stereotypes about gendered communication patterns affect this group (Shaw, 2020: 144). This means that in institutions where males predominate, women are pioneers of less confrontational and more cooperative speech styles due to the generally believed idea that women have consensual communication patterns. Therefore, in addition to their increased visibility and other challenges in politics, women also have the extra burden of being expected to civilise previously male-only domains. The myriad ways in which women are still marginalised and divided within these organisations, however, are frequently overlooked in the notion that they can civilise these settings. In order to justify the concentration of women in a small number of, typically inferior institutional and organisational roles, arguments have been made by others and occasionally the women themselves that they have qualities such as strong communicators, good listeners, and problem solvers. (Ibid.).

Ideas about such stereotypical and normative gendered behaviour are embedded in beliefs about the gender order and what is also called gender differences discourse (Shaw, 2020: 7). This is the ideological position that assumes there are fixed gendered differences in the behaviour and communicative style of women and men. Therefore, linguistic behaviour of women and men will be characterised in ways that are compatible with the community's more common representation of the fundamental natures of these groups. Gendered beliefs control how people participate in the gender hierarchy and serve as the justification for such engagement. In this way, it is possible to think of gendered ideologies that emphasise difference or opposites as a significant lens for the way people view reality, difference being for most people what gender is all about. There is a feminist critique that examines the workings of these kinds of gendered ideology as demonstrated in various forms of political discourse that underlies these entrenched conceptions and the sociolinguistic research questions. A notion of 'male voice of authority', or the idea that men, not women, should carry out

social standards and other authoritative behaviours, is a cornerstone of these gendered ideological viewpoints. (Shaw, 2020: 7-8.).

There is a set of ideological positions that are a part of wider cultural norms relating to traditional gender roles and stereotypes (Shaw, 2020: 8). There exists a constant evaluation of the linguistic behaviour of women and men, including their language and voice quality, as well as the gendered character of the public/private division. As a result of gendered assumptions about the male voice of authority, women are put in what is known as the 'double bind' of women in leadership positions. Given that public speaking at "high-performance" events is a regular and frequent component of their everyday professional lives, women in politics may be more vulnerable to the consequences of these double binds than women in other professions, as parliaments exist to facilitate discussion, and when a politician is elected, it is considered that they are capable of speaking in public. (Shaw, 2020: 8.).

The tension between perceived 'feminine' traits such being easily persuaded, emotional, and irrational and the 'masculine' traits of maturity and competence expected of public leaders is referred to as the femininity/competence bound (Shaw, 2020: 8). Double binds can take many different forms, not the least of which is in regard to ideals of femininity, physical appearance, feelings, and authenticity. Language use frequently plays a key role in how well these dilemmas and conflicting expectations are handled. However, it is undeniable that any successful politician must have some level of ambition, which presents female politicians with a challenge, as being ambitious is not considered a feminine trait. Female politicians must therefore reduce the negative impacts of being automatically viewed as acting contrary to stereotypes just because they are female politicians in each case of a double bind circumstance. UK Prime Ministers Theresa May and Margaret Thatcher symbolically embodied this set of choices in their choice of ancillary feminine accessories: May wore hefty necklaces, bracelets, and fashion-statement shoes, whilst Thatcher had her iconic handbag. These accessories demonstrate how they skilfully navigated gender, politics, and the double bind of appearing both feminine enough to conform to normative notions of femininity while avoiding appearing overly feminine in order to risk negative perceptions that they lack the perceived masculine leadership qualities of strength and toughness. (Shaw, 2020: 8-9.).

2.2. Women in public offices

Historical and classical portrayals of women being silenced and eliminated from public speech have been described, in numerous studies. As quoted in the introduction, in the ancient Greek epic poem, Odyssey by Homer, Odysseus's son Telemachus scolds his mother and tells her that there is no place for women in the public sphere. Studies describing the historical repression and prosecution of

female public speakers who dared to join the male dominant authoritative public discourse are meant to highlight a modern point. The long back-story to antiquity can help to comprehend the reality that women, even when they are not silenced, still must pay a very high price for being heard, and that it may be related to the abuse that many women who do speak out are still subjected to. Cultural constructions of gendered linguistic behaviour are not entirely consistent; well-known linguistic studies demonstrate that some cultures value women's public speaking, and other research demonstrates that some women have in fact been encouraged to speak in public at various points in history. While these exceptions are taken into account, it is still overwhelmingly the case that women continue to experience intimidation and retaliation when they speak out in public. (Shaw, 2020: 9.).

Current academic literature indicates that in seeking a high-level office, female candidates frequently face a more challenging electoral arena than men partly due to gender stereotyping (Burns, Eberhardt & Merolla, 2013: 687). According to Lawless (2009: 74) women are nearly twice as likely as men to argue that it is harder for women to raise money for a political campaign, and only half as likely to believe that women and men have an equal chance of being elected to high-level office. Some women have explicitly stated that they are not qualified to run for office simply because they are the "wrong" sex. Gendered stereotypes impacting women's access to power in the public sector deal with women's personalities, professional abilities, and the traditional female roles women are still expected to fulfil (Robson, 2009: 206). While female candidates can occasionally profit from these stereotypes, they are commonly perceived as having fewer of the characteristics and competencies associated with executive office (Burns et al., 2013: 687). The characteristics women are often seen lacking are, for example, strong leadership, and competence in foreign affairs and the military. These assumptions often place women at a disadvantage. (Burns et al., 2013: 687.).

The realm of public speaking has been identified as a masculine domain and women must linguistically tie matters of public policy to their expertise in the domestic realm or risk violating audience expectations (Robson, 2009: 208). Moreover, when a woman enters politics and does not make any serious effort to negotiate a masculine behaviour or manner and even embraces her femininity, she is likely to be perceived as "vulnerable, weak and out of her league" (Lim, 2019: 255). However, because she is only covertly or partially overturning traditional role expectations and assumptions, she also appears less threatening and more appealing. Consequently, what she loses in respectability, she gains in likeability. (Ibid.).

In 2008 Senator Hillary Clinton went up against Senator Barack Obama in the primary election. Obama was very well liked and as a man, he did not need to worry about appearing too tough or too masculine. This was not the case for Clinton. According to Lim (2019: 257) Clinton was put in a role

of the "unruly woman" who still was not masculine enough to be the president, the leader. Even though, Lawless (2009: 72) argues, there is deeply embedded societal sexism that often accompanies women's inclusion in politics, a consensus among observers and analysts is that Clinton did not lose to Obama because she is a woman. It is, in fact, argued that Clinton lost due to her campaign strategy in which she tried to appease people that could not have been appeased (Traister, 2011: 21). However, a national poll conducted after Obama won the democratic nomination showed that 51% of Americans were not ready to elect a woman to high office (Lawless, 2009: 75).

Consequences of public speaking can be compared to the effects of the double binds discussed earlier in terms of severity and harm to women. In the UK House of Commons, women are silenced by men using a variety of tactics, including "shushing" them across the chamber's floor, according to UK Member of the Parliament Jess Phillips (Shaw, 2020: 9). Increased levels of violence against women in politics, both internationally and in UK institutions, as well as severe "trolling" on social media are sanctions against women speaking out. Mary Beard, an English academic who has researched how women are positioned in the public realm, received harsh insults of her appearance on Twitter and was threatened with violence. She was, for example, called 'too ugly for TV'. The harsh comments of Beard's appearance serve to separate intellect from the feminine body and denigrate the former by using tired slurs about the latter, as if Beard's appearance and supposed lack of attractiveness could be used to dismiss her voice. (Shaw, 2020: 9-10.).

Similarly, as Lim (2019: 254) notes, even though Clinton was "the first First Lady to move into the White House with a full-time professional career of her own, the first First Lady to win elected office in the US Senate, and the first woman to seriously contend for a major party's nomination for the US presidency", the way language was used in the 2008 election cycle indicates that we have in some way stepped off a post-feminist era. Metaphorical politics are working with entrenched popular and cultural stereotypes embedded in the structure of language itself and thus, we must pay attention on how they are used. Upon her candidacy, Clinton became the target for many gendered metaphors used to conceptualise her role in public life; 'madonna', 'an unruly woman', 'a bitch', and a 'witch'. (Lim, 2019: 255, 266.). However, it did not end in just name calling. Lawless (2009: 72) presents evidence of Clinton being mocked in terms of her character, looks and being a woman. Clinton was talked about on radio shows and newspapers in a very negative way, and, for example, Rush Limbaugh, upon seeing an apparently unflattering photograph of Clinton, asked if Americans really wanted to stare at an aging woman. (Lawless, 2009: 72.). Furthermore, Bill Maher mocked Clinton for getting slightly emotional when discussing the experience of running for president by saying that "the first thing a woman does, of course, is cry" (Lawless, 2009: 72). This practice draws attention to

how frequently women are judged solely based on their bodies in public (Shaw, 2020: 10). Those who are men, however, are given the metaphysics of presence that is connected to the public voice that is philosophical, intellectual, and reasoned. (Ibid.).

There are currently 24 women in the US senate (United States Senate, n.d.). Single women politicians are routinely "gay-baited" and they are recommended to simply ignore such attacks (Robson, 2009: 213). However, stereotypes can be dismantled by using rhetoric that identifies and indicts them. This was the case with Senator Barbara Mikulski who served as a US senator from 1987 to 2017. Mikulski was urged to "come out of the closet" during her senatorial race in 1986 and her opposition argued that if she is elected the voters could say goodbye to their traditional values. These attacks eventually backfired when they were identified as unfairly attacking a woman merely for being single (Robson, 2009: 213). According to Robson (2009: 212) Mikulski negotiated the expectation through redefinition and even challenged the expectation. Mikulski argued that women cannot win with the traditional expectations cast upon them. She said that "if you're married, you're neglecting him; if you're single, you couldn't get him; if you're divorced, you couldn't keep him; and if you're widowed, you killed him!" (as quoted by Robson, 2009: 213). Robson (2009: 218) also notes that "the more substantive expectation of orientation toward family provides an advantage to women seeking elective office in times when domestic issues top the national agenda". By extending the stereotype into the public sphere it can be turned into an element of competence, while still remaining as female-identified. (Robson, 2009: 218.). Furthermore, it has been argued by Burns, et al. (2013: 697) that female candidates do not necessarily face an either/or decision with respect to which types of traits to emphasise. Instead, they might want to emphasise both their feminine and masculine traits, as it might be the most effective strategy for increasing overall evaluations of their constituents (Burns, et al., 2013: 697).

Agency over Clinton's career accomplishments was cast into doubt during the 2008 primary election when her success was attributed to her husband (Fulton, 2012: 303). Similarly, Vice President Harris has faced accusations of her using her relationship with a man in a high political position to launch her political career. These accusations first came to light in 2003, when Harris was running for her first public office. The accusations re-surfaced when Harris announced that she would be running for the Democratic nomination for the president. In august 2020 Nick Adams, who is, according to his Twitter profile, a best-selling author endorsed by President Trump, tweeted that "Kamala Harris had an affair with Mayor Willie Brown in San Francisco. That's what boosted her career. Isn't there a phrase for that?" (@NickAdamsinUSA, 2020). This kind of discourse reinforces the idea that many

still believe power is naturally the domain of men, and a woman could only be able to climb high on the political ladder with a help of a man.

2.3.   Floor allocation and gender

Men speak considerably longer than women and take more turns speaking at meetings, according to research done in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s and more recent studies conducted in the 2000s have confirmed this finding (Shaw, 2020: 12). This is pertinent to research on floor allocation in parliaments and gender. Studies have attempted to examine a larger spectrum of discursive norms in various work environments. The study on language and gender in the workplace by Janet Holmes (2006) is arguably the most significant of these. Holmes demonstrates how women and men in variously gendered employment situations draw on a wide range of language traits that are frequently and stereotypically linked with femininity and masculinity using a sizable corpus of data from New Zealand workplaces. To lessen the effects of acting in authoritative roles, women would, for example, develop comedic and "queenly" personas. In a similar vein, Louise Mullany (2007) investigates gendered discourses in the workplace, contributing to the fields of interactional and critical sociolinguistics by using several discourse analytic techniques. Like Holmes (2006), she finds that men and women draw on a variety of conventionally masculine and feminine approaches and adds actual data to support the claim that workplace communication norms are shifting toward more stereotypically female patterns of communication. Other pertinent workplace studies have investigated how women adjust to male-dominated workplaces by changing their standards of communication in order to work in various historically male-dominated professions like police officers and engineers. (Shaw, 2020: 12.).

These studies highlight how male-dominated workplace environments harm women and how they determine who is deemed most qualified for certain job roles (Shaw, 2020: 12). Additionally, because it is inconsistent with gendered communicative norms pertaining to how women should communicate, when women adopt confrontational or authoritative language to embrace the discourse norms of a male-dominated workplace, they are frequently regarded adversely for their behaviour. This has also been discovered to be true for men who adopt normatively feminine speech patterns in "feminine" industries as they are frequently made fun of for doing so. (Ibid.).

It has been argued that institutions are set up in this way to define, support, and uphold the authority of linguistic methods used by one gender, or by males from a particular class or ethnicity, while rejecting the power of others. The causes of this are multifaceted and partly stem from the fraternal networks that exist in parliamentary institutions and the prominence of women in previously male-

dominated fields of employment. Therefore, parliaments can be seen as a linguistic habitus in which certain people are forced into silence or extremely controlled language while others are given the freedom of a firmly established language. (Ibid.).

According to Shaw (2020: 12) Parliaments are gendered places, where the environment and the responsibilities of communication together serve as an indicator of a gendered style. Men utilise speech to direct and dominate others, get access to the floor, and maintain it once there (Shaw, 2020: 13). Asserting their superiority by verbosity, name-dropping, covert or overt boasting, and entertainment strategies like jokes or tales, they are inclined to employ language for display. On the other hand, males expect women to listen and find humour in them. Generally speaking, they are expected to agree and support rather than interrupt, challenge, or otherwise cast doubt on men's authority. If they choose to challenge, they must do so in ways that won't upset the status quo. (Ibid.).

3. Political campaigns and debates

In this chapter I will first examine the concept of political communication in order to define how it is understood in this study. After this, I will move on to discuss how political debates have been analysed in previous research and what has been the purpose of these studies. As I will declare, vice-presidential debates have not been studied as much as presidential debates, and thus, I think it is important to discuss their meaning and importance in political campaigns. As presidential and vice-presidential debates are televised, I will also examine televised debates as a medium. This topic has been very broadly studied and it has been declared that these debates have many advantages for the candidates as well as the viewers.

3.1. Political communication

As a term political communication has been given many different meanings, depending on the context in which it relates to (Tuman, 2008: 6). In a broad sense, it can be defined as a way of sharing, receiving, and transmitting information that influences a society's political discourse and, as a result, the electorate. In an even broader sense, however, evaluating political communication can include employing various perspectives and categorisations in terms of who is delivering the information and to whom it is conveyed. Thus, the focus of political communication is the communicator's efforts to influence public opinion, political views, or general support for a certain political party or candidate. Furthermore, political communication can be characterised as a discursive process between someone who holds or is seeking a political office and their constituents. The importance of political communication is especially highlighted in these types of persuasive processes between candidates and voters. As a result, political communication has a substantial impact on democratic elections.

(Tuman, 2008: 6-8.). Tuman (2008: 8) asserts that political communication is especially crucial during elections in political speeches, political debates, and media presence, since during these events and speech acts, candidates can convey relevant information about themselves to the electorate. This discursive process between the candidate and the electorate influences how the candidates and voters discuss campaign-related topics. Although the candidates' goal is to persuade voters, they must also evaluate how the electorate sees their communication efforts and campaign discourse and be prepared to make changes as needed. (Tuman, 2008: 8–10.).

3.2. Presidential campaigns

Presidential debates have been studied rather extensively since the first debate took place in 1960. According to McKinney and Carlin (2004: 204), this is mostly due to the fact that these debates draw larger crowds than any other single campaign event. Debates also receive substantial media attention and generate the most public interest and conversation among citizens of any campaign event. Many various approaches have been used in examining and evaluating presidential debates, and while no unified governing theory has been created, four theoretical viewpoints are most frequently encountered. These perspectives are normative democratic theory, media effects theory (with agenda-setting and uses and gratifications being the dominant effects theories) and argumentation and debate theory. Scholars relying to normative democratic theory evaluate the extent to which debates contribute to a more enlightened and rational electorate who are equipped to make an informed voting decision (McKinney and Carlin 2004: 205.). This theory has often been applied to studies concentrating on televised debates (see, for example, Kraus & Davis, 1981 or Joslyn, 1990). Agenda setting theory has been utilised, for example, by McCombs and Shaw (1972) to test whether issues discussed in a debate influence viewers' issue salience. With a similar approach, Katz and Feldman (1962) have concluded that debates make some issues more salient. Moreover, their study also revealed that the increase in particular issues' salience was seen to advantage one candidate over the other. However, studies applying agenda setting theory have received varying results and according to McKinney and Carlin (2004: 206) evidence both contradicting and confirming the 1960s findings have been found.

Uses and gratifications theory investigates how and why citizens engage in political debates, as well as how campaign statements are assessed in terms of their usefulness to voters. (McKinney & Carlin, 2004: 206). This has been studied by, for example, Sears and Chaffee (1979) and O'Keefe and Mendelsohn (1979). These studies report that people hold rather high expectations for debates and are mostly approve what campaign messages deliver. After the debate, in evaluating viewers' most important anticipated use, viewers often claim that they still wish to receive additional issue-based

information. The most dissatisfied viewers are those who claim their debate viewing is motivated by a need to achieve issue simplification or clarification to make their voting decision. These viewers often claim their exposure to debates raise additional questions and point to issue areas that need further explanation. (McKinney & Carlin, 2004: 206-207.). It is, however, important to remember that, as Murphy (1992: 219) notes, debates rarely alone resolve elections.

McKinney and Carlin (2004: 207) point out that as debates comprise of series of arguments, it is quite logical that argumentation and debate theory would guide research questions. However, they also note that studies clearly rooted in this theory are, in fact, quite restricted. By applying this theoretical perspective studies usually aim to detect who won and who lost the debate (see, for example, Levasseur and Dean, 1996). Although experts and journalists frequently claim that presidential debates do not represent an ideal debate model, the academic community has mostly abandoned this dispute. In fact, leading argumentation and debate scholars have declared that the issue is disputable as debates can appear in many forms. (McKinney & Carlin, 2004: 206-207.).

As I aim to establish what kind of rhetoric Senator Harris uses in her argumentation and how her arguments function, these aforementioned theories are not suitable for my analysis. The four most often applied theoretical perspectives aim to find out what kind of an effect the debates had in the election result. As that is not relevant for my study, I shall not be applying these theories.

3.3. Televised presidential debates

In the US presidential debates have become an accustomed feature of presidential campaigns (Jamieson & Adasiewicz, 2000: 25) and the televised presidential debate in the US ranks among the most watched event of a campaign (Blais & Perrella, 2008: 451). Blais and Perrella (2008: 451) even go as far as saying that "the epitome of an election campaign is the candidates' debate". According to Blais and Perrella (2008: 451) there is no other activity that is entwined within the foundational ideals of a democracy as an open debate where the candidates can talk directly to the voters and the voters can listen and compare their arguments (see also, Maurer & Reinemann, 2006: 491; Benoit & Sheafer, 2006). The first debate was held in 1960 between incumbent vice president Richard Nixon and Senator John F. Kennedy (Jamieson & Adasiewicz, 2000: 25). Debates did not take place again until 1976 when incumbent president Gerald Ford challenged Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter, to join him in these nationally televised events. Since then, presidential debates have occurred every four years (Jamieson & Adasiewicz, 2000: 25) and the debates are considered as the source voters rely on most for information about the election (Blais & Perrella, 2008: 451). Vice-presidential debates did not occur again until 1984 (Benoit & Airne, 2005: 225).

Hellweg, Pfau and Brydon (1992: xxi) state that televised presidential debates are not only communication events and Drucker and Hunold (1987:202), argue that these debates are a "new form of debate". Studies conducted by Drucker and Hunold (1987) suggest that televised presidential debates resemble television game shows. They have, for example, found similarities in the emotions that are at play, such as excitement, suspense, tension, and amusement. (Drucker & Hunold, 1987: 202.). Hellweg et al. (1992: xxi) claim that communication experts have ignored the importance of television in presidential debates and focused their analysis primarily on the content. Hellweg et al. (1992: xxii) also remark that television "exercises influence in a manner that is more similar to interpersonal communication than to radio, print or traditional public address communication." In their view, televised debates are shared television appearances that do not necessarily engage in confrontational argumentation. They also add that viewers are accustomed to short presentations that have entertainment value and that the candidates are more comfortable with the press conference format. Consequently, they argue, the current format of presidential debates does not share many similarities with the traditional debate. (Hellweg et al. 1992: 22-23.).

Televised presidential debates are a very limited format and genre. A candidate is allowed a set amount of time to answer each question after which the opposing contender can respond. As the time restrictions affect the arguments in the debates, the candidates often rely on impulsively assembled arguments (Hellweg et al. 1992:24). The quality of arguments and the overall discussion in the debates have also been criticised by Meadow (1983). According to Meadow (1983: 91), a debate provides the candidates with the opportunity to express their prepared statements "of the whistle-stop variety under the disguise of a debate". However, a fact that has been overlooked in discussions on debates, according to Jamieson & Adasiewicz (2000: 25), is that these debates are, of course, valuable to the candidate, but also for the voters. Studies have shown that the debates are more likely to reinforce voters' perceptions than they are to change them (Jamieson & Adasiewicz, 2000: 25). The candidates' positions on many subjects, their personalities, and their communication skills are all revealed to voters during the debates (Jamieson & Adasiewicz, 2000: 25). In fact, a great deal of presidential debate research has found that debate exposure affects viewer perceptions of candidates, and it seems that a superior personal presentation is more important to voters than a collection of issue-oriented debating points (McKinney & Warner 2013: 240).

Televised debates provide several advantages over other campaign communication methods for both candidates and audience (Maurer & Reinemann, 2006: 491). The candidates focus more on topics and less on criticizing their opponent than in other types of campaign communication since they, for instance, have far more time to explain their issue viewpoints than they do when they appear on

television news (ibid). The top three reasons given by viewers for watching debates, according to McKinney and Carlin (2004: 206), are a desire to learn about the candidates' viewpoints on various issues, to contrast candidate personalities, and to obtain knowledge that will aid them in casting their vote. However, as Maurer and Reinemann (2006: 492) point out, "whether candidates present their issue positions, or the state of the country accurately is not under examination". The assertions are unquestioningly accepted as true or dismissed as irrelevant, however it should be kept in mind that politicians participating in television debates are more concerned with winning elections than educating their viewers. As a result, they could employ deceptive rhetoric to refute unpopular ideas or to reframe evidence that contradicts their own claims. (Maurer & Reinemann, 2006: 492.).

Regardless of the debate's outcome, post-debate press reports can alter the public's sense of who won and who lost the debate (Jamieson & Adasiewicz, 2000: 25). This way the media can also focus the voters on tactical assessments rather than on the debate's substance (ibid), but, at the same time, the debates also enable voters to form opinions about candidates without the direct influence of journalists (Maurer & Reinemann, 2006: 491). Nevertheless, even if a voter would perceive that their candidate lost the debate that does not automatically translate into a changed vote (Jamieson & Adasiewicz, 2000: 26.). Furthermore, polling data has suggested that most voters usually have decided on a candidate before the first debate has aired, and thus, viewing a debate is far more likely to reinforce an existing preference than to create a new one (ibid.). However, as McKinney and Warner (2013: 240) state, there are studies that have found that "among undecided, conflicted, or weakly committed voters, debates do help form voting preference or even change candidate selection".

According to Blais and Perrella (2008: 460) the candidate ratings more often improve than deteriorate after a debate. They also point out that the less popular candidates tend to gain more from the debates and thus, the popularity gap between the candidates tends to decline after a debate. A debate gives the candidates a chance to improve their public image even if a candidate is forced to make denials or become under attack. Another point to consider here is that a debate can raise a candidate's public profile and consequently, the candidates receive more positive evaluations as they become better known. (Blais & Perrella, 2008: 460.).

3.4. Vice-presidential debates

The vice-presidential debate between Kamala Harris and Mike Pence was viewed by 57.9 million people (Koblin, 2020). The viewer count for vice-presidential debates is often substantially lower than it is in presidential debates, however, there are exceptions. In 2008, almost 70 million people

watched Sarah Palin's debate with Joe Biden and 56.7 million watched the 1984 debate between George H.W. Bush and Geraldine Ferraro. Ferraro being the first woman to take the vice-presidential debate stage. These three debates are the most watched debates in the history of vice-presidential debates, and all of them featured female candidates. (Ibid.).

