

A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF ZOHRAN MAMDANI'S VICTORY SPEECH: A SPEECH ACT THEORY APPROACH

Sadia Khan

*Lecturer in English, School of Foreign Languages, Bandırma Onyedi Eylül
University, Türkiye*

E-Mail: sadiakhan@bandirma.edu.tr

Sahibzada Wasim Iqbal

PhD Scholar, Department of English. FATA University, KP

E-Mail: wasim_sahib@yahoo.com

Dr. Akbar Ali

(Corresponding Author)

*Head of the Department of English/Assistant Professor, Department of English,
FATA University, Darra Adam Khel, FR Kohat, KP, Pakistan*

E-Mail: akbar@fu.edu.pk

Abstract

This paper analyses Zohran Mamdani's speech on his election victory using speech act theory, which focuses on the functions of political language as action rather than just a form of communication. The study aligns itself to the work of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) applying the locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary perspective and the classification of speech acts used in the locutionary according to Searle (1969) assertives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations, respectively, the study has two objectives; firstly, to determine and categorise the speech acts used in the Mamdani address, and secondly, to analyse how these acts pragmatically enlist audiences and build political meaning. A qualitative discourse-analytic approach was used to transcribe and analyse the speech line by line to discover the pragmatic force of the utterances. These results demonstrate that Mamdani incorporates several speech acts in a stratified manner in his speech. Assertives are claims of ideological truth, and they include claims such as 'housing is a human right' and 'hope is alive'. Orders get the listeners into action and participation. Commissives are promises that would bind the speaker to rent freezes, free buses, and free childcare. The expressives are a sign of appreciation and accessibility that confirms marginalised groups and builds solidarity. Pragmatically, such acts create a sense of hope, build trust, and make passive listeners active participants in a movement. The placement of the speech of Mamdani into the context of a more general tradition of political discourse analysis extends the already existing literature with its emphasis on the role of expressives and directives at the grassroots level of mobilisation, and also innovative ways in which political meaning is generated by means of commitments expressed in a concrete, politically oriented commissive. Finally, the study ratifies the victory speech not only as a celebratory but also as a performative leadership gesture, a gesture of unity, and a gesture of change, with the power to transform political reality and empower the community.

Keywords: Pragmatic analysis, Political discourse, Speech act theory, Locutionary act, Illocutionary act, Perlocutionary act, Zohran Mamdani, America, NewYork, Mayor elections

INTRODUCTION

Political language is not just a means of information transfer but also a powerful tool for creating social realities. Pragmatic analysis examines meaning construction in context, focusing on the meaning implied, the speaker's intentions, and the audience's interpretation. According to the University of Sheffield, pragmatics examines the application of linguistic signs, words, and sentences in real-life situations, and this is because meaning is created by interaction and context

as opposed to literal semantics. In the same manner, MasterClass defines pragmatics as the component of linguistics that concerns what the speaker means and what the listener imagines, depending on the surrounding circumstances and mental activity. By examining the performativity and persuasiveness of political speech, we can move beyond its surface content and investigate its deeper dimensions. Speech Act Theory is one of the most powerful strategies in pragmatics, developed by J.L. Austin and subsequently elaborated by John Searle. In asserting that utterances could act rather than describe states of affairs, Austin introduced the distinction between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts (Austin, 1962). Searle further generalised them into five: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations, each representing the illocutionary force of language (Searle, 1969; ThoughtCo, 2025). Such a theoretical prism is especially applicable to cases of political speeches, when politicians choose words to proclaim their accomplishments, set a course, appeal to the masses, and create shared identities. It has been shown in earlier studies that pragmatic strategies are helpful in the analysis of political discourse. Drămnescu (2016) emphasises the practical definition of discourse analysis, which shows how language can be used strategically in political communication, and then discusses how intention and context lead to persuasion. Khater et al. (2024) applied the Speech Act Theory to one of King Abdullah II's national addresses, demonstrating how speech acts can bind people together and express shared values. Likewise, Azam (2024) reviewed the speech of Shahbaz Sharif, the Pakistani President who won the elections, and found that the combination of speech acts and rhetorical devices built persuasive appeals. These works are firm reminders that political speeches are not impartial discourses of power, solidarity, and ideological formulations but practices of power performing practices. It is against this context that the current paper utilises pragmatic analysis, drawing on Speech Act Theory, to examine Zohran Mamdani's victory speech. Through analysing the illocutionary force of his words, claiming Housing as a right, stating historic change, and making the promise to act on behalf of tenants, this study aims to prove how political speech comprises action and mobilisation of the audiences and the redefinition of socio-political realities.

