



**President Joe Biden's political speeches on two different wars  
The War in Afghanistan vs. The War in Ukraine**

The use of strategies of legitimization in Joe Bidens political speeches regarding two different wars  
in relation to intercultural and globalized communication.

Lisa Brødbæk

Culture, Communication & Globalization

Supervisor: Julia Zhukova Klausen

*Character Count: 149.597*

# Abstract

War can be defined in many ways, as well as it can be constructed through different frameworks. People may not have considered this before, but the construction of war depends on how we as human beings make up the understanding of the phenomenon of war, as well as who speaks on behalf of understanding this phenomenon.

The study researches the following problem formulation: *“How does Joe Biden make use of strategies of legitimization through his speeches, when speaking upon major events such as the withdrawal of NATO in Afghanistan and the Russian Invasion of Ukraine? Does he make use of the same strategies of legitimization in both speeches? If so, how does the fact that he mobilizes strategies related to the war from Afghanistan, how does this participate in the construction of the Ukrainian war within the framework of his speech regarding the war in Ukraine, by Joe Biden?”*

The thesis includes an analysis of two speeches by Joe Biden in relation to speaking about war. One discusses the war in Afghanistan, whereas the second speech discusses the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Both speeches have been analyzed through the method of critical discourse analysis (CDA) by Norman Fairclough. The use of strategies of legitimization has been implemented through the use of CDA. This has been done to visualize how Joe Biden constructs the Ukrainian war through the framework of speech, in relation to the different strategies of legitimization. The thesis makes use of theories in relation to language and discourse to back up the findings in the analysis, as it focuses on the use of language, and how language through speech makes meaning in relation to social actors and their speeches.

The results from this thesis have been that Joe Biden makes use of mobilizing strategies from his first speech to his second speech, as well as the first speech he held has helped him construct the speech regarding the war in Ukraine within the framework of speech. He is able to draw parallels between the two speeches through the use of strategies of legitimization, which participates in the construction of the Ukrainian war within the framework of his speech regarding the war in Ukraine.

## Table of Content

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The President of the United States .....</i>	<i>6</i>
Political Stance.....	7
<b>Theory .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<i>Communication as discourse.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>The notion of Language and Discourse .....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Philosophy of science.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Political discourse .....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>NATO &amp; International Relations Theory.....</i>	<i>14</i>
NATO.....	14
International relations theory .....	15
<i>The notion of Globalization .....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Critical Discourse Analysis .....</i>	<i>19</i>
<b>Method.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<i>Critical Discourse Analysis .....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Textual.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Discourse Practice.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Social Practice.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Strategies of legitimization.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Five strategies of legitimization .....</i>	<i>24</i>
Legitimization through emotions .....	24
Legitimization through a hypothetical future .....	25
Legitimization through rationality .....	25
Voices of expertise.....	25
Altruism.....	26
<i>Approach to Data Collection .....</i>	<i>26</i>
Search Terms and Choice of Data.....	26
<b>Analysis.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<i>Text Analysis.....</i>	<i>28</i>
Remarks by President Biden on Afghanistan .....	28
Remarks by President Biden on the United Efforts of the Free World to Support the People of Ukraine.....	39
<i>Discourse Practice.....</i>	<i>48</i>
Remarks by President Biden on Afghanistan .....	48
Remarks by President Biden on the United Efforts of the Free World to Support the People of Ukraine.....	49
<i>Social Practice.....</i>	<i>51</i>
The two speeches up against each other .....	52
<b>Discussion .....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>61</b>

**Bibliography..... 63**

## Introduction

History is defined as the study of past events that have happened. There can be a history of many things, but one thing about history is that it is an event that will never be forgotten. Some of the main events that have happened in newer times are the withdrawal of NATO's presence in Afghanistan as well as the Russian Invasion of Ukraine. Both major events not only influence one nation, but rather it impacts the rest of the world. Both events have gained a lot of attention, both humanitarian as well as political attention. Joe Biden, the 46<sup>th</sup> President of the United States has shared his remarks on both events, with the use of political discourse in his speeches.

For this thesis, I have researched which topics I find relevant and interesting in relation to the CCG program, and I have found that I find political discourse interesting in relation to speaking about specific newer events that have happened in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. I, therefore, find it interesting to research the following problem formulation: *How does Joe Biden make use of strategies of legitimization through his speeches, when speaking upon major events such as the withdrawal of NATO in Afghanistan and the Russian Invasion of Ukraine? Does he make use of the same strategies of legitimization in both speeches? If so, how does the fact that he mobilizes strategies related to the war from Afghanistan, how does this participate in the construction of the Ukrainian war within the framework of his speech regarding the war in Ukraine, by Joe Biden?*

The war in Afghanistan was seen as an international conflict. It all started due to the terror attack on September 11, 2001, in the US. This led to the war between the US and Afghanistan. From 2002-to 2008, the aim was to defeat the Taliban Military and be able to rebuild the state of Afghanistan so that every human had their legal rights both men and women. In 2009 Barack Obama was elected president of the United States, where his goal was to implement more U.S military in Afghanistan, this was used as a strategy to defeat the Taliban and deviate possible attacks from the Taliban. (Council on Foreign Relations, 2022) Joe Biden did not at the time have political authority in relation to speaking about the war, but in 2021 he was elected as president of the United States, and he spoke about the withdrawal of military forces that had to be made. (Council on Foreign Relations, 2022) This is one of the speeches that I will be analyzing for my thesis. The speech is titled "Remarks by President Biden on Afghanistan" and was published on the website "The White House" where it can also be retrieved. The speech was published on August 16, 2021.

The Russian invasion of Ukraine happened on the 24<sup>th</sup> of February 2022. According to Putin, the reason behind the invasion was to “demilitarize and de-nazify” Ukraine, as he also explained that the invasion was a “special military operation”. A special military operation does not lead to the killing of 137 Ukrainians, which was what had happened in the starting hours of the invasion. (Skytt, 2022) The war in Ukraine is still an ongoing event, and therefore there is new information day by day. Putin has mentioned that anybody who tries to interfere or worse threaten Russia will suffer major consequences. (Kirby, 2022) The invasion started as an invasion but was soon discovered to be not only a war against Ukraine but against the rest of the world. This is yet another war, where Joe Biden has shared his political thoughts regarding this event. This is one of the speeches that I will be analyzing for my thesis. The speech is titled “Remarks by President Biden on the United Efforts of the Free World to Support the People of Ukraine”. The speech is published on March 26, 2022. The speech can be retrieved from the White House website homepage.

### [The President of the United States](#)

The president of the United States, Joe Biden also known as Joseph Robinette Biden Jr. He is the 47<sup>th</sup> Vice President, and when he won the election and became the President, his motto was to “restore America’s leadership and build our communities back better”. (The White House) Joe Biden has since his younger days been interested in politics. When he was 29, he was one of the youngest people that were elected to the United States Senate. Joe Biden has had a tough life in relation to his private life, he has lost both his wife and daughter in a car accident. His two sons were left with critical injuries, rather this did not stop him from becoming a senator and still managing to be with his family. (The White House, n.d.) Joe Biden found love again in 1977 and had a daughter, but even though he found love, tragedy hit him once again when his eldest son passed away due to brain cancer. Joe Biden mentions that it was a tough time, but still, his eldest son is his greatest inspiration in the mission of Joe Biden's life as President. Joe Biden has been a senator in Delaware for 36 years. This also shows that he through time has created an understanding of politics as well as he has created a leader in himself by facing some of the challenges that have taken place in the United States, such as domestic and international challenges. (The White House, n.d.)

Not only has Joe Biden managed to create a positive reputation throughout his life as the senate, but rather he has also reached a lot of recognition during his job as the 47<sup>th</sup> vice president. At this time, he worked together with Obama, and together they managed to prevent another “great depression” as well as they saved millions of jobs, with the help of the “Recovery Act”. Joe Biden has managed to create many positive outcomes, which may be the reason why he won the election against Donald Trump in 2021. (The White House, n.d.) Not only has Joe Biden created a positive reputation in the white house, but rather he also managed to create this after leaving the white house, by continuing his efforts to create opportunities for American citizens. (The White House, n.d.)

Joe Biden announced that he was running for President of the United States in 2019. His election was built upon his values and what he wanted to do for the nation if he was to be elected as the President of the United States. (The White House, n.d.) His statement that he wished for in an American future was “the battle for the soul of our nation, the need to rebuild our middle class and was the backbone of our country, and a call for unity, to act as One America”. (The White House) This message helped him towards where he is today, namely the President of the United States.

### Political Stance

In the United States, there are two major political stances, namely the Republic Party and the Democratic Party. Joe Biden is a democrat, and therefore after he won the election the United States is now living under the Democratic government. The main goal of the democratic party is to fight for a future that is brighter and more equal for all in the United States, this is mentioned on the democrats.org page, which explains the values and missions this democratic party has. The motto for the democratic party is “Building a Better America”. Joe Biden manages to live up to this motto by working towards investing in the middle classes, where he wants to bring down costs for working families. (Democratic Party, 2022)

The democratic party has existed for multiple centuries, but its goals and motives have not always been as pure as they are today. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it has been researched and found that the party accepted slavery, as well as resisted civil rights reforms, to be able to sustain the Southern voters who supported the. In the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, a change occurred, and the party

decided to undergo realignment ideological-wise. (Encyclopedia Britannica, n.d.) Here the changes were that they started supporting organized labor, the civil rights of minorities, and progressive reform. During the mid-1920s Franklin Roosevelt was one of the presidents of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. (Encyclopedia Britannica, n.d.) He managed to create the democratic party in the favor of greater government intervention regarding the economy as well he managed to contradict intervention in the government in the private, such as affairs that were non-economic in relation to citizens (Encyclopedia Britannica, n.d.).

The democratic party is the party that is known for being the oldest in the United States. It is also one of the oldest political parties in the world. The democratic party originated in 1792, whereas the republican party was also created to visualize the anti-monarchical views that this party had compared to the democratic party. (Encyclopedia Britannica, n.d.)

If we look forward in time and turn to 2016, the democratic party had for once a womanly role in the candidate seat of becoming the next president, even though this did not manage to go through, it was still a great deal. (Encyclopedia Britannica, n.d.) In 2020 a new vote was conducted, and the white house was now being governed by the democrats, a Joe Biden managed to gain victory in the election. Joe Biden managed to win with five million votes, as well as he won the electoral college. (Encyclopedia Britannica, n.d.)



## Theory

This part of the thesis includes my theory section. The thesis' theories include concepts of communication as discourse, the notion of language and discourse, philosophy of science, political discourse, NATO & International Relations Theory, and last the notion of Globalization. The theories that have been elaborated upon in this section are all very crucial as they form the philosophy of the project, and how it is built.

### Communication as discourse

The word communication stems from the Latin language, the Latin definition of communication refers to sharing and being in retention with, whereas in English communication relates to coming together. (Cobley & Schulz, 2013, p. 1) When discussing communication, and the theory, it researches the history, which relates to why things have formed the way they have in the world today. When making use of the communication theory, you take every aspect of time into consideration. (Cobley & Schulz, 2013, p. 9) Communication refers to language and the use of language discourse. This relates to each other, because language and choice of words evolve through time, and create a connection to the other, as people communicate words with each other. According to Cobley & Schulz, they mention that discursive language was explained in the Middle Ages. This was due to Greek and Latin being the well-educated languages, and therefore many of the terms being used when analyzing through communication and language discourse stem from Latin or Greek. As these were the well-educated languages that were used in the Middle Age, they managed to become the ones at the time whose structures and characteristics were and are the guidelines for the writing rules used today. (Cobley & Schulz, 2013, p. 61) The rules of usage in relation to these guidelines were split up into three levels. The first level discusses grammar. The grammar level investigates what classes could use a specific word, as well as how words work together in relation to each other. The second level discusses "rhetoric". This investigates how words are articulated, in other words, how they are expressed through speech or how a specific word is read in a context or interpreted by listening to it in another context. The third and last level is the level of logic. This focuses on combining the first and second levels and making sure that the words make sense when articulating a sentence. (Cobley & Schulz, 2013)

When understanding communication as discourse the “conventional model of communication process” must be taken into consideration. This model focuses on how communication makes meaning in a specific context, and the model includes different stages that repeat themselves when making use of communication as discourse. (Gudykunst and Kim, 2003) The use of encoding when understanding communication focuses on the way messages are understood and interpreted as well as how the communicator manages to appeal to the audience. This can be through different methods such as appealing to the audience in a way that the audience can put themselves in the place of the communicator. (Gudykunst and Kim, 2003) When a speech is constructed, there is typically a message that the communicator wants the audience to understand. Through the message there are two ways it can be interpreted, either through content dimensions where the purpose is to dig deeper into what the communicator is saying, and then there is the relationship dimension where it is being researched how things are being said. (Gudykunst and Kim, 2003) Both ways of interpreting and understanding a message are visible in this thesis in the sense that the critical discourse analysis takes the reader through all stages as we look at the textual part of the analysis researching “what is said”, in the sense of discourse practice and social practice whereas “how is said” is researched through the textual part of the analysis, digging deeper into the linguistic choices and how it is being portrayed. (Gudykunst and Kim, 2003)

Communication does not only include a speaker and an audience, but you must also be able to identify yourself with the given situation, in the sense that you come together and understand who the audience is that you are talking to. (Gudykunst and Kim, 2003) When identifying your audience, there are three categories that must be taken into consideration. Human, social and personal. All three categories are types of audience that one may have. When talking to humans overall, the communicator considers what the communicator has in common with all humans. (Gudykunst and Kim, 2003) When talking to a specific social group it is important to identify as the communicator what this social group and the communicator have in common, and last if the communicator is talking to someone in person or more private, it is important to be able to recognize how this actor is different from the social group, in the sense that they are an individual that the communicator is talking to. (Gudykunst and Kim, 2003) This thesis makes use of communication, as it is researching speeches by political actors and how their communication is

portrayed through strategies of legitimization within the use of critical discourse analysis.

Communication can be defined as processes that are symbolized, including how the connection between people with different backgrounds makes meaning. (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003, p. 17)

### The notion of Language and Discourse

Language is not only the way we speak words but also how we form and articulate these words.

Teaching and learning language refer to the way we learn to communicate language. Language forms how we understand the meaning of words and how it makes sense in a specific context.

