

Discursive Strategies of Stance Construction and Reproduction: Biden's Speech on the First Anniversary of U.S. Capitol Assault

Sa'id Abdulwahab Jawad

Discursive Strategies of Stance Construction and Reproduction: Biden's Speech on the First Anniversary of U.S. Capitol Assault

Sa'id Abdulwahab Jawad

Email: hum.said.abd@uobabylon.edu.iq

University of Babylon, College of Education for Human Sciences, Dept. of English, Iraq

المستخلص: تسعى هذه الدراسة إلى المساهمة في تقصي الاستراتيجيات الخطابية المتنوعة التي يوظفها رئيس الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية جو بايدن في خطابه في الذكرى السنوية الأولى للهجوم الذي قام به مناصرو الرئيس الأمريكي السابق دونالد ترومب على مبنى البرلمان الأمريكي واستثمار هذه الواقعة والاحتفال بها في خلق و إعادة انتاج موقف سياسي واجتماعي مناوئ. تستند الدراسة في منهجها إلى التحليل النقدي للخطاب ومفهوم فان دايك المسمى بالمربع الأيديولوجي . تمتاز هذه الاستراتيجيات المتنوعة بمساهمتها الفعالة في بناء الاستراتيجية العامة التي تهدف إلى تأسيس تمايز بين الإظهار الإيجابي للذات ونقيضه من الإظهار السلبي للآخر من خلال ما تمتلكه اللغة والنص من أيديولوجيات مؤثرة في بناء الواقع وتشكيله. استخدم الرئيس الأمريكي جو بايدن استراتيجيات متنوعة لتحقيق هدفه في بناء هذا الموقف. أظهرت نتائج التحليل ان استراتيجية العرض الإيجابي للذات والعرض السلبي للآخر أنها الأكثر استخداما تلاها في ذلك استراتيجية الاختيار المعجمي للكلمات ثم حلت استراتيجية العرض السلبي للآخر ثالثا. أما استراتيجيات التمجيد والسلطة والتعميم فقد كان استخدامها الأدنى من بين هذه الاستراتيجيات المتنوعة .

Abstract

This study seeks to contribute to the examination of the discursive strategies United States President Joe Biden applies to strategize the First Anniversary of U.S. Capitol Assault to construct and reproduce a recognized sociopolitical stance in his speech. The make-up of critical discourse analysis (CDA) used in this study with reference to van Dijk's ideological square hinges on the overall strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. These strategies show their capacity to be representatives of the overall strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, which reflect how loaded language or infused discourse with ideologies plays a key role in constituting and shaping reality. United States President Joe Biden uses various discursive strategies to achieve his aim of stance construction and reproduction. The strategy of 'Positive Self-presentation' is mostly used in the speech. It has the highest frequency of occurrence. 'Lexicalization' is the second deployed strategy whereas the third one is that of 'Negative Other-presentation'. The frequencies of occurrence with respect to strategies of 'National Self- Glorification', 'Authority' and 'Generalization' show the lowest percentages.

Keywords: discursive strategies, ideology, stance, critical discourse analysis (CDA), positive self-presentation, negative other presentation, evaluation

Introduction

On January 06, 2022, United States President Joe Biden with Vice President Kamala Harris gave a speech in Statuary Hall at the U.S. Capitol at which he commemorates the first anniversary of the Capitol attack of Jan. 6, 2021. The Hall was attacked by an insurrectionary group loyal to the former President Donald Trump. As Congress gathered in the Capitol building to certify Biden's presidential election victory, Trump's supporters took the building by storm at which the world was shocked to watch on live footage a scene of US politicians cowering from the mob. Biden condemned and assailed his predecessor, the former Republican President Donald Trump who claims voter fraud in the 2020 election. Trump's supporters refused to affirm that Biden won

this election and tried to weave lies about that election that triggered the mob's assault. The Capitol attack results in national division and concerns about democracy in America as it represents an anti-peaceful incident of power transfer. This day was described as the darkest day in US democracy. Joe Biden mentioned that Trump and his supporters appraise power over principle.

