Rhetorical Discourse Analysis Of Biden's Address To The Nation On Afghanistan: Positive Us And Negative Them

Hanan A Amaireh[1] , Luqman M Rababah[2]

[1]*English Language and Literature Department, Linguistics, Philadelphia University, Jordan*
hamaireh@philadelphia.edu.jo
[2]*School of Arts and Languages, Jadara University, Jordan , rababah80@gmail.com*

Abstract

This paper analyzes the political discourse of the American President Joe Biden address to the Nation on Afghanistan, which received no attention from discourse analysts yet. The research investigates how Biden tries to convince the audience of his viewpoints and decisions regarding its America's war in Afghanistan based on the Aristotelian perspective of rhetoric and van Dijk's "Ideological Square". The critical analysis reveals that Biden positively represents himself, his government and country. On the other hand, he negatively represents the Afghan government, people and the country. The study suggests analyzing other addresses from various perspectives.

Keywords: Afghanistan War, Ideological Square, Joe Biden, Rhetorical Analysis.

I   Introduction

This paper analyzes President Biden's Address to the Nation on Afghanistan, which has not been linguistically investigated yet. He delivered his speech from the White House after the collapse of the Afghan government to the Taliban. Therefore, it is essential to provide a background of the war in Afghanistan and a background of the speaker. Section 0 presents a background of the US war in Afghanistan, and section 0 presents a background of President Biden.

1.1 Background of the U.S. war in Afghanistan

This section presents a brief background of the U.S war in Afghanistan. The war in Afghanistan lasted for three centuries. The Afghan fighters overcame the British Forces in the nineteenth century, and defeated the Russian Army in the twentieth century. Then the American war in Afghanistan initiated in 2001 and lasted for 20 years until 2021.
What was the motivation for the US invasion of Afghanistan?

The American war in Afghanistan came as a reaction to September 11, 2001 attacks. Al Qaeda officially announced its responsibility for the attacks and bombings of the American towers and buildings. Four American Presidents witnessed the war in Afghanistan. George, W. Bush, Barack Obama, Donald Trump, and Joe Biden. President George W. Bush stated weeks after the attacks that the American forces had initiated attacks in Afghanistan against Al Qaeda and Taliban objectives, as they were responsible for the attacks. Mr. Bush claimed that the Taliban, who ruled most of Afghanistan at the time, had refused to hand over Al Qaeda leaders who had planned the attacks from inside the country. "Now the Taliban will pay a price," he asserted, adding that he planned to bring Al Qaeda leaders to court. When President Barack Obama took office, he began sending thousands more troops to Afghanistan in 2009, and by mid-2010, the number had risen to about 100,000. The Taliban, on the other hand, gained in strength, killing many Afghan security troops.

Osama bin Laden, the leader of Al Qaeda, was murdered in a complex near a military training academy in Abbottabad, Pakistan, by a US Navy SEAL team in May 2011. Mr. Obama declared in June that by 2014, he would begin returning American troops and handing over security responsibilities to the Afghans. By that time, the Pentagon had

concluded that only negotiations and settlement and not through military power could bring an end to the war. When the war reached a deadlock, President Obama concluded major combat operations on Dec. 31, 2014, and shifted his focus to assisting and training Afghan security forces.

Three years later, when President Donald Trump took office, he stated that despite his initial urge to withdraw all soldiers from Afghanistan, he would continue to fight the war. He made it clear that any troop withdrawals will be governed by battle conditions rather than predetermined deadlines. However, since 2018, the Trump administration has been in contact with the Taliban, resulting in formal talks that excluded the Afghan government, led by President Ashraf Ghani. In exchange, the Taliban agreed to cut relations with organisations such as Al Qaeda and the Islamic State, decrease violence, and negotiate with the US-backed Afghan government (Zucchino, 2021).

1.2 Background of the speaker

Since this paper analyzes the political discourse of President Biden, it is essential to provide a background of the speaker. Joseph Biden, the current President of the United States. Joseph Robinette Biden, Jr. was born in Scranton, Pennsylvania, USA, in 1942. He is the 46th President of the United States of America. He also served as the Vice President during the presidency of Barack Obama. Before becoming the 47th Vice President, Biden served in the U.S. Senate for 36 years representing Delaware. He is the 1st of four children born in Scranton, Pennsylvania, to Catherine Finnegan and Joseph Biden, Sr. the family moved to Delaware in 1953. He is a graduate of the University of Delaware and Syracuse Law School. He was a member of the New Castle County Council. Biden starred as a political figure at a young age; he was a member of the U.S. Senate at the age of 29. After the election, a tragedy hit his family as his wife and daughter were killed in a car accident, and his sons were severely injured. He swore into the U.S. Senate at the hospital. In 1977, he married Jill Jacobs, a teacher, and then an English Professor at a community college, and they have one daughter, Ashley Blazer Biden. During his service as a Senator for 36 years, Biden proved to be a shrewd

leader in tackling Americans' most serious challenges. He is accredited for co-authoring and spearheading the Violence Against Women Act, which toughens penalties against any domestic and sexual assaults against women.