When we make use of language, we do it in different ways, the first way is the way we speak in language, and how our mouth forms specific words, whereas when we write, the meaning is interpreted in a different way. When combining speaking and writing language as discourse is seen as we can elaborate with both the use of words that can be spoken, as well as words that can be better described when written. (Chafe, 1982) (Hughes, 1996, pp. 6-15)

When looking at the meaning of discourse it has been researched that there is not just one meaning, but several meanings that construct discourse depending on the given situation. Discourse is defined as being “any form of language in use”, this can both be verbal as well as written, meaning that there is no limitation. (Brown & Yule, 1983, p.1)

Language and discourse can cooperate, but they are not the same. This is crucial to be aware of, as discourse is made up of using language in verbal or written use. Language focuses on rules and patterns, whereas discourse focuses on describing the use of the language in relation to grammar and semantics. (Brown & Yule, 1983) The thesis makes use of critical discourse analysis, and therefore language and discourse used together and apart are important to mention, as they each work in their way to make up my thesis. The thesis focuses mostly on the discursive features, as there has been made use of the Critical Discourse Analysis, by Norman Fairclough. The linguistic features are implemented in the use of the CDA, which will be elaborated further in my method section.

## Philosophy of science

When construing this master's thesis, the philosophy of science behind this thesis is crucial. When discussing this master's thesis, one may wonder in which world this thesis exists. There can be many different opinions about this specific thesis and its existence in the real world. Through creating this thesis, it has been analyzed and researched that this thesis finds a place in the social constructivist world. This is due to the fact that the thesis discusses political speeches regarding war, and war is created by humans, in the sense that disagreement between nations or humans may lead to war, as well as history, but war is not only physical but also mental but still construed by people. (Olson, 1993)

This thesis being visible in the social constructivist world means that phenomena and people are only understood by studying their social conditions. When discussing social constructivism, it can be visualized through an epistemological or ontological view. In this thesis, it is viewed in the epistemological world. (Jindra, 2014) When making use of empiricism the human becomes aware of specific knowledge through one's senses, such as gathering information from different surveys or collecting data. Through epistemology, the knowledge within is gathered through how people view the world. In this thesis, I discuss and analyze political speeches regarding war. War is human-based in the sense that humans create war, and it is not created by particles and energy. If this was the case the thesis would exist in an ontological world. (Jindra, 2014)

The phenomena of war that this thesis discusses exist in the world of social reality. This is interesting because this thesis is crucial in the epistemological world in the sense that people create meaning upon this thesis. (Jindra, 2014) War has a different meaning depending on who you are as a person, where you were raised, and the social culture in the specific nation of the specific audience. There are different opinions regarding what defines a war, and therefore it is interesting in this case how humans create war through disagreements and how Joe Biden appeals to the audience in a way that approaches the audience in a respectful way, even though the audience may come from different social backgrounds. (Jindra, 2014) War is socially construed in the sense that language forms how people understand specific things such as recognizing the world and how it is construed. Therefore, the phenomenon "war" and the speeches that have

been analyzed in this thesis exist in a social constructivist world, because they help me up how people create opinions and understand the world in these two different situations. (Jindra, 2014)

### Political discourse

Issues are created to be solved. These are either natural disasters that must be prevented or issues created by humans. No matter which type of disaster or issue created it must always be solved in a way. This thesis focuses on a problem that is caused by humans, as the thesis digs deeper into speeches regarding war. War in this relation is created by humans in the sense that disagreements are formed, and therefore war is created, for the authorities to prove a point to the other.

When discussing political discourse, it can be understood in two different ways according to Van Dijk, this can be through analyzing political discourse. When doing this, the focus is on the political discourse such as a political speech where you analyze the text and talk in regard to the context politically. Another way of understanding political discourse is by analyzing discourse analysis with a political view of this analysis. (Dunmire, 2012) Political discourse and the linguistics visible in this discourse help examine specific phenomena in relation to politics as well as making use of political discourse make it possible to analyze political deeds that may be visible in political speeches as they are construed in the words that are spoken. With the use of political discourse, it is possible for social actors to gain power through their use of words. Murray Edelman has made different works in regard to political discourse, where he has found that creating meaning in the use of words through political discourse is crucial in practicing politics as it helps influence and persuades potential followers of political parties. (Dunmire, 2012)

Many different theorists have found that making use of political discourse and analyzing it, shows how it can help the social actor for the better as they are able to analyze what specific terms and phrases are used to create a specific opinion in the minds of their followers. (Dunmire, 2012)

Politics has always existed in the world, as there have always been beliefs, cultures, or ideologies that nations have formed and live by. Today many nations have the possibility to have more than one political belief, as these are formed in relation to what a specific human believes is correct. (Harutyunyan, 2021) These political beliefs have been created through people's

upbringing and what they lived by in their childhood, as well as the history that has been in the specific nation that the individual lives and grew up in. Discourse is formed in the way people create thoughts in their minds in relation to specific events that have happened, and they now must take into consideration and assess what their opinion is about the specific event. People can be defined in specific groups, where people are also politicians. (Harutyunyan, 2021) Politicians understand the use of discourse and how they can construct the use of rhetorical skills that they have accomplished as well as their personal experiences through life, to persuade people's thoughts and opinions in relation to specific topics. Politicians understand what use of discourse they have to implement in their speeches to gain the right audience as well as they understand how they are able to persuade even the ones who may have been skeptical of the politician in the beginning. (Harutyunyan, 2021)

When defining political discourse, it has been researched that for the social actor to be able to gain audience and keep their focus. It is important that they sense the atmosphere that they are representing their speech in as well as they create the same emotion in the audience as the mood already is, e.g. when discussing war, there may be an oppressive atmosphere in the sense that the topic is very serious as well as it can create emotions relating to being sad in the audience. (Harutyunyan, 2021) When having this in mind when creating a political speech, the social actor has a good standpoint of being a successful converser. It is also important to mention that if the social actor succeeds, the audience is much more persuaded to listen and connect to the politician. (Harutyunyan, 2021)

## NATO & International Relations Theory

### NATO

NATO is known for being a defensive military alliance formed on April 14, 1949. NATO started military cooperation among its members governments. The requirement for being a part of NATO was to protect each other in the event of a military assault. NATO was established in the aftermath of the Cold war to prevent the military threat presented by the Soviet Union and its Eastern Europe colony states. The Warsaw Pact disintegrated, which led NATO to reinvent its mission, to be able to respond effectively to the former Soviet Union's instability. (North Atlantic Treaty Organization, n.d.)

Security in everyday life is crucial to be able to live and have a wealthy living. NATO's purpose is to be able to guarantee its nations member's freedom and security through political and military ways. (Riches & Palmowski, 2021) NATO's purpose is to support democrat values and be able to give its members the opportunity to consult with each other as well as cooperate on the defense and security questions that are visible when having to solve problems, create trust, and in the future prevent possible conflicts. (Riches & Palmowski, 2021) The military purpose of NATO is to find solutions that are peaceful when having to do with contentious issues. If the diplomats fail, NATO has the military strength to take on operations that are critical. The military operations are enacted within the clause in the trajectory, regarding collective defense in NATO, or under a mandate from the United Nations, alone or in cooperation with other nations and organizations that are international. (Riches & Palmowski, 2021)

Every day NATO gets together to discuss eventual problems and how they are solved in the best way, as well as they discuss and decide opportunities in relation to security on all levels and regarding different areas that must be taken into consideration. (North Atlantic Treaty Organization, n.d.) When something is decided in the "NATO" regime, this is defined as a collective decision between 30 nation members, as all decisions are taken in solidarity with each other. Public servants, civilians, and military experts meet every day at NATOS headquarters, where they discuss information, they have received, share their ideas, as well as they, help prepare decisions that may have to be taken in cooperation with delegations that are national and staff of NATO's headquarters. (North Atlantic Treaty Organization, n.d.)

### International relations theory

International relations theory helps one understand how the world is made up. In international theories, there are many different theories that give one a different perspective theoretically. The use of international relations theory helps one understand the world in a less complicated way than it is construed. There have been two major theories that have made up the use of international relations theory, but through time more theories have been discovered and therefore realism and liberalism, which are the main theories have faced a challenge. When making use of international relations, not all theories are approachable for one's thesis, and I have

therefore chosen the theory in international relations that I find most approachable in relation to my topic. (McGlinchey, Walters & Scheinpflug, 2017)

The most appropriate theory in relation to this thesis is constructivism.

Constructivism became known at the end of the cold war. The reason for this discovery may be “that states are self-interested actors who compete for power and the unequal power distribution among states which defines the balance of power between them”. (McGlinchey, Walters & Scheinpflug, 2017) This means that when states disagree, they create tension in relation to power, meaning that states which are actors, make up the meaning of disagreement, and it is thereby constructed by themselves and not by something natural. Constructivism digs deeper into how people make up the meaning of specific actions, such as the end of the cold war, which was enacted by “ordinary people” rather than construed by states or international organizations. Constructivism focuses on how we as human beings make up the world of our own. (McGlinchey, Walters & Scheinpflug, 2017) Negative actions and disagreements between people may according to a constructivist lead to war whereas positive actions may lead to peace in-between people. Social actors make use of this constructivism to their advantage as it makes it possible for them to create relations internationally by acting and interacting in specific ways, that have a positive outcome. (McGlinchey, Walters & Scheinpflug, 2017)

Constructivist’s view and make meaning of the world, as to how they see it through their eyes and opinions, and not based on history or what they have been told. An example of this could be, how telling people that a bomb attack is more dangerous than a shooting attack. (McGlinchey, Walters & Scheinpflug, 2017) Here a constructivist would make meaning of this by understanding that a bomb has more power than a shooter may have, rather it has nothing to do with the weapons rather the understanding of the social context. Constructivists always understand the possibility for change, which also lies in the word “constructivist” namely that something is under construction and may change through time. (McGlinchey, Walters & Scheinpflug, 2017)

Constructivists understand that there is a mutual constitution between society and social actors. This means that society has an influence on social actors as well as the opposite. Society construes the social actor in the sense that if something happens in society the social actors must act such as addressing the situation, which could be war. (McGlinchey, Walters &



Scheinpflug, 2017) When the social actor addresses the situation, it has an effect on society in the sense that society acts upon what the social actor has addressed, and society includes both the nation as well as the people of the nation. The way the social actors choose to address the specific event can be interpreted in different ways depending on how it is defined and what meaning this definition has to it. (McGlinchey, Walters & Scheinpflug, 2017)

When discussing constructivism, social norms take a great part in this discussion, as constructivists see that specific actors must act in a specific way, depending on who they are. States that have a specific reputation in relation to politics and social norms are expected to act in the way that their reputation is. (McGlinchey, Walters & Scheinpflug, 2017) Behaviors and norms are created when society adopts these and make them their own. A constructivist understands this as people coming together in a nation to fight famine because this is the right thing to do. If everybody in the nation comes together to do this, they create a norm that this nation is known for being helpful to others and wanting to make a change for the better. (McGlinchey, Walters & Scheinpflug, 2017) Constructivists may also see this in relation to what political party a nation lives under, such as the US lives under a democratic president, and democrats live by people being in power and having equal rights, meaning that the nation's behavior is construed by this.

### The notion of Globalization

When defining globalization, it can be viewed in different ways as it depends on which individual you are asking. Globalization can have different meanings, as it is a word of development. Globalization can be defined as communication and incorporation between people, companies, and social actors that come from different nations. When communicating and incorporating these create globalization, when defining globalization as a growing world both economically and culturally and accepting differences in-between nations, while creating new solutions for the better. (Skytt, 2021) (Wang, 2019)

Globalization became known in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, more specifically in the term was first used in the 1980s, where it could be found in scientific articles. The use of the word and the definition became visible during the end of the cold war. (Skytt, 2021) When the cold war ended this resulted in the world not being divided into two blocks, and it was now possible for

democracy and capitalism to be spread around the whole world and thereby become globalized. (Skytt, 2021)

When discussing globalization and how this is seen in the world, it can be defined as making the world a smaller place, and thereby the people in the world are closer to each other. This can be in relation to issues that must be solved or even positive events where people come together to celebrate or solve an issue. (Skytt, 2021) When globalization takes place, something in the world affects other things in the world, no matter the placement of this action happening. It is therefore not trivial what happens in other nations, than the nation that one is living in, as all nations have an impact on each other through globalization. (Skytt, 2021) Globalization is one way in how national cultures and social norms and changes are construed. The effect of globalization in regard to cultural, political, or economical is what helps shape the world in the way it is formed today. (Skytt, 2021) (Wang, 2019)

As mentioned above, globalization is defined in different ways depending on who you are asking. The focus of globalization in this thesis is connected to the spread of knowledge, as the thesis focuses on speeches regarding war. (Skytt, 2021) One way to define globalization is the use of knowledge being spread through different options and the movement of people from one place to the other. When defining the history of globalization, theorists believe that the term became known already in the 16<sup>th</sup> century without the term being defined as “globalization”. (Skytt, 2021) At this point in history, explorers globalized themselves as they connected the continents by exploring, this was then followed by the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, when it was possible to make phone calls, telegraphs and travel with trains, globalization became more known as the movement of people from nation to nation became possible, and the last part of history in relation to globalization is what the world is today, being able to travel with flight, the internet being used more than ever as well as spread of technology and information. (Skytt, 2021)

## Critical Discourse Analysis

When analyzing the speeches that I have introduced in my introduction, I will be making use of the methodology approach to critical discourse analysis. This analysis is a problem-oriented study, that researches the use of language in specific discourses. Wodak and Meyer mention that the use of CDA is approachable to use when aiming to find specific use of power and control that can be hidden when reading without researching what is being said and why it is being said. The objective of CDA is to research and crack to code to the relationship there is seen between the use of language and how it connects furthermore to the ideologies, power, and social structure.

(Fairclough, 1992)

CDA was founded in 1990, by scholars. At the time the use of CDA was not as broadly based as it has become today. The aim of the use of CDA is to help get a better understanding of how discourse functions in relation to the processes, figures, and changes that are visible socially through the findings that have been discovered when making use of CDA. (Fairclough, 1992) The use of language has been discovered and researched, which has resulted in finding that there are many different approaches to the use of language and how language and words make meaning. The use of language also depends a lot on the one who is speaking the words, as it manages to create power and an advantage for the one who speaks the language that is being analyzed.

