

Critical Discourse Analysis of Biden's Speech on the US Withdrawal from Afghanistan

Hani Mohammad Amin Mohammad¹

¹Department of Basic Sciences, Faculty of Arts, Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan, P.O.Box 130, Amman 11733, Jordan

Correspondence: Hani Mohammad Amin Mohammad, Department of Basic Sciences, Faculty of Arts, Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan, P.O.Box 130, Amman 11733, Jordan. E-mail: h.mohammad@zuj.edu.jo

Received: October 12, 2023

Accepted: February 5, 2024

Online Published: February 23, 2024

doi:10.5430/wjel.v14n3p54

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n3p54>

Abstract

The study analyses Vice President Joe Biden's address to the UN General Assembly on the United States' departure from Afghanistan. The study uses Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to analyze the speech's language and rhetoric to reveal the hidden ideologies and beliefs that informed its development. The dynamic interplay between rhetoric and policy decisions and their broader ramifications in international relations and domestic understanding is the primary focus of this inquiry. Our research places the exact wording, words, and rhetorical methods against more extensive historical, geopolitical, and societal backgrounds. This research provides important insights into the complex interaction between political rhetoric, public perception, and policy repercussions by bridging these concepts with real-world effects. Especially for major foreign policy decisions, the findings illuminate how political narratives, when appropriately analyzed, disclose deeper levels of intention, rationale, and global strategy.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), US Withdrawal, Afghanistan, Political Rhetoric, Linguistic Strategies, Biden's Speech

1. Introduction

When US President Joe Biden delivered his first speech as president before the United Nations General Assembly (Biden, J. 2021), he showed no sign of remorse over his hasty decision to withdraw from Afghanistan, despite the Taliban regaining control of the country almost unopposed by the Afghan army. Biden announced that the United States would “no longer fight the wars of the past.” He stressed that he intends to use diplomacy and multilateralism when possible because “today many of our greatest concerns cannot be solved or even addressed by force of arms.” However, he also stressed its commitment to supporting its allies, saying that the United States would continue to “work collaboratively with local partners so that we do not need to rely so heavily on large-scale military deployments.” It seems that he did not realize that the efforts of the past that he rejected in his speech are the same cooperation with the allies that he calls for (Trump,2019; Trump, 2020)

Biden's position continues a pattern that began under President Barack Obama and has continued under President Donald Trump: portraying continuing military engagements in the Middle East as “forever wars”—that is, an endless conflict in which US intervention would be excessively costly, it cannot make a difference and only exacerbates the existing situation - without recognizing that these engagements are a vital long-term component of the fundamental approach to American security around the world. To quote Trump when he was a presidential candidate in 2015, “The Middle East is a huge swamp” (Middle East Eye. (nd); E-International Relations. (nd)). The Biden presidential campaign website phrased this statement more sensitively. However, the meaning remained the same: “Biden will end the eternal wars in Afghanistan and the Middle East, which have cost us untold blood and treasure.”

When it comes to Afghanistan, Biden and other critics of the war have focused on how quickly the Afghan army surrendered to the Taliban and collapsed despite the two decades the United States spent building its foundations. They considered this evidence that American forces were risking their lives in a hopeless cause. The day after the fall of Kabul in mid-August, Biden justified the decision to withdraw from Afghanistan by asking the following question: “How many more generations of America’s daughters and sons do you want me to send to fight the Afghans — that is, fight Afghanistan’s civil war — when Afghan forces are reluctant to do so?”

However, the Afghan army has proven its willingness to fight the Taliban, despite the high price. From 2001 to April [this year], approximately 66,000 Afghan soldiers and police were killed in Afghanistan, along with 2,448 American service members Wikipedia contributors. (2021). At the same time, joint US-Afghanistan military operations, especially when involving elite US-trained Afghan commandos, have kept the Taliban on alert, often outside major population centers. When ISIS emerged in Afghanistan in 2015, the established American presence on the ground contributed to rapid counter-terrorism measures, including air strikes and joint US-Afghan commando raids, which significantly undermined the organization by early 2017. The sudden US withdrawal from Afghanistan likely forced the Afghan army into unfamiliar circumstances, ultimately leading to its collapse – and to the humanitarian catastrophe we are witnessing now.