Vice-presidential debates have been rather inadequately studied as the focus tends to lie in presidential campaigns and debates. However, as stated by Benoit and Airne (2005: 225), "it is clear that voters see value in vice presidential debates". During vice-presidential debates, the voters also receive a chance to learn about the presidential candidates, as the vice-presidential candidates also discuss their running mates. Previous research has also shown that these debates provide information on the presidential candidate's decision-making skills and offer insight into the abilities of the vice-presidential candidate (Benoit & Airne, 2005: 225). Vice-presidential debates resemble presidential debates in numerous ways (Benoit & Airne, 2005: 233). The many important similarities between presidential and vice-presidential debates suggest that the constraints of the situation strongly influence the discourse of these important campaign events (ibid).

Hinck and Hinck (2002) studied presidential elections together with vice-presidential elections in terms of politeness theory. In their research they analysed the debates during the 1992 presidential election. According to their findings, political context determines whether the debate affects the election outcome (Hinck & Hink, 2002: 246). Benoit and Airne (2005: 226) conclude, that even if the vice-presidential debates would not have any significant influence on an election's outcome, they serve an important educational function. And thus, it is reasonable to claim that vice-presidential debates deserve scholarly attention (Benoit & Airne, 2005: 226).

By applying functional theory Benoit and Airne (2005) studied vice-presidential debates since the first debate in 1976. Each debate was content analysed for functions, topics, forms of policy, and forms of character and the results were compared with content analysis of the presidential debates held in the same years. In this study they aimed to learn if there are similarities or differences between presidential and vice-presidential debates and discovered that vice-presidential candidates are more aggressive in debates than presidential candidates. This was also visible in Hinck and Hinck's (2002) results, as the candidates had to struggle to have their turn to speak and the moderator asked very direct questions that challenged the candidates' image. Hinck and Hinck (2002: 247) also point out that the moderators can constrain candidate discourse or to provide possibilities for the candidates to attack one another. Benoit and Airne (2005: 233) also note that vice-presidential candidates debate policy more than character and that Democrats emphasise policy more than Republicans. According to this study vice-presidential candidates discuss future plans less often than presidential candidates

and emphasised leadership ability and personal qualities more than ideals. (Benoit & Airne, 2005: 233.).

I will be returning to Benoit and Airne (2005) in chapters 5 and 6 in which I will also give a more detailed description of functional theory of political campaign discourse.

4. Rhetoric and rhetorical strategies

The word 'rhetoric' derives from the ancient Greek term rhētorikē tekhnē, meaning the 'art' of persuasive discourse undertaken by a rhetor (Martin, 2014: 2). The word refers to both instruction in this practice and to the persuasive qualities of a discourse itself. Thus, it is both a mode of enquiry and the object of that enquiry. (Martin, 2014: 2.). According to Martin (2014: 2), studying rhetoric can mean either learning about the skills of persuasion or identifying the persuasive element in a discourse and thus, it is difficult to entirely separate the human skill of persuasion from the underlying persuasiveness of a discourse. In relation to politics rhetoric can be discussed as a research method but also as an aspect of the research subject (Palonen, 1997: 75). According to Palonen (1997: 75) rhetoric always contains a political perspective.

Rhetorical strategy indicates the purposeful assemblage of arguments for a specific occasion and setting considering its anticipated effects and by means of available techniques (Martin, 2014: 94). The work of Aristotle has handed down the notion of rhetoric as speech set up to be as persuasive as possible to specific audiences (Martin, 2014: 94). In modern political orders, rhetorical situations tend to emerge in the context of the routinised processes and behaviours of social and political systems (Martin, 2014: 98). Rhetorical analysis should, according to Martin (2014: 100), be concerned with three distinct moments of speech interventions. These are: the rhetorical context, the rhetorical argument, and the rhetorical effects. The rhetorical context refers to the immediate conditions giving rise to a speech occasion and interpreting it involves identifying the historical context. The rhetorical argument concerns the situation constituted in the language and performance of the speech itself. Rhetorical argument typically comprises of argumentative appeals, arrangement, style and delivery. Rhetorical effects involve interpreting the alteration to the situation after the intervention. (Martin, 2014: 100-101.).

The essential use of arguments in natural language is to persuade others of a stance towards a disputed topic (Wachsmuth, Stede, El Baff, Al Khatib, Skeppstedt, & Stein, 2018: 3752). Persuasion is seldom achieved through a loose set of arguments alone. Instead, an effective delivery of arguments follows a rhetorical strategy, incorporating logical reasoning with appeals to ethics and emotion and such a

strategy aims to select, arrange, and phrase a set of argumentative discourse units. (Wachsmuth et al., 2018: 3752.).

In this chapter I will discuss the role that persuasion and audience plays in a debate, rhetorical strategies in political debates as well as argument development.

4.1. Persuasion, politics and the political

Persuasion is a process where we are invited freely to give our assent, or not, to a point of view or a claim, thus, persuasion involves letting oneself be persuaded (Martin, 2014: 3). Most often, people do not mind being persuaded by people they know and trust, but in politics, it is often strangers who pursue people's support, and rather often on matters of great significance. Persuasion often invites one to identify with the point of view of the persuader. This desire to identify with the speaker may also lead to approving the persuader's authority over us, to make decisions for us. Persuasion in politics is often about achieving or keeping office. To seek or to be the subject of persuasion is therefore to engage in subtle relations of power and to be complicit with them. (Martin, 2014: 3-4.). Rhetoric is always situational and deeply contextual in its references to people, time, place, and action (Killingsworth, 2005: 24).

Rhetoric permits an understanding of persuasive speech as a situated practice of argumentation (Martin, 2014: 9). To study rhetoric is to consider how, at particular moments and locations, ideas are constructed into arguments with a certain force and direction in order to win the acceptance of an audience. Temporal and spatial aspects intertwine in rhetorical persuasion and speeches aimed at persuasion are creative articulations of various times and spaces. Time refers to processes of simultaneity, change, speed and duration and space implies the co-presence of ideas and objects, relationships, and distances between things. (Martin, 2016: 9-10.). Sensitivity to time is crucial in rhetoric (Killingsworth, 2005: 38). However, time, in rhetoric, involves more than just an awareness of the temporal context as it often communicates a sense of urgency or timeliness. The aspect of time focuses audience's attention by concentrating on a particular moment in time, but the persuasion power depends upon the author and audience coming to an agreement that the moment has arrived for a certain topic to receive close attention. (Killingsworth, 2005: 38.).

Persuasion entails imaginatively recreating the context inside which a judgement is to be made about what to think or how to act (Martin, 2016: 9). A proper understanding of this mutually situated and resituating process intertwines with the study of language as language is the medium through which humans construct their cultural and material world and their sense of self. (Martin, 2016: 9-10.).

4.2. Audience

The audience is an important factor during political debates as political debates do not take place in a vacuum and the candidates are not only making arguments for each other (Tuman, 2008: 124). The debates most often take place in context of an audience. The audience may consist of only a few people or a large crowd and/or of mass media that broadcasts the event to people who are not physically present. (Ibid.). And as discussed earlier, the debate between Harris and Pence gathered 57.9 million viewers which is the second largest total ever for a vice-presidential debate.

Substantial amount of research has examined how campaign strategies play out over the course of the campaign, however, little of this research has focused on debates (Boydstun et al., 2013: 255). Boydstun et al. (2013: 255) note that "debates are unique because candidates respond to moderator and audience questions on the fly and thus enjoy incomplete agenda control". Furthermore, unlike more targeted modes of strategic communication, televised debates demand candidates to appeal to a larger audience (Boydstun et al., 2013: 256).

According to Killingsworth (2005: 24), modern rhetoric differs from rhetoric as practiced in the era of Aristotle, where orators most often spoke directly to audiences that tended to be of the same class, race, gender, and nationality. Modern rhetoric must take greater pains with how to model and analyse rhetorical situations as there is a need for situational sensitivity. Rhetorical situations involve imagined, fictionalised, constructed versions of the speaker and the audience. (Killingsworth, 2005: 24, 35.). For an appeal to work, it must focus the audience's attention, push the counterarguments into the background, and encourage the audience to play along for a while even if they do not buy the argument completely (Killingsworth, 2005: 36).

The study of discursive tactics allowing us to compel or promote the mind's allegiance to the theses put forward for its acceptance is what Perelman refers to as The New Rhetoric (Jørgensen, 2009: 2). The word "adherence" encompasses both persuasion and convincing to the same extent as the traditional definition of persuasion. The audience is initially defined as the people the speaker hopes to persuade with their arguments. The key theoretical distinction between a specific audience and a universal audience is then made by Perelman. According to Perelman, convincing relates to a general audience but persuading a specific group does not. The target audience is made up of individuals who have something in common, like being a part of a political party or participating in an expert forum. The term "universal audience" describes arguments that aim to persuade every sane person to agree with them. The entire human race, or at the very least everyone who is intelligent and reasonable, constitutes the universal audience in Perelman's view. (Ibid.). Simply expressed, the main difference

between the two is that while in persuasive discourse the speaker seeks the support of a specific audience, in compelling arguments the speaker seeks the support of an audience that symbolises reason.

There has been discussion surrounding Perelman's idea that the speaker creates the universal audience (Jørgensen, 2009: 2). The universal audience, however, should be emphasised since it "relates to intersubjective rationality, and the fundamental point in making the universal audience a projection produced by the arguer, is that what counts as reasonable depends on time and location" (Jørgensen, 2009: 2). In other words, the idea of reason cannot be viewed as an unchanging collection of timeless facts or standards that are unrelated to history, culture, or circumstance. The general consensus is that both specific and universal audiences are constructed. Even though Perelman's theory uses argumentation aimed at actual audiences and seeks to understand and enhance practical argumentation, it lacks empirical support because the actual audiences are still a mystery to his theory. Although these are not the problems Perelman seeks to address, the persuasive effect depends on how precisely the speaker is able to formulate their argument and whether they are successful in winning over a genuine audience. (Ibid.).

Perelman's idea of audience and theory of values are intertwined (Jørgensen, 2009: 3). Perelman distinguishes between values, hierarchies, and locales and facts, truths, and presumptions. Presumptions, truths, and facts fall under the real category, while values go under the desirable group. According to the premises of argumentation, all of these are beliefs. Perelman distinguishes between local or concrete values and universal or abstract values. Justice and truth are two examples of abstract values, whereas the church is a physical illustration of a value. By mentioning universal principles like justice, Perelman declares that they can only be regarded as true for a worldwide audience if their content is not articulated. According to Perelman, the adherence of specific audiences will only be attained the second one seeks to dig into detail. As it appears to exclude the broad audience in political discourse, this might be considered as rather ambiguous in respect to deliberative rhetoric. This is so because political argumentation develops around competing ideals and how they affect how people make judgments in particular circumstances. (Ibid.).

According to Perelman, "values enter, at some stage or other, into every argument…In the fields of law, politics, and philosophy, values intervene as a basis for argument at all stages of the developments" (Perelman, 1969: 75, as quoted by Jørgensen, 2009: 3). This remark begs the question of whether motivational reasoning about disputed and competing values can be conveyed to the universal audience at all, and if it can, should we not draw the conclusion that the universal audience is inappropriate for political discourse? It is more likely that Perelman wants to emphasise the

significance of finding a common ground in order to acquire adherence because this appears very implausible. (Jørgensen, 2009: 3–4.). In other words, reasoning must be based on a consensus between the speaker and their audience in order to increase audience adherence (Lewiski & Mohammed, 2016: 6). The speaker must select ideas that are shared by their audience's values, hierarchies, and locales, as well as facts, truths, and presumptions that they accept. (Ibid.).

4.3. Rhetorical strategies in debates

Previous research suggests that candidates should aim to focus the agenda on topics that are most advantageous to them and to avoid topics that favour their opponents (Boydstun, Glazier, & Pietryka, 2013: 255). This aims to show and highlight the topics that are emphasised in a candidate's campaign. Alternatively, candidates can also "play to the crowd,", i.e., focus on a topic the public deems most important at the time. To a candidate who holds a strategic advantage over their opponents on salient topics, these two strategies are complementary. However, for a candidate who is disadvantaged on the topic most salient to the public, these two strategies are at odds. (Boydstun et al., 2013: 255.).

Studies have identified three categories of debate rhetoric that influence on citizen's attitudes and public opinion (Boydstun et al., 2013: 256). First, voters' minds can be predisposed to certain ideas through political speech, making them more approachable and therefore potentially more influential than they would otherwise be. Second, debate rhetoric can persuade voters to think differently about a given topic and thus change the relative evaluation of the candidates on this dimension. As mentioned earlier, studies have shown that debates can change people's vote intentions (see, for example, Benoit & Airne, 2005: 225). This is particularly a possibility with voters who have low political knowledge before the debate (Boydstun et al., 2013: 256). A third class of debate influence has to do with information gain (Boydstun et al., 2013: 256). As with other political messaging, debates can inform voters about current events and conditions as well as candidate traits and positions (Blais & Perrella, 2008; Benoit & Airne, 2005: 225).

4.4. Style and delivery

Persuasion often involves making emphases, expressing urgency, or conveying degrees of moral significance to help make auditors identify with the speaker and their claims (Martin, 2014: 72). These are, however, possible only if a speech takes a form that presses its argument in a way that is moving. Effective rhetoric does not only make one agree with what is said, it makes one want to agree, and that task is the responsibility of style and delivery. Style is the part that concerns language such as the choice of words, the figures and forms of speech and the overall tone of a discourse. When a

leader speaks with little attention to style the audience may generate negative feelings toward them, and the speaker may lose authority. (Martin, 2014: 72.).

Delivery has become equally as important as the content of speech because everything is recorded and remain in circulation long after the actual performance and can also be distributed much further than the immediate audience (Martin, 2014: 83). Delivery contains the manipulation of the paralinguistic tools, such as body and voice, to help sustain the point being argued. Speakers can move their limbs to direct the audience's attention through gestures and can adjust their voices to convey emotion and force. (Martin, 2014: 83-84.).

4.5.   Developing an argument

An argument is logically convincing if its premises are relevant as support for its conclusion, individually acceptable, and together sufficient to draw the conclusion (Wachsmuth et al., 2018: 3753). Appeals can, for example, aim to change audience's attitudes or to move the audience into action (Killingsworth, 2005:83). Perelman saw argumentation as an action taken by a speaker, who by using their arguments aims to gain the audience's acceptance for their statements (Palonen, 1997: 80). The speaker, audience, statement, and argumentation together form the core of Perelman's view of the political action. Rhetoric is important for this simple reason; it enables the audience to change their minds about the statements. (Ibid.).

In creating the inventory of argumentation techniques, Perelman characterises between two main processes that underlie them:

1. association: "schemes which bring separate elements together and allow us to establish a unity among them"

2. dissociation: "techniques of separation which have the purpose of dissociating, separating, disuniting elements which are regarded as forming a whole"

(Perelman, 1969: 190, as quoted by Lewiński & Mohammed, 2016: 6).

The techniques that trust on a process of association contain "making use of quasi-logical arguments, appeals to the existing structure of reality, and arguments that establish a new structure of reality" (Lewiński & Mohammed, 2016: 6). Argumentation by dissociation divides an apparently united concept into two contrasting viewpoints, such as appearance versus reality. This is typically done in response to inconsistencies. (ibid.).

Discovery of an argument involves selecting a form of reasoning that addresses the audience in a way that encourages them to reach the conclusion offered by the speaker (Martin, 2014: 57). According

to Martin (2014: 57), Aristotle claimed that this range consisted of three types of appeal: the appeal to logos, ethos, and pathos, or in other terms; to reason, authority and emotion. The appeal to reason involves an argument based on a logical procedure through which the speaker leads the audience, often by making use of evidence of some kind to demonstrate the accuracy of the conclusion. The appeal to authority involves calling attention to the appropriateness of the speaker to speak at all. This can be signalled in various ways, for example by announcing one's experience, qualifications, or job title. The appeal to emotion involves invoking the sentiments of the audience such as a sense of moral outrage, of hope or of humour. Each appeal constitutes a way of arguing that is recognised as being legitimate in particular contexts. Although, the three different types of appeal might be appropriate to certain contexts, they seldom function entirely independently of each other. In any process of argumentation, each appeal will be used to some extent. (Martin, 2014: 57-58.).

A rational argument involves a procedure by which we defend a specific conclusion, by making logical connections between the conclusion and certain premises (Martin, 2014: 59). A conclusion can be based on a particular case or by way of a general principle. The first is a form of inductive reasoning and the second is a form of deductive reasoning. In inductive reasoning the conclusion comes from an external form of evidence. If this evidence changed, the conclusion would not reasonably follow. In deductive reasoning, the conclusion is deduced from a general principle that is assumed to hold in any situation. From this follows that the premises are abstract, and they are assumed to be acceptable by any reasoning person. The argument, in both cases, is drawn from premises that we are required to accept if we are to reach the same conclusion. The speaker's task is to demonstrate the connection between the premises and the conclusion so that the reasoning is shown to be one that an auditor can follow and agree to be fair. The effectiveness of rational argumentation lies in the speaker's ability to make this connection appear as effortless and unforced as possible. Thus, even if the listeners do not like the conclusion, they are compelled by their own reasoning to accept it. (Martin, 2014: 59.).

Discovering the right argument or combination of argumentative appeals is an important part of a speaker's task (Martin,2014: 66). However, the argument still needs to be assembled into an order of presentation that delivers its effectiveness in full. Arrangement of the argument deals with the positioning of the various parts of speech and the way the speech flows from start to finish. The introduction part of a speech draws attention and offers an opportunity to present the speaker's view of the issue at stake and the stance to be taken on it. Introductory remarks function to allow a topic to be approached by adopting a tone that indicates what will come without saying it directly. Sometimes, however, the speaker will need to establish an initial relationship with the audience, if only by greeting

them. This is common in political campaign rallies, where different constituencies can be addressed individually and thanked directly. (Martin, 2014: 66.).

5. Functional theory of political campaign discourse

According to Benoit and Arne (2005: 227) campaign discourse is functional. It intends to achieve a certain end, to secure election to a public office by receiving enough votes in the election. A candidate pleads support from voters by persuading them that they are a better option than their opponent. This is done according to whatever criteria are most important to each voter. Three functions in political campaign discourse can confirm that one candidate is better than the other: self-praise, response to attack and criticism of an opponent. Self-praising is acclaims that identify the advantages of the candidate, responses to attacks are responses that refute candidate's alleged weaknesses and criticisms of an opponent demonstrate the weaknesses of an opponent and increase the attacking candidate's desirability. (Benoit & Airne, 2005: 227.).

Functional theory presumes that political campaign discourse occurs on only two kinds of topics: policy and character (Benoit & Airne, 2005: 227). Policy can be viewed as issues relating to, for example, taxes, jobs, terrorism or health care and character, for example honesty, compassion, courage, strength, or leadership ability. Furthermore, functional theory subdivides both policy and character into three types. Policy includes past deeds, future plans, and general goals and character includes personal qualities, leadership ability, and ideals. (Benoit & Airne, 2005: 227).

Benoit and Airne (2005) studied all the presidential debates and vice-presidential debates from 1976 to 2004. They formulated seven hypotheses and two research questions to guide them in their analysis. Their first hypothesis was that attacks will be more frequent in vice presidential debates than in presidential debates. This is because a vice-presidential nominee is not expected to be as 'presidential' as the presidential nominee, and thus, a more aggressive posture is expected. Their second hypothesis was that acclaims will be more common than attacks, and that defences will be the least common function. This they believed to be true because one must identify an attack to refute it and thus, defending against an attack may inform voters of an alleged weakness. (Benoit & Arne, 2005.).

Their third and fourth hypotheses were that the incumbent party candidates will acclaim more and attack less than challengers in vice presidential debate and that the incumbent party candidates will acclaim more and attack less on past deeds than challengers in vice presidential debates (Benoit & Arne, 2005). This is based on the idea that functional theory juxtaposes incumbent party candidates with challenger party candidates. For instance, incumbent party candidates have a record in the pursued office. Challengers might have records in other offices, such as the Senate or as a governor,

but disputably, experience in the White House is better evidence than experience elsewhere. Their fifth hypothesis was that policy will be discussed more than character because past research on presidential primary and general election debates has indicated that candidates stress policy more than character. They also posit two research questions: What are the proportions of the three forms of policy in vice presidential debates and what are the proportions of the three forms of character in vice presidential debates? Their last hypotheses were that general goals will be the basis of acclaims more often than attacks (8th) and ideals will be the basis of acclaims more often than attacks (9th). The last hypotheses were formulated because it is often easier to praise a goal or an ideal than to attack them. (Benoit & Airne, 2005: 227-228.). As described earlier in this thesis, most of Benoit and Airne's hypotheses were accurate.

In terms of this thesis, this study is very interesting as it is one of the very few studies that have used vice-presidential debates as research material. I will be using the same coding scheme on my research material to establish what kinds of functions can be identified in Harris's arguments. I will not simply settle for counting and categorising the different functions that are evident in the research material, but I will also discuss their discursive meanings. I will discuss the method of analysis more broadly in chapter 6.

6. Set up of the study

6.1. Research material

The research material for this thesis is the televised debate between incumbent vice president Mike Pence and Senator Kamala Harris. The debate took place on October 7th, 2020, at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City. Susan Page of USA TODAY was the moderator of the debate. Because of the COVID-19 pandemic there was only a small and socially distant audience present and everyone in the audience was required to wear a face mask and the candidates were seated 12 feet apart.

The two campaigns and the Commission on Presidential Debates had agreed to the ground rules for the debate and no one in either campaign, or at the commission had been told in advance what topics would be raised or what questions would be asked. It was a ninety-minute debate, and it was divided into nine segments of approximately 10 minutes each. Each segment started by the moderator posing a question to each candidate, sometimes the same question, sometimes a different question on the same topic. The candidates then had two minutes to answer, without interruption by the moderator or the other candidate. After that there was approximately 6 minutes to discuss the issue.

Although I will be concentrating on Senator Harris's rhetoric, I have transcribed the entire debate and it can be found in appendix 1.

6.2.   Methods of analysis

In my analysis I will be using Benoit's functional discourse analysis, Perelman's rhetorical analysis and in addition to these, I will also explore gendered features in Harris's discourse.

6.2.1   Rhetorical analysis

The art of rhetoric has evolved significantly since Aristotle's Rhetoric was written, and in 1966 Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts Tyteca released The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation. The New Rhetoric is an investigation of rhetorical arguments, and Perelman explicitly acknowledges that by doing so, he is going back to a subject Aristotle studied. In his subsequent book The Realm of Rhetoric (1982), Perelman continued his work with rhetoric and further developed his concepts. I believe it is beneficial to consider Aristotle in light of Perelman's work because Perelman highlights inconsistencies in Aristotle's ideas by using a different approach to rhetorical argument. But unlike Aristotle, who tacitly indicates that rhetorical argument is correct because it is a powerful inductive argument, Perelman does not provide any standards by which we may assess the accuracy of rhetorical argument as distinct from its efficacy.

Aristotle and Perelman both concentrate on the persuading aspect of rhetoric and develop extensive classifications to explain how one might persuade, but Perelman significantly expands on Aristotle's work in three key ways: by deeply examining the roots of practical argument in formal logic, by including the audience as a major component of the invention process, and by considering how argumentation functions on a psychological or cognitive level. Rhetoric, according to Aristotle, is the capacity to identify all potential persuasive strategies. The comprehensive view of argument in Perelman's theory makes it comparable to Aristotle's, despite the fact that his theory focuses only on argumentation rather than the entirety of rhetoric. According to Perelman's definition, all academics are interested in the methods of persuasion and what approaches one should employ when attempting to persuade someone through conversation. Both Aristotle and Perelman provide a notion of how persuasion appears in the real world in their respective eras. Naturally, because Perelman is writing from a contemporary perspective, he is able to provide a longer historical perspective. However, Perelman's conception of argumentation goes beyond what Aristotle provided because the 20th-century version provides a thorough knowledge of the principles behind the everyday arguments that individuals employ to persuade one another.

Aristotle offers guidance on topics like style and the proper use of metaphors in Rhetoric (2001: 84–86). In contrast, Perelman does not provide recommendations for particular strategies or their efficacy. However, Perelman (1982) gives sweeping findings, such as the fact that values are

particular to audiences and that the greatest arguments are those that appeal to a large audience. Therefore, if one wants to be persuasive, they should start with ideals that their auditors share. According to Perelman (1982: 13), a theory of rhetoric can only recommend that speakers adapt themselves to their audiences.