For 12 years, Biden served as a Chairman or Ranking Member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where he shaped US foreign policy. He was a keen supporter of issues and legislation concerning post-Cold War Europe, Southwest Asia, the abolition of apartheid in South Africa, weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, and the Middle East. Leading on critical national issues, representing the US abroad, enhancing middle-class Americans' living standards, combating violence against women, eliminating cancer as we know it, and reducing gun violence are some achievements of Biden as a Vice President (whitehouse.gov, 2021).

After providing a background of the American war in Afghanistan and a background of the speaker, it is important to define the key terms related to this research in section 0.

Since this study is a rhetorical analysis of President Biden's political discourse, it is essential to define key terms related to the study such as discourse analysis, rhetoric, critical discourse analysis and ideology.

1.3 Definition of key terms

1.3.1 Discourse Analysis

Zellig Harris (1952) is credited for coining the term "discourse analysis" (DA) for the first time. It is a branch of linguistics that delves into what participants need to know about language to communicate effectively. The investigation goes beyond the scope of a single word, phrase, or sentence. Discourse analysts do not look at single words in isolation; instead, they look at how cultural and social variables interact with language. Discourse analysts also investigate patterns of language in different texts. They also look at how language shapes people's relationships by providing different perspectives and understandings of the world. DA examines the impact of language on social identities and relationships. It is a common misperception that discourse analysis is limited to spoken

language; instead, it investigates both spoken and written forms of naturally occurring instances of language (Harris 1952; Stubbs 1983, Brown & Yule 1983).

1.3.2 Rhetoric

Rhetoric is a field that dates back to the 5th century B.C. in Greece (Richards 2008). It is the study of the art of persuasion, or orators' capacity to persuade an audience of their views or opinions (Prill 1987; Corbett 1990; Lanham 1993; Metcalf 2004; Borg 2013; O'Keefe 2015). Rhetoric permeates our daily lives; people try to persuade others of their beliefs and thoughts. Sellers, lawyers, religious men, politicians, or election candidates try to persuade customers, clients, judges, or voters to buy their products; convince people to adhere to a specific creed, follow certain principles, or convert to one religion, call the public to action by persuading the audience of their viewpoints, or to do an action.

Aristotle classified rhetoric into five pillars: memory, invention, style, delivery, and arrangement. Invention includes three angles of analysis: ethos, pathos, and logos (ethical, emotional, and logical appeals).

1.3.2.1 Ethos (ethical appeals)

Ethos, according to the classical approach, refers to the speakers' personality and character, as well as how their reliability and credibility are reflected in their speeches through the words they choose. This covers how presenters convey their knowledge, authority, intellect, and candor (Aristotle, Rhetoric, in Aristotle 1984). According to the current view, ethos encompasses both the speakers' personality and standpoint. Political charisma (language, voice), look, and lifestyle are all part of the personality. The speaker's attitude toward himself, the message, and the audience are three-dimensional (Cockcroft et al., 2013). The speakers' attitude toward themselves is reflected in their personality traits such as optimism, realism, thoughtfulness, imagination, and hatred, among others. The speakers' commitment or non-commitment to the truth of the message is indicated by their position toward the message.

1.3.2.2 Pathos (emotional appeals)

Pathos, according to Greek and Roman conceptions, is appealing to the audience's sentiments and passions. Speakers attempt to stimulate the emotions of the audience in order to urge people to act or react to specific situations (Sloane, 2001). There are both direct and indirect appeals to the audience's emotions in an attempt to convince them. Speakers try to stir positive or negative emotions of the audience in an unmediated way by direct appeals to certain emotions such as pessimism, optimism, hatred, love, unkindness, enmity, friendship, greed, compassion, pity, and fear, among other emotions (Aristotle, 1984; Cockcroft et al., 2013). Indirect appeals use rhetorical questions and storytelling to elicit emotional responses from the audience.