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/08/31/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-end-of-the-war-in-afghanistan>

an/

Critical discourse analysis analyzes texts in the context of politics and society to understand how social power is used, abused, and resisted. Van Dijk claims that critical discourse analysis is driven by a desire better to comprehend complex social problems (Salma, 2018). According to Van Dijk, the primary concern of critical discourse analysis is the function of language in establishing and maintaining power structures. Political, cultural, gender, ethnic, and class dominance are all included in this broad category of social inequality. Using critical discourse analysis on orally delivered texts like speeches is fascinating. Microstructure, macrostructure, and superstructure are the three levels of analysis used in Van Dijk's theory of language. In order to understand the source of the speaker's authority, the author employs social analysis. After much deliberation, the author of *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Joe Biden's Victory Speech* set out to dissect the Vice President's acceptance speech (Armada, 2021). Structural analysis is sometimes a part of discourse analysis. This section will dissect a text or collection of texts into its individual pieces. The themes or speakers' turns in oral discourse and paragraphs, phrases, or propositions in written discourse (more technical units will be described later) may serve as examples of these sections (which are, in reality, usually determined in terms of their functions or meanings). How linguistic constituents are held together to form meaningful wholes is another possible focus of a structural Discourse Analysis (Flowerdew, 2012).

In order to offer a substantial and precise addition to critical social or political analyses, critical discourse analysis must elucidate how language, language usage, discourse, and communicative occurrences contribute to the formation of power and inequality. Theory development, analytical methods, and empirical research processes are critical discourse analysis's foci, goals, and evaluation criteria (Van Dijk, 2015). Critical discourse analysis aims to reveal the latent ideological assumptions within our written or spoken texts that we are using to resist and exert power without realizing it (McGregor, 2010).

Discourse analysis is a branch of linguistics that examines how different modes of communication reflect and shape different aspects of society and culture. Discourse analysis also considers the impact of articles, pronouns, and tenses on the overall structure of discourse and the connections between different parts of speech (Van Dijk, 2016).

The narratives presented by presidents Biden and Trump, in particular, shape popular perception of the United States' role in the Afghan conflict, which I will address in my introduction. To decipher the ideological foundations and power dynamics of their rhetoric, this investigation will employ critical discourse analysis, reflecting on how language influences public opinion and policy assessments. When the president speaks, he frames the narrative around military battles, greatly influencing public opinion. To achieve their strategic goals, presidents might use their speeches to emphasize some points while downplaying others and to explain complicated foreign policy judgments. The public's views on the need, effectiveness, and ethics of military acts can be impacted by this framing, which can affect the support for or opposition to particular policies.

1.1 The Statement of the Problem

US foreign policy initiatives, especially those involving the Middle East, have become increasingly scrutinized and controversial in recent years. The US exit from Afghanistan is one of the most consequential and divisive of these choices. There was a wide range of responses at home and abroad after Vice President Joe Biden announced the withdrawal and defended it in front of the United Nations General Assembly.

The complex relationship between political rhetoric, policy choices, and their actual effects is the primary focus of this research. Biden's speech is a treasure trove of linguistic and rhetorical devices because it defends the US withdrawal from Afghanistan and lays out his plan for the future of American foreign policy. In addition to communicating meaning, these methods negotiate power relationships, defend policy choices, and influence public opinion.

However, the public dialogue and media narratives frequently offer only a piecemeal comprehension of such addresses. The issue emerges when isolated quotations overstate or understate the message's depth and complexity. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a thorough, objective, and critical analysis of President Biden's address in order to gain an understanding of the following:

1. The Ideologies at Play: What Are the Core Beliefs and Values Shape the Speech?
2. Words, phrases, and other linguistic and rhetorical choices: How do they affect the message's reception?
3. The impact of the speech's historical, political, and social setting should be considered.
4. Implications for the Real World: How do the language and rhetorical features of the speech correspond to actual results, such as changes in public opinion or responses from other countries?

Understanding the nuances of President Biden's argument for the US withdrawal from Afghanistan is vital in light of the far-reaching consequences of this decision, which range from geopolitical upheavals to humanitarian issues. To better grasp the options, difficulties, and repercussions of such momentous foreign policy decisions, this study seeks to fill the gap between the language of political speeches and their meaning.