Aristotle and Perelman both emphasise invention among the classical canons of rhetoric, which also include arrangement, style, delivery, and memory. Aristotle (2001:4) offers three methods of persuasion: establishing the speaker's authority and moral character; employing arguments that are rationally supported; and appealing to the target audience's appropriate emotions. Aristotle (2001: 63-64) covers the audience's feelings and the speaker's credibility in addition to his core points on logical proof, tactics, and topics. However, despite addressing some of the same topics, Perelman (1982) does not split the discussion in this way. Perelman (1982) does put together a range of methods for logical proof from argument, just like Aristotle did, but the values of the audience are more important to Perelman than the audience's feelings. Perelman believes that values are a component of the proof (Perelman: 1982: 27). All rhetorical audiences, both general and targeted, are formed, according to Perelman (1982: 14). The distinction between these audiences is that speakers who are speaking to a universal audience hope to change people's perceptions of facts and truth, whereas speakers speaking to a specialised audience hope to change people's perceptions of values (Perelman, 1982: 14, 27-29.).

Perelman (1982:9) claims that the purpose of reasoning is not to draw conclusions from premises. It is instead intended to increase the audience's devotion to the theses that are put forward for their approval. Such adherence never just happens; it always assumes that the speaker and the audience share a same notion or viewpoint. Argumentation aims to influence the audience and influence their attitudes through conversation. Instead of imposing its will through coercion or indoctrination, argumentation seeks to bring individuals to a shared notion or thought. It should be observed that reasoning often seeks to inspire action or at the very least to establish a desire to act, rather than merely attempting to win an adherence that is entirely intellectual. (Perelman, 1982: 9, 11-12.).

Aristotle (2001: 2, 6-9) asserts that rhetorical arguments are those based on probabilities. He views these arguments as flawed syllogisms and unmistakably sees them as an approximation to legitimate, demonstrative inference. Because they are inductive arguments supported by a substantial body of evidence, they are sound (ibid.). Aristotle (2001: 6-9) also draws attention to the moment an argument appears to be inductive but is actually deductively correct because it is founded on a universally true premise. Since Perelman (1982) contrasts logical systems with rhetorical thinking, his viewpoint departs significantly from that of Aristotle. Perelman (1982: 48–49) makes a distinction between

compelling and persuading arguments. While compelling argumentation tries to win over every rational creature, persuasive argumentation simply asserts validity for a certain audience (ibid.).

The rhetoric of Perelman (1982) was developed from formal deductive logic traditions. However, by using formal logic reasoning, one can only substantiate points that have previously been made in the case and comes to an unquestionable conclusion. One can get conclusions from practical argumentation about things that are not in the premises, but these conclusions are not as powerful as those drawn through formal logical reasoning. Because they are dependent on probability, the findings of a practical argument can be called into doubt. The audience is more likely to accept practical argumentation that resembles a demonstration, but for the argument to be persuasive, all ambiguity must be eliminated. (Ibid.).

In Perelman's (1982: 50, 53) rhetoric, a significant category of technique is referred to as quasi-logical arguments. Although they have the appearance of logical reasoning, quasi-logical arguments have a logical fault. Perelman (ibid.) analyses arguments based on the structure of reality and arguments that produce this structure, the dissociation of conceptions, and the interaction of arguments in addition to quasi-logical arguments. The first discusses arguments that are somewhat accurate by the standards of logic or mathematics. The second are arguments which lay on assumptions about causes, ends, and means, and the third covers arguments from example and analogy which serve to create the assumptions covered by the second. The fourth covers arguments which detach concepts such as appearance and reality and the fifth covers techniques which serve to intensify arguments. (Perelman, 1982: 50-51).

According to Perelman (1982: 19), an argument can either be built on the way reality is structured or on the preferences of the audience. Since everyone has various values and organises them in different ways, these beginning points are not universal. When using the starting points, the invention process must take the audience into account. The more persuasive an argument is, the more likely it is to be accepted; hence the strongest arguments are those that have the broadest appeal. (Perelman, 1982: 19-20.). A model of argument that examines the cognitive level is added to the debate of persuasion by Perelman (1982: 11). Arguments start with a premise that the audience must accept and then utilise argumentative strategies to lead to the thesis (Perelman, 1984: 13-14, 21). By examining the difference between the real and the preferred, Perelman's (1982: 21) distinction between specific and universal audiences can be understood. Because all rhetorical audiences are manufactured, the speaker imagines both particular and general listeners. Speeches for general audiences emphasise the real, whereas speeches for particular audiences emphasise the desirable. (Perelman, 1982: 13.). Knowing how the speaker and their audience transition from the premises to the argument is

important because practical argument, unlike strictly logical argument, asks the listener to accept something that is not stated in the premises (Perelman, 1982: 21).

Perelman (1982) emphasises that in order to increase the adherence of the audience, argumentation needs to be based on an agreement between the speaker and their audience. To secure that, the one making the arguments must choose facts, truths, and presumptions that are accepted by their audience as well as values, hierarchies, and loci that are shared by them. Perelman distinguishes between two main processes that underlie them: association and dissociation. These are schemes which bring separate elements together and allow to establish a unity among them and techniques of separation which have the purpose of dissociating elements which are considered as forming a whole. Techniques that depend on a process of association include making use of quasi-logical arguments, appeals to the existing structure of reality, and arguments that establish a new structure of reality. Argumentation by dissociation divides a seemingly united concept into two contrasting aspects such as appearance–reality, typically in response to incompatibilities. (Ibid.).

6.2.2   Functional discourse analysis

The following five goals have been established for vice presidential debates: demonstrating the nominees' suitability to serve as president, outlining their intended role in administration, outlining their policy positions, supporting their running mate, and attacking the opponent (Benoit & Airne, 2005: 226). These goals are in line with the three major objectives of political campaign speech that functional theory established. The presidential and vice-presidential candidates basically praise themselves or each other in the first three, defend themselves in the fourth and respond to attacks in the fifth, which is an attack like criticising an opponent. Campaign discourse serves a purpose since it is employed to further a specific goal. The end in the case of vice-presidential debates is, of course, to secure election to a public office by acquiring the most votes from citizens. A candidate seeks support from voters by persuading them that they are a better choice than their opponent according to whatever criteria are most important to each voter. (Ibid.).

In political campaign speech, there are three ways to prove one candidate is superior to the other (Benoit & Airne, 2005: 226). Self-praise or accolades highlight a candidate's advantages, Attacks or criticism of an opponent show their shortcomings, while defences or reactions to attacks refute any claims of a candidate's weaknesses (ibid.) These activities operate together as an informal type of cost-benefit analysis: acclaims enhance benefits, assaults increase an opponent's costs, and defences minimise a candidate's purported costs (Benoit & Airne, 2005: 226). By stating that this is an "informal" version of cost-benefit analysis Benoit and Airne (2005: 226) indicate that "functional

theory does not presume that all voters quantify costs and benefits or combine them mathematically". Acclaims, however, when persuasive, improve a candidate's perceived desirability, and attacks, when accepted by the audience, should reduce an opponent's perceived desirability. Defences, when successful, reduce a candidate's apparent costs. (Benoit & Airne, 2005: 226-227.).

Functional theory suggests that political campaign discourse only occurs on two kinds of topics: policy and character (Benoit & Airne, 2005: 227). Policy includes issues such as taxes, jobs, terrorism, health care, social security and education and character contains personality traits such as honesty, compassion, courage, strength, and leadership ability. Functional theory further subdivides both policy and character into three types. Policy includes past deeds, future plans, and general goals and character includes personal qualities, leadership ability, and ideals. (Ibid.).

7. Analysis

In my analysis I have divided the sections according to the functions Benoit and Airne established in their research: acclaims, defence, and attacks. As some of the arguments do not fall into any of these categories, I created a fourth one which I call "other functions". It is also notable that some statements fall under two or more categories but are only analysed in one as they are categorised in terms of their primary function. I will be paraphrasing most of Harris's turns, but as mentioned earlier, the transcription of the entire debate can be found in appendix 1. The full quotes I have decided to include here all have some interesting word choices I thought would be best left as they are.

I will analyse Harris's argumentation in terms of the functions of the arguments, Harris's rhetorical and discursive means as well as from the point of view of her being a female politician. I have italicised the rhetorical devices Harris utilises to highlight their usage in her argumentation.

Acclaims

Well, the American people have witnessed what is the greatest failure of any presidential administration in the history of our country. --- And here's the thing, on January 28, the vice president and the president were informed about the nature of this pandemic. --- They knew and they covered it up. The president said it was a hoax. They minimized the seriousness of it. --- And in spite of all of that, today they still don't have a plan. They still don't have a plan. Well, Joe Biden does. And our plan is about what we need to do around a national strategy for contact tracing, for testing, for administration of the vaccine and making sure that it will be free for all. That is the plan that Joe Biden has and that I have, knowing that we have to get a hold of what has been going on and we need to save our country. And Joe Biden is the best leader to do that and frankly, this administration has forfeited their right to re-election, based on this.

I the beginning of the debate, Harris claims that the Trump administration failed in handling the COVID-19 pandemic. She states that Trump never had a plan on how to handle it, but luckily Joe Biden does. This way Harris is simultaneously attacking the opponent and appraising Biden. She

states that their plan outlines the steps that must be taken to implement a national strategy for contact tracing, testing, vaccination administration, and ensuring that it will be provided at no cost to everyone. Harris seems to assume that her audience agrees with her and she tries to reinforce the audience's commitment to the thesis by laying out the plans Biden has and highlights the fact that these plans better the lives of every American. Harris gives *examples* and *demonstrates* how they will pursue to save the nation and get a handle on what has been happening. However, her reasoning is rather demonstrative and not necessarily accepted by a universal audience. The measures needed to be taken in managing a pandemic are not shared by everyone and thus, Harris might try to gain the adherence of a universal audience, but she does not necessarily succeed in it. She most likely reinforced the democratic voters' views and might have even compelled someone who was not going to vote to vote. However, many republicans had and have very different views on pandemic managing and Harris most likely did not reach them with her argumentation.

Harris states that Joe Biden is the ideal leader to steer the nation out of the pandemic and that based on their performance the Trump administration has given up their right to be re-elected. By giving *examples* on how Biden would handle the pandemic better Harris *demonstrates* the weaknesses of the Trump administration and establishes the advantages of Biden, and as such, she is attacking and appraising at the same time. By stating that the Trump administration does not deserve another term and that Biden would be a better option, Harris is making use of a *quasi-logical argument*. Her argument is modelled after the assumption that everyone believes Trump has done a terrible job and that Biden's plan is better. This claim might seem like a logical argument, *"they have failed, it is our turn to try"*, but claiming this is not sound when there is no evidence of anyone doing the job better in the past. However, if Harris is able to gain the adherence of the audience with these claims, the illogicality does not matter as the audience is the one making that judgement.

So let me tell you first of all, on the day I got the call from Joe Biden, it was actually a Zoom call, asking me to serve with him on this ticket was probably one of the most memorable, memorable days of my life. I, you know, I thought about my mother, who came to the United States at the age of 19, gave birth to me at the age of 25 at Kaiser Hospital in Oakland, California. And the thought that I'd be sitting here right now I know would make her proud and she must be looking down on this. You know Joe and I were raised in a very similar way. We were raised with values that are about hard work, about the value and the dignity of public service and about the importance of fighting for the dignity of all people.

When the discussion turns to presidential disability, Harris tells why she believes Biden asked her to be his running mate. She smiles when she talks about her mother, who came to the US when she was 19-years old and gave birth to Harris at the age of 25. She even mentions a specific hospital in Oakland, California where she was born. By mentioning the hospital, city and state Harris is

identifying herself with her audience by creating commonalty. She gets more serious when she recalls her accomplishments in the District Attorney's office, as the Attorney General and as a Senator.

I was elected the first woman of color, and black woman, to be elected Attorney General of the state of California, where I ran the second largest Department of Justice in the United States, second only to the United States Department of Justice. There I took on everything from transnational criminal organizations to the big banks that were taking advantage of homeowners, to for profit colleges that were taking advantage of veterans. And then, of course, now I serve in the United States Senate as only the second black woman ever elected to the United States Senate. I serve on the Senate Intelligence Committee where I've been in regular receipt of classified information about threats to our nation and hotspots around the world.

Harris talks about travelling the world and meeting with soldiers in war zones, making her not only accomplished but also brave and compassionate. She provides *examples* of the reasons why she is a competent choice for a vice president and possibly president if Biden for some reason was unavailable. Harris says that she believes that she and Biden share a common purpose, which is to lift people up and come together as a unified nation. Strong leadership, military and foreign policy expertise are qualities that women are frequently perceived as lacking (Shaw, 2020: 144). These presumptions frequently disadvantage women who are seeking high-level offices (ibid.), but Harris pinpoints all the expertise she has in these areas. Adherence is gained here by stating the facts by providing *examples* from where a conclusion can be drawn. Harris has worked in all these high-level positions, and she has a record to show for it. Harris also presents herself as someone who will always defend those that are less fortunate and in need of help.

She also identifies herself with other people of colour by stating that she was the first woman of colour to be elected Attorney General of the state of California and only the second black woman ever to be elected to the United States Senate. It could be established that Harris is addressing a few particular audiences within the audience: people of colour, women of colour and women. Although, these audiences do not necessarily share the same values nor can they be reduced into one or even three groups, Harris is addressing them in ways that resonate with many of them as Harris represents all of them.

Harris continues that she and Biden had extremely similar upbringings. She says that they were both brought up with principles that emphasise perseverance, the worth and dignity of public service, and the significance of defending the dignity of all people. Harris is trying to appeal to the audience's *values* by sharing her own. Perseverance and dignity of all people can be viewed as rather universal values, and thus, Harris should be able to reach a broad audience. At the same time, she is also appraising herself and Biden, as she tells the audience that this is what they believe in, and these are some of their virtues. Harris is not directly attacking the Trump administration in her statement, but

it could be interpreted that she believes that these are not values that Trump shares. This way she is *disassociating* herself and Biden from Trump. She has mentioned earlier in the debate that Trump has divided the nation and values some people over other, unlike Biden and Harris, who see every American life as important as the other.

Harris says that she believes Biden asked her to work with him because of her professional background, which included becoming the first female district attorney in San Francisco, where she helped to innovate law enforcement practices and change the criminal justice system. Here, again, Harris is appealing to her audience by establishing the *values* she believes in, and that are quite commonly shared among the Americans. She also mentions being the first woman to be elected as the district attorney in San Fransisco. Harris does not use stereotypical female rhetoric, but really accentuates the fact that she is a woman. Harris also appeals to the less advantaged Americans by stating that she has helped to reform the American criminal justice system that has long discriminated against the less fortunate citizens. Harris *illustrates* and provides *examples* of how competent she is.

It is also notable that even though Harris gave a moving speech about this she did not answer the original question at all which was about presidential disability. The reason why Biden chose her to be her running mate has nothing to do with the fact that neither of the presidential candidates had released their health records. This is of course intentional, as Harris does not want to answer this, because Biden and Trump have both withheld them. As she cannot defend this, she deflects and tells why she is a great candidate. Harris is 22 years younger than Biden, and thus, it is more beneficial for her to talk about herself in this respect.

As the discussion moves on to economy, Harris starts by stating that there was a time when the United States valued science and made research and development investments, making it a global innovator.

On the issue of the economy, I think there couldn't be a more fundamental difference between Donald Trump and Joe Biden. --- Joe Biden believes you measure the health and the strength of America's economy based on the health, and the strength of the American worker and the American family. --- There was a time when our country believed in science and invested in research and development so that we were an innovation leader on the globe. Joe Biden will use that money to invest in education.

According to Harris, Biden will invest money in educational opportunities. Harris *illustrates* this by telling the audience that it will be free for people to enrol at a two-year community college and one can attend a public university for free if their family's income is less than $125,000. Additionally, Biden will make sure that all student loan debt is reduced by $10,000. In contrast to enacting a tax package, which had the advantage of allowing American firms to conduct business offshore, Biden views the economy as being about investing in the American people. Harris juxtaposes Trump's and

Biden's *values* as she appraises Biden and attacks Trump at the same time. Values are at the centre of Harris's argumentation as she *disassociates* Biden from Trump. Enabling education for everyone is a topic that most Americans can agree on, or the very least it is rather difficult to argue against. Of course, there are people who seem to find it unjust that some people have reductions on their student loans when they themselves had to pay theirs in total, however, those are not the people Harris is trying to persuade. Thus, in a way, Harris aims to gain the adherence of *a particular audience* as she is addressing all the Americans who are affected by this right now. That is the younger voters, who did not vote in the 2016 elections. Studies have shown that only 39% of Americans between the ages 18-29 voted in 2016 and the number increased to 50% in the 2020 elections (Tufts University Tisch College CIRCLE, 29.4.2021), hence, it could be argued that Harris's argumentation was successful in this way.

According to Harris, Biden will create jobs that relate to clean energy and renewable energy. This is illustrated by giving *examples* of how Biden acknowledges that the West Coast is on fire, he observes the storm-ravaged Gulf states and has seen and spoken with Iowan farmers whose entire harvests have been wiped out by flooding. And most importantly, Biden has faith in science. Harris appraises Biden for understanding what the situation with the climate change is and for understanding what needs to be done to prevent natural disasters from happening because of global warming. Biden, who believes in science also believes in helping the people who have suffered because of the climate change. Thus, *values* are again at the centre of the argumentation as Harris addresses these people directly and tells them that Biden sees them and wants to help them. This way Harris is able to gain the adherence of a particular audience and appeal to a larger audience at the same time: The people who are directly affected and the ones who share their concerns. Although Harris appraises Biden in her arguing, she also attacks Trump by insinuating that he does not believe in science, or that he does not care the same way Biden does.

In questions of foreign policy, Harris states that Biden understands that it is all about keeping your word.

He [Joe Biden] says, you know, 'Foreign policy: it might sound complicated, but really it's relationships, they're – just think about it as relationships. And so, we know this, in our personal, professional relationships – you gotta keep your word to your friends. Got to be loyal to your friends. People who have stood with you, got to stand with them.

Foreign policy is often considered as a realm in which men succeed and women do not necessarily understand (Shaw, 2020). I personally belief that Harris understands foreign policy very well, but Harris also understands the common conception that it is not a topic of female politicians' concern. This is probably the reason Harris only discusses Biden's merits in foreign policy and leaves herself

out of the discussion. Harris appraises Biden for being a faithful ally who acknowledges how important relationships with other countries are. By calling other countries "friends" Harris also *disassociates* Biden from Trump who practiced rather isolationist foreign policy.

When the discussion turns to issues of racial justice Harris talks about George Floyd, a man who was murdered by a police officer in May 2020.

And it just, it brings me to, you know, the eight minutes and 46 seconds that America witnessed, during which an American man was tortured and killed under the knee of an armed, uniformed police officer.

Harris also talks about the protests that took place all over the world after the death of George Floyd.

People around our country, of every race, of every age, of every gender – perfect strangers to each other – marched shoulder to shoulder, arm and arm, fighting for us to finally achieve that ideal of equal justice under law.

She also mentions taking part on these protests herself and that she thinks violence should always be condoned and that people must fight for their values. These can be viewed as universal *values* that cannot be contested and by mentioning her own participation in the protests, she is also appraising herself as well as *establishing commonalties* and *identifying with the audience*.

I believe strongly that, first of all, we are never going to condone violence, but we always must fight for the values that we hold dear, including the fight to achieve our ideals. And that's why Joe Biden and I have said on this subject, look, and I'm a former career prosecutor. I know what I'm talking about. Bad cops are bad for good cops. We need reform of our policing in America and our criminal justice system, which is why Joe and I will immediately ban chokeholds and carotid holds. George Floyd would be alive today if we did that.

Harris discusses her career as a former prosecutor, establishes that she must know what she is talking about and gives elaborate *examples* to prove it. She states that a police reform must happen, and the criminal justice system needs to reform as well. Harris then *demonstrates* these reforms by stating that Biden would ban chokeholds and carotid holds, so that there can never be another case like George Floyd's. Biden and Harris would also "require a national registry for police officers who break the law", "get rid of private prisons and cash bail", "decriminalize marijuana" and "expunge the records of those who have been convicted of marijuana". As the US criminal justice system is inherently racist and outdated, Harris is appealing to the marginalised groups of America. Harris is also appealing to the allies of these groups and as such, she is addressing a very large audience, leaving out only the voters with very different values and who probably would not vote for a democrat in any situation. By providing *examples* of how the Biden administration would better the criminal justice system Harris is inviting the audience to make the conclusion that they would do a better job than the Trump administration.

Prior to the debate President Trump had said numerous times that he would not accept a peaceful transfer of power if Joe Biden wins, thus as the final question the candidates are asked what they would do if this happened.

Joe and I are particularly proud of the coalition that we've built around our campaign. We probably have one of the broadest coalitions of folks that you've ever seen in a presidential race. Of course, we have the support of Democrats, but also independents and Republicans, in fact, seven members of President George W. Bush's cabinet are supporting our ticket. --- And I believe they are doing that because they know that Joe Biden has a deep, deep-seated commitment to fight for our democracy, and to fight for the integrity of our democracy, and to bring integrity back to the White House. And so, we believe in the American people. We believe in our democracy. And here's what I'd like to say to everybody: vote.

Harris starts by telling how proud they are of the coalition they have built around their campaign. She states that they probably have "one of the broadest coalitions of folks that you've ever seen in a presidential race". According to Harris, Joe Biden has been able to get the support, not only from the Democrats, but also independents and Republicans, in fact, seven members of President George W. Bush's cabinet support their ticket. Harris lists people by name and profession and she says she believes they support Biden because they know that Joe Biden is unwaveringly committed to defending democracy, upholding its integrity, and restoring honour to the White House.

Harris appraises their ticket by counting all the people who support it, highlighting the point that they do not only have the support of democrats but independents and a former republican president's cabinet members as well. This appraisal works also as an attack, as it tells the audience that not even all the republicans support Trump. Harris uses very appraising words to describe Biden such as the "defender of democracy", "integrity", and "honour" and although she does not implicitly say that the opponent lacks these qualities, it is implied in her arguments. Harris is persuading the audience by providing *examples* of how strong their ticket is with the intent that the audience would conclude that Biden would be a better choice than Trump.

By stating that Biden would bring honour back to the White House Harris is appraising Biden and attacking Trump. If honour needs to be brought back, it means someone is responsible for it being gone in the first place. She concludes her turn by stating that she (unlike Trump) has faith in democracy and just encourages people to vote. Harris is opposing Trump and Biden in issues that most people value: democracy, honesty, and honour. By doing this, she is able to *associate* Trump with negative values and Biden with positive values.

We have it within our power in these next 27 days to make the decision about what will be the course of our country for the next four years. And it is within our power, and if we use our vote, and we use our voice, we will win. And we will not let anyone subvert our democracy, with what Donald Trump has been doing as he did on the debate stage last week,

when again in front of 70 million people, he openly attempted to suppress the vote. Joe Biden, on the other hand, on that same debate stage – because clearly Donald Trump doesn't think he can run on a record because it's a failed record – Joe Biden on that stage, said, 'Hey, just please vote.' So, I'll repeat what Joe said. Please vote.

The final question in the debate comes from an eighth grader from Springville, Utah.

When I watch the news, all I see is arguing between Democrats and Republicans. When I watch the news, all I see is citizen fighting against citizen. When I watch the news, all I see are two candidates from opposing parties, trying to tear each other down. If our leaders can't get along, how are the citizens supposed to get along? Your examples could make all the difference to bring us together.

Harris of course starts by complementing the person who asked the question. This is followed by a story of why Joe Biden decided to run for the president. It was after the Charlotteville incident which troubled Biden to the core. Here Harris is appraising Biden for his values and attacking Trump for lacking them. Harris continues that Biden could not stand the hatred and division among the citizens that had taken place during the Trump administration that he felt he must do something. Again, appraising Biden and attacking Trump simultaneously.

Joe Biden has a history of lifting people up and fighting for their dignity. You mean you have to know Joe's story to know that Joe has known pain, he has known suffering, and he has known love.

Harris is *creating commonalty* between the American citizens and Joe Biden while appraising him. Biden has a history of lifting people up and working in a bipartisan way. Biden would end the fighting and unite the nation like a true leader. Although Harris is not explicitly saying it, this is an attack on Trump. This is because Trump is not a president who respects all the citizens, and he has divided the nation through his actions. By saying that the last four years have been about division among the citizens and accepting hate, Harris is *associating* Trump with negative attributes and essentially saying that Trump does not value the same things as most Americans do. This is also an indirect way of making *a pragmatic argument*, where Trump's actions are assessed in terms of their consequences.

Attacks

Well, the American people have witnessed what is the greatest failure of any presidential administration in the history of our country. And here are the facts. 210,000 dead people in our country in just the last several months. Over 7 million people who have contracted this disease. One in five businesses closed. We're looking at frontline workers who have been treated like sacrificial workers. We are looking at over 30 million people who in the last several months had to file for unemployment.

In her first turn Harris starts by criticising the Trump administration on how they handled the COVID-19 pandemic. Harris states that the American people have experienced the worst presidential administration failure in the nation's history. She then proceeds to give detailed *examples* to prove her claim by asserting that during the COVID-19 pandemic 210 000 people have died and that the

virus has affected more than 7 million people. Harris also ads that one in five companies have had to shut down due to the economic situation. These claims function as attacks and she tries to gain the audience's adherence by giving numerical evidence that the audience can accept as facts. The evidence is provided by giving *examples* of how the Trump administration has failed and the audience is invited to draw conclusions based on these examples.