1.3.2.3 Logos (logical appeals)

The use of logic and reasoning to support speakers' arguments is logical appeals. There are several forms of arguments that speakers might use to back up their claims, as noted below:

1.3.2.3.1 Argument types

1 Quoting authoritative sources or people in positions of power (Aristotle, Rhetoric in Aristotle, 1984).
2 Examining the causes and consequences of a problem (Aristotle, Rhetoric in Aristotle 1984; Ehninger & Brockriede, 2008).
3 Future-Prediction: This is an argument based on foreseeing future events grounded on current circumstances (Sproule, 1980).
4 Maximisation-Minimisation: This is an argument based on paying additional attention to a certain point or underestimating an issue on purpose (Sproule, 1980).
5 Fear Appeal: This is an argument that highlights the heinous or annoying consequences of an issue (Sproule, 1980).
6 Dilemma Appeal: This is a type of argument that focuses on finding solutions to a specific problem and providing remedies (Sproule, 1980).
7 Parallel instances: Comparing and contrasting different cases or circumstances (Aristotle, 1984; Ehninger & Brockriede, 2008).
8 Statistics-Based Argument: Using numbers, percentages, measures, and comparisons to

make a case (Sproule, 198; Ehninger and Brockriede, 2008).

9 Analogy Argument: This is an argument in which similar points of different entities, objects, or concepts are highlighted (Sproule, 1980; Ehninger & Brockriede, 2008).

10 Argument from the Past: Participants should fulfill their promises (Aristotle, 1984).

11 Consequences-Based Argument: Investigating positive or negative consequences of an issue (Sproule, 198; Ehninger & Brockriede, 2008).

12 Examining the causes and effects of a problem (Aristotle 1984, Ehninger & Brockriede, 2008).

Although Aristotle's taxonomy and perspective of rhetoric, or the art of persuasion, was introduced hundreds of years ago, it is still employed as a theoretical framework for political speech analysis in the twenty-first century, as will be explored later in section 0. The Aristotelian taxonomy of rhetoric will be used in this study, with one canon, invention, being the focus. It will examine Biden's ethical, emotional, and logical appeals he employs to persuade the public of his ideas, points of view and call them to action.

1.3.4 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) examines how the social and political contexts affect the way participants of the discourse employ language. Ideology, gender, race, and cultural differences, are all discussed under the umbrella of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), as well as how these themes are mirrored and constructed in literature. CDA examines how social ties shape language. It also entails questioning and dissecting the texts. This necessitates delving into the texts' hidden ideas and recognizing certain biases that authors exploit through the use of language (Fairclough & Wodak 1997; Rogers 2004; Paltridge 2012). According to Rogers (2004), language is always social, and discourse reflects and develops the social reality. In social and political situations, CDA studies how text and language ratify, replicate, and legitimise social power, abuse and injustice (van Dijk, 2015).

After defining the key terms, section 0 reviews the previous research papers that analyzed the political discourse of Joe Biden and other prominent American leaders,

especially during and after the presidential campaigns and elections.

Ideology and "Ideological Square"

Ideology is a crucial issue of discussion in Critical Discourse Analysis. Political discourse is seen as a valuable resource for learning about speakers' thoughts, thoughts, and stance. "Belief systems" or "ideas" that control and integrate other socially shared viewpoints are referred to as ideology (van Dijk 2006, p.116). Fairclough (2001) claims that "the choice of writing in a text" is influenced by and helps to build social ties among participants, and that the speakers/authors' choice of phrases is ideologically significant (Fairclough 2001: 97). To conduct a more thorough ideological evaluation, van Dijk (2001) designed the "Ideological Square." It is a four-dimensional approach to determining people's thoughts, opinions, and position, among other things. It is mirrored in the following manner:

A. Highlighting positive aspects of Ourselves.

B. Stressing or communicating negative feelings or information about Them.

C Suppressing / downplaying favourable elements of Them

D. De-emphasizing or suppressing negative parts of Ourselves (van Dijk, 2001).

This demonstrates how we can use mild expressions to substitute blunt or exaggerated statements to make long or short remarks about our own or others' positive or negative attributes, emphatically or not, in an overt or hidden way.

2 Literature review

American political discourse receives global attention, and plenty of research papers analyzed this discourse, especially the discourse before and after the presidential elections. Joe Biden's discourse, as the current President of the United States of American, received attention from discourse analysts, in particular. They investigated the language he used during the election campaigns and debates and after winning the elections as the incumbent President in office. This section reviews previous studies that analyzed the political discourse of the American President

Joe Biden. Some previous studies focused only on the discourse of Joe Biden, such as Ghani and Hussein 2021; Saputra 2021; Shi 2021; Pavlikova 2021; Renaldo 2021. Other studies conducted a comparative political discourse of Donald Trump and Joe Biden during the 2020 election campaign, like Sartika 2021; Abdrukhmanova & Redkozubova 2021; Yenikeyev 2021; & Pavlikova 2021. Heletka & Ryzhkova (2021) compared Trump and Biden's pre-election debates with other presidential debates of 2012, 2016, and 2020.