CDA was not created in a few days, it took many years before the term “Critical Discourse Analysis” was seen as a thing. This was due to the fact, that around the world different theorists had been working with language and how to analyze the use of words in the language, but these later came together and formed the use of “Critical Discourse Analysis” It has been found that the use and research of critical linguistics can be traced back to 1970. Many theorists have worked with different theories to make up the understanding of linguistical choices in language. (Catalano & Waugh, 2020)

In relation to political discourse when analyzing within the use of CDA, Wodak mentions that it is important when analyzing these types of discourses, that one manages to distance themselves from the actual problem, though she recognizes that no research is possible of being objective. Still, researchers must do their best to take all issues into perspective before drawing any conclusion. (Catalano & Waugh, 2020)

## Method

This section includes the methods for this thesis. The used methods in this thesis are the following: Critical Discourse Analysis and Strategies of legitimization. These two methods make up the thesis in the sense that they help me form the thesis and answer my problem formulation. In my method section, I have also included the approach to data collection, elaborating upon how I have chosen to make use of the data I have collected, and how this data has been collected. Both speeches that I will be analyzing are both relevant to this choice of method, as they include linguistic features that are relevant when analyzing upon critical discourse analysis and strategies of legitimization.

### Critical Discourse Analysis

When analyzing the political discourse, namely the speeches by Joe Biden in relation to his remarks on two different wars, I have chosen to make use of critical discourse analysis. I find this most appropriate to make use of, in reference to my problem formulation. CDA can be used to analyze texts in different contexts. This is the most suitable method in relation to the use of the five legitimization strategies. It can be discussed who the founders of CDA were, as I have explained above in my theory section, it has been researched and discovered that CDA has been used broadly through time but was first seen as an active use when analyzing linguistic choices in the '70s. In applying critical discourse analysis, the thesis is critical of the choices of language in the political discourse that is being analyzed. CDA is divided into three parts: textual, discourse practice, and social practice. When analyzing with the use of the three parts, the analysis is more thorough as it considers all views. (Catalano & Waugh, 2020)

### Textual

As mentioned above, when using CDA, the analysis is divided into three parts to allow for a more thorough analysis. The first part of the CDA is the textual analysis. The body part studies language choices in speech. There are many different terms to study when using CDA. I have chosen specific terms that I will study for both speeches. These will be discussed in the next section. (Fairclough, 1992)

“Lexis” discusses what words mean and how the words create meaning. The words that make meaning are created by social variables. (Fairclough, 1992) Culture and society form words, but the interpretation of a word varies depending on the context in which it is said, as it depends on both the context of the words and the meaning in the context. Social actors give meaning to words that help them express their views on speech. (Fairclough, 1992) The use of “lexis” also helps to examine the ideological positions held by social actors. It is important to understand the ideological stances associated with the legalization strategy, as political parties may have different goals in how they present themselves and attract speech audiences. The choice of words is also relevant to the legitimization strategy, as it helps make the strategy used in speech more obvious. (Fairclough, 1992)

The second term that I have chosen to apply in my analysis is the use of “overlexicalization”. The term focuses on how words are repeated. Words are often repeated to prove a point, and social actors try to approach the audience with the use of overlexicalization in relation to making the audience understand a specific statement. (Fairclough, 1992) When looking at excessive lexicalization in political speeches, the purpose of the speech can be explored, and repeated words can also refer to specific legitimization strategies This can provide of understanding of which strategies the speeches use most engagingly. (Fairclough, 1992, p. 185)

The third term that I chose for this work is the use of metaphors. Metaphors, when written, usually refer to idioms that mean something else. (Fairclough, 1992) Metaphors are used to explain things that mean one thing but refer to another. This can be used for political speeches, as it allows social actors to appeal to the audience in a more understanding way. (Fairclough, 1992)

### Discourse Practice

When it comes to comprehending text, it is crucial to look at the context in which they are being delivered. Each context can give a text or a speech a unique meaning. Speeches and writing are received in a variety of ways, depending on the discourses used and the sort of social actor delivering the speech. (Fairclough, 1992, p. 78) The discourse practice defines the process of a speech, which includes the creation of the text, how it is delivered to readers and audience and how the target groups consume the text or speech.

Texts are written for the precise setting in which they will be performed. The composition of the text is also influenced by the interpretive work that was employed in its creation. (Fairclough, 1992, p. 79) Texts have a variety of reasons; some are written to promote human rights, while others are written to spark a debate that could lead to something harmful. This, too, is dependent on the global situation and the text's relevance to the situation at hand. Although not all writings are intended to spark arguments, the most influential texts by social actors often produce a response from the audience. (Fairclough, 1992, p. 79)

"Intertextuality" is the first concept that will be utilized to investigate discourse practice in both speeches. Texts that relate to other texts to make up the meaning of a single text are referred to as intertextuality. This defines that it is possible for a speech to employ intertextuality by referencing to previous speeches to assist the speaker make sense of his own. When intertextuality is used, it allows the audience to comprehend a certain remark. It appeals to certain feelings and views that audience may have had in response to the other speeches being referenced while referring to other occurrences. (Fairclough, 1992, p. 104)

"Interdiscursivity" is the second concept that will be utilized to analyze the speeches. Interdiscursivity is the study of how one discourse may connect to another. Interdiscursivity also refers to the potential for a link to existing between discourses. When using interdiscursivity, genres workout together to create discourse. (Fairclough, 1992)

### Social Practice

Social practice is the final component of the critical discourse analysis. The politics, culture, and larger society all have a role in the discourse, according to social practice. The study of how speech is constructed in relation to society is known as social practice. One of the key reasons that the speech's conclusion is the way it is might be because society's distance and social attitudes are visible in the speech. As a result, it is critical to investigate the author's prior knowledge, such as nationality and cultural traits of the specific nationality. (Fairclough, 1992)

The speeches are produced in different contexts even though they speak upon the same purpose, which is in relation to war. Analyzing social practice will aid in understanding both the society in which the speech was made and what the speaker says about the society in which it

was published. When examining power relations and ideological disputes that will be discovered. (Fairclough, 1992)

### Strategies of legitimization

When we talk about legitimization, the term has distinct suggestions in different contexts. Speakers who employ legitimization engage in social behavior. Legitimization is accomplished by speech and arguments, in which the speakers justify their motivation. When people utilize legitimization, it is typically because they are looking for acceptance from others. When someone is legitimate in front of their audience, they are trustworthy and want to be recognized by their readers or audience. (Reye, 2011) The technique for gaining support from individuals is to first put the concept into action and explain why it is the best way to go. A sociocultural conceptualization shapes the notion of something being right or accurate, implying that it is how individuals choose to construct their opinions and interpret what is spoken. An example of this could be how vegans believe that they should not consume meat and that no one should do so, but non-vegans have a different perspective on what is good and wrong. (Reye, 2011)

The term “legitimization” is derived from the Latin term “legitimus”. The meaning of the word has been broadened in recent years, and it is now used in a variety of contexts. The formal use of legitimization may also be found in intimate relationships, such as being warned that Santa will not come to visit if you do not behave. (Reye, 2011) This statement appeals to the emotions of a youngster while also gaining respect and specific action from the parent to the child. When addressing specific events such as the Second World War, a politician may utilize a claim to appeal to people’s emotions, because the Second World War was distinguished for being an outrageous period, according to studies. These two examples are very distinct, yet both statements have a defined purpose and a specific legitimization structure, intended for two separate audiences. (Reye, 2011)

Political discourse investigates how politicians approach the audience as well as their speech while speaking in public. When politicians speak in front of an audience, their purpose is frequently to give a certain message that the audience must evaluate. Politicians are authoritative sources, which means that their remarks are legally sanctioned. When politicians talk to the public, they are “creating an official, institutional discourse, produced by a person who is

authorized” (Reyes, 2011, p. 783). When a politician gives a speech to the public, it is done in a specific context, which also validates the politician’s authority. When validating the politician’s authority, the power that he or she has when giving the speech causes the audience to believe that the speech is the truth. (Reyes, 2011, p. 784) When giving speeches, politicians have the authority to exploit symbolic power. They do this by using persuasive speech to implement their political goals in a natural and understandable manner so that the audience does not ask questions about why these goals but be set, but rather understands why these goals must be set and are persuaded that the politician’s goals are their own goals being enacted through an authority. In the methodological section of this thesis, there are five strategies of legitimization that will be investigated, as it relates to the application of critical discourse analysis.

### Five strategies of legitimization

My theory section elaborates on the use of strategies of legitimization including how they might be employed in political speeches and why they are used. This section will elaborate on the five strategies in relation to critical discourse analysis. The goal of using CDA is to examine the relationship between the textual, discourse, and social practices of a certain issue. The thesis investigates the linguistics of how legitimization is observable in language when using legitimization tactics. Other studies in relation to political discourse have in the past made use of strategies of legitimization. There are five strategies of legitimization, that will in the following sections be elaborated further upon. (Reyes, 2011, p. 782)

### Legitimization through emotions

When politicians employ emotion to appeal to their audience, they use the concept of “we” vs. “they” group. This entails forming a viewpoint in which “we” agree with the social actor speaking, while “they” are incorrect. (Reye, 2011, p. 782) In this case, the social actors speaking about the event may create a scenario where they appeal to the audience’s emotions by referring to other events in relation to the speech that can create a specific opinion in the audience’s mind. (Reye, 2011, p. 782) An example could be discussing an event that has claimed many lives and referring to 9/11. This appeals to the emotion of sadness and fear. The social actor might achieve their speech’s purpose by eliciting a certain form of feeling from the audience.



### Legitimization through a hypothetical future

When social actors employ this method, they are able to demonstrate their dominance by describing a specific future act. (Reye, 2011, p. 786) This refers to political figures discussing the past and how it may affect the future if the public does not respond appropriately. The audience may be inclined to act in a specific manner if it may avoid or cause a hypothetical future, therefore this remark appeals to them. (Reye, 2011, p. 786) This tactic may be viewed as a deceptive method for social actors to gain what they want and achieve their objective by manipulating their audience/target group. (Reye, 2011, p. 786)

### Legitimization through rationality

This strategy focuses on the time it takes for something to be spoken to become a reality. (Reye, 2011, p. 786) When employing this technique, social actors have devised a strategy and considered the consequences of that strategy before putting it into action. In this scenario, many sources are used to investigate the potential of certain activities if they were to be carried out. (Reye, 2011, p. 786) This strategy is implemented by employing phrases that are linguistically dependent on power and authority.

### Voices of expertise

This expertise strategy relies on referring to specialists who state particular facts. When a social actor talks to an audience and makes use of specialists and their expertise, the speech gains legitimacy in a different way than when the other methods are used. (Reye, 2011, p. 786). This is because the voice of expertise relates to authorization, and social actors employ this tactic to enhance their positions, as well as to ensure that the audience believes that the material being presented has been thoroughly investigated and is accurate. Authorization is also associated with approved sources, which means that the information they possess is presented in a “formal context, producing official and institutional discourse” (Reye, 2011, p. 786).

## Altruism

When social actors communicate to an audience, they make sure that the purpose is for everyone, not just themselves. (Reye, 2011, p. 787). When a social actor employs altruism, he or she is able to explain why this objective is correct and how having this goal benefits all. While social actors are able to obtain shared understanding from their audience, they get a higher level of legitimacy and do not appear as selfish in their speeches when appealing to their audience. (Reye, 2011, p. 787). The social actor is able to persuade the community that in order for a goal to be achieved, the audience of the speech must fully support it. (Reye, 2011, p. 787)

## Approach to Data Collection

This section of the thesis includes the approach to data collection, elaborating upon how the search terms for this thesis have been found as well as the reason behind the choice of data and why this is relevant for the thesis.

### Search Terms and Choice of Data

For this thesis, I chose my topic by looking at how the world is constructed today and major events that have happened in the nearest 21<sup>st</sup> century. Here I found that the war in Ukraine, as well as the withdrawal of troops in Afghanistan, are major events that I would like to research deeper into. These both happened within a year's gap, which I find relevant to the world today. Both events can be connected to globalization, and the intercultural globalized dimension that this master's program has, in the sense that war can be defined as a globalized phenomenon, due to the fact, that war affects the correlation the world has in relation to culture, the world's economy and the population of the world. These are all affected, in a globalized sense, and therefore I find it relevant to research for this thesis. War happening, whether it is in Ukraine or Afghanistan still contains different meanings depending on who is being asked about the phenomenon of war. I find it interesting to research and analyze Joe Biden and his speeches, as he has made a speech for each event, and research whether he is just repeating himself in his second speech regarding war or if there is a significant difference between the two speeches when they are both addressing war but in two different relations. When collecting my data, I have chosen speeches that both relate to war, and were published around the same time by the same social actor. I find it

interesting, whether these speeches remind of each other or are construed in two different ways when it is the same social actor presenting both speeches. When choosing speeches by the same social actor I find that I have the needed information to construe this thesis, as I analyze the strategies Joe Biden makes use of, if he repeats himself in the speeches or not, and what this does for him in relation to justification of speaking upon war.

I wanted to research a specific social actor and the speeches in relation to war that this social actor has performed. Therefore, I had to choose two different speeches in relation to war. These two were the speeches by Joe Biden regarding the War in Ukraine and the withdrawal of troops in Afghanistan. The speeches that I have chosen are titled: "Remarks by President Biden on Afghanistan" and "Remarks by President Biden on the United Efforts of the Free World to Support the People of Ukraine". The first speech is published in 2021 and the second speech is published in 2022. I find it interesting to research whether Joe Biden repeats himself in these speeches, and what this does for him if this is the case. It was therefore important for me to find a social actor that had spoken about the two wars, to be able to complete this thesis. Both speeches have been made into transcripts and can be found in the appendix of this thesis.

## Analysis

In this section of the thesis, the analysis will be conducted. The analysis will help me find my answer to my problem formulation, as well as it will make the comparison between the two speeches more visible. The analysis researches the subject matter of the speeches, researching and analyzing the different terms that have been elaborated upon earlier in the thesis.

### Text Analysis

The first section of the three parts of the analysis is textual analysis. The part researches and analyzes the textual findings in the speeches. The strategies of legitimization will also be included in this section. The terms that will be used when analyzing the textual part of the critical discourse analysis are lexis, overlexicalization, and the use of metaphors. When referring to the specific speeches I will be referring to appendix 1 for the speech by President Joe Biden in Afghanistan, as well as the second speech regarding the war in Ukraine will be referred to as appendix 2. Both appendixes include page numbers as well as line numbers to refer to.

#### Remarks by President Biden on Afghanistan

The first speech that I will be analyzing is Joe Biden's remarks on Afghanistan. This speech discusses the war ending in Afghanistan, military troops were withdrawn, and many years of war were unaccomplished. This speech is referred to as appendix 1. The analysis and line numbers referred to in this first speech can be found in appendix 1 of this thesis.