As the democratic voters most likely already agree with Harris on her statements, Harris is trying to convince other voters as well. It is often perceived that numbers do not lie, but they do not necessarily tell the whole story either. The numbers Harris provides of the fatalities and how the virus has affected the American people might be true, but her logic is not completely sound, as there is no way of telling how many people would have died or lost their job had the pandemic been handled differently. Thus, by trying to convince the audience with examples, Harris's argumentation is *quasi-logical*. However, it can be said that Harris's claims have a foundation. In the light of the numbers, the Trump administration has failed miserably and, as one cannot argue with numbers, Harris's presumptions are reinforced with valid argumentation and thus, the audience might come to a conclusion they are invited to make which is that the Trump administration failed.

Furthermore, Harris claims that Vice President Pence and President Trump received information regarding the nature of the epidemic on January 28 and that they were told that it would be contracted since it is airborne, that it will harm young people, and that it is devastating in consequence. She highlights the fact that they were aware of what was happening but chose not to inform the American people. Harris is making use of *examples* to gain the audiences adherence as she explains how the Trump administration failed. The audience is asked to deduce that if they were told the same information the president was told in January, the impact the pandemic had on the citizens would not have been a serious as it was. Harris also asks the audience to imagine what they might have done to prepare if they had known what they knew on January 28 rather than March 13. More *examples* of how the Trump administration failed is provided when Harris states that they covered up what they knew about the virus and that the president even called the virus a hoax.

However, her claims are not entirely true. Trump never called the virus a hoax, this has been fact checked by Politifact and other fact checking websites (see for example, Drobnic Holan, 2020). This claim was often repeated by the democrats, and it was most likely done intentionally. As Trump did not call the virus a hoax, these claims have no foundation in facts. Harris is merely repeating something that had already been distinguished as not being true, but at the same time believed by many Americans. She is reinforcing a presumption that is not true and thus, justification for that claim can be challenged and cannot be accepted as valid argumentation. On one hand, Harris's rhetoric is

not valid, but on the other hand, when looking at the function of it, it is rather successful as she is attacking Trump and Pence in a way that the audience may find difficult to deny. The validity of an argument is not determined by the truthfulness of it, but the audience's acceptance of its premises. Thus, the function of the argument is more important than the validity of the premise behind it.

Vice President Pence, of course, uses his turn to talk about how they have succeeded in handling the pandemic, but Harris uses another speaking turn to attack and repeats the number of fatalities and the fact that Pence was aware of the gravity of the situation on January 28. Harris continues that Pence himself has admitted that they did not tell the truth because the President wanted people to stay calm. At this point Harris's turn ends and the moderator wants to move on. Harris insists that she gets to finish her thought, but then Pence talks over her, and Harris needs to tell him that she is speaking. Not once, but twice. Studies have shown that men tend to talk over women in professional settings (see e.g. Shaw, 2020), but Harris is not going to take it. This is a good example of how Harris's rhetoric and presence are not what is expected of a woman. Harris is a powerful figure who will not be interrupted or talked over, not a mediator whose job is to keep the conversation civil.

The moderator gives Harris 15 more seconds to finish her turn and then Pence would get a chance to response. Harris uses her 15 seconds to ask the American people:

How calm were you when you were panicked about where you're going to get your next roll of toilet paper? How calm were you when your kids were sent home from school and you didn't know when they could go back? --- How calm were you when your children couldn't see your parents because you were afraid they could kill them?

By asking these questions from the audience, Harris is making *a pragmatic argument* as she seems to presume that the value of an act is determined by its consequences. Here, all the fatalities and suffering people had faced during the pandemic were the direct consequence of Trump's actions. By doing this, Harris is trying to appeal to people's emotions. By asking how the audience feels about the way the Trump administration handled the pandemic and how they withheld important information she aims to plead to their *values*. Values, as Perelman describes, are particular to audiences, however, issues relating to the COVID-19 pandemic are very much universal as they had and still have an impact on everyone. Harris succeeds in attacking the Trump administration on its values and at the same time appealing to the audience's emotions.

Pence is asked about an event organised by President Trump during which many people contracted the virus. To which Pence answers that they trust the "American people to make choices in the best

interest of their health" and that Biden and Harris are all about mandates and government control. Trump and Pence on the other hand are about freedom and respecting the American people.

Harris sees here another opportunity to attack the Trump administration for not telling the truth about the virus in January 2020:

Let's talk about respecting the American people. You respect the American people when you tell them the truth. You respect the American people when you have the courage to be a leader speaking of those things that you may not want people to hear but they need to hear so they can protect themselves. But this administration stood on information that if you had as a parent, if you had as a worker knowing you didn't have enough money saved up, and now you're standing in a food line because of the ineptitude of an administration that was unwilling to speak the truth to the American people. --- The American people who have had to sacrifice far too much because of the incompetence of this administration.

Harris is calling the Trump administration incompetent and saying that the American people have had to make unnecessary sacrifices due to that incompetence. She also provides *examples* of why they failed: they are cowards with no leadership ability nor integrity. Harris is addressing every American whose life has been impacted by the virus. She claims that the impact is the direct consequence of the actions of the administration. Harris invites the audience to draw a conclusion from a premise that "Trump did this and now you are in this situation". Harris is using the pronoun 'you' instead of just talking about people who "are standing in a food line". By doing this, Harris is addressing everyone affected by this personally.

In addition, Harris is talking about *values*, such as honesty and integrity. Harris seems to imply that the American people should be able to trust that the administration has the people's best interest at heart, but with Trump as the president they cannot do that. This is because Trump lacks integrity and thus, cannot be trusted. Harris *associates* Trumps shortcomings directly to the predicament people are currently in. However, she is making assumptions based on what has happened and what could have happened and that is not valid argumentation as the conclusion cannot be drawn from the premise. Even though, it is questionable that the Trump administration withheld information regarding the seriousness of the pandemic, there is no way of knowing what would have happened if someone else was the president or even if people were informed more in January. Nevertheless, Harris gives forceful *examples* and again appeals to people's emotions and *values*, and builds her argumentation on a seemingly shared consensus: would not you have wanted to know in January what you were told in March?

When Harris is asked if she would take a vaccine if one would be available the moderator accidently calls Harris Kamala Harris instead of Senator Harris. The moderator immediately apologises but Harris responds: "It's fine. I'm Kamala" and then proceeds to answer the question about the vaccine.

By not being bothered about being called by her first name or at least not showing it, Harris conveys the idea that she too, is a regular person. This is the first time during the debate where Harris expresses traits that are considered feminine. She smiles and says that it is alright to call her by her first name instead of her title. As Shaw (2020:144) states women are believed to have agreeable communication patterns and thus have pioneered in less confrontational and more cooperative speech approaches. This is also a rhetorical mean aimed to create *presence* and *communion* with the audience. Harris too, is a person whose life is affected by the actions of the administration, not just an unapproachable and distant politician running for the office. To the actual question she answers that if the public health professionals recommend it, she would be the first in line to take one, but if "Donald Trump tells us that we should take it, I'm not taking it." Harris attacks Trump as she makes it clear that she does not trust Trump's judgement on decisions concerning the pandemic. This is yet another example of how Harris *associates* Trump's personal traits with the way the pandemic was handled. Trump cannot be trusted as Trump does not know what he is doing. By stating this, Harris also pinpoints the fact that she trusts the medical professionals and she states this in a way that cannot be challenged; the professionals know more than the president and they should be listened to. Hence, while attacking Trump, Harris also makes an argument that can be seen based on a commonly shared truth or opinion.

When the discussion turns to the relationship between China and the United States Harris once again sees the opportunity to attack Trump on how the pandemic was managed.

Susan, the Trump administration's perspective, and approach to China has resulted in the loss of American lives, American jobs and America's standing. There is a weird obsession that President Trump has had with getting rid of whatever accomplishment was achieved by President Obama and Vice President Biden. For example, they created, within the White House, an office that basically was responsible for monitoring pandemics. They got away, they got rid of it.

Harris states that President Trump has a strange obsession with undoing everything that Vice President Biden and President Obama accomplished. For instance, according to Harris, they established an office at the White House that was essentially in charge of keeping track of pandemics, but Trump discarded it. Harris also claims that President Obama and Vice President Biden sent a team of medical specialists to China to keep an eye on both current trends and potential future developments regarding pandemics. According to Harris, The Trump administration removed them. Harris provides *examples* and *demonstrates* how the previous administration did a better job and how they were aware of the possible threats. However, as Trump does not care about the wellbeing of the American people, his actions have caused 210 000 fatalities in the United States. By saying this and repeating the number of fatalities during the pandemic Harris is rather successful in blaming Trump for it. Although, the issue at hand did not relate to the pandemic, Harris turns the conversation back

to the argument that seems to be her most powerful one: The Trump administration failed with the pandemic. This attack does not only criticise Trump, but also appraises Biden along with Obama. Harris compares these two administrations in a way that it looks like the previous one would have handled the pandemic better. This, of course, cannot be proven, but it seems that Harris only wants people to consider it by putting it out there. Not necessarily a completely valid argument, but rather powerful rhetoric nevertheless.

The candidates are both asked if they have had a conversation with their running mates about safeguards or procedures when it comes to the issue of presidential disability.

Harris describes the day Joe Biden asked her to be his running mate one of the most memorable days of her life and she is smiling when she talks about it. Harris makes the point of mentioning that Biden had asked this in a zoom call. This was probably a conscious decision. When the world is struggling with the COVID19 pandemic, she states that she too must follow the regulations and guidelines. Harris does explicitly not say it, but this is clearly critique against President Trump, who did not follow the rules and regulations and had, at the time of this debate, contracted the virus. This is also a remark regarding the previous discussion in the debate where it was established that Trump had organised an event at the white house where the virus spread widely. Thus, even when talking about herself, Harris is able to attack Trump by insinuating that he and his administration have not managed the pandemic well. In terms of rhetorical means, Harris is again quite skilful in presenting herself as someone who *identifies* with the audience as she is *establishing commonalty* to gain the audience's adherence.

When the moderator asks if Harris thinks the voters have the right to know more detailed health information about presidential candidates Harris answers: "Absolutely. And that's why Joe Biden has been so incredibly transparent." However, the topic she decides to discuss is not health records: "And certainly, by contrast, the President has not, both in terms of health records, but also let's look at taxes." Harris tells the audience that "because of great investigative journalism" people are now aware that Trump only paid $750 in taxes. She even makes a point of saying that when she first heard about it, she thought it was $750,000. Harris continues to discuss Trump's finances by talking about Trump's debts:

We now know Donald Trump owes and is in debt for $400 million. And just so everyone is clear, when we say in debt it means you owe money to somebody. And it'd be really good to know who the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, owes money to because the American people have a right to know what is influencing the president's decisions. And is he making those decisions on the best interest of the American people, of you, or self-interest.

Harris is questioning Trump's integrity and loyalty to the American people by giving *examples* of his dishonesty in the past, from which the audience is invited to draw a conclusion that Trump is always deceitful. This is of course on the contrary to Joe Biden who has always been honest.

Joe has been incredibly transparent over many, many years. The one thing we all know about Joe, he puts it all out there. He, he is honest. He is forthright. But Donald Trump on the other hand, has been about covering up everything.

Here Harris is again addressing broad audience and she makes arguments that can be seen as universally accepted. Harris is also attacking Trump and appraising Biden at the same time: Trump is a liar and a cheat, whereas Biden is reliable and honest. For argumentation to be successful, it is essential to *establish and uphold shared values* as they guide behaviour and determine what is appropriate, and thus, Harris puts Trump and Biden's values against each other to highlight their differences.

Furthermore, according to Harris, there could not be a greater difference between Biden and Trump when it comes to the economy. Harris *exemplifies* that this is because Joe Biden thinks that the well-being and resilience of the American worker and the American family are the best indicators of the health and strength of the American economy, while Donald Trump assesses the health of the economy by looking at how rich people are doing. She claims that this is the reason Trump "passed a tax bill benefitting the top 1% and the biggest corporations of America, leading to a $2 trillion deficit that the American people are gonna have to pay for." *Values* are again highlighted, and Harris's statement could be rephrased as "Biden values every American citizen and Trump values the wealthy". Harris attacks Trump's values based on his actions, and as such her argumentation is focusing on concrete values that can be attached to Trump personally. She also provides *an example* of how this can be seen in Trump's actions.

Harris states that Joe Biden will overturn that tax bill on day one and he will use the funds to make investments in the citizens of the United States through a plan that calls for investment in infrastructure, as Donald Trump promised to do. Harris recalls hearing Trump talking something about an infrastructure week, which apparently never actually took place. Here, Harris is again quite successfully calling Trump out on a promise he never kept and at the same time praising Biden for having a solid plan. According to Harris, Biden will take that action and make infrastructural investments. These investments involve improving the roads and bridges as well as spending money on renewable and clean energy sources. Biden will use the money to fund the necessary innovation-related activities. Harris is *creating a cause-and-effect scenario* where Biden will overturn Trump's tax bill and use the money on something that will benefit every American. Harris had already mentioned a $2 trillion deficit that Trump had caused, and one might easily connect these two

statements and conclude that the money Biden would use to better the American infrastructure comes directly from that. Of course, it is not that simple, and Harris knows that, but she is intentionally oversimplifying the matter to suit her own means. Another point she is making (without actually saying it) is that the wealthy people and the big corporations should pay more taxes than the average citizen. This is a rather leftist approach and Harris disguises it nicely under the attacks and appraises in order to not alienate voters who lean more on the right.

Of course, now the economy is a complete disaster, but Joe Biden on the one hand, did that. On the other hand, you have Donald Trump, who has reigned over a recession that is being compared to the Great Depression. On the one hand you have Joe Biden, who was responsible with President Barack Obama for the Affordable Care Act, which brought health care to over 20 million Americans and protected people with pre-existing conditions and what it also did is it saved those families, who otherwise were going bankrupt because of hospital bills they could not afford.

Harris states rather *illustratively* that the economy is currently in utter disarray and Donald Trump has presided over a recession that has been compared to the Great Depression. She claims that Joe Biden was instrumental in enacting the Affordable Care Act, which provided health insurance to over 20 million Americans, protected those with pre-existing conditions, and saved the families of patients who would have otherwise gone bankrupt due to unaffordable hospital bills and compares this to Trump, who was at the time fighting in court to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Which, as Harris explains, means that if one has pre-existing conditions, they will no longer be protected.

If you have a pre-existing condition, heart disease, diabetes, breast cancer, they're coming for you. If you love someone who has a pre-existing condition, they're coming for you. If you are under the age of 26 on your parents' coverage, they're coming for you.

This is again an attack on Trump's *values* and actions that reveal his true values. Harris states that Trump is trying to make it harder for the average citizen to receive medical treatment and this is because Trump only cares about the wealthy citizens of America. To put it simply, Trump is trying to take the money from the poor and give it to the rich like a reversed Robin Hood. Whereas Biden truly cares about the American lives and wants everyone to have equal opportunities in life. Harris argues this by giving very specific *examples* on how Trump and Biden differ in their *values*. As valuing health is quite universal, Harris is addressing a very wide audience.

Harris attacks Trump and appraises herself and Biden again by saying that when she first got to the Senate, she served on the committee that was responsible for the environment and claims that the Trump administration does not believe in science. Harris and Biden understand and know what needs to be done, while Donald Trump does not care or understand. Harris *demonstrates* this by giving *examples* of what Trump has had to say about natural disasters.

Joe's plan is about saying we're going to deal with it, but we're also going to create jobs. Donald Trump, when asked about the wildfires in California and the question was, you know, the science is telling us this, you know what Donald Trump said? Science doesn't know. So, let's talk about who is prepared to lead our country over the course of the next four years on what is an existential threat to us as human beings.

By calling the climate change an existential threat to everyone Harris is addressing and appealing to her audience in a way that is difficult to contest. She depicts Trump as someone who is clearly unbothered by the effects the global warming has for the whole human race.

Joe is about saying we're going to invest that in renewable energy, we're going to be about the creation of millions of jobs, we will achieve net zero emissions by 2050, carbon neutral by 2035– Joe has a plan. This has been a lot of talk from the Trump administration, and really it has been to go backward instead of forward. We will also re-enter the climate agreement with pride.

Harris provides more *examples* of how Biden is more qualified than Trump as she states that Biden will make sure that money will be invested in renewable energy, that millions of jobs will be created, and that they will attain net zero emissions by 2050 and carbon neutrality by 2035. In her view, the Trump administration has been talking a lot, but in reality, it has been talking about going backwards rather than forward. Harris also states that with Joe Biden as the president, the US will be proud to re-join the climate agreement. Harris is attacking Trump and appraising Biden simultaneously by bidding their *values* regarding the environment against each other. Harris tells the audience that Trump is not looking into the future but rather values other things than the environment more, whereas Biden has concrete plans to slowdown global warming and better the lives of everyone in the process.

Earlier in the debate Pence mentioned a trade war with China. Harris circles back to that when the discussion turns to employment and gives *examples* of how it affected the lives of the American citizens. Harris claims that the Trump administration lost the trade war and as a result 300 000 manufacturing jobs were lost.

Farmers have experienced bankruptcy, because of it. We are in a manufacturing recession, because of it. And when we look at where this administration has been, there are estimates that by the end of the term of this administration, they will have lost more jobs than almost any other presidential administration.

Harris attacks the Trump administration for causing 300 000 people in manufacturing to lose their jobs. Harris is addressing all these people and people who fear that the economic situation will cause them to lose their job as well. This is not a fixed group of people who all value same things but having a job and the fear of losing it are rather universal concerns. However, Harris is again drawing conclusions that are not completely sound. The trade war had an impact on the manufacturing jobs in the US, but Harris also claims that by the end of their term the Trump administration will have lost more jobs than any other administration before it. While this could be true (Harris does not give any

evidence of it), there is no way of proving this would not have happened under any administration during an unprecedented time period such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Thus, even if Harris's claim seems plausible when it is presented like this, the cause-and-effect relationship cannot be shown without a doubt. This, however, does not make her arguments defective as the success of an argument is determined by the audience and how they perceive it. If the audience accepts Harris's premise and the conclusion drawn from it, the argument can be viewed as successful.

And the American people know what I'm talking about. You know. I think about 20-year-olds, you know we have a 20-year-old, 20-something-year-old, who are coming out of high school and college right now and you're wondering, "Is there going to be a job there for me?". We're looking at people who are trying to figure out how they're going to pay rent by the end of the month. Almost half of American renters are worried about whether they're going to be able to pay rent by the end of the month.

Harris appeals to the younger voters when she states that there are many 20-year-olds graduating and wondering if there is going to be a job for them and if they can pay their rent. She claims that almost half of the American people living on rent are worried whether they can afford their rent by the end of the month, and this is the Trump administration's fault.

This is where the economy is in America right now and it is because of the catastrophe and the failure of leadership of this administration.

These are powerful and *illustrative* words by Harris, but she provides no evidence for the statistics she gives. Harris states her arguments as undisputable facts and leaves it up for Pence to rebut. Although this is not necessarily valid argumentation, it is a forceful attack against the opponent. And by choosing to use words such as "catastrophe" and "failure" in the same sentence with the opponent Harris is able to cast doubt in the opponent's abilities and professional skills. Harris uses repetition as an amplifier when she repeats the number of lost manufacturing jobs (300 000) caused by the trade war with China that resulted in a manufacturing recession. According to Harris it is because of the failed trade war the Americans now have to pay thousands of dollars more for goods. By attacking Trump on failing the trade war, Harris is addressing all the people who were directly affected by it. According to Harris, American lives, jobs, and reputation have been lost because of the Trump administration's perspective and strategy toward China. Harris seems to argue that it is because of Trump's personal values that have led to this situation as she *associates* Trump's character and actions to the current situation.

Pence had previously stated that the Trump administration will stand against China as they have done in the past, but Harris continues to attack Trump's character and credibility in relation to his foreign policy:

Pew, a reputable research firm, has done an analysis that shows that leaders of all of our formerly allied countries have now decided that they hold in greater esteem and respect Xi Jinping, the head of the Chinese Communist Party, than they do Donald Trump, the President of the United States, the commander in chief of the United States.

This is a clever way to appeal to voters who are very much against China and communism. By stating that a communist leader of China is held in greater esteem than the President of the United States, Harris is able to turn the tables on the republicans, who are not considered to be fond of communism and who often use the word communist as an insult against the democrats. Thus, Harris is able to expand her audience to the voters who would not normally be a part of it. Additionally, she repeats Trumps's title, "the President of the United States, the commander in chief of the United States". This again amplifies her words as she invites the audience to draw a conclusion that, based on the failed trade war, Trump is not qualified for the position he is currently in. This is yet another time where Harris uses *examples* to gain the adherence of her audience.

When discussing foreign policy Harris says that it is important to know who your adversaries are and keep them in check. This is, according to her, not at all what the Trump administration has been doing:

But what we have seen with Donald Trump is that he has betrayed our friends and embraced dictators around the world. Let's take for example, Russia. So, Russia – I serve on the Intelligence Committee of the United States Senate. America's intelligence community told us Russia interfered in the election of the President of the United States in 2016 and is playing in 2020. Christopher Wray, the director of the FBI, said the same, but Donald Trump, the commander in chief of the United States of America prefers to take the word of Vladimir Putin over the word of the American intelligence community.

Harris again contests Trump's integrity and loyalty by giving concrete *examples* of his actions. By attacking Trump this way Harris is able to expand her audience to every patriotic American voter as she argues that Trump does not trust the American intelligence committee or the director of the FBI, but instead, believes Vladimir Putin, the president of Russia. Considering that many Americans have long had some reservations about Russia, this is a rather powerful attack. In addition, Harris seems to imply that Trump does not actually care if Russia meddled with the 2016 elections. She is also *associating* Trump with a notorious Russian leader, Vladimir Putin. This way she is asking the audience to make connections between these two people. Her aim is to gain the audience's adherence by *illustrating* Trump's and Putin's similarities.

Harris continues by stating that Trump has walked away from agreements such as the Iran nuclear deal, which has put the United States in a less safe position because Iran could be building up a significant nuclear arsenal.

We were in that deal, guys, we were in the Iran nuclear deal with friends, with allies around the country, and because of Donald Trump's unilateral approach to foreign policy, coupled with his isolationism, he pulled us out and has made America less safe.

Harris claims that this is purely because Donald Trump does not understand what it means to be honest, another attack on his *values* and an *example* of them. Harris attacks Trump on his approach on foreign policy and as well as his character and simultaneously appraises Biden who understands what it means to be honest, and that integrity is one of the things that makes America a strong nation. With her attack Harris aims to *demonstrate* that Trump's lack of understanding of foreign policy has affected the safety of every American citizen. This is a rather *pragmatic argument* as she asks the audience to presume that the value of an act is determined by its consequences.

Vice President Pence responses to the remarks on making America less safe by mentioning Kayla Mueller. Ms. Mueller was a young woman who was abducted by the ISIS in 2013 and later killed in 2015. Pence claims that it was the Obama administration's fault that Ms. Mueller died and that they had an opportunity to save her but failed because they hesitated to act. Pence also claims that if Donald Trump had been president at the time Ms. Mueller would be alive today and that their administration destroyed the ISIS caliphate and says that he cannot understand why Biden and Harris would want to re-enter the Iran nuclear deal. He claims that the Obama administration transferred $1.8 billion to the leading state sponsor of terrorism. Pence continues that the United States was let out of the agreement thanks to President Donald Trump, who also killed Qasim Soleimani, a member of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps who served as a military officer in Iran, as he was heading to Baghdad to attack Americans. According to Pence the American people should be aware that America and its allies are safer because of this.

Harris responds to Pence's claims first by expressing her sympathy for the Mueller family and stating that it was terrible what happened to her and that it should never had happened. Harris also speaks for Joe Biden and President Obama and says that she knows they feel the same way. Then, Harris attacks Pence for his mentioning of Soleimani. Following the attack on Soleimani, American troops in Iraq were the target of a counterattack. According to Harris, American soldiers sustained significant brain injuries in this attack, which Donald Trump dismissed as headaches. Harris continues that this has to do with a tendency of Donald Trump's to denigrate the men and women who serve in the US armed forces by calling them losers and suckers. It is true that it has been claimed that Trump has called soldiers who died in the war losers and suckers (see for example, Goldberg, 2020), however, Trump has consistently denied doing so. Harris's argumentation seems to aim at questioning Trump's character and although she is technically not being dishonest in her arguments, she is

repeating something that cannot be proven accurate. However, this has no bearing on the power of the argument. If the audience accepts the premise based on Harris's *examples* and draws the same conclusion, the truthfulness of the proposition is insignificant.