The following are the objectives of the research:

1. To analyse the victory speech given by Zohran Mamdani through the application of Speech Act Theory to determine the different speech act types.
2. To investigate the role the Mamdani speech plays pragmatically in addressing audiences and creating political meaning.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The pragmatic and speech-act approaches have analysed political discourse, where language in this context serves both as communication and as action. The basis was set by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), who showed that utterances could perform actions such as declarations, promises, or demands. The framework has been utilised across different contexts to reveal how political leaders mobilise audiences through the construction of ideological realities. Drămnescu (2016) highlighted that pragmatic discourse analysis reveals the strategic use of language in political communication, as leaders employ directives and commissives to demonstrate authority and support. Khater et al. (2024) analyzed a national address by King Abdullah II, and it is demonstrated that speech acts bring citizens closer together and strengthen their shared values. The article by Azam (2024) focuses on the victory speech of Shahbaz Sharif in Pakistan, where assertiveness and declarations are key elements of persuasive appeal. These works emphasise the performative aspect of a political speech across different cultural settings. Other scholars have

extended this question. Fairclough (1995) and Van (1997) believed that political discourse reproduces power structures, and pragmatic analysis provides information about how micro-level speech acts contribute to macro-level ideological presentation. The use of political language as the instrument of legitimisation was discussed by Chilton (2004), whereas Wilson (2015) identified how the use of speech acts during the parliamentary debates serves to undermine or support the authority of institutions. The most recent analysis of Barack Obama's speeches was conducted by Al-Hindawi and Al-Azzawi (2018), who demonstrated how commissives and declarations were used to spread hope and present the image of a leader. Also, Al-Momani (2019) examined Donald Trump's campaign speeches and found that directives and assertives were strategically used to mobilize populist sentiment. In recent decades, emphasis has been placed on political discourse, especially the rhetoric of American Presidents. Researchers have increasingly turned to corpus-based and critical discourse analysis (CDA) approaches to study how political leaders use language to construct narratives, mobilize supporters and draw in-group and out-group lines. For instance, Gill and her colleagues (2025) and Raza and his colleagues (2024) compare the inaugural speeches of Trump and Biden; their discourse shows a difference in rhetorical processes as well: Trump's speech resembles assertive information delivery and invocation of the audience, whereas the rhetoric of Biden leans towards empathy, unity, and democratic values. Both of the leaders, however, use devices, such as lexicalization, victimization, populism, metaphor, and modality, to fashion their public personas and public policy agenda. Further empirical research has explored the finer details of self-presentation and opposition in political speech. Raza et al. (2024b) and Imran et al. (2024) address the effort that Trump made to create division and nationalism and authoritative statements compared with Biden's resilience and constructive leadership. This analysis of hedges and boosters by Raza et al. (2025c) highlights the contrast between Trump's assertive and urgent tone, and Biden's more inclusive and cautious approach.

Notwithstanding these strengths of the studies, very little has been done on a pragmatic research into progressive American politicians, including Zohran Mamdani, whose analysis is based on housing justice and equity. The current literature has concentrated on the Middle East, South Asia, and presidential situations, and little has been done on grassroots-based victory speeches in the US. This gap provides no information on how Mamdani achieves the pragmatic effect of mobilising his audiences and creating political meaning with the use of his speech acts, assertives, directives, commissives, and declarations.