2. Literature Review

Ghanem's (2023) study entitled "Rhetorical Strategies in News Media Discourse." Rhetorical strategies in written and spoken media are discussed. Through a combination of description and analysis, this article seeks confirmation of the practical relevance of rhetorical discourse and its effect on the media. This study includes an introduction, a brief study, and two chapters. According to the results of this

research, rhetorical strategies are pretty prevalent and significantly affect both the news and the audience. Yosef's (2023) study's working title is "Rhetorical Strategies in News Media Discourse." It analyses the use of rhetoric in both written and spoken media. Through a combination of description and analysis, this article seeks confirmation of the practical relevance of rhetorical discourse and its effect on the media. This study consists of an introductory section, a brief body of research presented in two chapters, and a conclusion. The findings of this research show that the use of rhetorical strategies is widespread and has a significant effect on both news and audiences.

Mehmood's (2022) discourse analysis of the "war on terror" following 9/11 is the topic of this paper. It contends that the United States established a particular discourse in order to secure and legitimize its political and strategic goals in the war on terror in Afghanistan. The official texts and significant statements made by the US Government about the war on terror after 9/11 are analyzed in this study using the qualitative method of discourse analysis. It demonstrates how the geo-strategic overstretch doctrine led to the rhetoric surrounding the war on terror in the United States. US troops leaving Afghanistan was a diplomatic blunder, but it did raise doubts about the wisdom of waging a protracted war on terror. Political and strategic discourses aid in conceptualizing a policy, while a discourse switch signals a paradigm shift grounded on logic. Future research on the effects of hegemonic discourse, which has consistently failed or reversed the United States' narrative on combatting terrorism in Afghanistan, can benefit greatly from this study. It shows that the US departure strategy from Afghanistan is based chiefly on domestic economic and political interests and that discourses are mainly built for public consumption.

Mustofa (2022) A speech is written and practiced by the speaker before delivery. He makes his points clear by replacing harsh language with more soothing phrases. In this study, we examine a variety of speech texts with a focus on euphemism, which is used to convey a nuanced impression to the listener to forestall negative reactions. Its purpose is to analyze Biden's use of political euphemisms regarding their categories, purposes, and characteristics. It uses the theory of euphemism developed by Allan and Burrige (1991) and the theory of political euphemism developed by Zhao and Dong (2010). This descriptive qualitative study reveals ten categories of euphemistic expressions: metaphor, flippancy, circumlocution, acronym, one-to-one substitution, part-for-whole euphemism, hyperbole, understatement, jargon, and collocation. Euphemism serves three critical social functions: informing, comforting, and guiding its community members. Finally, the study identifies various characteristics of euphemisms, such as avoiding strong language, hiding meaning, and swapping out standard terms.

Fauzi (2021), In his study, aimed to apply Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis (CDA) theory to Joe Biden's August 31, 2021, radio address on the subject of ending the war in Afghanistan. The author used Van Dijk's three text analysis components—macrostructure, superstructure, and microstructure—to deconstruct the data and expose the ideology. From a semantic perspective, I also classify the ideologies into six categories to determine which ideology predominated in the speech. This study seeks to answer the following research question: What ideology underlies Joe Biden's call to end the Afghanistan war? Based on the collection and analysis of non-numerical data such as observations, interviews, documentation, and other more discursive forms of information, this study employs a descriptive qualitative approach to capture the depth of context and individual viewpoints of the subject. Data for this study comes from transcripts of presidential speeches hosted at <https://www.whitehouse.gov>, while the video of the speeches can be viewed on the CNBC Television YouTube channel. There were three phases to the data analysis: Using van Dijk's category-based analysis (CDA), we may examine the three stages of text analysis, sort the data into the appropriate categories, and then apply the appropriate analytical methods. The findings revealed a wide range of ideas present in Biden's presentation. The macrostructural factors are where security, reasons to end war, and America's future may be found. Elements of the roof symbolize America's new future, the ideology of successful evacuations, and the ideology of dangerous, inevitable evacuations. Ideology is displayed through the microstructures regarding the safety of the evacuation procedure, the causes of the US-Afghanistan war, the lack of a guarantee for a safe evacuation, the arguments for ending the war, the future of America, solidarity, responsibility, and humanity. There are 11 descriptions of self-identity, five descriptions of activity, six descriptions of goals, six descriptions of norms and values, two descriptions of position and relation, three descriptions of resources, and three descriptions of other identities, according to the results of the ideological classification based on the semantic perspective. This dominant self-identity description affirms Biden's authority and the validity of his judgment. Cognition and social environment are two areas left untouched by this study and could benefit from more investigation in future studies; given that discourse is greatly influenced by political processes, I further recommend constantly taking the data's novelty into account.