Harris also gives another *example* of how Trump does not respect or care about the American soldiers:

Donald Trump, who went to Arlington Cemetery, and stood above the graves of our fallen heroes and said, 'What's in it for them?' Because, of course, you know he only thinks about what's in it for him. Let's take what he said about John McCain. A great American hero. And Donald Trump says he doesn't deserve to be called a hero because he was a prisoner of war.

This is about an incident that happened in 2017 and none of the people present at the time have confirmed Trump saying that (see for example, Goldberg, 2020). Harris is working with emotions that these types of statements evoke and probably does not care if Trump said it or not, what matters is the way it can alter the voters' opinion on Trump. By *associating* Trump with unpatriotic values, and as the military is something the US has always been proud of, these claims are probably aimed to the more patriotic voters who traditionally vote for republicans.

Harris continues by circling back to the relationship Trump has with Vladimir Putin and providing more *examples* of Trump's unpatriotic tendencies.

--- you want to talk about who is the current commander in chief, and what they care about and what they don't care about. Public reporting that Russia had bounties on the heads of American soldiers, and you know what a bounty is? Somebody puts a price on your head, and they will pay it if you are killed. And Donald Trump had talked at least six times to Vladmir Putin, and never brought up the subject. Joe Biden would never do that. Joe Biden – Joe Biden would hold Russia to account for any threat to our nation's security or to our troops who are sacrificing their lives for the sake of our democracy and our safety.

Again, Harris seems to be addressing the republican voters by claiming that Trump does not care about the American soldiers. These attacks on Trump's integrity are rather compelling as the military and the lives lost at war matter to many people. If it is perceived that Trump does not value the lives of American soldiers, it would most likely influence the election. And this, of course, is the end game of Harris's argumentation.

As the discussion turns to Supreme Court nominations and abortion rights in America Harris states that "there's the issue of choice, and I will always fight for a woman's right to make a decision about her own body. It should be her decision and not that of Donald Trump and the Vice President Michael Pence." In this statement Harris *disassociates* herself from Trump and Pence and attacks them for trying to make decisions that do not concern them. She also defends everyone's freedom to choose for themselves. This is a value that should be universally accepted but for some reason it is not. Harris

seems to know this and after rather quickly after stating her own opinion moves on to expand the question on what other issues are at stake in this nomination.

As a woman, I would have liked Harris to argue more strongly for the abortion right. It is quite disappointing that she almost dismissed the question in fear of losing some of the more conservative voters. Instead of fighting for bodily autonomy, Harris takes this opportunity to talk about the Affordable Care Act and how right now, Donald Trump is in court attempting to repeal it. Harris seems to understand that her audience is more universal on matters of health than abortion. She mentions the number of people who had died during the COVID-19 pandemic and *exemplifies* how approximately 7 million people have what will one day be regarded as a pre-existing condition as a result of contracting the virus. According to Harris, if Trump wins there will be no more protections for people with pre-existing conditions and this will result in over 20 million people losing their coverage. Harris attacks Trump again by insinuating that he does not care about the lives of every American. Repealing the Affordable Care Act would not have an impact on the wealthy citizens but on people with lesser income. Harris aims to gain the audience's adherence by appealing to their *values* and by *associating* Trump's actions and his character. Harris also simultaneously manages to appraise Biden for his leadership abilities.

The contrast couldn't be more clear. They're trying to get rid of the Affordable Care Act. Joe Biden is saying let's expand coverage, let's give you a choice of a public option or private coverage, let's bring down premiums, let's lower Medicare eligibility to 60. That's true leadership.

When Harris discusses racial injustice, she states that the incumbent president refused to condemn white supremacists in front of 70 million Americans, even though he was given the chance.

He was – he called Mexicans rapists and criminals. He instituted as his first act a Muslim ban. He, on the issue of Charlottesville, where people were peacefully protesting the need for racial justice, where a young woman was killed and on the other side there were neo-Nazis carrying tiki torches shouting racial epithets, anti semitic slurs. And Donald Trump, when asked about it, said there were fine people on both sides. This is who we have as the President of the United States. And America, you deserve better. Joe Biden will be a president who brings our country together.

Harris recalls that Trump has referred to Mexicans as criminals and rapists and as his first act as president he instituted a Muslim ban. And in the Charlottesville incident where a young woman was killed, Harris continues, on the other side there were people peacefully calling for racial justice and on the other side there were neo-Nazis holding tiki torches and chanting racial and anti-Semitic obscenities, but President Trump said there were good people on both sides. Harris tells the audience, the American people, that they deserve a better president than Trump and she provides very *illustrative* examples to support that claim.

According to Harris, Joe Biden sees beauty in diversity, and he would be a president who brings America together. She is attacking the opponent by calling them out on their racism or the very least their refusal of condemning racist behaviour among their voters. As racism should be seen as universally not acceptable, Harris is trying to gain the adherence of every rational person. While attacking Trump, Harris also finds a way to appraise Biden as someone who values diversity. She is once again placing the candidates in opposing positions where it is clear to see that one of them is on the wrong side. On one hand there is a candidate who supports racism and on the other, a candidate who values every human as the same. By *associating* Trumps actions with negative values, such as Nazism and islamophobia, Harris urges the audience to conclude that Trump does not represent every American nor does he care about every citizen.

When asked about accepting the result of the election, Harris attacks Trump for implying that he would not accept the result and for trying to suppress the vote. Trump had, for example, made claims about how voting through the mail should not be accepted and Harris implies that it is because Trump does not want everyone to vote, for he does not think he can win a fair election.

We will not let anyone subvert our democracy, with what Donald Trump has been doing as he did on the debate stage last week, when again in front of 70 million people, he openly attempted to suppress the vote. Joe Biden, on the other hand, on that same debate stage – because clearly Donald Trump doesn't think he can run on a record because it's a failed record.

 This is a powerful attack on Trump as she is *disassociating* herself and Biden from Trump. They believe in a fair election where every vote counts and Trump aims to suppress the vote in areas and groups of people who most likely would not vote for him. This is also a "call to action" because one of the most important aims of Harris's rhetoric is to get people to vote as she seems to believe that the more people vote the better chances the democrats have of winning. As her final attack, Harris states that Trump and his administration have failed miserably, and they do not deserve to be selected for a second term. The "call to action" is there – vote or he will continue to ruin our country.

Defences

After Harris attacked the Trump administration on its ability to handle the pandemic, Pence tries to manipulate the situation by saying that Harris had undermined the sacrifices the American people had made during the pandemic:

You know there's not a day gone by that I haven't thought of every American family that's lost a loved one. And I want all of you to know that you'll always be in our hearts and in our prayers. But when you say what the American people have done over these last eight months hasn't worked, that's a great disservice to the sacrifices the American people have made.

To this Harris responds: "I'm referring to your president". In her response Harris does not only defend herself but attacks Trump at the same time as she does not say *the* president, but *your* president. By doing this she is separating herself from the administration by *disassociating*.

After Harris had appraised Biden on questions of economy, Pence takes the floor and says: "America, you just heard Senator Harris tell you, on day one Joe Biden's gonna raise your taxes". To which Harris responds that that was not what she said. Pence tries to twist the conversation so that it would seem that Biden and Harris want to raise everyone's taxes, "bury the economy under a $2 trillion Green New Deal", eliminate fossil fuels and ban fracking. Pence even goes as far as saying that "Joe Biden wants to go back to the economic surrender to China that when we took office, half of our international trade deficit was with China alone".

Harris starts to give an answer to Pence's claims by first establishing that they would not raise taxes on people who makes less than $400,000 a year but is cut off by Pence. Thus, Harris has to tell him that it is her turn to speak. And again, she needs to do it twice.

After she has gained her turn back, she continues:

Joe Biden will not raise taxes on anyone who makes less than $400,000 a year. He has been very clear about that. Joe Biden will not end fracking. He has been very clear about that. Joe Biden is the one who during the Great Recession was responsible for the Recovery Act that brought America back. And now the Trump Pence Administration wants to take credit when they ran when they rode the coattails of Joe Biden's success for the economy that they had at the beginning of their term.

This time Harris must defend Biden against Pence's claims and she is speaking very clearly and uses repetitive and *illustrative* language in order to make her point as clear as possible. She is also stating her arguments as facts that cannot be contested. Harris also uses this opportunity to attack the Trump administration while defending as well as appraising Biden. Economy is usually a topic that prefers the republican candidate, but Harris is able to turn this around by claiming that it was the democratic administration that saved the economy and now the current administration is trying to take credit for it.

Pence claims that Biden and Harris would ban fracking and ruin the American economy. Harris repeats that they would not ban fracking and in response to Pence's claim that Biden's economic plan would decrease American jobs, Harris states that Moody's estimates that Biden's economic strategy would result in 7 million more jobs than Donald Trump's.

Alright, so first of all, I will repeat, and the American people know, that Joe Biden will not ban fracking. That is a fact. That is a fact. I will repeat that Joe Biden has been very clear that he thinks about growing jobs, which is why he will not

increase taxes for anyone who makes less than $400,000 a year. Joe Biden's economic plan – Moody's, which is a reputable Wall Street firm – has said will create 7 million more jobs than Donald Trump's.

Harris needs to defend Biden against Pence's attack again by repeating what she has already said. She also uses a third party to prove that Pence is wrong. Thus, Harris managed to defend and appraise Biden as well as attack Trump simultaneously. By stating that a respected financial services company such as Moody's believes in Biden's economic plan, she is able to add credibility to her claim. Mentioning Moody's also works as a very approachable *example* of how good Biden's economic plan is.

On Monday (October 12, 2020) following the debate, the Senate Judiciary Committee was scheduled to open hearings on Amy Coney Barrett's nomination to the Supreme Court. As her confirmation would (and did) result in conservative majority of the court, it was likely it would be amenable to tightening restrictions on abortion, even to repealing the important Roe v. Wade decision and each state would then control who had access to abortion. Both candidates are asked what they would like their home state to do if Roe v Wade was overturned. Vice president Pence does not answer this but returns to the previous question and then finally wishes that Judge Amy Coney Barrett would get a fair hearing, unlike Justice Brett Kavanaugh, another Supreme court justice appointed by Trump. Pence is also worried that Judge Barret would be attacked based on her religious believes.

First of all, Joe Biden and I are both people of faith. And it's insulting to suggest that we would knock anyone for their faith, and in fact, Joe if elected will be only the second practicing Catholic, as President of the United States. ---

In her turn Harris starts by stating that Joe Biden and herself are people of faith and to imply that they would criticise anyone for their faith is offensive. She also points out that if elected Joe Biden would be only the second practicing Catholic as President of the United States. This time Harris only defends herself and Biden without a counterattack. The defence is mainly about stating a fact and Harris does not use more of her floor time on it. On the issue of the Supreme Court nomination Harris feels that it would be more reasonable to elect the president first and then see who gets appointed to the Supreme Court. Harris is quite clever doing this because in this way the American people are being included in the decision making. Even if they did not have any actual say in the matter, it would feel like that.

--- Joe has been very clear, as the American people are: Let the American people fill that seat in the White House, and then we'll fill that seat on the United States Supreme Court.

Vice President Pence mentioned earlier that President Trump was committed to maintaining protections for people with pre-existing conditions. However, they have not explained how they would do that if the Affordable Care Act was struck down. When asked about details about their plan Pence starts to talk about abortions and how he is pro-life and not ashamed of it. Pence states that

Biden and Harris support taxpayer funding of abortions "all the way up to the moment of birth" and this is why they do not want Judge Barret to be appointed to the Supreme Court. According to Pence, Biden and Harris are only trying to delay the nomination to get their own way.

--- there have been 29 vacancies on the Supreme Court during presidential election years, from George Washington to Barack Obama. Presidents have nominated in all 29 cases. But your party is actually openly advocating adding seats to the Supreme Court, which has had nine seats for 150 years, if you don't get your way.

Harris smiles and says that "I'm so glad we went through a little history lesson. Let's do that a little more. In 1864 --- ". Here Pence interrupts Harris for the fifth time during the debate and Harris again has to tell Pence that it is her turn to speak. When this is established, Harris begins to talk about Abraham Lincoln, "honest Abe". She uses the occurrence of the year 1864 when Lincoln was up for re-election as an *example*.

Abraham Lincoln was up for re-election, and it was 27 days before the election, and a seat became open on the United States Supreme Court. Abraham Lincoln's party was in charge, not only in the White House, but the Senate. But honest Abe said it's not the right thing to do. The American people deserve to make the decision about who will be the next President of the United States, and then that person can select who will serve for a lifetime on the highest court of our land.

Harris did not answer Pence's question but compares and *associates* themselves with Abraham Lincoln, who I believe is the most respected President among the American people. Thus, it must be reasonable to let the election happen first and then start nominating Supreme Court Justices. Of course, as we now know, Trump did nominate and appoint Justice Barret in 2020.

Pence, of course, states that Harris did not answer the question and claims that the voters would "like to know if you and Joe Biden are gonna pack the Supreme Court if you don't get your way in this nomination". Harris defends herself by stating that she was on the Senate Judiciary Committee and that she has witnessed appointments of individuals for lifetime positions on the federal courts, district courts, and Courts of Appeal who are entirely ideological and who have been proven to be unqualified by legal professional groups.

So, the Trump-Pence administration has been – because I sit on the Senate Judiciary Committee, Susan, as you mentioned. And I've witnessed the appointments, for lifetime appointments to the federal courts, district courts, Courts of Appeal — people who are purely ideological people who have been reviewed by legal professional organizations and found to have been not competent, are substandard. And do you know that of the 50 people who President Trump appointed to the Court of Appeals for lifetime appointments, not one is black? This is what they've been doing. You want to talk about packing a court? Let's have that discussion.

Harris, of course, does not settle to only defend herself, but attacks Trump at the same time as she points out that there is not a single black person among the 50 lifetime nominations to the Court of

Appeals made by President Trump. Still not answering Pence's question, Harris attacks Trump on appointing unqualified people for high courts and for being racist in these appointments. With this attack Harris is again making judgement calls on Trump's character and questioning his *values*. If Trump has only appointed white ideological people with no qualifications to positions of power, it tells quite a lot about his character and values. Diversity is considered a universal value by most people and by providing these *examples* Harris is successful in casting doubt on Trump's ability to make these important appointments.

After Harris had appraised herself on matters of law enforcement Pence tries to argue that Harris does not necessarily understand what she is talking about and that a police reform bill has been on the table before, but Harris did not accept it. Pence claims that Harris "filibustered Senator Tim Scott's bill on the Senate floor that would have provided new accountability, new resources". Harris defends herself by providing evidence and *examples* of how she is more qualified to discuss these matters than Pence is.

I will not sit here and be lectured by the Vice President on what it means to enforce the laws of our country. I am the only one on this stage who has personally prosecuted everything from child sexual assault to homicide. I'm the only one on this stage who has prosecuted the big banks for taking advantage of America's homeowners. I am the only one on this stage who prosecuted for-profit colleges for taking advantage of our veterans.

Harris expresses rhetoric not usually expected from a woman. She very strongly argues for her own expertise and will not let a man try to diminish it. She explains elaborately what she has done in her career as a prosecutor and how she is more competent to discuss a police reform and enforcing the law than Pence is. As Harris lists her accomplishments, she is also telling the audience that she has always defended the ones in need, were they children, veterans, or murder victims. She invites the audience to conclude that she has done this before and will do it again. Harris represents herself as a fearless woman who will never back down when justice needs to be done. By mentioning these groups Harris is addressing a very large audience and not just defending herself but also appraising herself as well as attacking Pence.

Pence sees here the opportunity to discuss Harris's record and claims that when she was the Assistant Attorney in San Fransisco and when she left office African Americans were 19 times more likely than whites and Hispanics to face prosecution for minor drug offenses and when she was California's attorney general, she enhanced the state's disproportionate incarceration of Black people. Regarding California's criminal justice reform, Pence claims Harris took no action. Harris has 30 seconds to answer these claims and she defends herself by providing *examples* of how she, in fact, has already advanced the efforts of reforming the criminal justice system.

Having served as the Attorney General of the State of California, the work that I did is a model of what our nation needs to do, and we will be able to do under a Joe Biden presidency. Our agenda includes what this administration has failed to do.

Harris continues to provide *examples* and *illustrations* when she states that she was the first state-wide law enforcement official to mandate that officers wear body cameras and have them turned on all the time. She continues that contrary to what Pence might think, Biden and Harris acknowledge that implicit prejudice exists, thus they were the first to demand that law enforcement receive training on it. Harris then states that she will not be lectured by Pence about enforcing the law. Harris is again taking a very strong stance and telling Pence that he has no business talking about Harris's record. Harris appraises herself and discusses how she is personally responsible for creating a model of a better criminal justice system and holding police officers responsible for their actions. She also attacks the Trump administration for not recognising the problems the US has in their justice system or at least not making any effort to correct them.

We did the work of instituting reforms that were about investing in re-entry. This is the work that we have done and the work we will do going forward and, again, I will not be lectured by the Vice President, on our record of what we have done in terms of law enforcement and keeping our community safe and a commitment to reforming the criminal justice system of America.

Equal rights and the citizens' safety are universal values and Harris aims to appeal to the audience by enforcing them. Harris also attacks Trump and Pence by claiming that their administration has failed the American citizens by not tackling the systemic racism embedded in the US criminal justice system. The attack serves as way to persuade the audience to conclude that Biden would do a better job as the president than Trump.

Other functions

Before the conversation turns to economy the following exchange of words happens:

Vice President Pence: – if Joe Biden and Kamala Harris are in the White House.

Page: You know, that's a good segue into our third topic–

Senator Harris: That's a great segue.

Harris makes a joke and lightens the mood. Harris no doubt is charismatic, and she knows how to appeal to her audience. After this Harris answers to the question about the economy.

Issues of racial justice came up for discussion during the debate and in particular, Breonna Taylor, a 26-year-old emergency room technician in Louisville, who was shot and killed in March 2020 when police officers broke into her residence while carrying out a search warrant related to a drug

investigation. According to the authorities, they identified themselves, but Taylor's partner claimed not to have heard them do that. He fired a shot from a gun that was registered to him, wounding a police officer. The officers then opened fire on the residence with almost 20 shots. They claim that they were defending themselves and at the time of the debate none of them had been charged in relation to Taylor's death.

Harris starts her turn by stating that she does not believe justice was done in Taylor's case.

She was a beautiful young woman. She had as her life goal to become a nurse, and she wanted to become an EMT to first learn what's going on out on the street, so she could then become a nurse and save lives. And her life was taken, unjustifiably and tragically and violently.

By characterising Breonna Taylor as a young woman who aspired to help people in need Harris creates an opportunity for herself to appeal to the audience's emotions. *Evoking emotions* is a powerful way of persuading the audience and Harris utilises rather strong vocabulary such as "unjustifiable", "tragic" and "violent". Losing innocent lives is something everyone can agree on being unnecessary and wrong and as such Harris is *relating herself to her audience*. She is not necessarily utilising any of the common functions (attacking, appraising, or defending), however her rhetoric is very relatable and approachable and as such she is appealing to a broad audience in stating her own *values*.

8. Discussion and conclusion

The research questions for this thesis discussed Harris's rhetorical strategies and the functions of her argumentation as well the stereotypes linked to female politicians and feminine speech. To conclude the findings of this study, I will first discuss Harris's rhetorical strategies, then move on to the functions and then review Harris's discourse in the light of research conducted on stereotypes related to feminine speech. I will also contemplate possible further studies that could be conducted in the future.

To gain the audiences adherence, Harris very often relies on examples and illustrations and these two strategies were the most visible ones. She also regularly uses association and disassociation as well as makes pragmatic arguments. Harris is appealing to a wide audience, but as it can be presumed that particular people will vote for a democrat whatever the case, Harris often aims to gain the adherence of particular audiences within the audience. These are the voters who are, for example, indecisive or independent. This is a good strategy as, according to McKinney and Warner (2013: 240), studies have shown debates can alter the voting preference of indecisive, conflicted, or weakly committed voters. Harris relies most often to the fact that an argument does not have to be logical to be effective as she

makes several suggestions to the audience based on premises that seem reasonable enough to draw conclusions from, but are, in fact, quasi-logical.

Harris often appeals to her audience's emotions and the purpose of her reasoning is not to draw conclusions from premises but to increase the audience's dedication to the theses presented to them. In her argumentation Harris often assumes that there is a shared viewpoint that can be utilised. As Perelman states, compelling argumentation aims to win over every rational creature and persuasive argumentation affirms validity for certain audiences. For rhetoric to be effective, all ambiguity must be eliminated, and this is what Harris aims to do every time Pence tries to distort her words. This is clear especially in the parts where Pence claims that Biden will raise everyone's taxes and ban fracking. Harris repeatedly corrects Pence and uses words like "I will repeat", "that is absolutely not true" and "Joe Biden has been very clear". By repeating her words, Harris aims to eliminate any ambiguity Pence tries to insert in the discussion.

In Perelman's view, all audiences, universal and targeted, are formed. The difference in addressing them is that when the speaker addresses a universal audience, they aim to change the audience's perceptions of facts and truths and when addressing a targeted audience, they aim to change the audience's perceptions of values. From the analysis of Harris's rhetoric, it can be deducted that she often aims to manipulate the audience's perception of facts and truths. For example, by mentioning that President Trump called the coronavirus a hoax, even though he did not actually do that, or by stating that Trump continuously denigrates the US military. Both these statements are based on premises that cannot be proven to be true, but Harris leaves it to Pence to refute them. And thus, it should be recognised that politicians who take part in televised debates are more concerned with influencing voters than educating the public.

Harris also claims that the Obama administration is responsible for the good economic situation America had when Trump was elected. The Trump administration was unrelated to it and only after Trump was elected the economy crashed. In other words, Trump is at fault for the state of the economy. Even though there may be some truth to that, it is not Trump's fault that COVID-19 damaged the whole world's economy. However, when put simply, the American economy worsened after Trump was elected. Thus, there is a conclusion to be drawn, even though the cause-and-effect relationship is not necessarily completely sound. However, as mentioned, validity of an argument does not always matter, but what matters is that is that it seems reasonable, and the audience accepts it.

Benoit and Airne divided the purposes of political campaign discourse to acclaims, attacks, and defence. In this debate all these purposes were visible, but also occasionally overlapping. Harris often

took the opportunity to praise herself and Biden and at the same time attack Trump and Pence. Similarly, her defences functioned often as attacks on the Trump administration. Benoit and Airne also stated that the topics can be divided into issues of policy and character. This was also clearly visible in this debate. However, Harris did combine these at times. She made connections between Trump's character and his foreign policy, insinuating that because of his character flaws he is incompetent to make reasonable decisions in terms of foreign relations. Harris mainly highlights the fact that Trump is unreliable and does not value honesty. Unlike Biden, of course. Biden is a man of his word, and he has the ability to maintain good relationships with allies and adversaries.

In Benoit and Airne's study it was revealed that vice presidential candidates attack more than defend. This was the case with Harris as well. Harris had 25 turns during the debate, and she attacked 15 times. Some of the turns also contained several attacks and she only defended herself and Biden 3 times. Acclaims were visible in 12 of the turns, however, some of the attacks also included acclaims. Harris discusses policy a bit more than character but does frequently mention Trump's untrustworthiness when discussing policy related issues. Thus, the difference is not that great.

Harris's rhetorical devices did not vary much between different functions. She mostly makes use of examples and illustrations and aims to gain the adherence the audience. However, there are some devices that are more common in other functions than in the other. For example, when trying to establish commonalties with marginalised groups, Harris is addressing particular audiences within the audience, and this was primarily visible in the acclaims category. In addition, associating and disassociating, were mostly (but not only) visible in the attacks category. Also, in the attacks category, Harris utilised a pragmatic argument more often than in the other two categories.

It has been stated (Shaw, 2020) that women are marginalised in public places because of how strongly authority and masculinity are correlated and women supposedly lack the confidence to act in an authoritative manner. The double bind that female politicians face is that if they are passionate, they are too emotional and if they are perceived as emotionless, they do not live up to their roles as women. Harris, however, doesn't appear to be disturbed by this. From the very beginning, it is clear that Harris is not going to be less confrontational and express cooperative speech styles which are, according to Shaw (2020) often affiliated with feminine speech. Harris claims her turn from Pence, she talks about her previous accomplishments as a prosecutor and a senator and will not let Pence undermine her. However, it is notable that as Shaw (2020) suggests, policy topics that female politicians most often oversee differ from the ones that male politicians do. Male politicians often have responsibilities that relate to foreign policy and finance, and women tend to oversee softer policy topics. This is important in terms of this thesis, as during the debate, Harris discusses extensively about her own qualifications,

but when subjects of the economy and foreign policy arise, Harris focuses on Biden's qualifications and experience.