The present paper tries to critically delve into the dynamics of the relationship between political practices and discourse. It goes without saying that language is one of the most crucial means language users have at their disposal to disseminate information, convey particular messages as well as to construct and reproduce a specific stance in light of the perception and mental models of the intended audience. Political speeches are thought of as being non-neutral due to their explicit and implicit tactics whether they are legitimate or illegitimate to influence and shape society. This reflects the controlling power discourse has on prevailing course of action and ideologies of others. What triggers the attention of the researcher is the political investment with all dexterity of a politician to utilize this attack and to celebrate the first anniversary of U.S. Capitol Assault as a reminiscent socio-political event of the gravest of threats to democracy in U.S. Celebrating an anniversary of an event happened in a previous year is an act of constructing a stance by its very nature. In his speech, Biden metaphorizes the Capitol Assault as a dagger at the throat of democracy at which democracy was attacked—simply attacked. United States President Joe Biden has the potentials to express political and social power and to successfully sway discourse content and structures under specific contextual factors (van Dijk, 2001). In addition to the content of discourse, the context of a communicative situation has an effect on the mental representations of the audience in interpreting speech to the best interest of the speaker's attitudes, ideologies, and stances. Thus, this speech represents an ideological stance. Stance taking contributes to energizing ideologies and to naturalize both social ideologies and social structures. It is deliberately constructed and reproduced on the long way to the political arena at which politicians are usually worried about imminent matters and political confrontations, not to mention, the twofold way politicians act whether being individual political actors or members of a political party.

This paper targets hitting the critical understanding and exploration of the discursive (ideological) strategies United States President Joe Biden adopts to strategize the First Anniversary of U.S. Capitol Assault. It investigates how these discursive strategies act as complexes of meanings in the construction and reproduction of stance. The "Us/Them" division or strategy in Biden's speech aims to legitimize such stance through the general strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. On this account, the paper intends to analyze the frequency and importance of such strategies showing which strategy(s) is/are more frequently used on the basis that language (discourse) is never neutral and that the choice of specific words (strategies) plans not only to describe world but also take part in making it. In other words, the paper works on examining, identifying, and quantifying these discursive strategies.

The methodology followed in the study is a critical discourse analysis of the speech under study. The analysis starts with identifying the discursive strategies utilized in the speech as well as their frequency of occurrences. Then, it goes on to analyze how these strategies play an important role in constructing and reproducing stance with reference to van Dijk's (1998) ideological square model at which the overall strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation is observed. Finally, the results of the analysis are inspected and discussed to arrive at specific concluding remarks accordingly.

Stance

Many scholars have used the concept of stance in a broad sense to refer to a variety of characteristics which are mainly related to attitude, ideology, people, concepts, and position. Scholars have given different definitions of this concept according to the different approaches followed and the methodology employed. Speakers generally undertake stance on the basis of their knowledge, identity, ideology, and sociocultural values and norms. Thus, the verbal performance or speech is thought to be recognized as a mode of expressing such beliefs and norms.

John du Bois, who is one of the leading figures in research on stance, thinks of stance as a composite which "encompasses multiple facets at once" (2007: 145). He expresses the idea that an act of stance taking can be subdivided into three main aspects (stance triangle): evaluation, positioning and alignment (2007: 163). He succinctly puts forward the following definition of stance which is referred to by (Richardson and Corner, 2011: 251) as the most accepted one:

... a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field.

The definition shows that stance is an act of communication which exists in open view to evaluate and position individuals whether against or with as far as certain sociocultural matters are concerned. It is clear that stance emphasizes the point that all utterances are dialogical. It can be said that this thought also operates as far as political speeches are concerned given that in political speeches the speaker figures on the addressee.