3. Method

3.1 Design and Approach

To analyze and evaluate President Joe Biden's address on the US departure from Afghanistan, this study used a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), a qualitative method. The study's overarching goal was to dissect linguistic and rhetorical expressions of power and ideology.

3.2 Materials

The speech given by Vice President Biden to the General Assembly of the United Nations by President Obama about the consequences of the US withdrawal from Afghanistan served as the primary source material for this analysis. The transcript of the speech provided by the government was used as the analytical unit. Some of the analyzed speech is available here: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/04/14/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-way-forward-in-afghanistan/>

3.3 Procedure

The first step is speech collection: the official archives were scoured for a transcript of Biden's address, and that text was read through carefully and thoroughly on many occasions to ensure a thorough grasp of the material. Then, an initial analysis is done through recurring ideas, stories, and rhetoric to establish the first themes. After that, the application of CDA: Using CDA methods, this investigation explored. Then, the step of macrostructures: To grasp the underlying ideas and concepts of the speech. Then, the microstructures: Examining the connotations of particular words and phrases. After that, the rhetorical strategies: Examine Biden's use of rhetorical strategies such as anaphora, metaphor, passive Voice, appeals to morality/values, Pathos, and ethos to better understand his argument. Finally, contextual analysis: This comprehensive comprehension of Biden's position and arguments was achieved using a combination of linguistic and textual analysis, as well as consideration of contextual variables such as the United States' historical involvement in Afghanistan, geopolitical dynamics, and the decisions of prior administrations.

3.4 Analytical Framework

1. Van Dijk's CDA Model: Fauzi's 2021 implementation of Van Dijk's CDA model inspired this investigation, particularly the trinity of text analysis components (macrostructure, superstructure, and microstructure). The study's overarching goal was to expose hidden ideologies by applying this framework to dissect the speech.
2. Semantic Perspective: The speech was analyzed for its dominating narratives, which were determined by categorizing ideologies into separate groups.

3.5 Data Analysis

Narrative analysis was used to draw conclusions after selecting pertinent passages from the speech. Each theme, rhetorical tactic, and contextual element was described in depth, illustrated with relevant quotes or excerpts from the speech, and analyzed critically to reveal its broader implications and aim. Through careful passage selection and examining word choices and rhetorical methods, I applied Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to President Biden's address on Afghanistan. The speech's larger story placed each recognized rhetorical device and subject into context, with direct quotations showing how language generates power dynamics and ideologies. The speech's impact and aims were thoroughly examined about US foreign policy and public perception through a meticulous investigation of how particular word choices and sentence structures reflect underlying political and social meanings.

3.6 Validation and Trustworthiness

To ensure the trustworthiness of the analysis, triangulation was performed. Comparisons were made with previous analyses, especially Fauzi's work in 2021. Peer reviews were also considered to check the analysis's validity.

4. Results

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of President Biden's Speech on Afghanistan:

Here, we will dissect Vice President Biden's speech about the US's involvement and eventual exit from Afghanistan. In particular, CDA is interested in how language can negotiate power dynamics. After the United States withdrew from Afghanistan, the Taliban quickly took control. In this speech, Vice President Biden addressed this issue to the public. He made it quite obvious why the United States should leave Afghanistan.

- **Negative Lexicalization:**

- Expression: "The truth is: This did unfold more quickly than we had anticipated."

The "truth is" in the first half of the sentence is a call to openness, while the second portion of the line admits a lack of foresight. It aims for both predictability and originality in its plot twists. President Biden's use of the word "truth is" in his address can be better understood by delving into this choice's linguistic and rhetorical implications; this will shed light on his communication approach. This statement sets the tone for an open and honest admission of the unexpected speed of events in Afghanistan by signaling a desire to be forthright. The statement deftly balances responsibility with the unpredictability of results, adding depth to the story and allowing for a more nuanced understanding of leadership and foresight by contrasting a claim of openness with an admission of error.

- Expression: "The events we are seeing now are sadly proof that no amount of military force would ever deliver a stable, united, secure Afghanistan."

"Sadly proof" suggests that the situation is unfortunate but out of the United States' hands.

"No amount of military force" makes military involvement pointless and useless.

More investigation on the meanings of "sadly proof" and "no amount of military force" could be conducted in the analysis. The first statement portrays America as understanding the seriousness of the situation while also suggesting that it will happen and that it is not responsible for it. The second view holds that military action will not solve the Afghan problem and advocates for a conceptual shift away from military action instead. This shows that the United States foreign policy priorities have been reevaluated, and it represents a more sophisticated view of power and the limitations of force, as well as a shift in strategy in dealing with complicated international challenges.