The first term that the thesis will be analyzing upon is the use of "lexis". This refers to how words are being spoken, and what they mean in a specific situation. When words are chosen and spoken, they make up an opinion by the audience of the speech, which the speaker is aware of, and this can be a strategy to gain followers politically depending on what the speech is about. In line 7, appendix 1 Joe Biden mentions the verb "unfolding", referring to the situation in Afghanistan regarding the war and military troops. The use of the verb "unfolding" makes the audience understand that this situation is not yet under control, rather there are still decisions to be made before the situation is fully under control and completed in relation to military troops being withdrawn from Afghanistan. This also introduces the situation and the status of the situation, so that the audience is up to date and is informed that Joe Biden knows as much as the

rest of the audience. In line 8, appendix 1 he follows the use of the verb “unfolding” and mentions the verb “developing” in relation to the ongoing events. Here Joe Biden makes the audience understand that the situation is being handled and is slowly developing, which he addresses as being the main event of the speech. Joe Biden mentions in line 9, appendix 1 the adverb “rapidly”. This is defined as something happening very fast, which is mentioned in relation to the situation, and how an event is an evolving event, that changes every minute. In these first lines, Joe Biden is making use of strategy through the use of emotion, this is done in-between the lines as he does not make use of words that implement a type of emotion, rather the words he is making use of appeal to the audience understanding how the ongoing situation is unfolding. This creates the emotion of calmness, as Joe Biden mentions that he and his team are doing their best, to monitor the situation and how it is developing. Joe Biden follows his speech by explaining and describing the purpose of the War in Afghanistan, and how the US managed to what he in line 22, appendix 1 mentions as “degraded” Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan. The verb refers to something being reduced below standards, which in this case is a positive outcome, of the war in Afghanistan. This appeals to the strategy of legitimization through emotions, as Joe Biden manages to explain what the US has succeeded with, this creates the emotion of being proud in the audience, as he elaborates on what the nation has achieved in its years of being in Afghanistan. In line 25, appendix 1 Joe Biden mentions the noun “mission”, which appeals to the strategy of legitimization through rationality, as a mission is defined as an operation that has been rationally thought out, before acting. The use of the noun “mission” also makes the audience understand that this choice of having military troops in Afghanistan was not unconsidered, rather it was part of a military operation to prevent possible attacks from Al-Qaeda on the US or other NATO nations. As Joe Biden explains the purpose of America’s visibility in Afghanistan, he mentions in line 29, appendix 1 the noun “terrorist” in relation to the terrorist attack that happened in 2001 towards the US. The use of the noun “terrorist” is a word, that brings fear to one’s emotions, as it connects with a negative meaning in the sense that “terrorist” is defined as a group or a person who performs acts that involve killing people to prove a point. This appeals to the strategy of legitimization through emotion, as the audience understands the reason for the visibility in Afghanistan. The war against terror was already ongoing, but the event of 9/11, was the major starting point of terrorism becoming the most discussed topic in relation to the global security policy. In line 35, appendix 1

Joe Biden mentions the adjective “adamant”, which gives the audience the understanding that he will not take any problems from anybody, rather he wants to focus on today’s problems rather than digging our graves and keeping on discussing problems from the past. The use of the noun “adamant” shows his willpower as president, and also visualizes how he stands in regard to the ongoing situation, that the threats in the past, are past for a reason, whereas the threats that are visible today are the ones the nations should worry about. “Adamant” is a very firm noun, which appeals to the audience’s emotions, because they get the sense that the president stands by what he has stated, and thereby the audience knows that there will be no decisions taken half-minded. In line 47, appendix 1 Joe Biden mentions the adverb “firmly”, in relation to how he and his team will be watching out for possible threats. The use of the adverb “firmly” makes the audience understand, that this situation is taken seriously, as it makes one understand that any threats will not be crossed any of Joe Biden’s or his team’s eyes. With the use of this adverb, he appeals through the strategy of emotion, as he makes the audience gain the emotion of hopefulness and trust, because they may feel safe when they know that they are open-minded and always on the watch for possible threats towards the US or NATO. Following Joe Biden’s speech, he continues to discuss the situation and what has been done and what is being done to handle the situation. In line 50, appendix 1, he mentions how he was elected president and mentions the verb “inherited” in relation to Trump and the deals that he had made with the Taliban when he was president. The use of the verb “inherited” makes the audience understand that he had no choice, but this is standard practice when taking over a political post, that decisions must also be taken over. The choice of this verb appeals to legitimization through emotion, as he makes his audience feel sympathy for the actions that must be taken, as he presents it as having no choice, and therefore makes the audience accept the fact that he had to inherit this deal that Trump had earlier made with Taliban. Followed by this statement he mentions in lines 58-59 “The choice I had to make, as your president, was either to follow through on that agreement or be prepared to go back to fighting the Taliban...” The use of the pronoun “I”, appeals to the audience understanding that he had to decide, rather the way he formulates this statement, he mentions the adjective “prepared” in relation to military troops may have to go back to fighting the Taliban even though they knew they would lose this battle as the U.S forces were to leave Afghanistan on May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021. The way this statement is formulated, Joe Biden makes use of legitimization strategy through altruism as

well as appeals to the audience's emotions. The use of altruism is visualized by making the audience understand that this situation was not easy to decide upon, but with the deal that Trump had earlier made, he forms his statement so that the audience understands there was no other choice. As well as he mentions the pronoun "I", he does this in relation to the audience understanding that this decision he took, was for the best outcome for everybody. The strategy of legitimization through emotion is visible, as he makes the audience feel sympathy for him, as he mentions the choice he had to make as your president, referring to the US, was to, in other words, leave while they have the chance or risk killing innocent soldiers, with no ceasefire after May 1<sup>st</sup>. This makes the audience understand that he had two different choices, but if he had chosen different, severe consequences would have faced him during his time of being President of the United States. Moving on, to line 61, appendix 1 Joe Biden mentions the noun "agreement", in relation to no protection of the forces in Afghanistan after May 1<sup>st</sup>. The use of the noun "agreement" appeals to the strategy of legitimization through voices of expertise, in the sense that the agreement is a legal document that states the protection of NATO nations in Afghanistan, the legal document contains expertise within rights, which is stated as article 5 in the collective defense of NATO. In line 74, appendix 1 the noun "truth" is mentioned in relation to Joe Biden stating that he always wants to speak the truth when talking to the nation. The use of the noun "truth", when explaining the situation in Afghanistan, makes the audience understand that Joe Biden and his team were also surprised by the situation and the escalation of the situation. This appeals to the strategy through altruism, as Joe Biden makes the audience understand that he is as much in this situation and handling the situation as the rest of the nation. Speaking the truth and recognizing one's mistakes or findings, appeals to the audience, as the audience understands that we are all in the same situation and Joe Biden makes it clear that he wants to be honest towards his nation. When he mentions the noun "truth" in relation to wanting to speak the truth he makes himself not seem selfish, rather he recognizes his findings in regard to the situation and makes him a part of the situation rather than standing outside. Following line 83, Joe Biden mentions how The US military should not be fighting, a fight that the nation of Afghanistan is not willing to fight themselves. The use of the adverb "not", makes it clear to the audience, that Joe Biden and the American nation have fought for the nation of Afghanistan, but have failed which has been caused due to the fact that Afghanistan does not want to fight themselves, therefore Joe

Biden mentions the adverb “not” to appeal to the audience emotions, as he recognizes that lives have been lost in this war, and this will not continue if both parts do not want to fight. The use of the adverb “not” appeals to the emotion of sadness because he relates this adverb to negative things that have happened in Afghanistan, but he will not stand by this anymore, and therefore he does not want to risk losing any more innocent troops. In line 84, he mentions the pronoun “we” several times, this is in relation to talking about NATO, who are the “we”. The way that it is possible to define who the “we” is, is followed by the use of the proper noun “NATO” as well as the pronoun “our”. The use of the pronoun “we” makes it visible to the audience that he is not acting on his own, rather he has allies that work together with him for the better. This appeals to the strategy of altruism, in the sense that he does not appeal selfishly, as if he is taking the decisions one-sided, rather he makes the audience understand who is behind him, what they have done for Afghanistan, and why the changes that are occurring must happen. In line 95, Joe Biden mentions the adjectives brave and capable, recognizing the soldiers who come from Afghanistan, but he also mentions that even though they are “brave” and “capable” the war has in these 20 years, not been won over, and therefore the future will not look any brighter than it has in the past 20 years. In this sense, Joe Biden appeals to the strategy through a hypothetical future. This is done as he explains what has happened throughout the 20 years of war in Afghanistan, how the mission was not completed, and that one must realize that it is a never-ending war if troops are sent to Afghanistan once again. Following line 106, Joe Biden uses the adjective “strategic” when describing their competitors, in regard to challenging the western dominated international system. They would love to see the US and NATO continue paying resources and attention in regard to trying to make Afghanistan stable again. The use of the adjective “strategic” makes the audience understand that Russia and China, view this situation in a strategically different way, as they would love to see the US paying more for nothing, followed by the verb “stabilizing” making the audience understand that what the US and NATO have been doing these many years is trying to stabilize Afghanistan, but have failed due to Afghanistan’s forces not fighting. In line 122 he manages to use the strategy of legitimization through emotion in a very gloomy way, as he mentions the following “So I’m left again to ask who argue that we should stay: How many more generations of America’s daughters and sons would you have me send to fight Afghans – Afghanistan’s civil war when Afghan troops will not? How many more lives – American lives – is it



worth? How many endless rows of headstone at Arlington National Cemetery?” The use of the noun “lives” in this phrase, makes the audience understand that many lives were taken from us, and if this war continues this will follow, with no good result as Afghan troops are not willing to fight themselves, followed by the noun “headstone” referring to the stone at a cemetery, which you visit when people have passed away. These nouns are in this situation referred to in negative situations, appealing to the strategy of legitimization through emotion, where the emotion in the audience is sadness, that this situation has been going on, and could continue if they had not been withdrawn. In line 127, Joe Biden mentions the noun “mistake” in relation to how the mistake was that they kept on fighting when there was no one else fighting. The use of the noun “mistake” appeals to the emotion of acknowledgment towards the audience, as the audience acknowledges him and he is standing by that this operation became a mistake when it was only NATO fighting in Afghanistan, rather than Afghan military forces also. In line 132, Joe Biden makes use of the noun “interest” which refers to wanting to know more or research deeper into something. In this relation, he mentions how the US is interested in the world, and therefore the mistake of having military troops in Afghanistan, will not be repeated. The use of the noun “interest” appeals to the strategy of legitimization through a hypothetical future, as Joe Biden mentions that the “US has interests in the world that we cannot afford to ignore”. These interests are not mentioned, what they are, but as he appeals to the past and learning from mistakes, one may get the understanding that learning from the mistakes made in the past, may gain a brighter future, as long as it does not repeat itself. In line 135, Joe Biden makes use of the pronoun “I”, where he explains how he wants to acknowledge the people who have lost their loved ones. Here he appeals to legitimization through emotion, as he makes use of the adjective “painful” to describe the feeling that the ones who have lost their loved ones must have felt and are going through. Even though he makes use of adjectives that have a negative meaning, he also manages to appeal to legitimization through a hypothetical future, by as he mentions in line 155, that “we will continue to support the Afghan people”, the use of the verb “continue”, makes the audience understand that this is what the US has been doing the whole time, even though they failed, as well as he mentions the verb “lead”, describing how this situation will be forward-looking. This appeals to the legitimization strategies through emotions as well as a hypothetical future as he makes the audience hopeful that even though this situation has had a negative outcome, in relation to many lives being lost, it will

possibly be a brighter future, by learning from past mistakes. The strategy of legitimization through a hypothetical future, is also visible in the statements he mentions stating “we will” in lines 152, 155, and 157, which is a phrase that determines what will be done in the coming years in this relation. In line 162, Joe Biden mentions the noun “rallying”, in relation to how to make the world join the foreign policy and the goals within. With the previous mistakes that have been made and recognized, Joe Biden has a plan that this is the way to act, to make people join the US. The use of the noun “rallying” appeals to the strategy through rationality, as it is visible how Joe Biden has made specific considerations in his experience with military deployment and come up with a strategy that may work for the future. This also appeals to the strategy of legitimization through a hypothetical future, as he mentions in line 157 the verb “continue” explaining what they have done and how this will be kept on being done in the future, which he states in lines 160-162. In lines 164 to 167, Joe Biden mentions what the mission he was given involved. In these lines, he makes use of the noun “safety”. This appeals to the strategy of legitimization through emotion, as he mentions how his mission was to evacuate a lot of people, but the use of the noun “safety”, makes the audience understand what the purpose of this mission was, and that Joe Biden did not want to leave anybody behind where it was not safe. This appeals to the emotion of feeling safe, as he makes the audience feel safe in his way of phrasing his sentence. Followed by line 169, he mentions the adverb “safely” again appealing to people’s safety and wanting the audience to understand that this was his main goal, that no one should be harmed during this evacuation. In line 187, Joe Biden mentions the adjective “vulnerable” to describe the Afghans coming to the US. The use of this description of the Afghans shows how his speech makes use of the strategy of legitimization through altruism, as he appeals to the audience and makes them understand that not only must he help these Afghans, rather the whole nation must be open-minded, as these people fleeing from Afghanistan are homeless, and need a new beginning. The use of altruism is also seen in the way Joe Biden makes use of the pronoun “we” in relation to “we’re” in line 187, where he includes himself as part of the bigger picture, and not just mentions the US nation has done the following but he and others have been acting upon the situation. Moving on to line 198, Joe Biden mentions the verb “attack” in relation to explaining how the US and NATO would react if the Taliban were to attempt to destroy the operation. The use of the verb “attack” as well as the verb “disrupt” in line 199, appeals to the strategy of legitimization through emotion, because it