To me, it almost seems that Harris feels that she has nothing to prove as a woman or as politician. She did not come to the debate to defend herself or Biden, but to show the audience how badly the Trump administration failed the American people. Harris seems to trust that Trump will cause his own downfall. When Harris discusses her own as well as Biden's merits, she seems to be simply stating facts.

Joe Biden has not announced if he is going to be running for a second term, but if he should do that, it would be interesting to see if Harris's rhetoric is different the second time around and if being the incumbent vice president has an impact on her argumentation and topics she decides to discuss. If Biden decides against seeking re-election and Harris decides to run as the Democratic nominee, that could be another potentially interesting development. If this were to occur, research could be conducted to assess Harris's rhetorical strategies and argumentation during the Democratic Party's 2020 and 2024 presidential primaries. Although Harris withdrew from the 2020 presidential race, there is still a lot of data to analyse because she participated in multiple debates with other democratic contenders.

Bibliography

@NickAdamsinUSA (2020). Kamala Harris had an affair with Mayor Willie Brown in San Francisco. That's what boosted her career. Isn't there a phrase for that? 12.8.2020. Available at https://twitter.com/NickAdamsinUSA/status/1293307804833521666 [Accessed 5.3.2021]

Aristotle. (2001). *Rhetoric*. (Roberts, W.R.) Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Tech.

Benoit, W. L., & Airne, D. (2005). A functional analysis of American vice presidential debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *41*(4), 225-236.

Benoit, W. L., & Sheafer, T. (2006). Functional theory and political discourse: Televised debates in Israel and the United States. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *83*(2), 281-297.

Blais, A., & Perrella, A. M. (2008). Systemic effects of televised candidates' debates. *The international journal of press/politics*, *13*(4), 451-464.

Boydstun, A. E., Glazier, R. A., & Pietryka, M. T. (2013). Playing to the crowd: Agenda control in presidential debates. *Political Communication*, *30*(2), 254-277.

Burns, S., Eberhardt, L., & Merolla, J. L. (2013). What is the difference between a hockey mom and a pit bull? Presentations of Palin and gender stereotypes in the 2008 presidential election. *Political Research Quarterly*, *66*(3), 687-701.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, *1*(8). Available at http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8 [Accessed 23.10.2022]

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*(6), 1241-1299.

Drobnic Holan, A. (2020). Ask PolitiFact: Are you sure Donald Trump didn't call the coronavirus a hoax? 8.10.2020. *Politifact.* Available at https://www.politifact.com/article/2020/oct/08/ask-politifact-are-you-sure-donald-trump-didnt-cal/ [Accessed 23.10.2022]

Drucker, S. & Hunold J. (1987). The debating game. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*.

4 (2) 202-207.

Fulton, S. A. (2012). Running backwards and in high heels: The gendered quality gap and incumbent electoral success. *Political Research Quarterly*, *65*(2), 303-314.

Goldberg, J. (2020). Trump: Americans Who Died in War Are 'Losers' and 'Suckers'. *The Atlantic 4.9.2020*. Available at https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2020/09/trump-americans-who-died-at-war-are-losers-and-suckers/615997/ [Accessed: 23.10.2022]

Griebie, A., Immelman, A., & Zhang, Y. (2020). The political personality of 2020 Democratic vice-presidential nominee Kamala Harris. Collegeville and St. Joseph, MN: St. John's University and the College of St. Benedict, Unit for the Study of Personality in Politics.

Hellweg, S., Pfau, M. & Brydon, S. (1992). Televised presidential debates. *Advocacy in contemporary America*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Hinck, E. A., & Hinck, S. S. (2002). Politeness strategies in the 1992 vice presidential and presidential debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *38*(4), 234-250.

Jamieson, K. H., & Adasiewicz, C. (2000). What can voters learn from election debates? In Coleman, S. (ed.), *Televised election debates.* Palgrave Macmillan, London. 25-42.

Jørgensen, C. (2009). Interpreting Perelman's universal audience: Gross versus Crosswhite. *Argumentation, 23(1), 11-19.*

Joslyn, R. A. (1990). Election campaigns as occasions for civic education. In Swanson D.L. & Nimmo, (eds.), *New directions in political communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 86–119

Katz, E., & Feldman, J. J. (1962). The debates in the light of research: A survey of surveys. In S. Kraus (ed.), *The great debates: Kennedy vs. Nixon, 1960*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 173–223.

Killingsworth, M. J. (2005). *Appeals in modern rhetoric: An ordinary-language approach*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press.

Koblin, J. (2020). Pence-Harris Debate Is No. 2 in Vice-Presidential Ratings, With 58 Million TV Viewers. *The New York Times 8.10.2020 (4.11.2020).*

Available at https://www.nytimes.com/2020/10/08/business/media/pence-harris-debate-is-no-2-in-vice-presidential-ratings-with-58-million-tv-viewers.html [Accessed 3.3.2021]

Kraus, S., & Davis, D. K. (1981). Political debates. In Nimmo, D.D. & Sanders, K. R. (eds.), *Handbook of political communication*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. 273–296.

Lawless, J. L. (2009). Sexism and gender bias in election 2008: A more complex path for women in politics. *Politics & Gender*, *5*(1), 70.

Levasseur, D., & Dean, K. W. (1996). The use of evidence in presidential debates: A study of evidence levels and types from 1960 to 1988. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 32, 129–142.

Lewiński, M., & Mohammed, D. (2016). Argumentation theory. *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Theory and Philosophy*, 1-15.

Lim, E. T. (2009). Gendered metaphors of women in power: The case of Hillary Clinton as madonna, unruly woman, bitch and witch. *Politics, gender and conceptual metaphors*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. 254-269.

Lips, H. M. (2020). *Sex and gender: An introduction*. Waveland Press.

Martin, J. (2014). *Politics and rhetoric: A critical introduction*. London; New York: Routledge.

Maurer, M., & Reinemann, C. (2006). Learning versus knowing: Effects of misinformation in televised debates. *Communication Research*, *33*(6), 489-506.

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36, 176–185.

McKinney, M. S., & Carlin, D. B. (2004). Political campaign debates. *Handbook of political communication research*, 203-234.

McKinney, M. S., & Warner, B. R. (2013). Do presidential debates matter? Examining a decade of campaign debate effects. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *49*(4), 238-258.

Murphy, J. M. (1992). Presidential debates and campaign rhetoric: Text within context. *Southern Journal of Communication*, *57*(3), 219-228.

Palonen, K. (2014). *Kootut retoriikat: Esimerkkejä politiikan luennasta*. Jyväskylän yliopisto.

Perelman, C. (1982). *The realm of rhetoric*. (Kluback, W.) University of Notre Dame Press. Notre Dame, Indiana.

Robson, D. C. (2000). Stereotypes and the female politician: A case study of Senator Barbara Mikulski. *Communication Quarterly*, *48*(3), 205-222.

Shaw, S. (2020). *Women, language and politics.* Cambridge University Press.

Traister, R. (2011). *Big girls don't cry: The election that changed everything for American women.* Simon and Schuster.

Tufts University Tisch College. CIRCLE. (2021). Half of Youth Voted in 2020, An 11-Point Increase from 2016. Available at https://circle.tufts.edu/latest-research/half-youth-voted-2020-11-point-increase-2016 [Accessed: 27.11.2022]

Tuman, J. S. (2008). *Political Communication in American Campaigns*. United States: Sage Publications.

Wachsmuth, H., Stede, M., El Baff, R., Al Khatib, K., Skeppstedt, M., & Stein, B. (2018). Argumentation synthesis following rhetorical strategies. *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. 3753-3765

Weldon, S. L. (2008). Intersectionality. In Goertz, G. & Mazur, A.G. (eds.) *Politics, Gender and Concepts: Theory and Methodology*, 193-218.

Yount, K. M., & Sharma, K. (2020). The US vice presidential debate: a Black woman's resistance to white masculine dominance and white fragility to assert equal voice on public policy. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 1-7.

Appencices

Appendix 1. Transcription of the vice-presidential debate.

Vice Presidential Debate at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, Utah

October 07, 2020

PARTICIPANTS:

Senator Kamala Harris (D-CA) and Vice President Mike Pence (R)

MODERATOR:

Susan Page (USA Today)

PAGE: Good evening. From the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, welcome to the first, and only, vice presidential debate of 2020, sponsored by the nonpartisan Commission on Presidential Debates. I'm Susan Page of USA TODAY. It is my honor to moderate this debate, an important part of our democracy. In Kingsbury Hall tonight we have a small and socially distant audience and we've taken extra precautions during this pandemic. Among other things, everyone in the audience is required to wear a face mask and the candidates will be seated 12 feet apart. The audience is enthusiastic about their candidates, but they've agreed to express that enthusiasm, only twice. At the end of the debate and now when I introduce the candidates. Please welcome California Senator Kamala Harris and Vice President Mike Pence.

PENCE: Thank you.

PAGE: Senator Harris and Vice President Pence thank you for being here. We're meeting as President Trump and the First Lady continue to undergo treatment in Washington after testing positive for COVID-19. We send our thoughts and prayers to them for their rapid and complete recovery and for the recovery of everyone afflicted by the coronavirus. The two campaigns and the Commission on Presidential Debates have agreed to the ground rules for tonight. I'm here to enforce them on behalf of the millions of Americans who are watching. One note, no one in either campaign, or at the commission or anywhere else has been told in advance what topics I'll raise or what questions I'll ask. This ninety-minute debate will be divided into nine segments of about 10 minutes each. I'll begin a segment by posing a question to each of you, sometimes the same question, sometimes a different question on the same topic. You will then have two minutes to answer, without interruption by me or the other candidate. Then we'll take six minutes or so to discuss the issue. At that point, although there will always be more to say, we'll move on to the next topic. We want a debate that is lively, but Americans also deserve a discussion that is civil. These are tumultuous times, but we can and will have a respectful exchange about the big issues facing our nation. Let's begin with the

ongoing pandemic that has cost our country so much. Senator Harris, the coronavirus is not under control. Over the past week, Johns Hopkins reports that 39 states have had more COVID cases over the past seven days than in the week before. Nine states have set new records. Even if a vaccine is released soon, the next administration will face hard choices. What would a Biden administration do in January and February that a Trump administration wouldn't do? Would you impose new lockdowns for businesses and schools in hotspots? A federal mandate to wear masks? You have two minutes to respond, without interruption.

HARRIS: Thank you Susan. Well, the American people have witnessed what is the greatest failure of any presidential administration in the history of our country. And here are the facts. 210,000 dead people in our country in just the last several months. Over 7 million people who have contracted this disease. One in five businesses closed. We're looking at frontline workers who have been treated like sacrificial workers. We are looking at over 30 million people who in the last several months had to file for unemployment. And here's the thing, on January 28, the vice president and the president were informed about the nature of this pandemic. They were informed that it's lethal in consequence, that it is airborne, that it will affect young people and that it would be contracted because it is airborne. And they knew what was happening, and they didn't tell you. Can you imagine if you knew on January 28, as opposed to March 13, what they knew what you might have done to prepare? They knew and they covered it up. The president said it was a hoax. They minimized the seriousness of it. The president said you're on one side of his ledger if you wear a mask, you're on the other side of his ledger if you don't. And in spite of all of that, today they still don't have a plan. They still don't have a plan. Well, Joe Biden does. And our plan is about what we need to do around a national strategy for contact tracing, for testing, for administration of the vaccine and making sure that it will be free for all. That is the plan that Joe Biden has and that I have, knowing that we have to get a hold of what has been going on and we need to save our country. And Joe Biden is the best leader to do that and frankly, this administration has forfeited their right to re-election, based on this.

PAGE: Thank you- Thank you, Senator Harris. Thank you, Senator Harris. Vice President Pence, more than 210,000 Americans have died of COVID-19 since February. The US death toll as a percentage of our population is higher than that of almost every other wealthy nation on Earth. For instance, our death rate is two and a half times that of Canada, next door. You head the administration's Coronavirus Task Force. Why is the U.S. death toll, as a percentage of our population, higher than that of almost every other wealthy country? And you have two minutes to respond, without interruption.

PENCE: Susan thank you. And I want to thank the Commission and the University of Utah for hosting this event. And Senator Harris, it's a privilege to be on the stage with you. Our nation has gone through a very challenging time this year. But I want the American people to know that from the very first day, President Donald Trump has put the health of America first. Before there were more than five cases in the United States, all people who had returned from China, President Donald Trump did what no other American president had ever done. And that was he suspended all travel from China, the second largest economy in the world. Now, Senator, Joe Biden opposed that decision. He said it was xenophobic and hysterical, but I can tell you, having led the White House Coronavirus Task Force, that that decision alone by President Trump bought us invaluable time to stand up the greatest national mobilization since World War II. And I believe it's saved hundreds of thousands of American lives. Because with that time we were able to reinvent testing. More than 115 million tests have been done to date. We were able to see to the delivery of billions of supplies so our doctors and nurses had the resources and support they needed. And we began, really before the month of February it was hard to develop a vaccine and to develop medicines and therapeutics that've been saving lives all along the way. And under President Trump's leadership, Operation Warp Speed, we believe, will have literally tens of millions of doses of a vaccine before the end of this year. The reality is, when you look at the Biden plan, it reads an awful lot like what President Trump and I and our task force have been doing every step of the way. And quite frankly, when I look at their plan that talks about advancing testing, creating new PPE, developing a vaccine, umm, it looks a little bit like plagiarism, which is something Joe Biden knows a little bit about. I think the American people know that this is a president who has put the health of America first and the American people, I believe with my heart, can be proud of the sacrifices they have made. It's saved countless American lives.

PAGE: Thank you, Vice Pres- Thank you Vice President Pence- Thank you, Vice President Pence. Senator Harris, would you like to respond?

HARRIS: Oh, absolutely. Whatever the Vice President's claiming the administration has done, clearly it hasn't worked when you're looking at over 210,000 dead bodies in our country, American lives that have been lost, families that are grieving that loss. And you know, the vice president is the head of the task force and knew, on January 28, how serious this was. And then, big thanks to Bob Woodward, we learned that they knew about it. And then when that was exposed, the vice president said when asked 'Well, why didn't y'all tell anybody?', he said 'Because the president wanted people to remain calm'.

PAGE: Well, let's go –

HARRIS: No, I – Susan, I – This is important –

PENCE: Susan, I have to weigh in here –

HARRIS: Mr. Vice President, I'm speaking.

PENCE: I have to weigh in –

HARRIS: I'm speaking. I wanna –

PAGE: You have 15 more seconds and then we'll give the vice president a chance to respond.

HARRIS: Thank you. So I want to ask the American people, how calm were you when you were panicked about where you're going to get your next roll of toilet paper? How calm were you when your kids were sent home from school and you didn't know when they could go back?

PAGE: Thank you. Thank you, Senator Harris –

HARRIS: How calm were you when your children couldn't see your parents because you were afraid they could kill them?

PAGE: Let's give Vice President Pence a chance to respond. Vice President Pence, you have one minute to respond.

PENCE: You know there's not a day gone by that I haven't thought of every American family that's lost a loved one. And I want all of you to know that you'll always be in our hearts and in our prayers. But when you say what the American people have done over these last eight months hasn't worked, that's a great disservice to the sacrifices the American people have made.

HARRIS: I'm referring to your president.

PENCE: The reality – If I may, if I may finish, Senator. The reality is Dr. Fauci said everything that he told the President in the Oval Office, the President told the American people. Now President Trump I will tell you has boundless confidence in the American people and he always spoke with confidence that we'd get through this together. But when you say it hasn't worked – when Dr. Fauci and Dr. Birks and our medical experts came to us in the second week of March, they said if the President didn't take the unprecedented step of shutting down roughly half of the American economy that we could lose 2.2 million Americans. That's the reality.

PAGE: Thank you. Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: They also said to us if we did everything right, Susan, we could still lose more than 200,000 Americans.

PAGE: Vice President Pence –

PENCE: Now, one life lost is too many, Susan.

PAGE: Thank you –

PENCE: But the American people, I believe, deserve credit for the sacrifices that they have made, putting the health of their family and their neighbors first, our doctors, our nurses, our first responders –

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: – and I'm going to speak up on behalf of what the American people have done.

PAGE: Vice President Pence, you were in the front row at a Rose Garden event 11 days ago, at what seems to have been a super-spreader event for senior administration and congressional officials. No social distancing, few masks, and now a cluster of coronavirus cases among those who were there. How can you expect Americans to follow the administration safety guidelines to protect themselves from COVID when you at the White House have not been doing so?

PENCE: Well, the American people have demonstrated over the last eight months that when given the facts they're willing to put the health of their families, and their neighbors and people they don't even know first. President Trump and I have great confidence in the American people and their ability to take that information and put it into practice. In the height of the epidemic, when we were losing a heartbreaking number of 2,500 Americans a day, we surged resources to New Jersey, and New York, and New Orleans and Detroit. We told the American people what needed to be done and the American people made the sacrifices. When the outbreak in the Sunbelt happened this summer, again, Americans stepped forward. But the reality is the work of the President of the United States goes on. A vacancy on the Supreme Court of the United States has come upon us and the president introduced Judge Amy Coney Barrett –

PAGE: Yes, thank you- Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: At that- If I may say, that Rose Garden event, there's been a great deal of speculation about it. My wife Karen and I were there and honored to be there. Many of the people who were at that event, Susan, actually were tested for coronavirus. And it was an outdoor event, which all of our scientists regularly and routinely advise, the difference here is President Trump and I trust the American people to make choices in the best interest of their health. Joe Biden and Kamala Harris consistently talk about mandates, and not not just mandates with the coronavirus but a government takeover of healthcare, the Green New Deal –

PAGE: Thank you- Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: – all government control. We're about freedom and respecting the freedom of the American people.

HARRIS: Let's talk about respecting the American people. You respect the American people when you tell them the truth. You respect the American people when you have the courage to be a leader –

PENCE: Which we've always done –

HARRIS: – speaking of those things that you may not want people to hear but they need to hear so they can protect themselves. But this administration stood on information that if you had as a parent, if you had as a worker knowing you didn't have enough money saved up, and now you're standing in a food line because of the ineptitude of an administration that was unwilling to speak the truth to the American people. So, let's talk about caring about the American people. The American people who have had to sacrifice far too much because of the incompetence of this administration. It is asking too much of the people –

PENCE: Susan, we talked about the American people –

PAGE: Vice President Pence –

HARRIS: – It is asking too much of the people that they would not be equipped with the information they need to help themselves to protect their parents and their children.

PENCE: Susan, the president –

PAGE: No, I'm sorry. Kamala Harris – Senator Harris, I mean. I'm sorry.

HARRIS: It's fine. I'm Kamala.

PAGE: No, no, you're Senator Harris to me. For life to get back to normal Dr. Anthony Fauci and other experts say that most of the people who can be vaccinated need to be vaccinated, but half of Americans now say they wouldn't take a vaccine if it was released now. If the Trump administration approves a vaccine, before or after the election, should Americans take it and would you take it?

HARRIS: If the public health professionals, if Dr. Fauci, if the doctors tell us that we should take it, I'll be the first in line to take it. Absolutely. But if Donald Trump tells us that we should take it, I'm not taking it.

PAGE: Vice President Pence, there have been a lot of repercussions from this pandemic. In recent days, the president's diagnosis of COVID-19 has underscored the importance of the job that you hold, and that you are seeking. That's our second topic tonight, it's the role of the vice president. One of you will make history on January 20, you will be the vice president to the oldest president the United

States has ever had. Donald Trump will be 74-years-old on Inauguration Day. Joe Biden will be 78-years-old. That already has raised concerns among some voters, concerns that have been sharpened by President Trump's hospitalization in recent days. Vice President Pence, have you had a conversation or reached an agreement with President Trump about safeguards or procedures when it comes to the issue of presidential disability? And if not, do you think you should? You have two minutes without interruption.

PENCE: Well, Susan, thank you. Although I would like to go back –

PAGE: I think we need to move on to the issue of the vice presidency –

PENCE: Well, thank you but, I would like to go back. Because the reality is that we're going to have a vaccine, Senator, in record time, in unheard of time, in less than a year. We have five companies in phase three clinical trials. And we're right now producing tens of millions of doses. So, the fact that you continue to undermine public confidence in a vaccine if the vaccine emerges during the Trump administration, I think is unconscionable. And Senator, I just ask you, stop playing politics with people's lives. The reality is that we will have a vaccine, we believe, before the end of this year, and it will have the capacity to save countless American lives. And your continuous undermining of confidence in a vaccine is just, it's just unacceptable. And let me also say, you know the reality is when you talk about, about failure in this administration, we actually do know what failure looks like in a pandemic. It was 2009. The Swine Flu arrived in the United States. Thankfully, it was, ended up not being as lethal as the coronavirus. But before the end of the year, when Joe Biden was Vice President of the United States, not seven and a half million people contracted the swine flu, 60 million Americans contracted the swine flu. If the swine flu had been as lethal as the coronavirus in 2009 when Joe Biden was vice president, we would have lost 2 million American lives. His own Chief of Staff Ron Klain would say last year that it was pure luck. That they did "everything possible wrong". And we learned from that. They left the Strategic National Stockpile empty. They left an empty and hollow plan, but we still learned from it. And I think –

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President Pence – Vice President Pence, your time is up –

PENCE: – the American people, I'm gonna say again, can be proud of what we have done–

PAGE: Vice President Pence, I'm sorry. Your time is up– Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: – and, Senator, please stop undermining confidence in a vaccine.

PAGE: Senator Harris, let me ask you the same question that I asked Vice President Pence, which is have you had a conversation, or reached an agreement with Vice President Biden, about safeguards

or procedures when it comes to the issue of presidential disability? And if not, and if you win the election next month, do you think you should? You have two minutes, uninterrupted.

HARRIS: So let me tell you first of all, on the day I got the call from Joe Biden, it was actually a Zoom call, asking me to serve with him on this ticket was probably one of the most memorable, memorable days of my life. I, you know, I thought about my mother, who came to the United States at the age of 19, gave birth to me at the age of 25 at Kaiser Hospital in Oakland, California. And the thought that I'd be sitting here right now I know would make her proud and she must be looking down on this. You know Joe and I were raised in a very similar way. We were raised with values that are about hard work, about the value and the dignity of public service and about the importance of fighting for the dignity of all people. And I think Joe asked me to serve with him because I have a career that included being elected the first woman District Attorney of San Francisco, where I created models of innovation for law enforcement, in terms of reform of the criminal justice system. I was elected the first woman of color, and black woman, to be elected Attorney General of the state of California, where I ran the second largest Department of Justice in the United States, second only to the United States Department of Justice. There I took on everything from transnational criminal organizations, to the big banks that were taking advantage of homeowners, to for profit colleges that were taking advantage of veterans. And then, of course, now I serve in the United States Senate as only the second black woman ever elected to the United States Senate. I serve on the Senate Intelligence Committee where I've been in regular receipt of classified information about threats to our nation and hotspots around the world. I've traveled the world. I've met with our soldiers in our, in war zones. And I think Joe has asked me to serve with him because he knows that we share, we share a purpose, which is about lifting up the American people. And after the four years that we have seen of Donald Trump, unifying our country around our common values and principles.

PAGE: Thank you, Senator Harris. You know neither, neither President Trump nor Vice President Biden has released the sort of detailed health information that had become the modern norm until the 2016 election. And in recent days, President Trump's doctors have given misleading answers or refused to answer basic questions about his health. And my question to each of you, in turn, is, is this information voters deserve to know? Vice President Pence, would you like to go first?

PENCE: Well, Susan, thank you. And let me, let me say on behalf of the President and the First Lady, how moved we've all been by the outpouring of prayers and concern for the President. And I do believe it's emblematic of the prayers and the concern that have ushered forth for every American impacted by the coronavirus. But the care the president received at Walter Reed Hospital, White House doctors, was exceptional. And the transparency that they practiced all along the way will

continue because the American people have a right to know about the health and well-being of their President. And we'll continue to do that. But I'm just extremely grateful and was more than, more than a little moved by the broad and bipartisan support. And, Senator, I want to thank you and Joe Biden for your expressions and genuine concern. And I also want to congratulate you, as I did on that phone call, on the historic nature of your nomination.

HARRIS: Thank you.

PENCE: I never expected to be on this stage four years ago so I know the feeling. But the reality is, we've got an election before the American people, in the midst of this challenging year, and the stakes have never been higher.

PAGE: Thank you – Thank you, Vice President Pence. I wanna give Senator Harris a chance to respond to the same question I asked, which is do voters have a right to know more detailed health information about presidential candidates, and especially about presidents, especially when they're facing some kind of challenge?