- **Rhetorical Strategies:**

Anaphora: "We went to Afghanistan almost 20 years ago with clear goals... We achieved those objectives. That is why we went."

The repeated use of "we went" emphasizes the original goal and provides a subtle defense of the decision to leave once that goal has been met.

In Biden's address, the term "we went" is used multiple times to emphasize the original goals of the US participation in Afghanistan. This explains the withdrawal and suggests that those objectives were accomplished. This linguistic choice serves to both reiterate the reason for the military engagement and discreetly justify the decision in the face of complicated geopolitical dynamics by framing the mission's completion as a natural consequence of achieving the stated goals.

Metaphor: "The buck stops with me."

Means acknowledging and accepting blame. The metaphor serves as an allegory for leadership while also deflecting criticism from the actions of previous administrations.

In addition to taking full Responsibility, President Biden's metaphor of "The buck stops with me" demonstrates a sophisticated style of leadership. This remark takes responsibility seriously while delicately differentiating his administration's decisions from their predecessors. In the context of the departure from Afghanistan, it reflects a multi-pronged approach to conveying leadership and accountability by emphasizing the president's will to take full responsibility for all results, positive or negative.

Passive Voice: "Mistakes were made."

Blame is spread thin when it's unclear who was at fault.

Appeal to Morality/Values: "Our true strategic competitors, China and Russia, would love nothing more than the United States to continue to funnel billions of dollars in resources and attention into stabilizing Afghanistan indefinitely."

The argument centers on American priorities and the greater challenge or threat.

The declaration highlights the strategic realignment of American foreign policy, emphasizing bringing military actions in line with larger American objectives and recognizing the limits of military might in dealing with intricate geopolitical crises. This trend highlights the necessity for a sophisticated national security strategy that considers the changing world and points to a move away from long-term military operations and toward strategic competition.

Persuasion through Pathos/Pathos: "I am deeply saddened by the facts we now face."

Emotions are stirred when the speaker shares his or her loss and reaches out to those who may understand.

The speaker brings humanity to the story by discussing a loss they have had or that others have as a group. This helps to connect the dots between policy actions and the real lives they affect. The speaker's relationship with the audience is strengthened by this method, which elicits empathy and makes the discourse more relatable and compelling.

Ethos through leadership: "I am President of the United States of America, and the buck stops with me."

Biden takes control of the story by claiming Responsibility and Leadership while insisting he is not at fault.

As he stands firm, Biden distinguishes between taking responsibility for his actions and blatantly admitting fault. Using this rhetorical method, he strengthens his authority and demonstrates a sophisticated leadership style that understands the challenges of making decisions in a volatile geopolitical environment.

- **Themes of the Speech:**

American responsibility: "I am president of the United States of America, and the buck stops with me."

The emphasis on his job and his ability to make decisions lend strong support to the central notion of responsibility.

The concept of accountability is further emphasized by Biden's focus on his job as president and his power to make decisions. Responsible management of the nation's actions and repercussions, particularly in the context of Afghanistan, is a larger narrative that this approach supports, and it also serves as an assertion of his leadership.

Afghan responsibility: "We gave them every tool they could need. We paid their salaries. But Afghan leaders gave up and fled the country."

The Afghan leadership is held accountable in this area since they were allowed to stand firm but decided not to.

Regarding the reaction of the Afghan Leadership, in particular, this remark critically examines the interplay between support and power in international relations. It highlights the complexity of leadership and accountability in a war zone and implies a sophisticated evaluation of their actions or inactions when faced with hardship.

Terrorism Threat: "We will maintain a laser focus on our counter-terrorism missions there and in other parts of the world."

The war against terrorism would continue even after the pullout, it has been assured.

This statement emphasizes the importance of maintaining worldwide counter-terrorism activities. However, it also signals a change in strategy away from direct military intervention and toward alternative types of engagement and monitoring, which can address security

concerns without deploying many troops.

Past Mistakes: "After 20 years, I have learned there was never a good time to withdraw US forces."

By emphasizing the extensive US commitment, Biden suggests that remaining longer would not have appreciably altered the outcome.