Sartika (2021); Abdrukhmanova & Redkozubova (2021); Heletka & Ryzhkova (2021); and Pavlikova (2021) analyzed Trump and Biden's political discourse before the presidential elections, and during the election campaigns and debates. Sartika (2021) conducted a comparative analysis of Trump and Biden's debates and examined the techniques they employed to convince the audience following van Dijk's theoretical analytical framework. She investigated the use of three part-lists, interruptions, personal pronouns, and fillers. The analysis revealed that both political leaders used sarcasm and mocked each other. In addition to that, many interruptions were also noticed in Trump's discourse. Both used repetition to emphasize their ideas. In addition, they used 1st person pronouns (I and we) to positively self-represent themselves, and 2nd and 3rd person pronouns (you and he) to negatively represent others. Trump called Biden by his first name, which is unusual in such a formal setting. They both used the list of three to reinforce their positive identity and negative image of their opponent. Similarly, Abdrukhmanova and Redkozubova (2021) examined how Trump and Biden represent themselves and their opponent during the 2020 American presidential debates to convince the audience to vote for them. Their analysis is in line with Sartika's results; they found that Biden and Trump ridicule, accuse, and insult each other; they show negative evaluation of their opponent to increase their reputation. Pavlikova (2021) approached the electoral speeches from a different perspective; she examined the use of metaphors of the 2020 American presidential campaign in a comparative analysis of Trump and Biden. She analyzed five speeches for every speaker. Pavlikova found the following frequent conceptual metaphors employed by the

speakers: ECONOMY IS A BUILDING, VIRUS IS WAR; POLITICS IS WAR, ELECTIONS ARE WAR, COUNTRY IS A PERSON/ PLANT; NATION IS A BUILDING / PERSON / THIEF, HEART / CITY /, and ORGANISATION IS WAR.

Heletka & Ryzhkova (2021) investigated antithesis in the discourse of the American elections, which is characterized by employing binary axiological concepts of antonyms. Their data included electoral public speeches and debates of 2012, 2016, 2020. Their analysis revealed that the strategy of suggestion or impelling "intensifies argumentation," which is heavily employed by speakers to manipulate the audience. Suggestion appeals to voters' sub conscious, and it is realized by antithesis. For example, Senator Clinton said: "There is a smart way to protect our borders, and there is a dumb way to protect our borders". The debates are centered on employing antithesis, and focus on creating positive images of the speakers and attacking their opponents.

Ghani and Hussein (2021); Saputra (2021); and Shi (2021) analyzed Biden's (2020) victory speech. Ghani and Hussein conducted a critical discourse analysis of Biden's victory speech. They investigated the President's ideology and the United States' visualisation through the lens of a socio-political situation during the pandemic. They adopted Fairclough's (1989) three-dimensional method in a corpus-based analysis. The quantitative analysis revealed that Biden used repetition, inclusive language, and intentional word choice. He demonstrated that by his rejection of discrimination and bias in the United States and highlighting the severe effects of the pandemic on the economy. Shi (2021) analyzed Biden's victory speech from the outlook of language meta-function. Like (Ghani and Hussein, 2021), Shi (2021) conducted a critical discourse investigation of Biden's speech. He analyzed how political ideational functions, voice, transitivity, and normalisation systems are realized in Biden's speech. In addition, he explored how interpersonal functions are realized through modality and mood systems. Moreover, he examined how the textual function is realized through information structure, theme-rheme structure, and cohesion system. His analysis revealed that shaping the speaker's social identity, ideology and interpersonal relationship, establishing the speaker's persuasiveness and credibility, and the

speaker's command of the subject and objective stance can be incorporated through the meta-function of language. Saputra (2021) explored face management of Biden's victory speech, which is relevant to the concept of politeness as suggested by Goffman. The analysis revealed that Biden reflected a positive face by showing solidarity using "my fellow Americans." He showed the happiness of his election victory as the 46th President of the United States. He created a rapport with the audience and reflected the desire to be liked and accepted by others.