METHODOLOGY

The present research is based on a qualitative research design for pragmatic analysis. The primary datum comprises Zohran Mamdani's victory speech, delivered on 4 November 2025 after being elected mayor of New York City, defeating Andrew Cuomo. The theoretical perspective used to analyse the speech is the theory of Speech Act (Austin, 1962; 1969). It was written down and evaluated to identify the many speech acts, such as assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations, that were present in the text. The analytical process involved three stages: data collection, where transcripts and media reports were grouped; categorization, where the utterances were grouped into three operations: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts; and interpretation, where each act was assessed by its pragmatic operation, that is, how language mobilises the audiences and generates political meaning. This approach to the method allows for this type of systematic study of the functioning of Mamdani oration as a form of political action rather than a form of communication.

Data Analysis: This paper used the Speech Act Theory to analyse Zohran Mamdani's speech, conducting a careful, line-by-line analysis to identify its locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary elements. The utterances were categorised into the five main speech act types used by Searle: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. Assertives came up in which Mamdani stated truths or beliefs, such as 'Housing is a human right'. Instructions were issued in the form of extensions of the call-to-action phrase, like "We are not asking; we are demanding." The commissives were reflected in the promises to continue the fight for housing justice. Expressives took place when gratitude or emotional appeal is to be shown, such as a thank you to the persons who helped the other person. The historic value of the win was represented by the use of the declarations, as in Tonight we made history. The paper not only delves into the illocutionary power of these utterances but also examines their perlocutionary power, namely, mobilising audiences, inspiring solidarity, and redefining housing policy as a moral imperative. The analysis shows that the linguistic choices Mamdani makes in the form of systematic classification and interpretation pragmatically realise political action and create collective meaning.

FINDINGS

Locutionary Acts: In the opening of Zohran Mamdani's victory speech, the locutionary acts are the literal words and descriptive utterances he uses to set the scene and acknowledge his audience. He begins with a direct expression of gratitude: "*Thank you, my friends*", which is a simple but powerful locutionary act that establishes the tone of appreciation. He then invokes a historical reference, quoting Eugene Debs: "*The sun may have set over our city this evening, but... I can see the dawn of a better day for humanity.*" This utterance, at the locutionary level, is a statement that juxtaposes the imagery of sunset and dawn, conveying a shift from hardship to hope. Mamdani continues with vivid descriptions of the working class: "*Fingers bruised from lifting boxes on the warehouse floor, palms calloused from delivery bike handlebars, knuckles scarred with kitchen burns.*" These are locutionary acts in the form of descriptive sentences that paint a concrete picture of physical labor and suffering. He then asserts: "*These are not hands that have been allowed to hold power, and yet over the last 12 months, you have dared to reach for something greater.*" At the locutionary level, this is a factual statement about exclusion and resistance. Finally, he declares: "*Tonight, against all odds, we have grasped it. The future is in our hands.*" This is another locutionary act, literally stating that victory has been achieved and that power now belongs to ordinary people. Taken together, these locutionary acts provide the raw linguistic material of the speech: expressions of thanks, historical quotations, descriptive imagery, and factual assertions. They are the surface-level utterances that, when analyzed further, reveal deeper illocutionary intentions and perlocutionary effects. Mamdani's locutionary acts are the literal words and descriptive statements that form the surface meaning of his speech. He begins with factual assertions: "*New York, we have answered those fears. Tonight, we have spoken in a clear voice. Hope is alive.*" At the locutionary level, these are straightforward declarations of victory and resilience. He continues with a descriptive recounting of collective action: "*More than a million of us stood in our churches, in gymnasiums, in community centers as we filled in the ledger of democracy.*" This is a locutionary act of narration, presenting the physical act of voting as evidence of democratic participation. His repetition of "*hope over tyranny, hope over big money and small ideas, hope over despair*" is another locutionary act, literally listing contrasts to emphasize the choice voters make.

Later, Mamdani quotes Jawaharlal Nehru: *"A moment comes but rarely in history, when we step out from the old to the new..."* a locutionary act of citation that brings historical authority into his speech. He also outlines policy proposals in literal terms: freezing rents, making buses free, delivering universal childcare, hiring teachers, cutting bureaucracy, and improving housing conditions. These are locutionary acts of policy description that state concrete measures. Toward the end, Mamdani engages in call-and-response with the audience: *"Together, New York, we're going to freeze the?"* Audience: *"Rent."* This is a locutionary act of dialogue, literally exchanging words with supporters. Finally, his closing *"New York, this power, it's yours. This city belongs to you. Thank you."* is a locutionary act of direct address and gratitude. Collectively, these locutionary acts provide the raw linguistic material: factual statements, descriptive narration, quotations, policy outlines, and interactive dialogue.