It is clear from Biden's focus on the length of American commitment that he has reached the strategic conclusion that a longer military presence will not significantly alter Afghanistan's course. Thinking about the bigger picture, this viewpoint highlights the need to assess the benefits and drawbacks of long-term commitment critically.

Afghan Forces Accountability: "We gave them every tool they could need... We gave them every chance to determine their future. We could not provide them with the will to fight."

The analysis suggests that the Afghan forces have some of the blame, as the United States may have supplied all the necessary means but not the motivation to put those means to good use.

While the United States did supply the Afghan troops with training and equipment, the criticism implies that it may have failed to instill the courage and determination that the forces needed to put those assets to good use in their fight against the Taliban. According to this viewpoint, there is a complicated relationship between material support and psychological preparation in military efficiency.

Contextual Analysis of President Biden's Remarks on the US Withdrawal from Afghanistan

The importance of context in all forms of public conversation cannot be overstated. There were several layers of meaning in Vice President Biden's statement to the country about the United States' withdrawal from Afghanistan. Both the structure and content of the speech were heavily affected by the context of the United States' protracted presence in Afghanistan.

1. The Weight of Past Administrations

Biden made it a point to explain the reasoning behind past policies and actions the United States government implemented during his speech. He made it crystal apparent that the Trump administration's signing of a deal with the Taliban was the impetus for the withdrawal. By emphasizing this, Biden put the retreat into a broader context, explaining how the administration's trajectory was continued.

To be clear, Biden did not utilize this allusion to absolve himself of culpability. Instead, he used it to stress the difficulty and duration of the American presence in Afghanistan. This also supports the view that the decision to withdraw has been in the works for quite some time and has been shaped by the insights of several different administrations.

2. A Two-Decade Long Quagmire

Biden's use of the timeline of US involvement was an attempt to stress the extensiveness and difficulty of that position. This was not a war that lasted a generation but rather one that lasted many. Over two decades, there were major shifts in strategy, objectives, and the global political scene.

Biden commented with a sharp question: "How many more generations of America's daughters and sons would you have me send to fight Afghanistan's civil war when Afghan troops will not?" This not only alluded to the past but also raised concerns about where things may go if the United States stayed involved in the future. The term "generations" provides an extra layer of emotional weight, prompting listeners to consider the human toll of conflict.

3. Evolving National and International Context

There have been significant shifts in the domestic and international settings in the years that the United States has been involved in Afghanistan. Economic difficulties, political polarisation, public health crises, and shifting public opinion towards overseas interventions have all plagued the United States on the home front. New forms of terrorism and rising nations are undermining the established order on a global scale.

Biden points out that decisions should be made in a manageable way by setting the withdrawal within this bigger framework. They result from domestic difficulties and worldwide changes that have occurred over time.

4. The Shifting Goals and the Reality Check

US forces invaded Afghanistan to eliminate al-Qaeda and make the country unsafe for terrorists. Biden noted that these goals grew to encompass nation-building, which was not the original plan.

By situating the departure in light of this shift in goals, Biden made it apparent that the United States should revert to its original objectives and stop meddling in another country's internal politics and issues. This allusion to shifting priorities helped put the choice to withdraw in a realistic perspective.

5. The Humanitarian and Ethical Context

Biden's statement has significant humanitarian overtones beyond its political and historical surroundings. He spoke about the toll this protracted war has taken on American families and the lives of American service members. These examples were meant to remind the audience that wars are more than simply political maneuvers; they also take a tremendous toll on the lives of ordinary people.

The context is crucial. There were several historical, political, and humanitarian factors that informed Biden's address on the US

withdrawal from Afghanistan. With this emphasis, Biden hoped to provide listeners with a fuller picture of the circumstances surrounding the United States' decision to join Afghanistan, the subsequent shift in goals, and the subsequent need to withdraw.

I thoroughly investigated the language and structure of President Biden's Afghanistan speech to understand the power dynamics and ideologies transmitted through critical discourse analysis (CDA). Finding examples of negative lexicalization, such as downplaying the importance of military action or acknowledging the possibility of unanticipated developments, was part of the research. I used rhetorical devices like anaphora and metaphors to stress my unique aims and underscore my sense of responsibility. We distilled the following themes: American Responsibility, accountability of Afghan Leadership, and the persistent threat of terrorism. The contextual analysis provided a thorough comprehension of the choice to withdraw and its wider ramifications, which took into account the speech's background: long-term US involvement, changing international relations, and home pressures.