Renaldo (2021) & Yenikeyev (2021) examined Biden's inauguration speech. Renaldo investigated how presupposition and ideology are reflected in Biden's inaugural speech from a critical discourse analysis perspective. She adopted van Dijk's (2006) conception of presupposition. Three types of presupposition were used in the speech (factive, lexical, and existential), and the lexical presupposition was the most frequent type in the data. For example, "Few periods in a nation's history have been more challenging or difficult than the one we've in now" (Renaldo, 2021, p. 500). This means that the current time is challenging, but previously America faced more challenging situations. Yenikeyev (2021) has also analyzed Biden's inauguration speech and compared it to Trump's speech. He explored speech patterns representing linguistic world images of Trump and Biden's inaugural speeches. In Trump's discourse, the concept of nativism has increased in his linguistic perspective of the world as the analysis revealed. This implies that preference must be given in favour of your country. Biden's primary focus is centered on America's role in supporting other countries. Both leaders share this desire to fight for the well-being of Americans and solidarity to keep the nation united to achieve thrivingness. Searching the literature, there is a gap in the studies that examined the American political discourse that represents the American war in Iraq, and this paper comes to fill this gap.

After reviewing the previous studies that analyzed the political discourse of President Joe Biden and other prominent presidents, it was discovered that just a few studies have been undertaken on Biden's addresses and no attention has been given to the address to the Nation on Afghanistan, which has garnered no attention from researchers yet.

2   Methodology

The data includes President Biden's Address to the Nation on Afghanistan. The speech includes (2,397) words. He delivered his speech from the White House after the collapse of the Afghan government to the Taliban. The analysis is a blended theoretical framework of Aristotle's perspective and classification of rhetoric and van Dijk's (2001) "Ideological Square" of critical discourse analysis. The speaker's ethical, emotional, and logical appeals to the audience are examined following the Aristotelian classification of invention, which is one of the main tenets of the art of persuasion. Although this classification was developed hundreds of years ago, it is still used as a foundation for political discourse research to evaluate the persuasive methods used by political leaders to convince the audience of their ideas and opinions.

In analysing the speaker's ethical appeals, the paper examines the use of the personal pronouns I and we in the corpus and how frequently they are employed by using the Antconc Software. In analysing the speaker's emotional appeals, the analysis investigates the emotions the speaker tries to arouse in the audience. Moreover, the paper examines the various logical appeals President Biden employ to persuade the audience of his viewpoints.
The critical analysis follows van Dijk's (2001) theoretical framework of the "Ideological Square". It examines how President Biden reveals his ideology in the speech by the representation of us (himself, the American people, and the government), and the manifestation of them (Afghanistan, the Afghani government, the Afghans, and their allies).

4   Results & discussion

4.1 Ethos (Speaker's Ethical Appeals)

President Biden ethically appeals to his character to convince the audience of his ideas. Personal pronouns such as the pronoun "I" and "we" are used to reflect the speaker's ethical appeals. Highlighting the personal experience

is also employed by the President to persuade the audience of his viewpoints.

4.1.1 The use of the personal pronoun "I"

The pronoun I is highly used in the speech, 55tokens (2.2%) were used. For example: "I've worked in these issues as long as anyone. I've been throughout Afghanistan during this war, while the war was going on, from Kabul to Kandahar to the Kunar Valley. I've traveled there on four different occasions. I've met with the people, I've spoken to the leaders, I spent time with our troops. And I came to understand firsthand what was and was not possible in Afghanistan."

Biden ethically appeals to his character by emphasizing his long experience and knowledge of the situation in Afghanistan. He means that he is not talking from an ivory tower; instead, he talked to the people and soldiers, and is acquainted with the situation there. Therefore, his decision to stop the war there is realistic and based on the past and current situations. Biden employs parallelism by repeating the parallel structures of "I've worked", "I've been", "I've traveled", and "I've met" to persuade the audience that he is a skillful and experienced politician who deserves their trust. He also tries to elicit emotional responses from them and attract their attention. Parallelism is a rhetorical device frequently employed in speeches to convince, motivate, and /or create emotional responses in an audience. Complex thoughts are easier to process when clauses or phrases are balanced. The importance of each word or thought should be balanced; each phrase or idea should be equally vital as its counterpart. Moreover, readers or listeners' attention is maintained by employing parallelism (yourdictionary.com).

President Biden expresses his stance toward the message he conveys to the audience and stresses the fact that his messages are clear, and he is straightforward with them. He notes:

> I'm clear on my answer. I will not repeat the mistakes we've made in the past -- the mistake of staying and fighting indefinitely in a conflict that is not in the national interest of the United States. Of doubling down on a civil war in a foreign country. Of attempting to remake a country through the endless military deployments of US forces.