creates fear in the audience, making them understand that there is this risk, but also creating hope in the audience, as Joe Biden mentions this to know that they are prepared for the worst. In line 200, Joe Biden mentions the verb “defend” and the adjective “forceful”, in relation to explaining how Joe Biden and his team will protect the US. The use of this verb and adjective appeals to strategy through emotion, where the emotions are hopefulness and safety that the US will do everything in power to keep the nation safe. He follows line 200 by mentioning the pronoun “we”, where he includes himself in this problem, showing the strategy of legitimization through altruism as he is included in the bigger picture, and makes it clear that he will fight with the rest, he follows the strategy of altruism in line 203, where he mentions the nouns “people” and “allies” referring to how he wants to get these to safety when performing the operation. Again, he shows that he is part of something bigger, and it is his responsibility to get these to safety. In line 209, Joe Biden makes use of the noun “proof” and the adverb “sadly” to describe what the results of the war in Afghanistan have ended with. This both appeals to the strategy of legitimization through emotions, as the audience gains the emotion of sadness, that so many years of fighting and losing loved ones have come to this result. Also, the use of these words appeals to the strategy of legitimization through a hypothetical future, due to the fact that Joe Biden explains how no military forces would ever be able to deliver a safe Afghanistan. Here he is also appealing to the future, and no matter how long this battle would continue if he had not made the choice to withdraw military troops, there would hypothetically still not be a happy ending in the future. The use of the strategy through a hypothetical future is also seen in lines 211-213, where Joe Biden mentions the adverb “now” in relation to discussing the current situation, he mentions the future and explains how this situation would hypothetically have outplayed the same way in the future, and therefore the missteps that have been taken in the past must be seen as something positive that may have gained a brighter future, as soldiers are not losing their lives in an unfair battle. In line 218, Joe Biden mentions the pronoun “I” followed by the verb “mislead” where he appeals to the audience to make them understand, that he does not want to give them fake news rather he wants them to understand that mistakes have been made in the past and that these mistakes will be made right, by taking the decision of withdrawing military forces in Afghanistan. This appeals to the strategy of legitimization through emotion, as the audience gets the emotion of hope and feeling safe that what Joe Biden has done, is the correct decision as he displays himself as being

honest towards the situation, which is also seen in line 219, where he mentions “nor will I shrink from my share of responsibility” where he includes the pronoun “I” to once again make the audience understand that he is part of something bigger, namely the situation which appeals through the strategy of legitimization through altruism. In line 229, the use of altruism is also visible as Joe Biden mentions the verb “degrade” to describe one of the missions that have succeeded and to make the audience understand that not the whole war has had negative outcomes, but some missions have succeeded. When he mentions the mission, he again makes use of altruism by including himself, by using the pronoun “our” which includes himself and others. In lines 240-242, Joe Biden appeals to the emotion of proudness, through the audience as he mentions why he became president and makes it clear that this decision was one of the tough tasks that come with becoming president. Even though he talks about himself and becoming president, he manages to make use of altruism, because he does not sound selfish, rather he mentions that this decision he has made is one of the reasons that the nation has voted for him as president. The speech ends with Joe Biden recognizing the men and women that have fought for the American nation, and the lives that have been lost in this relation, recognizing the brave soldiers in this situation. By recognizing these soldiers, he creates legitimization through emotions in the audience, as it makes the audience feel proud of what people have done for the nation, and that people have risked their lives is sad, yet they have still done a huge thing for the American nation, which makes the audience have the emotion of proudness of the American nation as well as other NATO nations that have fought in this war. Joe Biden manages to include and recognize not only American soldiers, but he mentions in line 257 “our troops, our diplomats, and the brave Americans” making the audience understand that all the people who fought for America are all part of his team, which is visible in the use of the pronoun “our”. This again makes the audience understand that Joe Biden sees himself as something bigger and recognizes not only his nation, but all who were part of this war, creating the strategy of legitimization through altruism.

The next term that the analysis will be researching is the use of overlexicalization. Overlexicalization is used for the speaker to prove a specific point, and for the audience to get an understanding of a specific statement. In the speech, Joe Biden mentions several words more than once, where he proves a specific point in this relation. Joe Biden mentions the pronoun “we” 59 times, when using the pronoun “we”, Joe Biden makes use of the strategy of legitimization

through altruism. This is visible because when he mentions “we” he includes himself in the decisions. The pronoun “we” includes himself and his national security team. He makes this clear in line 11 mentioning “My national security and I” followed by the pronoun “we” when talking about him and them throughout the speech. Joe Biden mentions the pronoun “I” 56 times in the speech. When making use of this pronoun it is in the context of discussing himself and what he has done in relation to this situation, as well as what his actions have caused in the past when he was vice president. The use of the pronoun “I” makes it visible to the audience that he wants to portray what he has done for this situation rather this is not done in a selfish way, as he includes both the positive and negative outcomes of the situation and decisions that he has made. The use of the pronoun “our” is mentioned 48 times in the speech. This pronoun is mentioned in relation to Joe Biden explaining the situation in Afghanistan and the mission. It is visible that the use of the pronoun “our”, discusses him and his national security team when talking about what their goal was for the mission and what their goal is for the future in this relation. In line 25, Joe Biden mentions the pronoun “our” for the first, which is mentioned in relation to the pronoun “we” in lines 22-23. Again, this appeals to the strategy of legitimization through altruism as he includes himself in the bigger picture and makes the audience understand that he is on their side of the situation, but still has his goals in relation to the situation but manages to make the audience a part of this by him being a part of the audience. The noun Afghanistan is mentioned 43 times for the audience to understand what the speech is about, and that this specific speech does not discuss other problems in the world, rather it only focuses on the situation in Afghanistan. This may be important to address, other nations may also be struggling with specific situations, but this is not what is going to be recognized in this speech. In the speech, Joe Biden mentions the noun “military” 15 times. In this speech, the military is the voice of expertise as they are the ones who have the expertise within this situation. Therefore, the use of the noun “military”, makes it possible for Joe Biden to portray as being legitimate through the voice of expertise as he includes the military, as the experts within their field. Throughout the speech Joe Biden continues to repeat different words, rather these chosen words, are the most crucial to mention as they are the most mentioned words in the speech.

Moving on to the last term in the textual relation of the speech is the use of metaphors. The use of metaphors is visible when the social actor is trying to make a specific point,

where a metaphor is more common to use than explaining the actual situation. Metaphors are in some situations more approachable, as it makes some statements more understandable for the audience of the speech. In line 22, Joe Biden mentions the phrase “We never gave up the hunt for Osama Bin Laden”. Osama Bin Laden has always been a target for the US military after 9/11 but has had difficulties finding him and executing him. The use of the phrase “gave up the hunt...” is a metaphor for “killing” Osama Bin Laden, but the use of this metaphor makes the audience understand that this situation was a hunt in the sense that he was difficult to capture, but at last, they managed to do so. In line 68, Joe Biden mentions “I stand squarely in my decision”. “Stand squarely” is a metaphor for being fair and honest in a specific situation, where Joe Biden in this situation is being fair and honest towards his decision. In line 71, Joe Biden mentions “We were clear-eyed about the risks...” the use of the phrase is a metaphor for being realistic about the risks there were when withdrawing the military from Afghanistan. In line 209, the phrase “graveyard of empires” is mentioned in relation to discussing how the situation in Afghanistan will not be changed because of the lack of help from Afghan military troops. The use of the phrase “graveyard of empires” is a metaphor that refers to foreign powers who have tried to fight for Afghanistan but have failed, the Empires are the foreign powers, and the graveyard is where the fallen soldiers of the foreign powers lie. In line 222, Joe Biden mentions “... the buck stops with me”. “Buck” is a metaphor for responsibility, where Joe Biden makes it clear that he does not want a 5<sup>th</sup> president to make the decision of the American military troops in Afghanistan and therefore he mentions “the buck stops with me”. The use of this metaphor also appeals to altruism as the decision he is taking, is his decision, but he includes the audience and makes them understand that if he did not make this decision, it would be an ongoing problem for the fifth president of the United States presiding over the war in Afghanistan. In line 225 the phrase “laser focus” is mentioned in relation to keeping a focus on the counter-terrorism missions. The use of the metaphor “laser focus” refers to giving a specific topic 100 percent focus, like a laser does when pointing it at a specific spot, making the audience understand that they want to keep their focus on what is believed to be the correct mission to focus on rather than losing this focus. Throughout the speech the use of metaphors is visible, and it is understandable how the social actor manages to make use of this to make the speech more approachable for the audience.

## Remarks by President Biden on the United Efforts of the Free World to Support the People of Ukraine

The second speech that I will be researching is presented by the President of the United States, Joe Biden. This speech discusses the situation going on in Ukraine, namely the Russian invasion. The speech was published on March 26, 2022, when Joe Biden went to visit Poland. The aim of this speech is for the audience to get an understanding of the situation going on, as well as Joe Biden, is not afraid to establish his feelings towards Putin and what he has done toward the Ukrainian nation. This speech is referred to as appendix 2, where line numbers have been implemented in the analysis.

The first term that will be analyzed in the speech is “lexis” which as previously mentioned analyzes the meaning of words, how they are construed in a specific context, and how they make meaning in this specific context. Joe Biden approaches his speech in line 12, appendix 2 by thanking the audience who have come to hear his speech. The interjection “thank you” refers to thankfulness, which shows how Joe Biden is thankful that these people have chosen to come and listen to his speech, as well as he acknowledges the president of Poland, by thanking him that it is possible for him to hold this speech. Even though the situation that Joe Biden is about to address he makes sure to start his speech off calmly, which shows empathy towards the audience, by starting slowly when addressing the situation in Ukraine. Joe Biden refers to the Polish Pope in line 15, appendix 2, and how he has mentioned “be not afraid”, “afraid” is an adjective that refers to people’s emotions, as it is a feeling that people can have, especially in this relation. Joe Biden includes this in his speech to establish that the polish nation and the rest of the world shall not be afraid of this situation even though it is very intense, but the citation refers to the “power of faith, the power of resilience, and the power of the people.” Which is mentioned in lines 20-21, appendix 2. Joe Biden chooses to include the noun “power”, which is a noun that refers to how the nation has the power and that together they are strong and will fight this situation. This noun becomes positively charged in this particular context, in the sense that he believes in the power of faith, resilience, and people. When Joe Biden chooses to include citations from popes of Poland, this creates a situation where he appeals to the polish nation that we are all in this together and no one is alone. As Joe Biden explains how the situation once looked regarding Ukraine and Russia, he makes use of the adjective brutal in relation to how the system was at the time. The

adjective “brutal” refers to something awful, but as he mentions the Pope and his citation, “the brutality would overcome to something positive”, namely the purpose of the message. The choice of words and how the words make meaning at the beginning of the speech are spoken to address the seriousness of how history is repeating itself. Many of the words that Joe Biden speaks at the beginning of the speech refer to defeat, referring to dark moments, but also how the dark moments got turned around into something positive, which appeals to the emotions of the audience, creating hope that this situation will create positivity at the end. Even though the war between Russia and Ukraine has just begun, in the sense that Russia invaded Ukraine on February 24, 2022, the use of words and how the words make meaning from lines 1 to 45, appendix 2, Joe Biden makes use of adjectives such as afraid, cruel, and brutal which are adjectives that refer to a negative meaning. With the use of these words, Joe Biden makes use of the legitimization through a hypothetical future. This is done because he discusses the history, how it took place at the time, and how the war was defeated. One could discuss whether Joe Biden mentions this, as history may be repeating itself, and therefore what once has happened may become a hypothetical future. Joe Biden also mentions how the new situation going on must be handled, to prevent the hypothetical future, in line 41, appendix 2 he refers to being clear-eyed, this adjective refers to not missing any small details and being aware of every move that the opponent may suddenly make. In line 49, Joe Biden refers to the adjective sacred. “Sacred” means that something is holy, in this line he refers to being at the Royal Castle of Warsaw which is a sacred place in relation to humankind and their search for freedom. The use of this adjective refers to something that is kept safe, and Joe Biden recognizes this and empowers how it must stay this way, even though the situation in Ukraine becomes critical day by day. In relation to the choice of words and how the words make meaning, Joe Biden makes an obvious choice in including important people who have fought for their nation earlier in time, when mentioning these important people he makes use of words such as “brave” which is an adjective that refers to someone doing something that may have a negative effect on them in the future but still manages to stand up for themselves and their people when fighting in what they believe is the right thing to do. Joe Biden also makes use of the adjective “ardent”. This word is used to describe a person who is very willing to fight for a specific cause. Joe Biden mentions both individual people and acknowledges their braveness when fighting through history for their rights, as well as he mentions Ukraine as a nation that is brave for



“fighting for essential democratic principles” when Joe Biden mentions these people both individually and as a nation, he manages to appeal to the audience feelings and how the audience should also acknowledge these brave people. Appealing to the audience’s emotions also refers to the strategy of legitimization through emotions, as specific feelings come in relation to obtaining specific emotions, the use of this strategy can be seen as being useful because the speech shows when the audience applauds in relation to what he is saying. In line 97, appendix 2 Joe Biden quotes Putin on the use of the word “de-nazifying”, this verb refers to getting rid of Nazism, which Putin believes that Ukraine has lived by before he invaded the nation. Here Joe Biden makes use of the noun “lie”, and the adjective “cynical”, referring to Putin’s citation. Making use of these words refers to how Joe Biden is astonished by the fact that Putin has this opinion. In lines 97-98, appendix 2 Joe Biden mentions “Putin has the gall to say he’s “de-Nazifying” Ukraine. It’s a lie. It’s just cynical. He knows that. And it’s also obscene”. Here he refers to the adjective “obscene”, which is an adjective used to explain situations that have crossed a line. The word of choice and how the words make meaning refer to how Joe Biden is against Putin and his statements regarding the Ukraine nation. When implementing this in the speech and directly calling Putin a liar, this can create both a positive and negative outcome, as it is somewhat of a statement to call another politician a liar. In line 100, appendix 2 Joe Biden mentions Zelensky and his family’s history being “wiped out”, this verb is a softer version of mentioning how Zelensky’s father’s family was killed in the Nazi Holocaust. The use of the adjective “wipe out” also refers to the purpose of the holocaust which was to wipe out all Jewish people. Here Joe Biden again appeals to history, and how history has affected Ukraine and the president of Ukraine, Volodymyr Zelensky. In line 112, appendix 2 Joe Biden discusses The Kremlin, which is also known as Russia, where he mentions how Russia portrays NATO in a negative way, with the use of the verb “destabilizing” which refers to something being closed. The verb is used in a negative way, which can be seen as he follows his statement by mentioning that nothing is further from the truth. In line 117, appendix 2 Joe Biden makes use of the verb “avert” in relation to explaining how NATO tried to prevent Russia from crossing and invading Ukraine, as well as he makes the audience understand that this is a crisis that is happening. The noun “crisis” refers to when a difficult choice or event must be handled. The noun “crisis” is easy for the audience to understand, rather than the choice of any other word. The audience understands what a crisis involves and the serious actions that must be taken into