The idea of stance triangle helps in understanding the reason behind some social actors' particular stances in particular situations. Du Bois also states that "Stance is an act of evaluation owned by a social actor" (2007: 173). In addition to evaluation, it reflects that a stance taker is there to express a specific position against or with others. This definition reflects three aspects of meaning: act, responsibility and value. The first shows that stance is a public act which both affects and is affected by others' actions. Responsibility, the second aspect, mark "who took which stance" with the possible results. The third aspect refers to calling on as well as reproducing systems of sociocultural value (ibid). Du Bois argues that expressing a stance or having a position aims to have designs on certain sociopolitical values and norms as he puts in the following quotation:

One of the most important things we do with words is to take a stance. Stance has the power to assign value to objects of interest, to position social actors with respect to those objects, to calibrate alignment between stance takers and to invoke systems of sociocultural value. (Du Bois 2007: 139)

Stance is defined by Jaffe (2009: 9) as follows: "Stance saturates talk about others, in which speakers engage in both explicit and implicit forms of social categorization and evaluation, attribute intentionality, affect, knowledge, agency to themselves and others and lay claim to particular social and/or moral identities". This definition goes hand in hand with that of John du Bois as they both show that stance represents intentional classification and evaluation of certain values in a particular context. Jaffe (ibid) argues the characteristics of stance as being non-transparent as far as the context of discourse is concerned. She argues that stance is 'a

form of contextualization' as it stipulates the speaker's position in relation to specific event. Ochs (1993: 288) states that stance represents "display of a socially recognized point of view or attitude", which helps to make up social reality. The shared basis most researchers interested in when the analyzing stance lies in studying language in terms of the discourse-functional and interactional perspectives instead of system-functional ones (Englebretson, 2007: 1).

The present paper takes on Du Bois' (2007) definition of stance in the critical discourse analysis of the discursive strategies of stance construction and reproduction. As stance is tackled as an interactional aim that is constructed and reproduced discursively with evaluating and aligning with others, the general strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other- presentation can duly lay the foundations of the analysis of the subject under study.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a broad approach which is employed widely in analyzing discourse. It helps in determining how people in power shape their discourse. Fairclough & Wodak (1997 in van Dijk, (2015) state that the term discourse whether spoken or written represents a form of 'social practice'. (CDA) focuses on the way language exercises its power in the society. It is concerned with the ways "discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge relations of power and dominance in society" (van Dijk, 2001: 353). (CDA) deals with the relationship between discourse (text and talk) and society. It is a way of looking into discourse critically to investigate how discourse can cause an impact on society. It differs from other forms of discourse analysis in its critical nature. The critical aspect refers to the idea of going beyond the analysis of the formal features of discourse. (CDA) can be distinguished from other research approaches. In this respect, Fairclough (2013: 10) raises the following two features. Firstly, the approach of (CDA) tries to make a connection between the discourse under study and certain aspects of the social process at which (CDA) can be described as being a "systematic transdisciplinary analysis". Thus, it is necessary to have good knowledge of the context of that discourse. Secondly, as it is said that (CDA) "addresses social wrongs in their discursive aspects and possible ways of righting or mitigating them" (ibid 2013: 11), we can give it the feature of being normative. (CDA) regards "language as a form of social practice" (Fairclough 1989:20). It takes into consideration that the social and political control is reproduced by "text and talk." Fairclough (1989:15) observes that "language connects with the social through being the primary domain of ideology, and through being a site of, and a stake in the struggle for power." This opens the door to the next section of ideology and discourse.

Ideology and Discourse

For van Dijk (1998: 17), ideology represents a system of beliefs and ideas. It expresses shared interests and propositions of social groups and that "ideologies are typically, though not exclusively, expressed and reproduced in discourse and communication". Oktar (2001: 314) states that ideology is "presentations of who we are, what we stand for, what our values are and what our relationships with others are". This definition reflects how ideology plays an important role in the construction of as well as the perception of the dichotomy of "us" and "them" divisions in society. These two extremes, "us" and "them", are mostly utilized to politically demonstrate the strategy of positive self-presentation (in-group) and negative other-presentation (out-group).