5. Conclusion

A complex interplay of rhetoric, duty, and reality unfolds in Vice President Biden's speech on the US withdrawal from Afghanistan. When viewed through the lens of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the speech reveals the many subtle ways language conveys meaning, negotiates power, and influences public opinion. His remarks contain the weight of history, the shifting goals of a protracted conflict, and the human cost that cannot be ignored. The juxtaposition of several administrations with current events highlights the multifaceted nature of the United States' involvement in Afghanistan. This choice was made against the backdrop of a changing national and international climate, reflecting a readjustment of priorities and an honest recognition of the world.

While Biden's speech touches on the withdrawal's immediate context, it is grounded in a broader historical, ethical, and humanitarian framework. It conjures up a story that is as much about keeping promises as it is about looking ahead. Reflecting the difficulties of leadership in a dynamic international environment, his statements attempt to bridge the gap between policy choices and their human ramifications. The debate over when and how to remove troops from Afghanistan illustrates the difficulties inherent in making foreign policy decisions, the importance of remaining flexible in the face of shifting circumstances, and the weight of the duties that come with holding a global leadership position.

Acknowledgments

Not applicable

Authors contributions

Not applicable

Funding

Not applicable

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Sciedu Press.

The journal's policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

Open access

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

References

- Armada, P. (2021). *A Critical Discourse Analysis on Joe Biden's Victory Speech*, English Literature Study Program Faculty of Cultural Sciences Hasanuddin University Makassar. Retrieved from http://repository.unhas.ac.id/id/eprint/24306/2/F041181352_skripsi_02-06-2022%201-2.pdf
- Biden, J. (2021, September 21). *Remarks by President Biden before the 76th Session of the United Nations General Assembly*. The White House. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/09/21/remarks-by-president-biden-before-the-76th-session-of-the-united-nations-general-assembly/>
- E-International Relations. (nd). Donald Trump, the Middle East, and American Foreign Policy. Retrieved from <https://www.e-ir.info>
- Fauzi, A. (2021). Reflection of ideology: A critical discourse analysis of Joe Biden's speech on the war's end in Afghanistan: undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim.
- Flowerdew, J. (2012). *Discourse in English language education*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203080870>
- Ghanem, Y. (2023). Rhetorical Techniques in Informative Jordanian Media Discourse: A Pragmatic Study of Selected Modules. *Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan Journal for Human & Social Studies.*, 4(1), 219-237.
- McGregor, S. L. T. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: A primer*. Mount Saint Vincent University. Retrieved from <https://publications.kon.org/archives/forum/15-1/mcgregorcd.html>
- Mehmood, S., Sulaiman, S., & Jabbar, A. (2022). Discourse analysis of the US War on Terror policy in Afghanistan. *Journal of Humanities, Social and Management Sciences (JHSMS)*, 3(1), 487-500. <https://doi.org/10.47264/idea.jhsms/3.1.34>
- Middle East Eye. (nd). *Donald Trump in the Middle East: A story of big winners and losers*. Retrieved from <https://www.middleeasteye.net>
- Mustofa, M. A. (2022). *The Analysis of Euphemism Expression in Joe Biden's Speech "Statement on Terror Attack in Afghanistan"*. Undergraduate Thesis. Department of English Literature, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang: Advisor Zainur Rofiq, MA.
- Salma, N. F. (2018). *Exploring Van Dijk: Critical Discourse Analysis's Aims*. <https://doi.org/10.31227/osf.io/mwrnq>
- Trump, D. (2019). *Remarks by President Trump to the 74th Session of the United Nations General Assembly*. Trump White House Archives. Retrieved from <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-74th-session-united-nations-general-assembly/>
- Trump, D. (2020). *Donald Trump Speech 2020 UN General Assembly Transcript*. *Rev Blog*. Retrieved from <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-speech-2020-un-general-assembly-transcript>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2016). *Critical discourse analysis*. *Revista Austral de Ciencias Sociales*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190500001975>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). *Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam. University of Amsterdam. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118584194.ch22>
- Wikipedia contributors. (2021). *List of Afghan security forces fatality reports in Afghanistan*. Wikipedia. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Afghan_security_forces_fatality_reports_in_Afghanistan
- Yosef, M. (2023). Rhetorical Techniques in Informative Jordanian Media Discourse: A Pragmatic Study of Selected Modules, *Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan Journal for Human and Social Studies*, 4(1).
- Websites
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/08/31/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-end-of-the-war-in-afghanistan/>