Illocutionary Acts: In the opening of Mamdani's victory speech, the illocutionary force of his words transforms literal statements into performative acts that carry intention and power. When he begins with *"Thank you, my friends"*, the illocutionary act is expressive, conveying gratitude and appreciation to his supporters. This is not merely a polite phrase but an act of recognition that strengthens the bond between leader and audience. His quotation of Eugene Debs — *"The sun may have set over our city this evening, but... I can see the dawn of a better day for humanity"* — functions as an assertive, affirming hope and situating his victory within a broader ideological struggle. By invoking Debs, Mamdani not only describes but also aligns himself with a tradition of working-class resistance, thereby performing an act of ideological positioning. When he vividly describes the hands of workers — *"Fingers bruised... knuckles scarred..."* — the illocutionary act is again assertive, presenting these images as evidence of exclusion from power. Yet when he declares *"Tonight, against all odds, we have grasped it. The future is in our hands"*, the illocutionary act shifts to a declaration, symbolically enacting a transfer of power from elites to ordinary people. This declaration does not simply describe victory; it performs it, making the audience participants in a new political reality. Similarly, his statement *"We have toppled a political dynasty"* combines an assertive (stating a fact) and a declarative (enacting a rupture with the old order). Finally, his repetition of *"a mandate for change, a mandate for a new kind of politics, a mandate for a city we can afford"* is a directive that urges institutions and citizens to embrace transformation. These illocutionary acts — expressives, assertives, declarations, and directives — illustrate how Mamdani's speech is not passive communication but active performance, showing how they pragmatically mobilize audiences and construct political meaning. Beyond the literal words, Mamdani's utterances carry illocutionary force, performing actions through language. His opening *"Hope is alive"* is an assertive affirmation of optimism's endurance despite adversity. His recounting of collective voting — *"More than a million of us stood in our churches..."* — is also an assertive, presenting evidence of democratic strength. The repetition of *"hope over tyranny, hope over big money..."* functions as a declaration, symbolically enacting hope as the defining choice of the people. Quoting Nehru is an assertive declaration that aligns his movement with historical transitions and enacts a symbolic "new age." When he outlines policies — freezing rents, free buses, universal childcare — these are commissives, promising future action and binding himself to deliver. His statement *"Safety and justice will go hand in hand"* is both an assertive (stating a principle) and a directive (urging institutions to act accordingly). His quote "Safety and justice will go hand in hand" is an assertive (proclaiming a principle) but a directive (encouraging institutions to take some action). His denial of the division, "We will not permit those who deal in hate to set us one against the

other" is a statement that makes unity a political fact. The address to the audience, as a call and response, - *Together, New York, we are going to freeze the? Rent.*" -- is an imperative, a unification of mass affirmation and participation. Lastly, he ends his speech with *"This power, it is yours. This city is yours"* is a statement which gives political authority to the citizens. In this regard therefore, the illocutionary acts here are assertives, commissives, directives, expressives and declarations since we can see that Mamdani speech is active and not a description of the performance of political action.