The definition of 'ideology' is mostly realized in its critical reference to certain negative characteristics as far as social or political opponents are concerned (van Dijk, 1998). Such reference can be traced or examined in the language utilized in a particular discourse or text at which ideologies are articulated and disseminated (Kress, 1985: 29). Ideologies can be wittily found in the purposeful choice of vocabulary and lexicon. The lexical choice is changed or

alternated in accordance with the different situations involved and the intended aim of that choice. This conforms to van Dijk's (2006) belief that vocabulary and ideology are interdependent. Van Dijk (1996, 1998) shows the potentials of ideologies in creating links between discourse and society at which discourse plays an important role in reproducing particular ideologies and consequently adopting specific stances. Discourse is an actual manifestation of ideology. Ideologies can be organized in a way or another to be understood as fundamental ideas and attitudes in relation to a variety of social reality perspectives which are shared by members of a party, organization, society or culture. Whether directly or indirectly, ideologies control the way people use language and plan their social practices (Blommaert and Verschueren, 1998; Fairclough, 1989; Hodge and Kress, 1993). Thus, ideological discourse analysis goes through examining the links between discourse and ideology. Such links are mostly indirect and can be mediated by cognition. Therefore, the critical understanding helps in

finding specific attitudes and stances of the involved events and contexts of communication. Approaching discourse analysis critically, scholars put forward the idea that ideology and language are interrelated and that relationship between them should not be trifled with. This can be reflected in the use of particular words and structures which are normally motivated in order to communicate certain messages (Fairclough 1995: 15). Such motivation uncovers the governing and regulating role of the speaker's discursive strategies which aim at establishing, naturalizing and reproducing certain stances to the benefit of the language user's social and political goals. Discursive structures are functionally chosen to influence the listener. They reflect the speaker's ideological stance. The reproduction of ideologies in discourse is termed by Fairclough (1995: *ibid*) 'naturalization'.

The Ideological Square

Van Dijk (1998: 267) proposed the "Ideological Square" to be a theoretical and methodological approach in the critical analysis of the strategies which express the positive sense (in-group) and the negative one (out-group). His argument states that ideologies seem to be polarized in representing "Self" and "Others" or "We" and "Them" to convey two extremes as "We are good and they are bad". This theoretical framework is employed to uncover the discursive construction and reproduction of ideology. The ideological discourse structure for him can be explained as:

- Express/emphasize information that is positive about Us;
- Express/emphasize information that is negative about Them;
- Suppress/de-emphasize information that is positive about Them;
- Suppress/de-emphasize information that is negative about Us.

Ideological Discursive Strategies

One of the fundamental concepts in the critical analysis of discourse is ideology. Van Dijk (2006) thinks of ideology as a collection of ideas that builds up a system of social beliefs, entities, practices, and acts of reproduction. Ideological discursive strategies are important in drawing the map of shaping the membership of the dichotomy (in-group) and (out-group) in politics- related discourse.

Van Dijk (2002, 2003, 2004, and 2006) puts forward some ideological discursive strategies that are used by language users, particularly, politicians to achieve their political goals. They are as follows:

- Authority: this strategy is utilized by language users to cite an authority with the aim of supporting one's claim.
 - Evidentiality: the strategy of presenting proof or evidence to legitimate, emphasize, or make a political action more noticeable. Authority and evidentiality aim to offer particular information about an action.
 - Hyperbole: it is an example of semantic rhetorical devices used with the target of exaggerating a particular meaning as in using metaphors.
 - Polarization: this strategy is based on making polarized extremes as in-group (self/us) and out-group (others/them).
 - National Self-glorification: making splendid or excellent of a speaker's country norms and values.
 - Number-Game: a strategy at which numbers and statistics are used to establish and support a specific stance.
 - Consensus: creating ties of solidarity by focusing on aspects of national interests as well as opposing what threatens them.
 - Illustration: the strategy of citing examples and instances to illustrate positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation.
 - Positive self-presentation: the strategy which is intended by the speaker to positively refer to his group, party, members, or organization.
 - Negative other-presentation: the reference to (out-group) members and distinguishing them from (in-group) ones creating an ideological borderline between good and bad. This frame of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation creates functional and social underlying representations of the choice of particular discursive strategies.
 - Lexicalization: refers to the intentional strategic choice of certain words for emphasizing a specific meaning.
 - Actor description: this refers to describing specific actors in accordance with particular ideologies as a way of classifying such actors into (in-group) and (out-group) membership classification.
 - Implication: the strategy of using implicit information and propositions that are derived from socially shared knowledge.
 - Presupposition: the strategy which is based on prior knowledge or shared knowledge. Presupposition can be triggered by certain expressions to convey that a proposition is true although it is not asserted.
- Categorization: this refers to grouping people and putting them in particular categories according to social or political affiliation.
- Comparison: comparing two entities, parties or countries with the aim of highlighting the bad qualities of the other.
 - Euphemism: it rests on avoiding unpleasant or offensive social fact.
 - Generalization: this refers to the strategy of making generalization in discourse to express specific attitudes and stances by shaping opinion and public discourse.
 - Irony: the indirect mentioning of something to make it more effective and to communicate a specific point of view.
 - Vagueness: this strategy refers to the utilization of vague and unclear expressions in order not to give enough information.

Discursive Strategies of Stance Construction and Reproduction: Biden's Speech on the First Anniversary of U.S. Capitol Assault

Sa'id Abdulwahab Jawad

- Victimization: this discourse strategy conveys the idea of displaying the bad or negative aspects of others (out- group) and representing self (in- group) as victims.
- Metaphor: one of the rhetorical devices at which an implicit comparison of two entities is made through meaning extension.

Political Speeches

Scholars agree upon the idea that speeches are excessively salient genres of political discourse. Reisigl (2008: 243) explains that a speech can be recognized as a chain of verbal acts stated coherently by a single person on a special social occasion to address specific audience in order to achieve a special purpose. This elucidation reflects the fact that a political speech is a non-neutral medium of communication which aims to guide the audience to form an opinion or construct a stance as argued by Woods (2006:53). Schäffner (1997: 2) thinks that political speeches are instances of sub-category of political texts. He shows that a speech can be thought of as political when it serves to fulfill various political functions in different political activities and confrontations.

Results and Discussion

The results of analyzing the full transcript of the whole speech under study show that a wide spectrum of discursive strategies was used by United States President Joe Biden in his speech issued in Statuary Hall at the U.S. Capitol. By the exploitation of these various strategies, Biden succeeded in constructing as well as reproducing a specific stance especially with reference to the electoral process. This stance is socially and politically contextualized in light of the associated contextual factors of the involved event.

The obtained findings of the analyzed data show some instances of the discursive strategies mentioned earlier. These strategies are shown in the following table which gives a summary of them with their frequency of occurrences and percentages.

The Frequency of Occurrences and Percentages of Discursive Strategies

No.

Type of Strategy

Frequency of Occurrences

Percentages %

Positive Self-presentation

16

9%

Lexicalization

15

8.5%

Negative Other-presentation

13

7.4%

Comparison

11

6.2%

Polarization

11

6.2%

Presupposition

10

5.6%

Categorization

9

5.1%

Actor description

9

5.1%

Implication

9

5.1%

Metaphor

9

5.1%

Illustration

8

Discursive Strategies of Stance Construction and Reproduction: Biden’s Speech on the First Anniversary of U.S. Capitol Assault