Biden tries to emphasize that his decision to stop the war in Afghanistan is the right one by repeating "mistake(s)," to indicate that staying there is not the correct solution. He emphasizes that he will learn from the previous mistakes, and by repeating the word "mistakes" he tries to say that his decision to stop the war there is sound. "Nor will I shrink from my share of responsibility for where we are today and how we must move forward from here. I am President of the United States of America. And the buck stops with me. I'm deeply saddened by the facts we now face." Biden ethically appeals to his character and position as a president and uses the phrase "the buck stops with me" to emphasize that he takes the responsibility of ending the war in Afghanistan, and will not try to pass it on to another president. He tries to draw a positive image of himself.

4.1.2 The use of the personal pronoun we

The pronoun we was highly used in the speech, 57 tokens (2.3%) were used. It was used to draw a positive image of Americans and their achievements, especially in Afghanistan. On the other hand, it is used to draw a negative representation of Them (the Afghans). President Biden notes:

> We gave them every tool. We paid their salaries. Provided for the maintenance of their air force. Something the Taliban does not have. The Taliban does not have an air force. We provided close air support.
> We gave them every chance to determine their own future. We could not provide them was the will to fight for that future". By employing the rhetorical device of parallelism, Biden highlights America's accomplishments in Afghanistan.

He repeats the parallel structures of "We provided…", "We trained…," and "We gave…", etc., to convince the audience and justify that they are not doing the Afghans any harm by their presence in Afghanistan, instead,

Americans assisted, trained, protected them, and paid their salaries. On the other hand, Biden emphasizes the negative traits of the Afghans; they are unable to fight for themselves, or worse, they do not have the will to fight for the sake of their own country, and they do not have an air force. This reveals Biden's hidden ideology in which he positively represents himself, his country, and government. On the other hand, he negatively portrays Afghanistan, the Afghans, and their government.

4.2 Pathos (speaker's ethical appeals)

President Biden tries to stir the audience's emotions to persuade them of the soundness of the decision to stop the war in Afghanistan. He notes, "I also want to acknowledge how painful this is to so many of us. The scenes we're seeing in Afghanistan, they're gut wrenching, particularly for our veterans, our diplomats, humanitarian workers, for anyone who has spent time on the ground working to support the Afghan people. For those who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan."

Biden uses the lexical items "painful", "gut-wrenching", and "lost loved ones" to move people's emotions, which express extremely upsetting feelings of dissatisfaction toward the consequences of the war in Afghanistan. Another rhetorical technique that President Biden uses to stir the emotions of the audience is rhetorical questions. Rhetorical questions are types of questions in which the speakers do not intend to seek an answer from the audience, or there is one clear answer for the specific question. They are employed to persuade the audience of the speakers' viewpoints (Roskos-Ewoldsen 2003, 305). Mr. Biden speaks:

> So what's happened? Afghanistan political leaders gave up and fled the country. The Afghan military collapsed, sometimes without trying to fight. If anything, the developments in the past week reinforced that ending U.S. military involvement Afghanistan now was the right decision. American troops cannot and should not be fighting in a war and dying in a war that Afghan forces are not willing to fight for themselves.

Biden tries to stir people's emotions by raising rhetorical questions to persuade the audience that the decision to stop the war in Afghanistan is the right one because they lost the Americans' lives, while the Afghans do not have the will to fight for their country. Therefore, lives, efforts, and money are wasted without real benefits in the advantage of America and Americans as President Biden asserts.

4.3 Logos (speaker's logical appeals)

President Biden uses argumentation and reasoning to convince the audience of his ideas. He employs various logical arguments, he notes:

> I've argued for many years that our mission should be narrowly focused on counterterrorism, not counter insurgency or nation building. That's why I opposed the surge when it was proposed in 2009 when I was vice president. And that's why as president, I'm adamant we focus on the threats we face today in 2021. Not yesterday's threats. And once we have completed this mission, we will conclude our military withdrawal. We will end America's longest war after 20 long years of bloodshed. The events we're seeing now are sadly proof that no amount of military force would ever deliver a stable, united secure Afghanistan, as known in history as graveyard of empires. What's happening now, could just as easily happened five years ago or 15 years in the future.