consideration. Reading through the lines, Joe Biden explains how his meeting with Putin went, and that it did not go as planned, because Putin kept on saying they were not going to invade as well as he discusses the plan that they had made so that Putin would not invade Ukraine. Here Joe Biden makes use of legitimization through rationality, which is visible because he explains to the audience how NATO offered different initiatives and considerations so that they could all agree for Russia to avert a war. In lines 135-140 Joe Biden mentions the following “There is simply no justification or provocation from Russia’s choice of war. It’s an example of one of the oldest human impulses: using brute force and disinformation to satisfy a craving for absolute power and control. It’s nothing less than a direct challenge to the rule-based international order established since the end of World War Two” Here he makes use of the phrase “rule-based international order” referring to how Putin is challenging this. The noun “challenge” refers to how Joe Biden is describing Putin as seeking a problem and wanting to poke to the fire, by invading Ukraine. The use of the noun “challenge” when defining what Putin is seeking, is a moderate way of referring to Putin. Joe Biden could have made use of other words to describe Putin’s actions, rather he does this in a moderate way, and also acts as a social actor in this sense, by not losing himself in relation to the anger Joe Biden has towards Putin. In line 142, appendix 2 Joe Biden mentions the verb “ravaged” in relation to how Europe was before the international rule-based was established, appealing to the audience and making them understand that this is not a possibility that Europe should go back to, rather he mentions “and it threatens to return...” here he makes use of the strategy of legitimization through a hypothetical future, warning the audience what could happen if Putin gets too much power and authority. The use of the verb “return” appeals to legitimization through a hypothetical future, as he mentions what once was, could happen again but should not. Moving on through the speech Joe Biden elaborates on how The US has handled the situation in relation to sanctions, and in line 165, appendix 2 he mentions the noun “corruption” which is used in relation to a criminal act. Here he makes the audience understand that Russian governments have made use of criminal actions, but now they are getting a taste of their own medicine and sharing the pain. In lines 186 -188, appendix 2 Joe Biden mentions how the Western world has come together, to provide for Ukraine, where he makes use of legitimization through altruism, because he does not seem selfish in this relation, rather he makes the audience understand that the western world stands together as one for the Ukrainian nation, making use of words in

relation to what the western world is contributing with, such as “military, economics, and humanitarian assistance”. When Joe Biden refers to the western world, he mentions how American forces are in Europe but do not engage in “conflict” with Russian forces. The use of the noun “conflict” refers to the Russian invasion of Ukraine, and Joe Biden makes it clear to the audience that NATO is not seeking war, rather they are seeking peace. In line 213, appendix 2, Joe Biden makes use of the noun “tears” in relation to seeing Ukrainian refugees feeling hopeless and not knowing what is going to happen to them, here Joe Biden appeals to the legitimization through emotions, as he explains what he saw, and how their mothers were crying, explaining a personal experience which is so devastating appeals to emotions of the audience, as he manages to make them understand and gain the same emotion that he had at the time. In line 245, appendix 2 Joe Biden mentions the noun “obstacle” in relation to how Russia is blocking relief support, explaining to the audience that even though there are difficulties on the way, the World Food Program is doing its best to help in this situation. In line 252, appendix 2 Joe Biden makes use of the noun “brutality” in relation to describing Putin and his actions, followed by the pronoun “myself” he refers to himself and appeals to legitimization through emotion, as he mentions how he has lost children himself and recognizes how this does not help people who have lost their families, but he manages to make use of legitimization through altruism, by sending his thoughts towards Ukraine’s, and explain how they are not alone, and he understands the feelings going through their bodies. In lines 259 and 262, appendix 2, Joe Biden makes use of the adjectives “strengthened” and “stronger” to explain how this situation has affected NATO, making them stronger and more strengthened. These adjectives are positive words, that are used to explain positive situations. Here he also appeals to the audience, that they should not be afraid, as the outcome NATO-wise has surpassed expectations. In line 288, appendix 2 Joe Biden makes use of the noun “enemy” in relation to Russians, where he explains that the Russian people are not the enemy rather it is the one leading that that is. Here he also appeals to the Russian audience, the ones who are able to hear this. This creates legitimization through emotions, as Joe Biden manages to establish that Russian people are not bad people, appealing to the emotions of the audience, and making them understand that the Russian people are as affected negatively by this as the rest of the world. In line 347, appendix 2 Joe Biden mentions the noun “darkness” in relation to how autocracy is driven, explaining how autocracy is not driven in a responsible way, as

“darkness” refers to something negative, and how it does not match other the flame of liberty. He makes use of the noun to explain what must be done in relation to NATO and that there are visible bumps on the way, due to how Russia has acted in this situation. Following line 351 he again mentions the noun “dark” in relation to how dark moments have afterward had a positive outcome, making use of legitimization through emotions has it creates hope to the audience that this crisis may have a positive outcome in the end. Throughout the speech Joe Bidens choice of words in relation to “lexis”, he does not make use of words that are difficult to understand as it is a big audience that he is holding his speech to, even though he held it in Poland the whole world was listening to what he had to say. It can therefore be discussed whether the choice of words and how the words make meaning in relation to their difficulty has been taken into consideration, as the audience was so wide. Through the speech, I have found different words in relation to the speech and my problem formulation that I found crucial to involve and elaborate upon, how he makes use of these words and phrases in relation to strategies of legitimization.

Moving on to the second term that I will be analyzing is “overlexicalization”. When reading the speech, Joe Biden manages to repeat many of his words, which I find interesting in relation to whether he is trying to prove a point, and what the point is. When reading through the speech, it is discovered how Joe Biden mentions the noun “people” 33 times. In the speech, Joe Biden mentions people in relation to defining who is talking to and about in the speech. What is interesting to take notice of, when he mentions this noun is in the following lines, he mentions which nation some of the people belong to, but he does not distinguish between who he is talking about, therefore the use of the noun “people” applies to everybody and is a very neutral word when discussing humans around the world. This noun appeals to the audience’s emotions, as he makes them feel as one unity by not writing e.g. “the Poles, the Danes, etc.” rather he makes all come together as one. In some lines, he mentions Ukrainians as one unity from the other, rather in this context it is appropriate, as he is explaining the situation in Ukraine, and therefore needs to clarify what the intent and who the speech is about, without making them feel excluded. In the speech, Joe Biden mentions the pronoun “I” 29 times. With the use of the pronoun “I” in his speech he appeals to personal experiences and mentions what he has been doing in relation to the situation, showing the audience that he cares for the situation, and takes action to prevent the situation from coming out of control. The use of the pronoun “I” and personal experiences appeal

to the strategy of altruism. Even though mentioning “I” in a speech and appealing to oneself, may seem selfish, it can be seen that in this context, he makes use of the pronoun to explain what he has done, and for the audience to understand what he has done, must be done, and that we are all in the same boat. Rather he does not only appeal to the audience that they must act, but he also includes himself, as an “us” vs. “them”. The “us” is the western world, fighting against “them” which is Putin and his people. He also manages to mention, that it is not the Russians that are the “bad” people, but it is Putin that has his way of ruling the Russian nation, and this is the crisis that must be handled. Joe Biden mentions the phrase “Russian people” 7 times, where he appeals to the Russian audience and wants to make them understand that they are not the enemy of this ongoing crisis, by mentioning the phrase “Russian people” and repeating it several times during a part of his speech, makes the audience understand that we are all in this together, also the Russian people, again he is appealing to the legitimization through altruism, as he makes it clear not only to himself but the audience that the Russian people are as afraid and curious about what is going to happen next. Joe Biden continues his speech and mentions “Russia” 22 times, this use of overlexicalization of this proper noun, defines who the speaker is talking about, as well as he mentions “Ukraine” 20 times, in relation to also discussing who the opponent of the invasion is. The noun “invasion” is only mentioned 4 times in the speech, this is interesting to take notice of, as Joe Biden does not focus his speech only on the invasion, rather he focuses on the invasion and how Russia in history and now is challenging the western world in their ongoing actions. The noun “freedom” is mentioned 13 times. “Freedom” refers to being free and acting, speaking, and thinking as one wants to. The use of the noun “freedom” and mentioning it in this speech refers to legitimization through emotion. The noun is used in relation to, how “freedom” is being taken away from the Ukrainians, because of the invasion. This may create the emotion of being frightful and fearful, that freedom will be taken away from one if the invasion continues and crosses the border of Ukraine and into a NATO nation. The emotion of fear and frightfulness may also be triggered in relation to the examples of freedom that Joe Biden mentions, which need to be recaptured, giving the audience the idea that freedom is being taken away from one. This use of the noun “freedom” also appeals to legitimization through a hypothetical future, which is seen, as he creates fear of losing freedom, as well as he mentions in between the lines, that this freedom is being taken away from us, if Putin keeps on taking these actions, and is not stopped in time. The

use of the pronoun “our” is repeated 12, where Joe Biden includes himself, and appeals to legitimization through altruism, making the audience understand that we are one unit, once again, and that Joe Biden is on the positive side of this crisis, but he is a part of it and wants to prevent it as much as the rest of the world. He does not appeal to the audience that only they must act, rather he makes them understand what he is doing is to create a better future for everybody. The proper noun “NATO” is mentioned 11 times, in relation to explaining who the defendants of the speech are, and who Joe Biden is speaking for and upon. In this case, the noun is not used in relation to legitimization strategies, but it is still crucial to mention the repetition of the word, as it is used, to make the audience understand who Joe Biden is speaking about, as he also mentions that NATO stands on the sideline of this situation, as Putin has not invaded a NATO nation, rather if this happens, it all NATO nations, that are in war with Putin. Joe Biden makes it clear in his repetition of NATO, how they stand stronger together than ever, and will not be fought over by this situation. Joe Biden mentions the noun “power” 10 times. The noun defines being strong and acting, as well as having the ability to act. In this reference in the speech, power is used to explain the possible act of the specific situation, as well as how handling it with the use of “power” will gain its advantage in relation to having faith in power. “Message” is a noun that is mentioned 10 times in the speech, where Joe Biden either refers to specific quotes or messages that have been given, in relation to the crisis, as well as he hopes these messages will give and send a specific signal toward the audience. This creates legitimization through emotion, as sending messages in the speech, and repeating quotes, lead to creating a specific emotion in the audience’s hearts. The adjective “free” is mentioned 10 times, which are all in relation to Joe Biden speaking upon the free world, and how we live in a free world. When he makes use of this adjective, it is either in the use of a quote, or he explains how the human rights include being free, the use of the adjective free appeals to the legitimization through emotions, as he appeals to positive emotions in the audience’s, by speaking upon what human rights are, in relation to freedom and what we have the right to, which is the way the way we should act. The noun “democracy” is mentioned 10 times. Democracy refers to the way of living, that most nations know of and live under. Joe Biden makes use of this noun to determine and establish what Russia has been doing, throughout history. The use of the noun “democracy” refers to legitimization through rationality, as he discusses this term in relation to power and authority, and what is being challenged by Russia and their actions, as

well as he mentions how the plans have been acted out and will be acted out in relation to acting in the invasion and maintain democracy in history. Throughout the speech there are linguistical choices that have been repeated, rather these uses of overlexicalization that I have discovered, are the most crucial in relation to the purpose of the speech and the findings of the use of strategies of legitimization through the different terms.

The last term that I will be making use of when analyzing the textual part of the analysis is the use of metaphors. Metaphors are used to give a better understanding of a specific context. The use of metaphors is visible in this speech, which will be elaborated upon in this section. It is crucial to mention, that in the speech Joe Biden makes us of quotes, which include metaphors. These will not be elaborated upon in this section, instead, they will be included in the discourse practice of the analysis, under the term "intertextuality". In line 37, appendix 2, Joe Biden mentions the phrase "battle for freedom", one may discuss whether this is a metaphor or not, instead, I define this as a metaphor, because freedom refers to a human right, and having to battle for this freedom, defines how the situation is construed, and what is at stake, namely one's freedom. The use of this metaphor, refers to the legitimization strategy through emotion, as the verb "battle" in this case, is referred to something negative, as one must fight for their right to freedom. In this case, Joe Biden is discussing history, and what people have suffered in the past time, this also refers to the strategy of a hypothetical future, even though he is not saying that this may repeat itself, rather he mentions history, so the audience understands what it once was, and therefore may repeat and not only be history. The phrase "wiped out" is mentioned in line 100, elaborating on Zelensky's family, and what has happened to them in the past. The use of the phrase "wiped out", is a metaphor, that explains how his family was killed by the Nazi's holocaust. The term "wiped out", gives a better understanding of how they were killed, as it is a normal reference in relation to the second world war, and the lives that were lost in this tragic event. In line 228, appendix 2, Joe Biden mentions how the polish nation and people, are willing to "open their heart", this is a metaphor that appeals to the strategy of legitimization through emotion, as "open their heart" is a figure of speech, due to the fact that it is not possible to open one's heart, rather it defines their warmth and welcomes to the Ukrainian refugees that are forced to flee their country. In line 363, appendix 2, Joe Biden mentions "the power of many is greater than the will of any one dictator." This metaphor, refers to the Ukrainian people being stronger as one unit, rather

than one dictator, creating an emotion of hope through legitimization, as he believes in the Ukrainian nation, and urge them to stand together, to be stronger than one dictator. The use of metaphors in the speech is few, but they are very remarkable as they all make use of the strategy of legitimization, and once again the metaphors that have not been elaborated upon, will be explained in the discourse practice of the analysis.

### Discourse Practice

The textual part of the analysis has now been accomplished, which leads me to the discourse practice of the analysis. Discourse practice focuses on what context the speech is given in, as well as how it is given, within the use of intertextuality, which refers to how a speech makes use of other texts, such as quotes from famous people, and how this is implemented in the speech to make the purpose of the speech more legitimized. The other term used within discourse practice is interdiscursivity which refers to how one discourse is used to accomplish another discourse and how the speech is represented in relation to linguistic choices and the level of difficulty the speeches are performed in.

### Remarks by President Biden on Afghanistan

Starting with the term “intertextuality” this refers to the speech making use of other texts, to help defend the given speech. When analyzing this speech, it has been discovered that Joe Biden does not make as much use of intertextuality in the sense that he does not include many quotes or phrases from other texts in this speech. The reason behind this could be that he is addressing a situation, where the decision of withdrawing military troops from Afghanistan has been made, and his speech has been construed to follow up on how this situation is being handled. When not making use of intertextuality in this speech it gains more legitimization, by not making including many other texts or quotes. The speech is portrayed as being truthful in the sense that Joe Biden manages to speak in an honest way, by including his own words, and not quotations that may give a false reality in the situation. The few quotes that he makes use of in relation to intertextuality are in line 193, appendix 2 where he quotes the Afghan government and what they have said in relation to exiting Afghanistan. Joe Biden mentions that the Afghan government mentioned the following “a crisis of confidence”. This term may have been mentioned by the Afghan government



but also refers to Jimmy Carter, a former political president of the US. Carter mentioned this phrase in one of his earlier speeches to make the US gain more confidence in him and a brighter future for the US. The phrase refers to losing confidence in a specific relation. (Carter, 1979) The use of intertextuality is also visible in line 209, appendix 2, where Joe Biden mentions the “graveyard of empires”. This phrase has been construed by history, and making use of this phrase shows intertextuality, as this phrase from history influences the speech and enhances specific points that are crucial in the speech.