Sa’id Abdulwahab Jawad

4.5%

Hyperbole

8

4.5%

Irony

8

4.5%

Evidentiality

7

3.95%

Consensus

7

3.95%

Repetition

6

3.4%

Victimization

5

2.8%

Number Game

4

2.3%

National Self- Glorification

4

2.3%

Authority

4

2.3%

Generalization

4

2.3%

Total

177

100%

Discussion

As it is clear from the table above, the data analyzed show that the mostly used strategy by United States President Joe Biden in his speech is the strategy of 'Positive Self-presentation'. It has the highest frequency of occurrence with the percentage (9%). The second strategy is 'Lexicalization' with the percentage (8.5%). The third is the strategy of 'Negative Other-presentation' with the percentage (7.4%). On the other hand, the strategies of 'National Self-Glorification', 'Authority' and 'Generalization' with the percentage (2.3%) have the lowest frequency of occurrence. These results reflect the fact that United States President Joe Biden makes a good utilization of the 'ideological square' (See p: 6). He emphasizes the good and positive information about 'Us' and bad or negative information about 'Them' as an attention-getter of 'good' against 'bad' representation. This is also obvious in the intended choice of the lexical items he used in his speech to embody these two extremes with the aim of constructing and reproducing a sociopolitical stance against the former President Donald Trump. Consequently, this stance plays an important role in naturalizing specific social ideologies that have the potentials to legitimize such stance.

Selected Illustrations

This section deals with discussing and explaining the use of the discursive strategies through some examples from the analyzed data. The following are selected illustrations.

Excerpt (1) THE PRESIDENT: Madam Vice President, my fellow Americans: To state the obvious, one year ago today, in this sacred place, democracy was attacked — simply attacked. The will of the people was under assault. The Constitution — our Constitution — faced the gravest of threats.

The above example is the beginning of Biden's speech. It starts with the vice president and the fellow Americans. This is the first step in establishing the positive side of the 'in -group' and 'out-group' dichotomous categorization which reflects the strategy of 'Positive Self-presentation' and Negative Other-presentation. To enhance this way of constructing stance, he does not forget to utilize the strategy of providing evidence of his opinions to legitimize and naturalize such stance. By the use of such strategy, he looks more convincing as if he says that 'I'm not weaving or fabricating things'. He chose the expression 'to state the obvious' one year ago today' which expresses that no one can deny what happens in this sacred place.

The strategy of hyperbole in the example above lies in the repletion in "democracy was attacked- simply attacked" with the use of the adverb 'simply'. Attacking democracy, as he

mentioned means that 'the will of the people was under assault'. These words reflect the strategy of victimization in the sense that people are victims of this severe attack. Once again the use of "The Constitution — our Constitution — faced the gravest of threats" Conveys the message that Biden and his followers represent the Constitution of US and not those who rebel and attack it with reference to the former President Donald Trump and his supporters. The use of "our" also aims to set up the ideological borderline between good and bad. Biden brings into play the kind of the superlative adjective "gravest of threats" to express the strategy of hyperbole coloured with comparison.

Excerpt (2) For the first time in our history, a president had not just lost an election; he tried to prevent the peaceful transfer of power as a violent mob breached the Capitol. But they failed. They failed.

And on this day of remembrance, we must make sure that such an attack never, never happens again.

In excerpt (2) above, Biden starts with "for the first time in our history" to create consensus and a general agreement among all the Americans that former President Donald Trump and his supporters represent the negative image in the history of US. This presupposes that no such image or event exists previously. Thus, the speaker makes a good use of the strategies of consensus and the strategy of presupposition to arrive at the ultimate aim of positive self-presentation and negative other- presentation. By the utilization of these strategies, he manages to persuade listeners of his alignment against those who attacked democracy and then to construct a sociopolitical stance accordingly. The strategy of actor description is also used as in "a president had not just lost an election; he tried to prevent the peaceful transfer of power". It is natural for the political competition to witness a loser in an election, but it is impossible for a former president to breach and break laws. Biden describes Trump as an aggressive man who leads a riotous and destructive mob. A very gloomy picture of potential future threat of democracy Biden tries to emphasize to be recognizably different from that of loyal, trusty, and peaceful people.

