

Mr. Chairman, delegates, and fellow citizens: I am honored to be considered for the nomination for vice president of the United States. [...] I accept the challenge of a tough fight in this election against confident opponents at a crucial hour for our country. And I accept the privilege of serving with a man who has come through much harder missions ... and met far graver challenges and knows how tough fights are won — the next president of the United States, John S. McCain.

Our nominee for president is a true profile in courage, and people like that are hard to come by. He's a man who wore the uniform of this country for 22 years and refused to break faith with those troops in Iraq who have now brought victory within sight. And as the mother of one of those troops, that is exactly the kind of man I want as commander in chief. I'm just one of many moms who'll say an extra prayer each night for our sons and daughters going into harm's way. Our son Track is 19. And one week from tomorrow — Sept. 11 — he'll deploy to Iraq with the Army infantry in the service of his country. My nephew Kasey also enlisted and serves on a carrier in the Persian Gulf. My family is proud of both of them and of all the fine men and women serving the country in uniform. Track is the eldest of our five children. [...]

Our family has the same ups and downs as any other — the same challenges and the same joys. [...] [T]here is much to like and admire about our opponent. But listening to him speak, it's easy to forget that this is a man who has authored two memoirs but not a single major law or reform — not even in the state Senate.

This is a man who can give an entire speech about the wars America is fighting and never use the word "victory" except when he's talking about his own campaign. But when the cloud of rhetoric has passed ... when the roar of the crowd fades away ... when the stadium lights go out, and those Styrofoam Greek columns are hauled back to some studio lot — what exactly is our opponent's plan? What does he actually seek to accomplish, after he's done turning back the waters and healing the planet? The answer is to make government bigger ... take more of your money ... give you more orders from Washington ... and to reduce the strength of America in a dangerous world. America needs more energy ... our opponent is against producing it.

Victory in Iraq is finally in sight ... he wants to forfeit. Terrorist states are seeking nuclear weapons without delay ... he wants to meet them without preconditions.

Al-Qaida terrorists still plot to inflict catastrophic harm on America ... he's worried that someone won't read them their rights? Government is too big ... he wants to grow it.

Congress spends too much ... he promises more. Taxes are too high ... he wants to raise them. His tax increases are the fine print in his economic plan, and let me be specific.

The Democratic nominee for president supports plans to raise income taxes ... raise payroll taxes ... raise investment income taxes ... raise the death tax ... raise business taxes ... and increase the tax burden on the American people by hundreds of billions of dollars. My sister Heather and her husband have just built a service station that's now opened for business — like millions of others who run small businesses.

Governor Sarah Palin's speech at the Republican National Convention, September 3, 2008

A CENTURY has passed since Washington wrote “To be prepared for war is the most effectual means to promote peace”. We pay to this maxim the lip loyalty we so often pay to Washington's words; but it has never sunk deep into our hearts. [...]

5 IN THIS country there is not the slightest danger of an over-development of warlike spirit, and there never has been any such danger. In all our history there has never been a time when preparedness for war was any menace to peace. On the contrary, again and again we have owed peace to the fact that we were prepared for war; and in the only contest which we have had with a European power since the Revolution, the War of 1812, the struggle and all its attendant disasters were due solely to the fact that we were not prepared to face, and were not ready
10 instantly to resent, an attack upon our honor and interest; while the glorious triumphs at sea which redeemed that war were due to the few preparations which we had actually made. We are a great peaceful nation; a nation of merchants and manufacturers, of farmers and mechanics; a nation of workingmen, who labor incessantly with head or hand. It is idle to talk of such a nation ever being led into a course of wanton aggression or conflict with military powers by the
15 possession of a sufficient navy.

THE DANGER is of precisely the opposite character. If we forget that in the last resort we can only secure peace by being ready and willing to fight for it, we may someday have bitter cause to realize that a rich nation which is slothful, timid, or unwieldy is an easy prey for any people which still retains those most valuable of all qualities, the soldierly virtues. We but keep to the traditions of Washington, to the traditions of all the great Americans who struggled for the real
20 greatness of America, when we strive to build up those fighting qualities for the lack of which in a nation, as in an individual, no refinement, no culture, no wealth, no material prosperity, can atone.

PREPARATION for war is the surest guaranty for peace. Arbitration is an excellent thing, but
25 ultimately those who wish to see this country at peace with foreign nations will be wise if they place reliance upon a first-class fleet of first-class battleships rather than on any arbitration treaty which the wit of man can devise. Nelson said that the British fleet was the best negotiator in Europe, and there was much truth in the saying. Moreover, while we are sincere and earnest in our advocacy of peace, we must not forget that an ignoble peace is worse than any war...

30 PEACE is a goddess only when she comes with sword girt on thigh. [...] Cowardice in a race, as in an individual, is the unpardonable sin, and a willful failure to prepare for any danger may in its effects be as bad as cowardice. The timid man who cannot fight, and the selfish, short-sighted, or foolish man who will not take the steps that will enable him to fight, stand on almost the same plane...

35 THIS NATION cannot stand still if it is to retain its self-respect, and to keep undimmed the honorable traditions inherited from the men who with the sword founded it and by the sword preserved it.... No nation should ever wage war wantonly, but no nation should ever avoid it at the cost of the loss of national honor. A nation should never fight unless forced to; but it should always be ready to fight. The mere fact that it is ready will generally spare it the necessity of
40 fighting....