The second and last term that I will be discussing in reference to discourse practice is interdiscursivity. This refers to how discourse or combined in specific texts such as speeches. The use of interdiscursivity is visible if texts combine genres that make up institutional and social meanings. In this speech, the use of interdiscursivity is visible in how the social actor formulates himself through his speech. The speech is easy to understand. Even though Joe Biden is speaking to the American nation, it is still performed through words that are easy to understand without being fluent in English. The speech is seen to be formal, as there are no casual and spontaneous remarks in the speech, everything has been written and ready to be spoken. Formal language is also often used when speaking in serious situations. The situation that Joe Biden is discussing is very serious, and therefore the use of formal language is also crucial to be able to appeal through legitimization strategies. The speech is easy to approach as it can be found on different media websites as well as the speech can be retrieved on the homepage of the White House, which is also where I have retrieved the speech. The article makes use of strategies of legitimization in different ways. Some strategies are more visible than others, but he still manages to include most of the strategies throughout his speech. The use of legitimization strategies can be viewed as interdiscursivity being portrayed in the sense that different discourses are being mixed. The discourses in this case are the use of different words being written that create a strategy of legitimization through the meaning of words.

[Remarks by President Biden on the United Efforts of the Free World to Support the People of Ukraine](#)

Beginning with the term “intertextuality” this will research the use of texts that relate to other texts. In the speech, it has been researched and found that Joe Biden makes use of many quotes

from different historical people, that have had a great impact on history and how it has formed and turned out today. The use of these quotes, and reference to historical people, shows how the speaker makes use of intertextuality, as well as the different quotes, refer to different meanings and strategies of legitimization. In line 15, Joe Biden mentions the quote “Be not afraid” referring to the Polish Pope who spoke these words after his election in 1978. (The Irish Times, 2005) The use of this quote does not only refer to the situation, rather it is historically approached, as the quote is held by a Polish Pope, and Joe Biden is holding this speech in Poland, as well as he further explains how this quote helped end “the soviet representation...” This means that this quote, was a starting point in relation to soviet representation, coming to an end in Poland at the time. The beginning of this speech starts with this quote to lead on to elaborate upon history, and how this quote was the end to crucial events and creating hope that this quote may receive the same outcome as it did in history. In line 33, the use of intertextuality is again visible when Joe Biden quotes professor Kierkegaard “Faith sees best in the dark”, this is again a metaphor used in relation to intertextuality, referring to the best solutions come when it seems most difficult. (Roberts, 2015) Here Joe Biden refers to the ongoing situation, knowing that a lot of the audience of this speech is in doubt about what to do and how to handle the situation. This metaphor and quotes refer to legitimization through emotions, as he appeals to be hopeful, and that even though it is a dark moment that the world has been hit by at the moment, this is when the perfect solution will be found. In lines 105-106, Joe Biden refers to the former president Abraham Lincoln, who once said “Let us have faith that right makes might” repeating “right makes might”. (Horton, 2010) This again refers to legitimization through emotion, as faith is an emotion created when being hopeful about something, and Joe Biden wants his audience to be hopeful, that this situation will make might. The use of intertextuality has shown that the speech focuses a lot on the use of legitimization through emotions, as the quotes that have been implemented appeal to one’s emotions.

Moving on to the next term in the discourse practice part of the analysis is interdiscursivity. This refers to making use of different discourses in one discourse, such as genres or styles that are associated with meaning in a single text that may be institutional or social. The use of interdiscursivity is researched within how the language is in the speech. The speech is formulated in a very appropriate way, in the sense that it is easy to understand. The speech is

performed in Warsaw, and therefore it is no matter of course, that the audience of the speech is fluent in English. This may also have been taken into consideration when forming the speech. The article regards an event going on in the world at the moment, and therefore the speech must also be easy to access, which is possible through different news media, as well as it can be found on the White House homepage, where I have retrieved the speech from. The article makes use of different strategies of legitimization, as well as the speech, refers to Joe Biden himself, and his personal experiences. The use of expertise through legitimization is not as visible, this may be due to the fact that the ongoing event is still so new, and therefore it can be difficult for experts to know what will happen and how it will happen, as well as when Joe Biden explains the history, he mentions how history has unfolded but does include the use of expertise because, in the case of this war, it has been difficult to find experts statements on this war, because war is such an unpredictable event, which can take a turn in any minute.

### Social Practice

The last part of the critical discourse analysis is the social practice. This part focuses on a wider perspective, digging into how the social environment is, in the places where the speeches were published in. When looking at social practice, the date and time of the speeches are crucial in this relation, as I am researching if there is a difference between the way Joe Biden portrays his speeches. The speech regarding Ukraine is published on March 26, 2022, while the speech regarding the war in Afghanistan is published on August 16, 2021. This was around half a year after he was elected as president of the United States. What I find interesting about these two articles, analyzing and researching if Joe Biden has different ways of strategizing his speeches from the first speech that was published in 2021, compared to the second speech published in 2022. I find that these articles are an appropriate use of data, to help me answer my problem formulation. As well as the globalized phenomenon is visible in the sense that the articles discuss two different wars. War is a term that is defined by each individual, dependent on how you were raised and what the specific nation you are from has experienced in relation to war. Even though the speeches are only published six months apart, they still make it possible for me to answer my problem formulation, as Joe Biden may have changed strategies to be able to appeal in a better way to his audience, when performing his speech in 2022. The audience in both articles is the

same in the sense that he is speaking to the whole world and not only the American nation. Therefore, it is also interesting to see his use of strategies, and if there is a visual difference in relation to the wars being about Afghanistan vs. Ukraine. The way it is possible to see who his audience is, is how the speeches are able to be retrieved which is publicly, as well as he speaks about war in both speeches, which is a globalized phenomenon that affects the whole world.

#### The two speeches up against each other

When analyzing social practice, I will be analyzing both articles as both articles are performed by the same politician, and therefore the political sense of the speeches are similar. The speeches are performed by Joe Biden, the president of the United States. The United States lives under a democratical regime, meaning that people have as many rights and authority as the leading power. Democracy is defined by humans being able to vote when decisions are made, meaning that everybody has a say before something is adopted. The fact that the politician is democratic is very visible in the sense that he makes use of the strategy of legitimization “altruism”, which focuses on including everybody, and that the government authority is not one compared to the rest of the population, but rather they are all one and fight for the same. Joe Biden refers to himself a lot of times in the speeches, appealing to people’s emotions as well as he appeals to people understanding that he is as much part of the nation and the situation that he is talking about, as well as his audience is.

In the speech regarding the situation in Afghanistan, Joe Biden appeals to the nation with the use of different strategies, but it is done in a specific way, as he makes use of legitimization through emotions and altruism, by including himself in the picture as well as he manages to explain to the nation what he has done with his national security team to be able to be where the nation is today regarding the situation. In this speech, Joe Biden also manages to make his political stance visible in the sense that he mentions different decisions that he has taken in relation to the situation, and that he has done this exactly because this is why people have voted for him as president. The voters believe that he will make the right choices when specific decisions must be taken. This situation is one of them, where he recognizes the fallen soldiers and how the Afghan nation has not managed to fulfill their part in relation to the mission in Afghanistan and therefore the military troops shall not suffer their rights and lives when

Afghanistan is not willing to do the same. He shows that even though he is a democrat and believes in all human rights being equal for everybody, the “everybody” part of this phrase is also very crucial in this relation. As he mentions, some may say that he has not taken the right decision, rather these people have not been mentioned by name nor which party they belong to, whether it is democrats or republican or any other. The democratic party is visible in the speech as the speech is very open-minded as Joe Biden is honest towards his audience in relation to mistakes that have been made in the past, as well as the agreement he had taken over when he became president. Through the use of legitimization strategies, it is also visible how the social actor is a democrat in the sense that he appeals mostly through the strategy of emotion and altruism. As mentioned above, democrats are constructed by everyone being involved, having equal rights, and making decisions together. With the use of these strategies, he manages to appeal to the audience and possible decisions that will be made in the future, such as political elections or other important events in his relation.

In the speech regarding the war in Ukraine, Joe Biden performs his speech in Warsaw, Poland. In the speech, he is very aware of his surroundings, which is visible as he recognizes Poland before speaking, and he includes intertextuality by implicating quotations from famous polish people from the past. The political view and how it is portrayed in the speech is very visible in the sense that Joe Biden is a democrat, and he manages to appeal to everybody’s feelings, and not let anyone feel left out. This is done by recognizing the nation he is in and performing his speech. With the use of strategies of legitimization in the speech, he appeals to the characteristics of being a democrat, as he makes it clear that we are all in this together, and the vision of a democrat is that everyone should have equal rights, as well as they, should also be included when making decisions that are crucial in any event. The way Joe Biden makes use of intertextuality by quoting famous people makes the use of social practice visible in the sense that it makes it possible to combine the perspectives that a specific structure has with the actions that it gives. Such as making use of these quotes is a perspective Joe Biden has chosen to include in his speeches to gain legitimization through the use of intertextuality, in the sense that making use of quotes from history, makes it possible to gain a more thorough speech, as he makes it clear to his audience that he has done his research in relation to the ongoing situation and the quotes make up the action that is now happening. Therefore, the use of quotes, makes it possible for him to

appeal to the audience with a message of faith and hope, such as earlier popes and presidents have done.

## Discussion

The purpose of this section is to discuss the findings that have been analyzed in my research.

These findings will help me answer my problem formulation, which is the following: *“How does Joe Biden make use of strategies of legitimization through his speeches when speaking about major events such as the withdrawal of NATO in Afghanistan and the Russian Invasion of Ukraine? Does he make use of the same strategies of legitimization in both speeches? If so, how does the fact that he mobilizes strategies related to the war from Afghanistan, how does this participate in the construction of the Ukrainian war within the framework of the speech regarding the war in Ukraine, by Joe Biden.”* When construing the discussion, I will be doing this by looking at the different parts of each speech and how each speech has been made up in relation to the use of strategies of legitimization and looking at the similarities and differences that are visible, as well as through the discussion I will be answering upon whether he mobilizes his strategies from the speech in relation to the war from Afghanistan, and how this makes up the construction of the Ukrainian war within the framework of the speech that Joe Biden has performed. When referring to which specific speech I am discussing, I will be referring to appendix 1, being the speech titled “Remarks by President Biden on Afghanistan” and appendix 2, being the speech titled “Remarks by President Biden on the United Efforts of the Free World to Support the People of Ukraine”.

When looking at the two speeches up against each other, it has been clear that Joe Biden makes use of strategies through emotions, in both speeches very often. The reason behind this relates to the theoretical part of this thesis, where it has been elaborated upon the communication between people, and the connection that there has to be for a social actor to meet the people they are speaking to at their level. It is important for social actors when speaking that they meet their audience at the audience’s level in relation to understanding the context of the speech, and the purpose of the speech. In both speeches, Joe Biden begins by greeting his audience. In the speech regarding Afghanistan, he is very straightforward and greets his audience, followed by explaining the reason behind the speech, whereas in the speech regarding Ukraine he is much more accommodating towards his audience, as well as he takes his time to greet and

thank his surroundings for welcoming him on stage, and being able to perform this speech. What is interesting to take notice of in these two introductions is the fact that the speech regarding Afghanistan was performed in the US, in the East Room of the White House, where he is at “home” and performing this speech, being less humble compared to when he is speaking upon the situation in Ukraine. The speech regarding Ukraine is performed in The Royal Castle in Warsaw, which is also visible in the presentation of the introduction he has in this speech. He is much more open in the sense that he thanks his audience for being here. At the beginning of his speech regarding Afghanistan, he makes use of the strategy of legitimization, in-between lines as he does not make use of words that appeals directly to one’s emotions, rather the phrases that he makes use of appeal to the audience’s emotions, compared to the speech regarding the war in Ukraine, he makes the strategy of legitimization through emotion very clear, in the sense that he makes use of words that connect with a type of emotion. The way that he performs his speech regarding the war in Ukraine is more down-to-earth, in the sense that he talks to the nation of Poland, as he is performing the speech in Poland. Joe Biden is more direct in his choice of words in the introduction. It can be discussed that the tone in the speeches is different due to the places where the speeches have been performed. When he is in the White House, one may discuss whether he feels more laid back, in relation to when he is out in public and speaking on behalf of not only his nation, but other nations that are in danger at the moment. Throughout both speeches as mentioned, he makes use of the strategy of legitimization through emotion. This is not the only strategy that he makes very much use of.

When reading through both analyses of the speeches, it has also been analyzed how he makes use of altruism. The use of altruism refers to being part of something bigger, where he manages to make himself part of the audience, and what they are going through as well as his plans are construed in such a way that the audience is persuaded that his plans are the right plans for everybody. When Joe Biden makes use of altruism in the speech regarding Afghanistan, he does this by including social actors and making the audience believe that these social actors have decided that he must now accomplish, due to the fact that he is the President of the United States, in this relation he discusses Trump and his earlier deals with Taliban. In another part of the speech his use of altruism is included in relation to discussing him and his national team, and that they are as big a part of the situation as the audience is, and therefore they need the audience to

rely on their actions being made as to the correct ones. Through the speech regarding Afghanistan, Joe Biden makes use of altruism, but it is interesting to take notice that he does not at many points only mention “I” as in himself, rather he mentions “I” and others. This is interesting to take notice of, as he appeals to not being selfish, rather he also makes the audience understand that decisions that have been made do not only include himself but also others, in case anybody is to blame him and his decisions in the future. When looking at the speech regarding Ukraine, Joe Biden also makes use of altruism in the same way, where he does not only include himself and the audience in the relationship but also includes other social actors, so that there are others to blame if this was the case. Even though he does this throughout most of his speech regarding the Ukrainian war, he also makes use of altruism by only including himself and his personal experiences. This shows how the speech regarding the war in Afghanistan has helped construct the understanding of the war in Ukraine, in the relation that he appeals more to himself, and shows strategies of legitimization through altruism, in a way that the audience understands that these words are not only performed to create an understanding of the ongoing situation, rather he also wants to make it clear how he feels about the situation and that he can relate personally. This creates a deeper connection between the audience and the social actor, in the sense that he makes use of communication as discourse through feelings that are not superficial, rather they have a deeper meaning. When looking at strategies of legitimization and the use of this through rationality, Joe Biden makes use of this in both speeches.