HARRIS: Absolutely. And that's why Joe Biden has been so incredibly transparent. And certainly, by contrast, the President has not, both in terms of health records, but also let's look at taxes. We now know because of great investigative journalism that Donald Trump paid $750 in taxes. When I first heard about it, I literally said "You mean $750,000?". And it was like no, $750. We now know Donald Trump owes and is in debt for $400 million. And just so everyone is clear, when we say in debt it means you owe money to somebody. And it'd be really good to know who the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, owes money to because the American people have a right to know what is influencing the president's decisions. And is he making those decisions on the best interest of the American people, of you, or self-interest. So, Susan, I'm glad you asked about transparency, because it has to be across the board. Joe has been incredibly transparent over many, many years. The one thing we all know about Joe, he puts it all out there. He, he is honest. He is forthright. But Donald Trump on the other hand, has been about covering up everything.

PENCE: Susan –

PENCE: Thank – Thanks – Thank you, Senator Harris. I want to give you a chance to respond, Vice President.

PENCE: Well, look, I respect the fact that Joe Biden spent 47 years in public life. I respect your public service as well.

HARRIS: Thank you.

PENCE: But the American people have a president who is a businessman, he's a job-creator. He's paid tens of millions of dollars in taxes, payroll taxes, property taxes. He's created tens of thousands of American jobs. The president said those public reports are not accurate. And the President also released, literally, stacks of financial disclosures the American people can review just as the law allows. But the distinction here is that Joe Biden, 47 years in public service, compared to President Donald Trump, who brought all of that experience four years ago–

PAGE: Thank you – Thank you, Vice President –

PENCE: – and turned this economy around by cutting taxes, rolling back regulation, unleashing American energy-

PAGE: Thank you – Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: – fighting for free and fair trade, and all of that is on the line –

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: – if Joe Biden and Kamala Harris are in the White House.

PAGE: You know, that's a good segue into our third topic–

HARRIS: That's a great segue.

PAGE: – which is about the economy. This has been another aspect of life for Americans that's been so affected by this coronavirus. We have a jobs crisis brewing. On Friday, we learned that the unemployment rate had declined to 7.9% in September, but the job growth had stalled, and that was before the latest round of layoffs and furloughs in the airline industry, at Disney and elsewhere. Hundreds of thousands of discouraged workers have stopped looking for work. Nearly 11 million jobs that existed at the beginning of the year, haven't been replaced. Those hardest hit include Latinos, blacks and women. Senator Harris, the Biden-Harris campaign has proposed new programs to boost the economy and you would pay for that new spending by raising $4 trillion in taxes on wealthy individuals and corporations. Some economists warn that could curb entrepreneurial ventures that fuel growth and create jobs. Would raising taxes put the recovery at risk? And you have two minutes to answer, uninterrupted.

HARRIS: Thank you. On the issue of the economy, I think there couldn't be a more fundamental difference between Donald Trump and Joe Biden. Joe Biden believes you measure the health and the strength of America's economy based on the health, and the strength of the American worker and the American family. On the other hand, you have Donald Trump, who measures the strength of the economy based on how rich people are doing. Which is why he passed a tax bill benefitting the top

1% and the biggest corporations of America, leading to a $2 trillion deficit that the American people are gonna have to pay for. On day one, Joe Biden will repeal that tax bill. He'll get rid of it. And what he'll do with the money is invest it in the American people. And through a plan that is about investing in infrastructure, something that Donald Trump said he would do. I remember hearing about some infrastructure week, I don't think it ever happened. But Joe Biden will do that. He'll invest in infrastructure. It's about upgrading our roads and bridges, but also investing in clean energy and renewable energy. Joe is gonna invest that money in what we need to do around innovation. There was a time when our country believed in science and invested in research and development so that we were an innovation leader on the globe. Joe Biden will use that money to invest in education. So for example, for folks who want to go to a two year Community College, it will be free. If you come from a family that makes less than $125,000, you'll go to a public university for free. And across the board, we'll make sure that if you have student loan debt it's cut by $10,000. That's how Joe Biden thinks about the economy, which is it's about investing in the people of our country, as opposed to passing a tax bill, which had the benefit of letting American corporations go offshore to do their business.

PAGE: Thank you, Senator Harris.

HARRIS: You're welcome.

PAGE: Vice President Pence, your administration has been predicting a rapid and robust recovery, but the latest economic report suggests that's not happening. Should Americans be braced for an economic comeback that is going to take not months, but a year or more? You have two minutes to answer, uninterrupted.

PENCE: When President Trump and I took office, America had gone through the slowest economic recovery since the Great Depression. When Joe Biden was vice president they tried to tax, and spend, and regulate, and bail our way back to a growing economy. President Trump cut taxes, across the board. Despite what Senator Harris says, the average American family of four had $2,000 in savings in taxes. And with the rise in wages that occurred, most predominantly for blue-collar, hardworking Americans, the average household income for a family of four increased by $4,000 following President Trump's tax cuts. But America, you just heard Senator Harris tell you, on day one Joe Biden's gonna raise your taxes. It's really remarkable to think, Susan –

HARRIS: That's not what I said.

PENCE: – I mean, right after a time where we're going through a pandemic that lost 22 million jobs at the height, we've already added back 11.6 million jobs because we had a president who cut taxes,

rolled back regulation, unleashed American energy, fought for free and fair trade, and secured $4 trillion from the Congress of the United States to give direct payments to families, saved 50 million jobs through the pay check protection program. We literally have spared no expense to help the American people and the American worker through this. Joe Biden and Kamala Harris want to raise taxes. They want to bury our economy under a $2 trillion Green New Deal, which you were one of the original co-sponsors of in the United States Senate. They want to abolish fossil fuels and ban fracking, which would cost hundreds of thousands of American jobs all across the Heartland. And Joe Biden wants to go back to the economic surrender to China that when we took office, half of our international trade deficit was with China alone. And Joe Biden wants to repeal all of the tariffs that President Trump put into effect to fight for American jobs and American workers. Joe Biden says democracy's on the ballot. Make no mistake about it, Susan. The American economy, the American comeback is on the ballot with four more years of growth and opportunity –

PAGE: Thank you – Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: – with four more years of President Donald Trump. 2021 is gonna be the biggest economic year in the history of this country.

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President Pence – Thank you, Vice President Pence. Senator Harris?

HARRIS: Well, I mean, I thought we saw enough of it in last week's debate, but I think this is supposed to be a debate based on fact and truth. And the truth and the fact is, Joe Biden has been very clear. He will not raise taxes on anybody who makes less than $400,000 a year –

PENCE: He said he's going to repeal the Trump tax cuts –

HARRIS: Mr. Vice President I'm speaking.

PENCE: Well –

HARRIS: I'm speaking.

PENCE: – it'd be important if you said the truth. Joe Biden said twice in the debate last week that he's going to repeal the Trump tax cuts. That was tax cuts that gave the average working family $2,000 in a tax break every single year –

HARRIS: That is – That is absolutely not true –

PENCE: – Senator, that's the math –

HARRIS: – that tax bill –

PENCE: Is he only gonna repeal part of the Trump tax cuts?

HARRIS: If you don't mind letting me finish –

PENCE: Please

HARRIS: We can then have a conversation. Okay?

PENCE: Please

HARRIS: Okay. Joe Biden will not raise taxes on anyone who makes less than $400,000 a year. He has been very clear about that. Joe Biden will not end fracking. He has been very clear about that. Joe Biden is the one who during the Great Recession was responsible for the Recovery Act that brought America back. And now the Trump Pence Administration wants to take credit when they ran when they rode the coattails of Joe Biden's success for the economy that they had at the beginning of their term. Of course, now the economy is a complete disaster, but Joe Biden on the one hand, did that. On the other hand, you have Donald Trump, who has reigned over a recession that is being compared to the Great Depression. On the one hand you have Joe Biden, who was responsible with President Barack Obama for the Affordable Care Act, which brought health care to over 20 million Americans and protected people with pre-existing conditions and what it also did is it saved those families, who otherwise were going bankrupt because of hospital bills they could not afford. On the other hand, you have Donald Trump who is in court right now trying to get rid of –

PAGE: Thank you, Senator Harris –

HARRIS: – trying to get rid of the Affordable Care Act, which means that you will lose protections, if you have pre-existing conditions. And I just, this is very important, Susan –

PAGE: Yes, well we need to give – We need to give Vice President –

HARRIS: – and it's just – He interrupted me and I'd like to just finish, please. If you have a pre-existing condition, heart disease, diabetes, breast cancer, they're coming for you. If you love someone who has a pre-existing condition –

PENCE: Nonsense

PAGE: Thank you – Thank you, Senator Harris –

PENCE: That's nonsense

HARRIS: – they're coming for you. If you are under the age of 26 on your parents coverage, they're coming for you.

PAGE: Senator Harris, thank you.

HARRIS: You're welcome.

PAGE: Let me give you a chance to respond.

PENCE: Well, I hope we have a chance to talk about health care because Obamacare was a disaster, and the American people remember it well. President Trump and I have a plan to improve health care and to protect, protect pre-existing conditions for every American. But look, Senator Harris, you're entitled to your own opinion, but you're not entitled to your own facts –

HARRIS: That's a good line.

PENCE: You yourself said on multiple occasions when you were running for president that you would ban fracking. Joe Biden looked his supporter in the eye and pointed and said, "I guarantee, I guarantee that we will abolish fossil fuels." We have a $2 trillion version of the Green New Deal, Susan, that your newspaper USA TODAY said really wasn't that very different from the original Green New Deal. More taxes, more regulation, banning fracking, abolishing fossil fuel, crushing American energy and economic surrender to China is a prescription for economic decline. President Trump and I will keep America growing. The V-shape recovery that's underway right now will continue with four more years of President Donald Trump in the White House.

PAGE: Thank you very, very much, Vice President Pence. Once again you provided the perfect segue to a new topic, which is climate change. And Vice President Pence, I'd like to pose the first question to you. This year we've seen record-setting hurricanes in the south. Another one, Hurricane Delta is now threatening the gulf. And we have seen record-setting wildfires in the West. Do you believe, as the scientific community has concluded, that man-made climate change has made wildfires bigger, hotter and more deadly? And it made hurricanes wetter, slower and more damaging? You have two minutes, uninterrupted.

PENCE: Thank you Susan. Well first, I'm very proud of our record on the environment and on conservation. According to all of the best estimates, our, our air and land are cleaner than any time ever recorded. And our water is among the cleanest in the world. And just a little while ago, the president signed the Outdoors Act, the largest investment in our public lands and public parks in 100 years. So, President Trump has made a commitment to conservation and to the environment. Now with regard to climate change, the climate is changing. But the issue is, what's the cause and what do we do about it. President Trump has made it clear that we're going to continue to listen to the science. Now Joe Biden and Kamala Harris, would put us back in the Paris Climate Accord. They'd impose the Green New Deal, which would crush American energy, would increase the energy cost of American families in their homes and literally would crush American jobs. President Trump and I believe that the progress that we have made in a cleaner environment has been happening precisely

because we have a strong free market economy. You know what's remarkable is the United States has reduced CO_2 more than the countries that are still in the Paris Climate Accord, but we've done it through innovation. And we've done it through natural gas and fracking, which, Senator, the American people can go look at the record. I know Joe Biden says otherwise now, as you do, but the both of you repeatedly committed to abolishing fossil fuel and banning fracking.

HARRIS: That's not true.

PENCE: And so by creating the kind of American innovation, we're actually steering toward a stronger and better environment. With regard to wildfires, President Trump and I believe that forest management has to be front and center, and even Governor Gavin Newsome from your state has agreed we've got to work on forest management. And with regard to hurricanes, the National Oceanic Administration tells us that actually as, as difficult as they are –

PAGE: Thank you – Thank you, Vice President –

PENCE: – there are no more hurricanes today than there were 100 years ago –

PAGE: Thank you – Thank you –

PENCE: – but many of the climate alarmists use hurricanes and wildfires to try and –

PAGE: Vice President Pence, I'm sorry, your time is up – Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: – sell the bill of goods of a Green New Deal. And President Trump and I are gonna always put American jobs and American workers first.

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President Pence. Senator Harris, as the Vice President mentioned, you co-sponsored the Green New Deal in Congress, but Vice President Biden said in last week's debate that he does not support the Green New Deal. But if you look at the Biden Harris campaign website it describes the Green New Deal as a crucial framework. What exactly would be the stance of a Biden Harris Administration toward the Green New Deal? You have two minutes, uninterrupted.

HARRIS: Alright, so first of all, I will repeat, and the American people know, that Joe Biden will not ban fracking. That is a fact. That is a fact. I will repeat that Joe Biden has been very clear that he thinks about growing jobs, which is why he will not increase taxes for anyone who makes less than $400,000 a year. Joe Biden's economic plan – Moody's, which is a reputable Wall Street firm – has said will create 7 million more jobs than Donald Trump's. And part of those jobs, that will be created by Joe Biden, are going to be about clean energy and renewable energy. Because you see, Joe understands that the West Coast of our country is burning, including my home state of California. Joe sees what is happening on the Gulf states, which are being battered by storms. Joe has seen and talked

with the farmers in Iowa, whose entire crops have been destroyed because of floods. And so Joe believes, again, in science. I'll tell you something, Susan, I served, when I first got to the Senate, on the committee that's responsible for the environment. Do you know this administration took the word science off the website? And then took the phrase climate change off the website? This— We have seen a pattern with this administration which is they don't believe in science. And Joe's plan is about saying we're going to deal with it, but we're also going to create jobs. Donald Trump, when asked about the wildfires in California and the question was, you know, the science is telling us this, you know what Donald Trump said? Science doesn't know. So, let's talk about who is prepared to lead our country over the course of the next four years on what is an existential threat to us as human beings. Joe is about saying we're going to invest that in renewable energy, we're going to be about the creation of millions of jobs, we will achieve net zero emissions by 2050, carbon neutral by 2035— Joe has a plan. This has been a lot of talk from the Trump administration, and really it has been to go backward instead of forward. We will also re-enter the climate agreement with pride.

PAGE: Senator Harris just said that climate change is an existential threat. Vice President Pence, do you believe that climate change poses an existential threat?

PENCE: As I said, Susan, the climate is changing. We'll follow the science, but, once again, Senator Harris is denying the fact that they're gonna raise taxes on every American. Joe Biden said twice in the debate last week that on day one he was going to repeal the Trump tax cuts. Those tax cuts delivered $2,000 in tax relief to the average family of four across America. And with regard to banning fracking, I just recommend that people look at the record. You yourself said repeatedly that you would ban fracking. You were the first senate co-sponsor of the Green New Deal. And while Joe Biden denied the Green New Deal, Susan, thank you for pointing out, the Green New Deal is on their campaign website. And as USA TODAY said, it's essentially the same plan as you co-sponsored with AOC when she submitted it in the Senate. And you just heard the senator say that she's going to resubmit America to the Paris Climate Accord. Look, the American people have always cherished our environment. We will continue to cherish it. We've made great progress reducing CO_2 emissions through American innovation and the development of natural gas through fracking. We don't need a massive, $2 trillion Green New Deal that would impose all new mandates on American businesses and American families, Joe Biden wants us to retrofit 4 million—

PAGE: Thank you – Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: – American business buildings. It makes no sense. It will cost jobs. President Trump –

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: – he's gonna put America first. He's going to put jobs first and we're gonna take care of our environment and follow the science.

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President Pence –

HARRIS: On the issue of jobs –

PAGE: Senator Harris

HARRIS: Let's talk about that. You, the Vice President earlier referred to, as part of what he thinks is an accomplishment, the President's trade war with China. You lost that trade war. You lost it. What ended up happening is, because of a so-called trade war with China, America lost 300,000 manufacturing jobs. Farmers have experienced bankruptcy, because of it. We are in a manufacturing recession, because of it. And when we look at where this administration has been, there are estimates that by the end of the term of this administration, they will have lost more jobs than almost any other presidential administration –

PENCE: Susan –

HARRIS: – And the American people know what I'm talking about. You know. I think about 20-year-olds, you know we have a 20-year-old, 20-something-year-old, who are coming out of high school and college right now and you're wondering, "Is there going to be a job there for me?". We're looking at people who are trying to figure out how they're going to pay rent by the end of the month. Almost half of American renters are worried about whether they're going to be able to pay rent by the end of the month. This is where the economy is in America right now and it is because of the catastrophe and the failure of leadership of this administration.

PAGE: Thank you, Senator Harris. Vice President Pence, let me give you just 15 seconds to respond because then I want to move on.

PENCE: Well, I'd love to respond. Look, lost the trade war with China? Joe Biden never fought it. Joe Biden has been a cheerleader for Communist China through over the last several decades. And, and again, Senator Harris, you're entitled to your opinion, you're not entitled to your own facts. When Joe Biden was vice president, we lost 200,000 manufacturing jobs and President Obama said they were never coming back. He said we needed a magic wand to bring them back. In our first three years, after we cut taxes, rolled back regulation –

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: – unleashed American energy, this administration saw 500,000 manufacturing jobs created –

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: – And that's exactly the kind of growth we're going to continue to see as we bring our nation through this pandemic –

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President Pence – Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: – your Green New Deal, your massive new mandates, your Paris Climate Accord, it's gonna kill jobs this time just like it killed jobs in the last administration.

HARRIS: Susan, I just need to respond very briefly, please.

PAGE: 15 seconds and then we'll move on.

HARRIS: Thank you. Thank you. Joe Biden is responsible for saving America's auto industry and you voted against it. So let's set the record straight. Thank you.

PAGE: I'd like to talk about China. We have, as our next topic, we have no more complicated or consequential foreign relationship than the one with China. It is a huge market for American agricultural goods. It's a potential partner in dealing with climate change and North Korea. And in a video tonight, President Trump again blamed it for the coronavirus, saying "China will pay." Vice President Pence, how would you describe our, our fundamental relationship with China? Competitors? Adversaries? Enemies? You have two minutes.

PENCE: Thank you Susan. Well let me, before I leave that, let me, let me speak to voting records, if I can. You know, everybody knows that NAFTA caused literally thousands of American factories to close. We saw automotive jobs go south of the border. President Trump fought to renegotiate NAFTA, and the United States, Mexico, Canada agreement is now the law of the land. American people deserve to know Senator Kamala Harris was one of only 10 members of the Senate to vote against the USMCA. It was a huge win for American auto workers. It was a huge win for American farmers, especially dairy in the upper Midwest. But, Senator, you said it didn't go far enough on climate change, that you put your, your radical environmental agenda ahead of American auto workers and ahead of American jobs. I think the American people deserve to know that. It's probably why Newsweek magazine said that, that Kamala Harris was the most liberal member of the United States Senate in 2019, more liberal than Bernie Sanders, more, more liberal than any of the others in the United States Senate. So, now with regard to China, Susan, first and foremost — China is to blame for the coronavirus. And President Trump is not happy about it. He's made that very clear. He made it clear again today. China and the World Health Organization did not play straight with the American people. They did not let our personnel into China to get information on the coronavirus until the

middle of February. Fortunately, President Trump, in dealing with China from the outset of this administration — standing up to China, that had been taking advantage of America for decades — in the wake of Joe Biden's cheerleading for China, President Trump made that decision before the end of January to suspend all travel from China. And again, the American people deserve to know, Joe Biden opposed President Trump's decision to suspend all travel from China. He said it was hysterical, he said it was xenophobic –

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President Pence – Vice President Pence, your time is up –

PENCE: – but President Trump has stood up to China and will continue to stand strong.

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: We want to improve the relationship, but we're going to level the playing field and we're going to hold China accountable for what they did to America with the coronavirus.

PAGE: Thank you. Senator Harris, let me ask you the same question that I asked the Vice President. How would you describe our fundamental relationship with China? Are we competitors, adversaries, enemies? You'll have two minutes, uninterrupted.

HARRIS: Susan, the Trump administration's perspective, and approach to China has resulted in the loss of American lives, American jobs and America's standing. There is a weird obsession that President Trump has had with getting rid of whatever accomplishment was achieved by President Obama and Vice President Biden. For example, they created, within the White House, an office that basically was responsible for monitoring pandemics. They got away, they got rid of it.

PENCE: Not true.

HARRIS: There was a team of disease experts that President Obama and Vice President Biden dispatched to China to monitor what is now predictable and what might happen. They pulled them out. We now are looking at 210,000 Americans who have lost their lives. Let's look at the job situation we mentioned before, the trade deal – the trade war, they wanted to call it – with China. It resulted in the loss of over 300 manufacturing jobs, and a manufacturing recession, and the American consumer paying thousands of dollars more for goods, because of that failed war, that they called it. And let's talk about standing. Pew, a reputable research firm, has done an analysis that shows that leaders of all of our formerly allied countries have now decided that they hold in greater esteem and respect Xi Jinping, the head of the Chinese Communist Party, than they do Donald Trump, the President of the United States, the commander in chief of the United States. This is where we are today, because of a failure of leadership by this administration.

PAGE: Senator Harris, we've seen changes in the role of the United States, in terms of global leadership, over the past four years – and of course times do change. What's your definition – we've seen strains with China, of course, as the Vice President mentioned, we've seen strains with our traditional allies in NATO and elsewhere. What is your definition of the role of American leadership in 2020?

HARRIS: So, you know Joe is – I love talking with Joe about a lot of these issues, and you know, Joe, I think, he said it, quite well. He says, you know, 'Foreign policy: it might sound complicated, but really it's relationships, they're – just think about it as relationships. And so, we know this, in our personal, professional relationships – you gotta keep your word to your friends. Got to be loyal to your friends. People who have stood with you, got to stand with them. You got to know who your adversaries are and keep them in check. But what we have seen with Donald Trump is that he has betrayed our friends and embraced dictators around the world. Let's take for example, Russia. So, Russia – I serve on the Intelligence Committee of the United States Senate. America's intelligence community told us Russia interfered in the election of the President of the United States in 2016 and is playing in 2020. Christopher Wray, the director of the FBI, said the same, but Donald Trump, the commander in chief of the United States of America prefers to take the word of Vladimir Putin over the word of the American intelligence community. You look at our friends at NATO. He has walked away from agreements – you can look at the Iran nuclear deal, which now has put us in a position where we are less safe, because they are building up what might end up being a significant nuclear arsenal. We were in that deal, guys, we were in the Iran nuclear deal with friends, with allies around the country, and because of Donald Trump's unilateral approach to foreign policy, coupled with his isolationism, he pulled us out and has made America less safe. So, Susan, it's about relationships. And the thing that has always been part of the strength of our nation, in addition to our great military, has been that we keep our word. But Donald Trump doesn't understand that because he doesn't understand what it means to be honest.

PAGE: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Senator Harris. Vice President Pence, let me give you a chance to respond.

PENCE: Well, thank you. Well, President Trump kept his word when we moved the American Embassy to Jerusalem, the capital of the State of Israel. When Joe Biden was vice president, they promised to do that and never did. We've stood strong with our allies, but we've been demanding. NATO is now contributing more to our common defense than ever before. Thanks to President Trump's leadership, we've strengthen our alliances across the Asia Pacific. And we've stood strong against those who would do us harm. You know when President Trump came into office, ISIS had

captured an area of the Middle East, the size of Pennsylvania. President Trump unleashed the American military, and our armed forces destroyed the ISIS caliphate and took down their leader al Baghdadi without one American casualty. al Baghdadi was responsible for the death of thousands. But notably, America's hearts today are with the family of Kayla Mueller, the parents of which are here with us tonight in Salt Lake City. Today, two of the ISIS killers responsible for Kayla Mueller's murder, were brought to justice in the United States. Jihadi John was killed on the battlefield, along with the other few. The reality is that when Joe Biden was vice president, we had an opportunity to save Kayla Mueller. Breaks my heart to reflect on it, but the military came into the Oval Office, presented a plan. They said they knew where Kayla was. Baghdadi had held her for 18 months, abused her mercilessly before they killed her. But when Joe Biden was vice president, they hesitated for a month. And when Armed Forces finally went in, it was clear she'd been moved two days earlier, and her family says — with a heart that broke the heart of every American — that if President Donald Trump had been president, they believe Kayla would be alive today.

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President.

PENCE: We destroyed the ISIS caliphate. And you talk about reentering the Iran nuclear deal. I mean, the last administration transferred $1.8 billion to the leading state sponsor of terrorism –

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President.

PENCE: President Donald Trump got us out of the deal, and when Qasim Soleimani was traveling to Baghdad, to do harm to Americans, President Donald Trump took him out. And America is safer, our allies are safer, and the American people should know –

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President. I would like to give Senator Harris a chance to respond, but not at such great length because of course there are other topics we want to talk about.

HARRIS: But I would like equal time.

PENCE: Yes. Please go ahead.