Perlocutionary Acts: The first part of Mamdani highlights the perlocutionary acts in how his words are intended and actually received by the audience. His thanksgiving, which begins with *"Thank You, my friends"* generates the perlocutionary effect of a warm welcome and inclusion and his supporters feel recognised and appreciated. Quoting Eugene Debs and stating that he can see the beginning of a better day of humanity, Mamdani gives hope that the listeners can see that they are winning a bigger battle in history. The graphic description of the hands of workers - - *Fingers bruised... knuckles scarred...* produces sympathy and pride making the audience remember about their sacrifices and inculcating in them a sense of dignity in their work. When he says, *Tonight, we have reached it against all odds. The future is our hands,* the perlocutionary effect is empowerment: audiences are manipulated in order to think that they are the ones who have political power, not the candidate alone. The fact that he tells us that *we have overthrown a political dynasty,* is triumphant and collective agency, further leading to the point that it removes systems that cannot be overthrown by ordinary people. Lastly, the repetition of the *a mandate for change, a mandate for a new kind of politics, a mandate for a city we can afford* brings urgency and persuasion to the audiences that change can and is necessary. The acts of perlocution reflect the way that Mamdani uses speech to mobilise audiences in a pragmatic way to convert passive listeners to the active participants of a new political reality. Consistent with objectives, analysis of his perlocutionary activity reveals that his words are not just describing victory but building solidarity, giving hope, making people feel that they should be responsible as a collective. Perlocutionary impacts of this passage tell us about the effect that the words of Mamdani have on the audience on their emotional, cognitive, and behavioural levels. His first words, which are, *Hope is alive,* are encouraging, as they assure the audience that they are not fighting in vain. The sheer description of masses voting creates pride and unity, and makes the viewer remember that they are collectively working on democracy. The use of the phrase *hope over tyranny, hope over despair,* is repeated in a way that has an emotional impact and makes the listeners believe that they too can bring change. Nehru quote gives historical legitimacy, which makes viewers want to see their victory as an installment of a bigger cultural struggle. With his campaign vows and wants such as free rent, free rides, free childcare his policy promise creates some hope and a feeling of trust, because audiences believe that positive changes will be made. His denial of classifying and intolerance help bring people together, increasing the fear less and building up social ties. The appeal-response to the audience creates excitement and activity and turns passive listeners into active co-authors of the agenda. Lastly, his own conclusion - *This power, it's yours. This city is yours*" -- creates a sense of empowerment, and it makes the listeners feel that they own the political process. These perlocutionary acts achieve the objectives by demonstrating that Mamdani uses the speech pragmatically to mobilise the audiences, to give them hope and to create political meaning in the process of touching the hearts and connecting with the masses.

Pragmatic Functions The speech by Mamdani to mobilise audiences and create political meaning: The victory speech of Zohran Mamdani is a means of mobilisation and meaningful

process and it transforms a victory into a movement to action. His monotony of assertives, including *Hope is alive* or *Housing is a human right*, does not simply declare, it puts the political struggle in the moral truth. Pragmatically, these utterances create politics meaning by providing a new definition of hope and Housing, as lived realities that audiences can possess. The rhetorical tool mobilises the audience based on the premise of the audience shared values and encouraging them to regard themselves as change agents, and not as spectators. It is also important that Mamdani is telling the audience to take action and internalise the win. Such expressions as *We are not asking, we are demanding* and *New York City, breathe this moment in* appear to be rather effective in shaping the force of the collective. These orders change the viewers who are not the beneficiaries of political promises to members of a movement. The fact that Mamdani asks them to breathe in the moment symbolically encourages them to be in the process of renewal, which can help strengthen the notion that the change of political objectives does not exist on the outside, but lived and experienced. On a pragmatic level, orders generate anticipation and urgency and these make the audience view the triumph as a point of departure and not a point of closure. The commissables of Mamdani further commit him and his movement to move on in the future. His promise, *I will wake each morning with one purpose, to make this city better to you than it was the day before* is no mere promise but a practical thing he does to invoke reassurance. It creates a political sense through putting leadership in the service and continuity whereby the audience is assured that their sacrifices will not go to waste. This promise has the effect of organising the supporters due to the trust and confidence that infuse them to continue with the struggle even after the election period. The pragmatic aspect of mobilisation is also done with expressives which include gratitude and emotional appeal.

Mamdani validates the existence of marginalised identities by appreciating various communities (Yemeni bodega owners, Mexican abuelas, Senegalese taxi drivers, and so on) and creates a meaning of politics based on inclusivity. These utterances are consistent with mobilising the audiences in terms of solidarity so that people feel visible and appreciated by the group. Pragmatically, instead of the leader being sterile, it humanises the leader, drawing in the people and the politician, and ensuring the victory of all people.