Through the analysis, it has been found that the use of rationality as a strategy has not been very visible in both speeches. The reason behind this may be that both situations in relation to war are difficult to define in regard to rationality. Rationality refers to how strategies and plans have been thoroughly thought through before performing this. In the speech regarding the war in Afghanistan and withdrawing troops, plans had already been made and failed, in relation to not being able to build a better Afghanistan. Therefore, the use of rationality is not as visible, rather the part of the speech where it is visible, Joe Biden explains his experience with the military and how this experience is able to create a better plan for now and for the future. In the speech regarding Ukraine, Joe Biden also makes use of the strategy of legitimization through rationality, rather this is done in a different way, as he manages to speak deeper into how plans have been taken into consideration, before speaking upon them. The use of rationality focuses on



how plans are taken into consideration, both the positive and negative outcomes, before performing them. Joe Biden makes use of altruism, by speaking to the audience and making them understand that they had a plan about what was going to happen and how it was going to play out in relation to what the benefits were for Putin, to not invade Ukraine, but Putin chose to overrule this by not following the plan and invading Ukraine. The use of rationalization in this speech is much clearer to the audience as they understand that a plan had been construed, and thought out before being performed, compared to the speech in Afghanistan, where Joe Biden relies his plans on experience, and not considerations of the future within the plan. In the speech regarding Afghanistan, it may be difficult for the audience to understand how rationality is visible compared to the clarification in the speech regarding the war in Ukraine and the rationality, in relation to the plans that had been taken into consideration before this situation. In the speech regarding Ukraine, Joe Biden mentions how NATO offered initiatives and considerations so that the plan for Russia in relation to invading Ukraine could be averted. In this relation, Joe Biden also explains the plans and considerations that had been made, which shows the use of the strategy of legitimization through rationality, where he makes it clear to the audience that different plans had been taken into consideration for the situation to be averted. This also makes the audience understand that there was no way that this situation should have taken place, but that NATO failed their mission, as Putin chose to do the opposite that they opposed. The use of rationality in the speech regarding Ukraine compared to Afghanistan is much more thought out, as well as it is clearly explained how things were to happen, for the situation to not happen, whereas the use of rationality in the speech regarding Afghanistan is very superficial as Joe Biden defines his use on previous experience of plans and the future, which is not something that can be relied on, as it is not a solid plan that can be taken into consideration when believing in the future.

In both speeches, Joe Biden makes use of the strategy of legitimization through a hypothetical future. In the speech regarding Afghanistan, he does this in-between the lines with the use of different words in different phrases that makes the audience understand that he is speaking about a hypothetical future. When he is doing this, he mentions the verb “continue” in relation to explaining what has been done in the past in relation to speaking upon basic rights of the Afghan people, this has been done in the past and will continue, implying that this will continue in a hypothetical future. He follows his use of a hypothetical future when speaking about

the war in Afghanistan and how the right choice was to withdraw troops, due to the fact that “no military forces would ever be able to a safe Afghanistan.” Joe Biden makes use of this strategy later on in his speech when he discusses how the situation in the future, may not have been any different when the Afghan people are not willing to fight their own battle. The use of hypothetical future, in this sense, makes the audience understand how the choices that have been made are for the better of a hypothetical more positive future. In the speech Joe Biden also makes use of the strategies of legitimization through a hypothetical future, rather he does this in a more aggressive way in the sense that he warns his audience of the consequences that could be visible if Putin manages to gain too much power and authority. The way of using this strategy and warning the audience also implements the strategy of emotion, where Joe Biden manages to “scare” the audience. When he does this, it makes it possible for him to construct war in a specific way, for his audience, and they understand that the construction of this war is serious and that it could end badly for all of us. Here he manages to construct war as a warning toward the future. With the use of this strategy, he manages to gain the audience’s attention by performing scare scenarios constructed by Putin and his way of performing more, and seeing the consequences of a hypothetical future, if Putin gets it his way.

Last the use of the strategy of legitimization through voices of expertise is interesting to dig into, as this is one strategy that Joe Biden does not include in both speeches. The speech regarding the war in Afghanistan and the use of the voices of expertise is also minimal in the sense that it can be difficult to define who is an expert when discussing the construction of war and war itself. What I have defined as experts in relation to the speech regarding Afghanistan is that the military is the experts in this relation, as it is within their field of expertise and knowledge. Joe Biden makes use of this in his speech regarding Afghanistan to back up statements in relation to the ongoing situation, where he implements the noun military, rather he does not make use of this strategy in the sense of explaining expertise of knowledge in regard to the war, so the audience may feel that they need to be confirmed by experts in the words he is speaking, as it is upon war. In relation to the speech regarding Ukraine, the use of experts and speaking on behalf of experts has not been visible. This could be due to the fact, that Joe Biden spoke a few days after the invasion of Ukraine, and therefore there have not been experts discussing the given situation, and once again it can be discussed, who should be recognized as experts when discussing war.

When Joe Biden does not make use of this strategy it could also be understood as a tactic towards his audience, by not including “experts”, as it, therefore, is not possible for the audience to blame him in relation to stating expertise facts, that relate to what he defines as an expert, compared to what the audience may define as experts, because once again it is important to remember that war is socially constructed, and we as humans make up “war”. Therefore, who defines war, and what is war defined by you?

Looking at the similarities and differences between the two speeches by Joe Biden, it is interesting to see how he mobilizes his strategies of legitimization in relation to the war in Afghanistan towards the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Through the comparison it is visible how his use of the same strategies is repeated, rather he makes use of the strategies in a more descriptive way when analyzing the speech regarding the war in Ukraine. When he does this, he represents how war is presented today, in the sense that it is done through the use of emotions, as this is the main strategy that he mobilizes in his speech. Emotions help construct war in a certain way, as well as set the tone for the specific event that is happening. In the speech regarding the Ukrainian war, Joe Biden mentions to appeal to the audience’s emotion in the sense of compassion, as he made use of linguistic choices that show his sympathy towards the Ukrainian nation, compared to the speech regarding Afghanistan, where he explains the situation, but makes more use of altruism, as he wants the audience to understand that the choices that have been made in this relation are for the better for everybody. When Joe Biden makes use of strategies of legitimization in his speeches it allows him to construct war in a certain way within this framework. This is being done through the majority use of strategies of legitimization through emotion and altruism, as he constructs war as being understood in a specific way through his linguistic choices, in relation to discussing the war in Ukraine and the situation in Afghanistan. The way that Joe Biden speaks about war, shows how war is presented today, namely through speech. This again shows how war is socially constructed, as Joe Biden speaks about war, and makes his audience gain an opinion that can both be negative or positive, thereby creating a debate that may lead to a positive or negative outcome in a socially constructed world. What is interesting to take notice of, in the two speeches is how his focus shifts within strategies of legitimization. Having analyzed both speeches, it can be discussed that in the speech regarding Afghanistan he makes use of strategies of legitimization through emotions and altruism, whereas

the strategy of altruism, is the dominating strategy in the speech regarding Afghanistan and the strategy of legitimization through emotions is the dominating strategy in the speech regarding Ukraine. Through the mobilization of strategies from the speech regarding Afghanistan, Joe Biden manages to construct the Ukrainian war within the framework of the speech regarding the Ukraine war, through the dominating strategy of emotion. When performing a speech, the social actor must also be able to communicate the message in the speech through appropriate language, so that it matches the audience. If the social actor manages to connect with the audience, this will be decisive for the success that the speech will have. (Montefiore, 2021)

## Conclusion

When beginning the process for the thesis, finding a relevant topic, took time in the sense that the most appropriate topic and relevance to this master's thesis had to be found. When finding the topic and creating a problem formulation, hypothetical thoughts had been taken into consideration, to help construct this.

Having reached the conclusion of this thesis, and answering the following problem formulation: *“How does Joe Biden make use of strategies of legitimization through his speeches, when speaking about major events such as the withdrawal of NATO in Afghanistan and the Russian Invasion of Ukraine? Does he make use of the same strategies of legitimization in both speeches? If so, how does the fact that he mobilizes strategies from his speech regarding the war in Afghanistan, how does this participate in the construction of the Ukrainian war within the framework of the speech regarding the war in Ukraine.”* I found that Joe Biden mobilizes his strategies of legitimization from his speech in Afghanistan to the speech in Ukraine. With the use of strategies of legitimization and repeating himself in both speeches, in the sense that he makes use of the same strategies with different examples, he constructs the idea of war in a specific way. This is done through strategies that create persuasion and understanding of the audience, as war is constructed in a peaceful way, as this has been done through speeches by Joe Biden. The way that Joe Biden chooses to speak upon two major events regarding war, backs up this thesis in the sense that I have researched and found that the thesis is visible in a socially constructed world. The way Joe Biden talks about the different wars in his speeches and mobilizes his strategies, he is part of the social construction of war, in the sense that he creates a specific meaning of war in the two situations and makes his speech part of a debate in relation to how he sees war, and what this does to his audience, through emotions, altruism, voices of expertise, hypothetical future, and rationalization. Joe Biden creates the possibility for his audience to create meaning and opinions about how he sees war, and what persuasions he manages to put into the minds of the audience through his use of speech. Both speeches connect, in the sense that he repeats himself through the dominating use of altruism and emotions in both speeches.

When looking at the thesis with an intercultural and globalized view, this has been visible in the sense that war is a globalized phenomenon. As war is defined as “a state or period of fighting between nations”. When discussing war, we are discussing events that cross national

borders within each other, meaning that it affects not only one nation but the nations around the ongoing war. War also creates tension in the world, as many nations are connected through the people and economy. War can be defined as another part of globalization. Through war, the actors of the world understand differences that must be taken into consideration, when coming to an agreement in relation to stopping the war. Today when war is happening, the whole world is affected by the connection that a nation has to the rest of the world. Many may not be aware of the connection, rather this is justified when war breaks out, as it becomes visible what crisis the world will be facing in the future. Such examples can be seen through the use of sanctions which can both be economical and diplomatic.

To sum up my conclusion, and my problem formulation, it is visible how Joe Biden makes use of strategies of legitimization, some strategies are more visible than others, which also connects with the situation that is being discussed, namely war. Joe Biden constructs war, through his use of speech and linguistical choices that he has made use of in both speeches, through the dominating strategies of emotions and altruism. What Joe Biden manages to do through his speeches, and mostly his speech regarding the war in Ukraine, is to repeat himself within the use of strategies, as well as makes it possible for nations to discuss the situation, but gains understanding from the audience in the sense that he manages to appeal to their emotions. Joe Biden is a social actor, part of NATO. Through his speech, he generates norms through his actions, which is his speech, the choice of action he has chosen to make, by performing this speech in Poland, informs other nations in relation to the war, what is expected from the nations in relation to actions and behavior. Social actors are able to construct war and the definition of war, in relation to their actions. This can be done in many ways, rather this thesis focuses on the speeches performed by a social actor, to help research how war is constructed through the framework of the speeches, and the mobilization of the visible strategies.

## Bibliography

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Catalano, T., & Waugh, R. L. (2020). Critical Discourse Analysis, Critical Discourse Studies and Beyond. *Perspectives in Pragmatics, Philosophy & Psychology*, 26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49379-0>

Carter, J. (1979, July 15). *Energy and the National Goals – A crisis of confidence*. Retrieved from <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/jimmycartercrisisofconfidence.htm>

Chafe, W., & Tannen, D. (1987). The Relation between written and spoken language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 16, 383-407. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2155877>

Cobley, P., & Schulz, J. P. (2013). *Theories and Models of Communication*. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>

Council on foreign relations. (n.d.) *The U.S. War in Afghanistan 1999-2021*. Retrieved from <https://www.cfr.org>

Democratic Party. (2022). *We are the Democratic Party*. Retrieved from <https://democrats.org>

Dunmire, L. P. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis: Exploring the Language of Politics and the Politics of Language*. Retrieved from <https://compass-onlinelibrary-wiley-com.zorac.aub.aau.dk/doi/10.1002/Inc3.365>

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. UK Cambridge: Polity Press

Gudykunst, B. W., & Kim, Y. Y. (2003). *Communicating with strangers: an approach to intercultural communication*. Boston, Mass: McGraw-Hill

Harutyunyan, R. (2021). Approaches and theories to the study of political speech. *Armenian Folia Anglistika*, 17(1). Doi: <https://doi.org/10.46991/AFA/2021.17.1.052>

Hughes, R. (1996). *English in speech and writing: investigating language and literature*. London, LDN: Routledge.

Horton, S. (2010, February 12). Lincoln- Right Makes Might. *Harper's Magazine*. Retrieved from <https://harpers.org>

Jindra, W, I. (2014). *A new model of religious conversion: Beyond Network Theory and Social Constructivism*. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>

Kirby, P. (2022, May 9). Why has Russia invaded Ukraine and what does Putin want? *BBC New*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com>

McGlinchey, S., Walters, R., & Scheinpflug, C. (2017). *International Relations Theory*. Retrieved from <https://www.e-ir.info>

Montefiore, S, S. (2021, June 1). What makes a great speech? *Literary Hub*. Retrieved from <https://lithub.com>

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (n.d.) *What is NATO?* Retried from NATO website: <https://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/index.html>

N.A. (2005, April 2). "Be not afraid" – papal quotes. *The Irish Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.irishtimes.com>

Olson, A. G. (1993). Literary Theory, Philosophy of Science and Persuasive Discourse: Thoughts from a Neo-Premodernist. *Journal of Advanced Composition*, 13 (2), 283-309. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20865918>



Reyes, A. (2011). Strategies of legitimization in political discourse: From words to actions. *Discourse and Society*. 22(6), 781-807. doi: 10.1177/09579265114119927

Roberts, K. (2015, September 11). "Faiths Sees Best in the Dark": Joe Biden and Kierkegaard [Blog Post]. Retrieved from <https://www.patheos.com>

Skytt, L. (2022). Krigen i Ukraine [The war in Ukraine]. Retrieved from <https://faktalink.dk>

Skytt, L. (2021). Globalisering [Globalization] Retrieved from <https://faktalink.dk>

The White House. (2022). *Remarks by President Biden on the United Efforts of the Free World to Support the People of Ukraine*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov>: Author

The White House. (2021). *Remarks by President Biden on Afghanistan*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov>: Author

Wang, Y, G. (2019). *Globalization*. [E-book] Retrieved from <https://kdbk-aub.primo.exlibrisgroup.com>