HARRIS: First of all, to the Mueller family, I know about your daughter's case, and I'm so sorry. I'm so sorry. What happened to her is awful. And it should have never happened. And I know Joe feels the same way. And I know that President Obama feels the same way. But you mentioned Soleimani. Let's start there. So, after the strike on Soleimani, there was a counter strike on our troops in Iraq. And they suffered serious brain injuries, and do you know what Donald Trump dismissed them as? Headaches. And this is about a pattern of Donald Trump's, where he has referred to our men who are serving in our military, as suckers and losers. Donald Trump, who went to Arlington

Cemetery, and stood above the graves of our fallen heroes and said, 'What's in it for them?' Because, of course, you know he only thinks about what's in it for him. Let's take what he said about John McCain. A great American hero. And Donald Trump says he doesn't deserve to be called a hero because he was a prisoner of war. Take – and this is, this is very important. When you want to talk about who is the current commander in chief, and what they care about and what they don't care about. Public reporting that Russia had bounties on the heads of American soldiers, and you know what a bounty is? Somebody puts a price on your head, and they will pay it if you are killed. And Donald Trump had talked at least six times to Vladmir Putin, and never brought up the subject. Joe Biden would never do that. Joe Biden – Joe Biden would hold Russia to account for any threat to our nation's security or to our troops who are sacrificing their lives for the sake of our democracy and our safety.

PAGE: Thank you, Senator Harris. This is such an important issue, but we have other important issues as well and I want to make sure we have a chance.

PENCE: I really have to respond to that. She has –

PAGE: Fifteen seconds, because –

PENCE: Well, I've got to have more than that.

PAGE: I'm sorry, Mr. Vice President, you've had more time than she's had, so far –

PENCE: The slanders against President Donald Trump regarding men and women of our armed forces are absurd.

PAGE: I'm sorry, Vice President Pence –

PENCE: My son is a captain in the United States Marine Corps, my son in law is deployed in the United States Navy. I can assure all of you with sons and daughters serving in our military, President Donald Trump not only respects but reveres all of those who served in our armed forces, and any suggestion otherwise is ridiculous. Let me also say –

PAGE: Vice President Pence. Vice President Pence. I didn't – Vice President Pence – I did not create the rules for tonight. Your campaigns agreed to the rules for tonight's debate, with the Commission on Presidential Debates. I'm here to enforce them, which involves moving from one topic to another, giving roughly equal time to both of you, which is what I'm trying very hard to do. So I want to go ahead and move to the next topic, which is an important one, as the last topic was, and that is the Supreme Court. On Monday, the Senate Judiciary Committee is scheduled to open hearings on Amy Coney Barrett's nomination to the Supreme Court. Senator Harris, you'll be there as a member of the

committee. Her confirmation would cement the court's conservative majority, and make it likely open to more abortion restrictions, even to overturning the landmark Roe v Wade ruling. Access to abortion would then be up to the states. Vice President Pence, you're the former governor of Indiana. If Roe v Wade is overturned, what would you want Indiana to do? Would you want your home state to ban all abortions? You have two minutes, uninterrupted.

PENCE: Well thank you for the question, but I'll use a little bit of my time to respond to that very important issue before. The American people deserve to know, Quasem Soleimani, the Iranian general, was responsible for the death of hundreds of American servicemembers. When the opportunity came, we saw him headed to Baghdad to kill more Americans, President Trump didn't hesitate and Quasem Soleimani is gone. But you deserve to know that Joe Biden and Kamala Harris actually criticized the decision to take out Quasem Soleimani. It's really inexplicable, but with regard to Joe Biden it's explainable, because history records that Joe Biden actually opposed the raid against Osama bin Laden. It's absolutely essential that we have a commander in chief who will not hesitate to act to protect American lives and to protect American servicemembers, and that's what you have in President Donald Trump. Now with regard to the Supreme Court of the United States. Let me say, President Trump and I could not be more enthusiastic about the opportunity to see Judge Amy Coney Barrett become Justice Amy Coney Barrett. She's a brilliant woman, and she will bring a lifetime of experience and a sizable American family, to the Supreme Court of the United States. And our hope is, in the hearing next week, unlike Justice Kavanaugh received with treatment from you and others. We hope she gets a fair hearing. And we particularly hope that we don't see the kind of attacks on her Christian faith that we saw before. Democratic Chairman of the Judiciary Committee before, when Judge Barrett was being confirmed for the Court of Appeals, expressed concern that the "dogma of her faith lived loudly in her." Dick Durbin of Illinois said that it was a concern. Senator, I know one of our judicial nominees, you actually attacked because they were a member of the Catholic Knights of Columbus, just because the Knights of Columbus holds pro-life views.

PAGE: Thank you. Thank you, Vice President Pence, your time is up.

PENCE: My hope is that when the hearing takes place, that Judge Amy Coney Barrett will be respected –

PAGE: Thank you Vice President.

PENCE: – treated respectfully and voted and confirmed to the Supreme Court of United States.

PAGE: Senator Harris, you're the senator from and former Attorney General of California. So let me ask you a parallel question to the one I posed to the vice president. If Roe v Wade is overturned, what

would you want California to do? Would you want your home state to enact no restrictions on access to abortion? And you have two minutes, uninterrupted.

PENCE: Thank you, Susan. First of all, Joe Biden and I are both people of faith. And it's insulting to suggest that we would knock anyone for their faith, and in fact, Joe if elected will be only the second practicing Catholic, as President of the United States. On the issue of this nomination – Joe and I are very clear, as are the majority of the American people. We are 27 days before the decision about who will be the next president of the United States. And you know before, when this conversation has come up, you know it's been about election year or election time. We're literally in an election. Over 4 million people have voted. People are in the process of voting right now. And so, Joe has been very clear, as the American people are: Let the American people fill that seat in the White House, and then we'll fill that seat on the United States Supreme Court. And to your point, Susan, the issues before us couldn't be more serious. There's the issue of choice, and I will always fight for a woman's right to make a decision about her own body. It should be her decision and not that of Donald Trump, and the Vice President, Michael Pence. But let's also look at what else is before the court. It's the Affordable Care Act. Like, literally in the midst of a public health pandemic – when over 210,000 people have died, and 7 million people probably have what will be in the future considered a pre-existing condition because you contracted the virus – Donald Trump is in court right now trying to get rid of the Affordable Care Act. And I've said it before and it bears repeating: This means that there will be no more protections, if they win, for people with pre-existing conditions. This means that over 20 million people will lose your coverage. It means that if you're under the age of 26, you can't stay on your parents coverage anymore. And here's the thing. The contrast couldn't be more clear. They're trying to get rid of the Affordable Care Act. Joe Biden is saying let's expand coverage, let's give you a choice of a public option or private coverage, let's bring down premiums, let's lower Medicare eligibility to 60. That's true leadership.

PAGE: You know, you mentioned earlier, Vice President Pence, that the President was committed to maintaining protections for people with pre-existing conditions and — but you do have this court case that you are supporting, your administration is supporting, that would strike down the Affordable Care Act. The president says, President Trump says, that he's going to protect people with pre-existing conditions, but he has not explained how he will do that. And that was one of the toughest nuts to crack, when they were passing the Affordable Care Act. So, tell us, specifically – how would your administration protect Americans with pre-existing conditions, have access to affordable insurance if the Affordable Care Act is struck down.

PENCE: Well, thank you, Susan. Let me just say, addressing your very first question, I couldn't be more proud to serve as vice president to a President who stands without apology for the sanctity of human life. I'm pro-life. I don't apologize for it. And this is another one of those cases where there's such a dramatic contrast. Joe Biden and Kamala Harris support taxpayer funding of abortion, all the way up to the moment of birth, late-term abortion. They want to increase funding to Planned Parenthood of America. Now for our part, I would never presume how Judge Amy Coney Barrett would rule on the Supreme Court of the United States but we'll continue to stand strong for the right to life. When you speak about the Supreme Court, though, I think the American people really deserve an answer, Senator Harris. Are you and Joe Biden gonna pack the court if Judge Amy Coney Barrett is confirmed? I mean, there have been 29 vacancies on the Supreme Court during presidential election years, from George Washington to Barack Obama. Presidents have nominated in all 29 cases. But your party is actually openly advocating adding seats to the Supreme Court, which has had nine seats for 150 years, if you don't get your way. This is a classic case of if you can't win by the rules, you're going to change the rules. Now you've refused to answer the question, Joe Biden has refused to answer the question. I think the American people would really like to know. If Judge Amy Coney Barrett is confirmed to the Supreme Court of the United States, are you and Joe Biden, if somehow you win this election, going to pack the Supreme Court to get your way?

HARRIS: I'm so glad we went through a little history lesson. Let's do that a little more. In 1864 –

PENCE: Well, I'd like you to answer the question.

HARRIS: Mr. Vice President, I'm speaking. I'm speaking. In 1864, one of the, I think, political heroes – certainly of the president, and I assume of you also, Mr. Vice President – is Abraham Lincoln. Abraham Lincoln was up for re-election, and it was 27 days before the election, and a seat became open on the United States Supreme Court. Abraham Lincoln's party was in charge, not only in the White House, but the Senate. But honest Abe said it's not the right thing to do. The American people deserve to make the decision about who will be the next President of the United States, and then that person can select who will serve for a lifetime on the highest court of our land. And so, Joe and I are very clear: the American people are voting right now. And it should be their decision about who will serve on this most important body for a lifetime.

PAGE: Thank you, Senator Harris and –

PENCE: Well, Susan. People are voting right now. They'd like to know if you and Joe Biden are gonna pack the Supreme Court if you don't get your way in this nomination.

HARRIS: Let's talk about packing –

PENCE: Once again, you gave a non-answer, Joe Biden gave a non-answer.

HARRIS: I'm trying to answer you now.

PENCE: The people deserve a straight answer. And if you haven't figured it out yet, the straight answer is they are going to pack the Supreme Court if they somehow win this election. I gotta tell you, people across this country, if you cherish our Supreme Court, if you cherish the separation of powers, you need to reject the Biden-Harris ticket come November the third and reelect President Donald Trump. We will stand by that separation powers and a nine seat Supreme Court.

HARRIS: Let's talk about packing the court then. Let's talk about.

PENCE: Please –

HARRIS: Yeah, I'm about to. So, the Trump-Pence administration has been – because I sit on the Senate Judiciary Committee, Susan, as you mentioned. And I've witnessed the appointments, for lifetime appointments to the federal courts, district courts, Courts of Appeal — people who are purely ideological people who have been reviewed by legal professional organizations and found to have been not competent, are substandard. And do you know that of the 50 people who President Trump appointed to the Court of Appeals for lifetime appointments, not one is black? This is what they've been doing. You want to talk about packing a court? Let's have that discussion.

PAGE: All right, thank you. Thank you, Senator. Let's go on and talk about the issue of racial justice.

PENCE: I just want the record to reflect, she never answered the question. Maybe the next debate Joe Biden will answer the question. But I think the American people know the answer.

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President. In March, Breonna Taylor, a 26-year-old emergency room technician in Louisville, was shot and killed after police officers executing a search warrant on a narcotics investigation broke into her apartment. The police said they identified themselves. Taylor's boyfriend said he didn't hear them do that. He used a gun registered to him to fire a shot, which wounded an officer. The officers then fired more than 20 rounds into the apartment. They say they were acting in self-defense. None of them have been indicted in connection with her death. Senator Harris, in the case of Breonna Taylor, was justice done? You have two minutes.

HARRIS: I don't believe so, and I've talked with Breonna's mother, Tamika Palmer, and her family, and her family deserves justice. She was a beautiful young woman. She had as her life goal to become a nurse, and she wanted to become an EMT to first learn what's going on out on the street, so she could then become a nurse and save lives. And her life was taken, unjustifiably and tragically and violently. And it just, it brings me to, you know, the eight minutes and 46 seconds that America

witnessed, during which an American man was tortured and killed under the knee of an armed, uniformed police officer. And people around our country, of every race, of every age, of every gender – perfect strangers to each other – marched shoulder to shoulder, arm and arm, fighting for us to finally achieve that ideal of equal justice under law. And I was a part of those peaceful protests. And I believe strongly that, first of all, we are never going to condone violence, but we always must fight for the values that we hold dear, including the fight to achieve our ideals. And that's why Joe Biden and I have said on this subject, look, and I'm a former career prosecutor. I know what I'm talking about. Bad cops are bad for good cops. We need reform of our policing in America and our criminal justice system, which is why Joe and I will immediately ban chokeholds and carotid holds. George Floyd would be alive today if we did that. We will require a national registry for police officers who break the law, we will – on the issue of criminal justice reform – get rid of private prisons and cash bail and we will decriminalize marijuana, and we will expunge the records of those who have been convicted of marijuana. This is a time for leadership. On a tragic, tragic issue…

PAGE: Thank you, Senator. Thank you, Senator Harris. Vice President Pence, let me pose the same question to you. In the case of Breonna Taylor, was justice done? You have two minutes, uninterrupted.

PENCE: Well, our heart breaks for the loss of any innocent American life, and the family of Breonna Taylor has our sympathies. But I trust our justice system, a grand jury that reviews the evidence. And it really is remarkable, that as a former prosecutor, you would assume that in a panel grand jury, looking at all the evidence, got it wrong. But you're entitled to your opinion, Senator. And with regard to George Floyd, there's no excuse for what happened to George Floyd. Justice will be served. But there's also no excuse for the rioting and looting that followed. I mean, it really is astonishing. Flora Westbrook is with us here tonight in Salt Lake City. Just a few weeks ago, I stood at what used to be her salon, was burned to the ground. By rioters and looters. And Flora is still trying to put her life back together. And I must tell ya, this, this presumption that you hear consistently from Joe Biden and Kamala Harris, that America is systemically racist. That as Joe Biden said, that he believes that law enforcement has an implicit bias against minorities, is a great insult to the men and women who serve in law enforcement. And I want everyone to know, who puts on the uniform of law enforcement every day, that President Trump and I stand with you. It is remarkable that when Senator Tim Scott tried to pass a police reform bill, brought together a group of Republicans and Democrats – Senator Harris, you got up and walked out of the room. And then you filibustered Senator Tim Scott's bill on the Senate floor that would have provided new accountability, new resources. But we don't have to

choose between supporting law enforcement, improving public safety, and supporting our African American neighbors and all of our minorities. Under President Trump's leadership –

PAGE: Thank you, Mr. Vice President

PENCE: – we will always stand with law enforcement and we'll do what we've done from day one which is improve the lives of African Americans. Record unemployment, record investments in education –

PAGE: Thank you, Mr. Vice President.

PENCE: – Fight for school choice, for –

PAGE: Senator Harris.

HARRIS: I will not sit here and be lectured by the Vice President on what it means to enforce the laws of our country. I am the only one on this stage who has personally prosecuted everything from child sexual assault to homicide. I'm the only one on this stage who has prosecuted the big banks for taking advantage of America's homeowners. I am the only one on this stage who prosecuted for-profit colleges for taking advantage of our veterans. And the reality of this is, that we are talking about an election in 27 days where last week, the President of the United States took a debate stage in front of 70 million Americans and refused to condemn white supremacists. And –

PENCE: Not true.

HARRIS: – it wasn't like he didn't have a chance. He didn't do it, and then he doubled down. And then he said, when pressed, 'Stand back. Stand by.' And this is a part of a pattern of Donald Trump's. He was – he called Mexicans rapists and criminals. He instituted as his first act a Muslim ban. He, on the issue of Charlottesville, where people were peacefully protesting the need for racial justice, where a young woman was killed and on the other side there were neo-Nazis carrying tiki torches shouting racial epithets, anti semitic slurs. And Donald Trump, when asked about it, said there were fine people on both sides. This is who we have as the President of the United States. And America, you deserve better. Joe Biden will be a president who brings our country together.

PAGE: Senator Harris –

HARRIS: – and recognizes the beauty in our diversity and the fact that we all have so much more in common than what separates us.

PAGE: Vice President Pence, let me give you a minute to respond.

PENCE: Thank you, Susan. I appreciate that very much. I think that's one of the things that makes people dislike the media so much in this country, Susan. That you selectively edit, just like Senator Harris did, comments that President Trump and I, and others on our side of the aisle make. Senator Harris conveniently omitted, after the President made comments about people on either side of the debate over monuments, he condemned the KKK, neo-Nazis and white supremacists and has done so repeatedly. Your concern that he doesn't condemn neo-Nazis – President Trump has Jewish grandchildren. His daughter and son-in-law are Jewish. This is a president who respects and cherishes all of the American people. But you talk about having personally prosecuted – I'm glad you brought up your record, Senator.

PAGE: Thank you.

PENCE: I really need to make this point. When you were DA in San Francisco, when you left office, African Americans were 19 times more likely to be prosecuted for minor drug offenses than whites and Hispanics. When you were Attorney General of California, you increased the disproportionate incarceration of Blacks in California. You did nothing on criminal justice reform in California. You didn't lift a finger to pass the first step back on Capitol Hill. The reality is, your record speaks for itself. President Trump and I have fought for criminal justice, for –

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President Pence

PENCE: – fought for educational choice and opportunities for African Americans –

PAGE: Thank you, sir.

PENCE: And we'll do it for four more.

PAGE: Thank you. You know there is no more important issue than the final issue that we're going to talk about tonight, and that is the issue of the election itself.

HARRIS: Susan, he attacked my record. I would like an opportunity to respond.

PAGE: Let me give you 30 seconds because we're running out of time.

HARRIS: I appreciate that. First of all, having served as the Attorney General of the State of California, the work that I did is a model of what our nation needs to do and we will be able to do under a Joe Biden presidency. Our agenda includes what this administration has failed to do. It will be about not only instituting a ban on chokeholds and carotid holes.

PAGE: Thank you.

HARRIS: I would like to go through –

PAGE: These are points that you made earlier in the hour and I want to talk about the election itself before we have to –

HARRIS: But I want to talk about the connection between what Joe and I will do and my record, which includes – I was the first state-wide officer to institute a requirement that my agents would wear body cameras and keep them on full time. We were the first to initiate a requirement that there would be a training for law enforcement on implicit bias, because yes, Joe Biden and I recognize that implicit bias does exist, Mr. Vice President, contrary to what you may believe. We did the work of instituting reforms that were about investing in re-entry. This is the work that we have done and the work we will do going forward and, again, I will not be lectured by the Vice President, on our record of what we have done in terms of law enforcement and keeping our community safe and a commitment to reforming the criminal justice system of America.

PAGE: Thank you, Senator Harris, and I'd like to pose the – I'd like you to respond first to the question on our final topic, the election itself. President Trump has, several times, refused to commit himself to a peaceful transfer of power after the election. If your ticket wins and President Trump refuses to accept a peaceful transfer of power, what steps would you and Vice President Biden then take? What would happen next? You have two minutes.

HARRIS: So, I'll tell you. Joe and I are particularly proud of the coalition that we've built around our campaign. We probably have one of the broadest coalitions of folks that you've ever seen in a presidential race. Of course, we have the support of Democrats, but also independents and Republicans, in fact, seven members of President George W. Bush's cabinet are supporting our ticket. We have the support of Colin Powell, Cindy McCain, John Kasich, over 500 generals, retired generals, and former national security experts and advisors are supporting our campaign. And I believe they are doing that because they know that Joe Biden has a deep, deep-seated commitment to fight for our democracy, and to fight for the integrity of our democracy, and to bring integrity back to the White House. And so, we believe in the American people. We believe in our democracy. And here's what I'd like to say to everybody: vote. Please vote, vote early, come up with a plan to vote, go to IWillVote.com. You can also go to joebiden.com. We have it within our power in these next 27 days to make the decision about what will be the course of our country for the next four years. And it is within our power, and if we use our vote, and we use our voice, we will win. And we will not let anyone subvert our democracy, with what Donald Trump has been doing as he did on the debate stage last week, when again in front of 70 million people, he openly attempted to suppress the vote. Joe Biden, on the other hand, on that same debate stage – because clearly Donald Trump doesn't think he

can run on a record because it's a failed record – Joe Biden on that stage, said, 'Hey, just please vote.' So, I'll repeat what Joe said. Please vote.

PAGE: Thank you, Senator. Vice President Pence, President Trump has several times refused to commit himself to a peaceful transfer of power after the election. If Vice President Biden is declared the winner and President Trump refuses to accept a peaceful transfer of power, what would be your role and responsibility as Vice President? What would you personally do? You have two minutes.

PENCE: Well, Susan, first and foremost, I think we're gonna win this election. Because while Joe Biden and Kamala Harris rattle off a long litany, the establishment in Washington DC and the establishment Joe Biden's been a part of for 47 years. President Donald Trump has launched a movement of everyday Americans from every walk of life. And I have every confidence that the same Americans that delivered that historic victory in 2016, they see this President's record, where we rebuild our military, we revived our economy through tax cuts and rolling back regulation, fighting for fair trade, unleashing American energy. We appointed conservatives to our federal courts at every level. And we stood with the men and women of law enforcement every single day, and I think, I think that movement of Americans has only grown stronger in the last four years. When you talk about accepting the outcome of the election, I must tell you, Senator, your party has spent the last three and a half years trying to overturn the results of the last election. It's amazing. When Joe Biden was vice president of the United States, the FBI actually spied on President Trump and my campaign. I mean there were documents released this week that the CIA actually made a referral to the FBI documenting that those allegations were coming from the Hillary Clinton campaign, and of course, we've all seen the avalanche with the — what, what you put the country through, for the better part of three years, until it was found that there was no obstruction, no collusion, case closed. And then Senator Harris, you and your colleagues in the Congress tried to impeach the President of the United States, over a phone call. And now Hillary Clinton has actually said to Joe Biden that under, in her words, under no circumstances should he concede the election. So let me just say, I think we're gonna win this election. President Trump and I are fighting every day in courthouses to prevent Joe Biden and Kamala Harris from changing the rules and creating this universal mail-in voting, that'll create a massive opportunity for voter fraud. We have a free and fair election; we know we're going to have confidence in it. And I believe in all my heart that President Donald Trump's gonna be reelected for four more years.

PAGE: You know I've, I've asked – I've written all the questions that I've asked tonight, but for the final question of the debate, I'd like to read a question that someone else wrote. The Utah Debate Commission asked students in the state to write essays about what they would like to ask you. And I

want to close tonight's debate with the question posed by Brecklynn Brown. She's an eighth grader at Springville Junior High in Springville, Utah, and here's what she wrote. Quote – "When I watch the news, all I see is arguing between Democrats and Republicans. When I watch the news, all I see is citizen fighting against citizen. When I watch the news, all I see are two candidates from opposing parties, trying to tear each other down. If our leaders can't get along, how are the citizens supposed to get along?" And then she added, "Your examples could make all the difference to bring us together" – end quote. So to each of you, in turn, I'd like you to take one minute, and respond to Brecklynn. Vice President Pence, you have one minute.

PENCE: Brecklynn, it's a wonderful question. And let me just commend you for taking an interest in public life. I started following the news when I was very young. And in America, we believe in a free and open exchange of debate. And we celebrate that, and it's how we've created literally the freest and most prosperous nation in the history of the world. I would tell you that – don't assume that what you're seeing on your local news networks is synonymous with the American people. You know, I look at the relationship between Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, the late justice who we just lost from the Supreme Court, and the late Justice Antonin Scalia. They were on polar opposites, on the Supreme Court of the United States – one very liberal, one very conservative. But what's been learned since her passing was the two of them and their families were the very closest of friends. Here in America, we can disagree, we can debate vigorously as Senator Harris and I have on this stage tonight. But when the debate is over, we come together as Americans. And that's what people do in big cities and small towns all across this country, so I just want to encourage you, Brecklynn, I want to tell you that we're going to work every day to have a government as good as our people, the American people, each and every day. We love a good debate. We love a good argument. But we always come together and are always there for one another in times of need. And we've especially learned that through the difficulties of this year.

PAGE: Thank you, Vice President. Senator Harris, what would you say to Brecklynn?

HARRIS: First of all, I love hearing from our young leaders, and when I hear her words, when I hear your words, Brecklynn, I know our future is bright, because it is that perspective on who we are and who we should be – that is a sign of leadership and is something we should all aspire to be.

And that you know that brings me to Joe. Joe Biden – one of the reasons that Joe decided to run for president, is after Charlottesville, which we talked about earlier, it so troubled him and upset him, like it did all of us, that there was that kind of hate and division. What propelled Joe to run for president was to see that, over the course of the last four years, what Brecklynn described has been happening. Joe has a long-standing reputation of working across the aisle and working in a bipartisan

way. And that's what he's going to do as President. Joe Biden has a history of lifting people up and fighting for their dignity. You mean you have to know Joe's story to know that Joe has known pain, he has known suffering, and he has known love. And so, Brecklynn, when you think about the future, I do believe the future is bright. And it will be because of your leadership, and it will be, because we fight for each person's voice through their vote. And we get engaged in this election, because you have the ability through your work, and through, eventually, your vote. To determine the future of our country, and what its leadership looks like.

PAGE: Thank you, Senator Harris, thank you, Vice President Pence. Thank you so much for being with us tonight. We want to thank, also, the University of Utah for its hospitality, and most of all our thanks to all the Americans who watched this debate tonight. Again, our best wishes for a quick recovery to President Trump, the First Lady and everyone who is battling COVID-19. The second presidential debate is next week on October 15, a town hall style debate in Miami. We hope you'll join us then. Good evening.