Theodore Roosevelt, “Navy Address”, Naval War College – Newport, R.I. June 2, 1897

Labour Manifesto. 1945 (<http://web.univ-pau.fr/~parsons/labmanif.html>)

VICTORY IN WAR MUST BE FOLLOWED BY A PROSPEROUS PEACE

[...] So far as Britain's contribution is concerned, this war will have been won by its people, not by any one man or set of men, though strong and greatly valued leadership has been given to the high resolve of the people in the present struggle. And in this leadership the Labour Ministers have taken their full share of burdens and responsibilities. The record of the Labour Ministers has been one of hard tasks well done since that fateful day in May, 1940, when the initiative of Labour in Parliament brought about the fall of the Chamberlain Government and the formation of the new War Government which has led the country to victory.

The people made tremendous efforts to win the last war also. But when they had won it they lacked a lively interest in the social and economic problems of peace, and accepted the election promises of the leaders of the anti-Labour parties at their face value. [...] The people lost that peace. [...]

Great economic blizzards swept the world in those years. The great inter-war slumps were not acts of God or of blind forces. They were the sure and certain result of the concentration of too much economic power in the hands of too few men.. [...]

But the war in the East is not yet over. [...] A short boom period after the war, when savings, gratuities and post-war credits are there to be spent, can make a profiteer's paradise. But Big Business knows that this will happen only if the people vote into power the party which promises to get rid of the controls and so let the profiteers and racketeers have that freedom for which they are pleading eloquently on every Tory platform and in every Tory newspaper.

They accuse the Labour Party of wishing to impose controls for the sake of control. That is not true, and they know it. What is true is that the anti-controllers and anti-planners desire to sweep away public controls, simply in order to give the profiteering interests and the privileged rich an entirely free hand to plunder the rest of the nation as shamelessly as they did in the nineteen-twenties. [...]

The Labour Party stands for order as against the chaos which would follow the end of all public control. We stand for order, for positive constructive progress as against the chaos of economic do-as-they-please anarchy.

The Labour Party makes no baseless promises. The future will not be easy. But this time the peace must be won. The Labour Party offers the nation a plan which will win the Peace for the People.

WHAT THE ELECTION WILL BE ABOUT

[...] The nation wants food, work and homes. It wants more than that-it wants good food in plenty, useful work for all, and comfortable, labour-saving homes that take full advantage of the resources of modern science and productive industry. It wants a high and rising standard of living, security for all against a rainy day, an educational system that will give every boy and girl a chance to develop the best that is in them.

These are the aims. In themselves they are no more than words. All parties may declare that in principle they agree with them. But the test of a political programme is whether it is sufficiently in earnest about the objectives to adopt the means needed to realise them. [...]

The Labour Party is a Socialist Party, and proud of it. Its ultimate purpose at home is the establishment of the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain-free, democratic, efficient, progressive, public-spirited, its material resources organised in the service of the British people. [...]

Speech by Gordon Brown. Tuesday 27 February 2007

The chancellor spoke today at a seminar on Britishness at the Commonwealth club, London.

(...) A few years ago less than half - 46% - identified closely with being British. But today national identity has become far more important: it is not 46% but 65% - two thirds - who now identify Britishness as important, and recent surveys show that British people feel more patriotic about their country than almost other European country.

- 5 One reason is that Britain has a unique history - and what has emerged from the long tidal flows of British history - from the 2,000 years of successive waves of invasion, immigration, assimilation and trading partnerships, from the uniquely rich, open and outward looking culture - is I believe a distinctive set of British values which influence British institutions.

10 Indeed a multinational state, with England, Scotland, Wales and now Northern Ireland we are a country united not so much by race or ethnicity but by shared values that have shaped shared institutions. Indeed, when people are asked what they think is important about being British many say our institutions: from the monarchy and the national anthem to the Church of England, the BBC and our sports teams.

- 15 But when people are also asked what they admire about Britain, more usually says it is our values: - British tolerance, the British belief in liberty and the British sense of fair play. Even before America said in its constitution it was the land of liberty and erected the Statue of Liberty, I think Britain can lay claim to the idea of liberty.

Out of the necessity of finding a way to live together in a multinational state came the practice of tolerance, then the pursuit of liberty and the principle of fairness to all.

- 20 Indeed Britain is a country that not only prides itself in its fairness, tolerance and what George Orwell called decency but - as we have seen in recent debates like that over the Big Brother show - wants to be defined by it, defined by being a tolerant, fair and decent country.

25 And there is a golden thread which runs through British history - that runs from that long-ago day in Runnymede in 1215 when arbitrary power was fully challenged with the Magna Carta, on to the first bill of rights in 1689 where Britain became the first country where parliament asserted power over the king, to the democratic reform acts - throughout the individual standing firm against tyranny and then - an even more generous, expansive view of liberty - the idea of all government accountable to the people, evolving into the exciting idea of empowering citizens to control their own lives.

- 30 Just as it was in the name of liberty that in the 1800s Britain led the world in abolishing the slave trade - something we celebrate in 2007 - so too, in the 1940s, in the name of liberty, Britain stood firm against fascism, which is why I would oppose those who say we should do less to teach that period of our history in our schools.

35 But, woven also into that golden thread of liberty are countless strands of common, continuing endeavour in our villages, towns and cities - the efforts and popular achievements of ordinary men and women, with one sentiment in common - a strong sense of duty. (...)

And the Britain of fairness to every individual we see expressed most of all in Britain's unique national health service, health care free of charge to all who need it, founded not on ability to pay but on need (...)