Lastly, the statements by Mamdani bring to practise new political reality, as they bring audiences together, changing the power landscape symbolically. Carries like the one that reads: *Tonight we made history and This power, it is yours. This city is your own* are not descriptive but performative and pass down possession of triumph to the people. Pragmatically, such statements create the meaning of politics as a participatory and collective one. They mobilise by making audiences feel proud of themselves and authorised, such that the success is perceived as some sort of group victory and not individual one.

DISCUSSION

Collectively, the speech made by Mamdani proves that political speech is pragmatic in nature: it does not simply explain, but acts, engaging audiences and creating meaning. His assertiveness sets ideological factualities, his commands incite involvement, his commissals assure devotion, his expressions create solidarity and his utterances realise change. The results affirm that the victory speech by Mamdani is a political action, mobilising people to keep on the struggle and creating a vision of politics that is based on hope and the idea of justice and collective empowerment.

In the present investigation, it is possible to conclude that the speech of Zohran Mamdani is very performative as the assertive, directive, commissives, expressives, and declarations have been

extensively used to mobilise the audience generating a political meaning. This fact adheres to the postulations of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) who wrote that linguistic activities were both descriptive and performative. Good example of how political leadership can shape new realities by the use of speech acts is the use of words by Mamdani such as: Tonight we made history, Housing is a human right, etc. to create new realities and establish ideal ideological truths.

It finds similar results to the ones reviewed by Dramnescu (2016), who asserted that a pragmatic discourse analysis could reveal that language is strategically employed during political communication. Like the Romanian case studies she studied, the address of Mamdani reveals that directives and commissives are central in projecting authority and solidarity. Also, Mamdani, concentrating on grassroots mobilisation and inclusivity, with his recognition of Yemeni bodega owners, Mexican abuelas, and Senegalese taxi drivers, elaborates on these concepts of Dramnescu, where expressives affirm marginalised identities and where diversity forms political meaning.

On the same note, Khater et al. (2024) evaluated the speech of King Abdullah II, focusing on speech acts as factors that connect people and support the value system. This can be compared to Mamdani's speech in terms of how he used declarations and assertions to bring New Yorkers together in the name of hope and justice. Nonetheless, the speech of Abdullah II gave a foreground of national unity under a monarchical system; the speech of Mamdani is highly populist and progressive because he used promises of rental freezes, free buses, and childcare to rally the masses. Therefore, the commissives in Mamdani's speech are both symbolic and policy-based, obligating him to make fundamental reforms.

In his article on the Shahbaz Sharif victory speech in Pakistan, Azam (2024) selected the assertives and declarations as the key aspects of assuring pleas. Mamdani's address relies heavily on assertions and statements and is characterized by a particular style of interaction. The directives can be co-authored with the audience, as evidenced by his call-and-response with the audience, i.e., we are going to freeze the rent together, New York. This interactive aspect adds to Azam's findings by illustrating how speech acts may be performed dialogically, rather than solely monologically, in the mobilisation of audiences.

The more general discourse-analysis tradition, such as that of Fairclough (1995) and Van Dijk (1997), placed particular focus on how political language recreates the structures of power. This point of view is both confirmed and refuted by Mamdani's speech. On the one hand, his claims and statements recreate progressive ideological frames, positioning Housing as a right and politics as a collective action. His directives and commissives, on the other hand, engage the institutionalised structures of power actively, denying the authority to those who deal in division and hate to set the conditions of politics. Pragmatically, he explains how language is both reproductive and resistant to power, depending on its illocutionary force and perlocutionary influence.