President Biden argues from consequences; he asserts that America's war in Afghanistan has resulted in unstoppable bloodshed without achieving the goal of bringing a stable, cohesive, and secure Afghanistan, which has been dubbed the "graveyard of empires" throughout history as Biden asserts. To understand the meaning of the "graveyard of empires," discourse analysts must have the cultural knowledge to fully understand it. It is a nickname attached to Afghanistan which means that conquering it was a difficult task as many empires and nations such as Britain, the Soviet Union and

the United States failed to govern the country (Pillalamarri, 2017). Biden also argues using numbers as he stresses the length of the American war in Afghanistan, which lasted for 20 years, and resulted in bloodshed. Another example in which Biden argued using numbers and statistics is exemplified in "We spent over a trillion dollars. We trained and equipped an Afghan military force of some 300,000 strong. Incredibly well equipped. A force larger in size than the militaries of many of our NATO allies. We gave them every tool. We paid their salaries."

Biden uses numbers such as "a trillion dollars," and "300,000 strong" to support his argument that the right decision is to completely withdraw the military presence in Afghanistan because the war there cost them a lot and caused many deaths and casualties. Parallelism is also used to support his argument by repeating the parallel structures of "We spent," "We trained," "We gave," and "We provided". This reflects the hidden ideology in which the President tries to highlight the American achievements in Afghanistan to draw a positive representation of the American government and its accomplishments. On the other hand, he tries to represent a negative image of the Afghan government and the situation there. Biden spots the light on the fact that Afghanistan does not have an air force, and the Afghans do not have the will and are unable to fight for themselves. So he draws a negative image of them (the Afghans), which reveals the hidden ideology.

5 Conclusion

President Biden uses ethical, emotional, and logical appeals to convince the audience of his ideas, thoughts, and his government's decisions. Parallelism is a prevalent rhetorical device in Biden's political discourse discussing the American war in Afghanistan. It is used in his ethical, emotional and logical appeals to the audience to attract their attention and convince them of his ideas and arguments.

Biden ethically appeals to his character by emphasizing his extensive expertise and awareness of the situation in Afghan. He implies that he is not speaking from an ivory palace, but rather from real experience. As a result, his choice to end the war there is

reasonable and grounded in past and current events. Biden uses parallelism to persuade the audience that he is a professional and knowledgeable politician who merits people's trust. The pronoun we was highly used in the speech. It was utilized to project a positive picture of the United States and its accomplishments, particularly in Afghanistan. However, it is used to create a hostile portrayal of them (the Afghans).

Biden uses rhetorical questions trying to elicit emotional responses from the audience to persuade them that ending the war in Afghanistan is the best decision because they had lost American lives while the Afghans lacked the will to fight for their nation. As a result, lives, efforts, and money are squandered without delivering tangible benefits to America and Americans, as President Biden claims.

The President employs logical appeals tailored with parallelism to emphasize the ideas he wants to convince the audience with. By doing that, he reveals a hidden ideology in which he positively portrays himself, the government and Americans. On the other hand, he negatively pictures the situation in Afghanistan, the Afghans, and the government.

The analysis demonstrates that in order to fully comprehend Biden's discourse, the analyst must go beyond the immediate context to the broader context and the cultural knowledge as in the case of "Afghanistan, as known in history as graveyard of empires".

Acknowledgement

REFERENCES

1. Abdurakhmanova, D., & Redkozubova, E. (2021). The discrediting strategy in the pre-election political discourse (based on the example of debates between Donald Trump and Joe Biden). In E3S Web of Conferences (Vol. 273, p. 12138). EDP Sciences.
2. Almwajeh, M., & Rababah, L. (2019). There is more to it than meets the eye: an intercultural study of religious speech acts between Jordanian and American students. International Journal of Linguistics, 11 (1),

34-45.
https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v11i1.14261

3. Almwajeh, M., & Rababah, L. (2018). Literature is the best tool of awaking moral understanding and evaluation: Wendell Berry's The Long-Legged House. AWEJ for Translation & Literary Studies, 2 (2), 69-80.
https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3186984

4. Banikalef, A., & Rababah, L. (2018). Gender differences and emotional expressiveness on Facebook: An analysis of prosodic features among Jordanian Facebookers. Studies in Linguistics and Literature, 2(3), 180-184.
http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/sll .v2n3p18

5. Bardaweel, M & Rababah, L. (2022). Gender differences in using Arabizi among Jordanian undergraduate students: A socio-linguistic study. Theory and Practice in Language Studies 12(1).86-95

6. Borg, J. (2013). Persuasion. The art of influencing people. (4th ed.). UK: Pearson.

7. Brown, G, & George, Y. (1983). Discourse analysis. Cambridge University Press.

8. Cockcroft, R., Cockcroft, S., & Hamilton, C. (2013). Persuading people: An introduction to rhetoric. Bloomsbury Publishing.

9. Corbett, E. (1990). Classical Rhetoric for the modern student. New York: Oxford University Pres.

10. Ehninger, D, & Wayne, B. (2008). Decision by debate. International Debate Education Association: IDEA.

11. Fairclough, N. (2001). Language and Power. (2nd ed). Harlow. UK: Pearson Education.

12. Fairclough, N., Wodak, R., & Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Discourse as social interaction. Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction, 2, 258-284.

13. Ghani, N. A., & Hussain, M. S. (2021). Application of Fairclough's model on Joe Biden's victory speech: Corpus assisted analysis of new US vision versus world voices. Psycholo78gy and Education, 58(2),10168-10181.

14. Harris Zellig, S. (1952). Discourse Analysis: A sample text. Language, 28(4), 474-494.

15. Heletka, M., & Ryzhkova, V. (2019). Antithesis as a Strategy of Suggestive Impact in American Electoral Discourse. Publishing House: UK.

16. Munazil, T, & Rababah, L. (2022). A Psycholinguistic Study of Persuasive Strategies Used in the Farewell Sermon of Prophet Mohammed (PBUH).Education and Linguistics Research, 8 (2). 1-16.

17. Munazil, T, & Rababah, L. (2022).An Investigation of Speech Acts Types Used in the Last Sermon of Prophet Mohammed (PBUH). Studies in Linguistics and Literature, 6(2). 31-44.

18. Lanham, R. A. (1993). A handlist of rhetorical terms. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

19. Metcalf, Allan. (2004). Presidential voices: Speaking styles from George Washington to George W. Bush. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

20. O'Keeffe, D. (2015). Persuasion: Theory and research. London: Sage Publications.

21. Paltridge, B. (2021). Discourse analysis: An introduction. Bloomsbury Publishing.

22. Pavlikova, Z. (2020). The Concept of metaphor in political speeches (Metaphors in the electoral speeches of Donald Trump and Joe Biden in the 2020 presidential elections). In URL: https://conferences. euba. sk/jazykapolitika/www_write/files/2020/pavlikova. pdf (дата звернення: 10.08. 2021).

23. Pillalamarri, A. (2017). Why Is Afghanistan the 'Graveyard of Empires'?. The Diplomat, 30, 200-220

24. Prill, P. (1987). Rhetoric and poetics in the early middle ages. Rhetorica, 5(2). 129-147.

i. https://doi:10.1525/rh.1987.5.2.129

25. Qudeisat, L & Rababah, L. (2021). A Linguistic Landscape Study Of Shop Signs In The Northern Part Of Jordan. Multicultural Education, 7 (11), 538-548.

26. Rababah, L. (2022). Overcoming Barriers to Student Engagement Online: Voices from L2 Instructors. .Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6 (4). 685-693.

27. Renaldo, Z. (2021). Presupposition and ideology: A critical discourse analysis of Joe Biden's inaugural speech. Professional Journal of English Education, 4(3). 497-503.

28. Richards, J. (2008). Rhetoric. London and New York: Routledge.

29. Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R. (2003). What is the role of rhetorical questions in persuasion?. In Communication and emotion (pp. 305-330). Routledge.

30. Sartika, T. (2021, March). Critical discourse analysis of Donald Trump's and Joe Biden's language in use in the 2020 United States presidential debates. In International Conference on Education of Suryakancana (IConnects Proceedings).

31. Sloane, T. O. (2001). Encyclopedia of rhetoric (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.

32. Stubbs, M, W. (1983). Discourse analysis. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

33. Shi, L. (2021). Viewing Joe Biden's Victory Speech in 2020 from the Perspective of Language Metafunction. International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation, 4(7), 109–114.

34. Yenikeyev, D. (2021). The linguistic world image of Donald Trump and Joe Biden (Based on the material of the inauguration speeches). Baltija Publishing. https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-083-4-9

35. Yenikeyev, D. (2021). The linguistic world image Of Donald Trump and Joe Biden (Based on the material of the inauguration speeches). Baltija Publishing.

36.

37.   https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-083-4-9

38. Saputra, M. (2021). A Face management of politeness in Joe Biden victory speech. International Journal of Education and Language, 1 (1). 64-69.

39. Van Dijk, T. (2001). Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction. Barcelona: Pompeu Fabra University.

40. Zucchino, D. (2021). The War in Afghanistan-How it Started and how it is Ending. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/article/afghanistan-war-us.html.

Websites

https://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/president-biden/. Accessed September 25, 2021

https://examples.yourdictionary.com/examples-of-parallelism.html (yourdictionary.com). Accessed: November 27, 2021