CONCLUSION

The current work attempted to examine Zohran Mamdani as an occasion of a victory address under the prism of the Speech Act Theory with two main goals: the first one being to identify and categorise the different types of acts used in the speech, and the second being to consider how the acts work pragmatically to enlist audiences and create political meaning. As the analysis of the given speech was conducted by relying on the distinction between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts introduced by Austin (1962) and the taxonomy of assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations, proposed by Searle (1969), it

turned out that Mamdani speech is not just a celebratory monologue but a specific performance of political transformation. Based on the findings, it is evident that Mamdani uses several speech acts in a stratified way in her speech. His assertions determine ideological truths, such as 'Housing is a human right' and 'Hope is alive'. His instructions move crowds, asking viewers to seize the present, take action, do justice, and help map the city's future. His commissals are a promise of perpetual struggle and tangible reforms, under which he made vows that rent would not be increased, buses would be free, and childcare would be available to everyone. His words convey appreciation and emotional support, legitimising marginalised communities and intensifying the inclusivity process. Lastly, his statements mark symbolic breaks with the previous political system, proclaiming that on this night we made history and giving power to the people themselves. These speech acts, combined, depict the pragmatic power of political language, showing how words may mention, act, and modify social realities at the same time. Considering the second objective, the paper will argue that Mamdani's speech is pragmatic in mobilising audiences and constructing political meaning. His words inspire hope, foster solidarity, and empower listeners to change. The persuasion and mobilisation of his perlocutionary effects, which include empowerment, trust, unity, and pride, prove that a victory speech is not merely a reflection of electoral success but rather a tool of persuasion and mobilisation. Based on his rhetoric, grounded in life experiences, historical references, and policy promises, Mamdani creates a political meaning that is inclusive and action-oriented, a that his audience sees the victory only as the start of the collective struggle, not its end. Compared with the past literature, this research makes a contribution to political discourse analysis in two ways. First, it demonstrates that expressives and directives may pragmatically mobilise differing grassroots audiences that confirm identities and invigorate participation. Second, it shows how policy-oriented commissives can create political meaning through concrete commitments that differ from the symbolic or abstract promises Mamdani offers in other situations. Thus, the study will address a gap in the literature that has received little scholarly attention: the victory speech of one of the progressive American politicians. The power of political language is ultimately highlighted in this work. Mamdani's victory speech is an indicator of how speech can be used to effect change, mobilise people, and create new political realities. Through pragmatic analysis and Speech Act Theory, the study can demonstrate that political speeches are not mere rhetorical performances but political leadership, solidarity, and an ideological struggle. The conclusion confirms that the power of language, once used strategically, can be turned into an instrument of empowerment; an instrument that can transform politics, rebrand the perception of power, and give people the desire to do something together.

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Azam, M. (2024). Pragmatic analysis of Shahbaz Sharif's victory speech: A speech act perspective. *Journal of Political Discourse Studies*, 12(2), 45–62.
- Drămnescu, M. (2016). Pragmatic discourse analysis in political communication: A case study. *Romanian Journal of Communication and Public Relations*, 18(3), 27–40.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Gill, A., Raza, S., & Ishtiaq, M. (2025). CORPUS-BASED GENRE ANALYSIS OF DONALD TRUMP AND JOE BIDEN'S INAUGURAL SPEECHES. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 8(1), 813-826.

- Imran, S., Raza, S., & Saeed, Z. (2024). Critical Discourse Analysis of Discursive Strategies Utilized in President Joe Biden's Inaugural Speech. *International Journal of Social Science Archives (IJSSA)*, 7(3).
- Khater, L., Al-Khatib, H., & Suleiman, R. (2024). Speech act analysis of King Abdullah II's national address. *Arab Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 88–104.
- Raza, S., Imran, S., & Shah, S. A. A. (2024). Critical Discourse Analysis of Discursive Strategies Utilized in Donald Trump and Joe Biden's Inaugural Speeches. *Al-Mahdi Research Journal (MRJ)*, 5(4), 245-256. <https://ojs.mrj.com.pk/index.php/MRJ/article/view/328>
- Raza, S., Saeed, Z., & Khan, A. N. (2025). A Corpus-Based Comparative Analysis of Hedges and Boosters in the Inaugural Speeches of President Trump and President Biden. *Journal of Arts and Linguistics Studies*, 3(1), 1157-1186. DOI <https://doi.org/10.71281/jals.v3i1.267>
- Raza, S. D. S. I., & Hassan, S. S. U. (2024). Critical discourse analysis of discursive strategies utilized in donald trump's inaugural speech. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 7(4), 99-120.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as social interaction*. Sage Publications.