The ideological square is clear in the deployment of the exclusive pronoun "they" and the inclusive one "we" to portray the (in-group) and (out-group) dichotomy as in "But they failed. They failed" and "we must make sure".

It is not a matter of just constructing a specific stance, but also reproducing it. Biden succeeded in imposing a negative mental model of Trump and his supporters in the minds of people. This can be read in "And on this day of remembrance, we must make sure that such an attack never, never happens again".

In excerpt (3) below, the use of the strategy of illustration is present. Biden gave an illustrative example of the most negative image of a former president in the history of America, who was just watching what was happening on TV without any responsible act towards the rallied mob. The strategy of repletion is very clear in Biden's use of "They weren't looking" and "They were looking" and "This wasn't" and "This was".

The strategy of lexicalization can be observed in the intentional choice of the specific lexical items which negatively describe Trump and his supporters. These items express a focus on ideological, value-oriented, and stance saturated perspectives as the following expressions

show: (Attack, lives at risk, capital under siege, armed insurrection, uphold the will of the people, deny the will of the people, subvert the Constitution)

Excerpt (3) We didn't see a former president, who had just rallied the mob to attack — sitting in the private dining room off the Oval Office in the White House, watching it all on television and doing nothing for hours as police were assaulted, lives at risk, and the nation's capital under siege.

This wasn't a group of tourists. This was an armed insurrection.

They weren't looking to uphold the will of the people. They were looking to deny the will of the people.

They were looking to uphold — they weren't looking to uphold a free and fair election. They were looking to overturn one.

They weren't looking to save the cause of America. They were looking to subvert the Constitution.

Excerpt (4) We are a great nation.

My fellow Americans, in life, there's truth and, tragically, there are lies — lies conceived and spread for profit and power.

We must be absolutely clear about what is true and what is a lie.

Excerpt (4) starts with the strategy of national self- glorification. Here, Biden positively presents himself through making splendid, great, and impressive scene of the society. This means that good people should do the same in praising the principles and values of their country. He tries to harmonize and shape the people in a growing consensus that categorizes what is good and what is bad. This is clear in the use of "truth" and "lies" at which "lies" is referred to as tragic. Using such strategies reflects the fact that he intends to focus on drawing borderlines between "Us" and "Them" as in van Dijk's ideological square at which "Express/emphasize information that is positive about Us" and "Express/emphasize information that is negative about Them".

The strategy of presupposition can be found in "We must be absolutely clear about what is true and what is a lie". This presupposes that those who spread a web of lies are threats to our democracy and constitution as they prefer their own interest to the country's interest. Thus, Biden raises fears of future imminent threats to democracy and builds, reproduces, and legitimizes his stance concomitantly.

In the following excerpt, Biden starts with "at this moment we must decide" to signal a new phase of life. This presupposes that the previous phase was a bad one. He invites people to stand against the former president and his followers and to create a consensual decision of the kind of nation. The repeated rhetorical question "Are we going to be" reflects the idea of making a comparison between what is good and bad as in the use of "light" and "shadow". He takes the stance of supporting a nation which lives by the light of truth rather than by living in the shadows of lies. The strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation is clear in the sense of evaluating membership of "in-group" and "out-group". The last part of the excerpt supplies an answer to the repeated questions raised earlier. The answer highlights the importance of becoming fully aware of recognizing the truth. The deployment of the strategy of generalization mirrors Biden's way of stance construction and reproduction as well as shaping local and political identity where such identification is established in accordance with observing democracy in America.

Excerpt (5) And so, at this moment, we must decide: What kind of nation are we going to be?

Discursive Strategies of Stance Construction and Reproduction: Biden's Speech on the First Anniversary of U.S. Capitol Assault

Sa'id Abdulwahab Jawad

Are we going to be a nation that accepts political violence as a norm?

Are we going to be a nation where we allow partisan election officials to overturn the legally expressed will of the people?

Are we going to be a nation that lives not by the light of the truth but in the shadow of lies?

We cannot allow ourselves to be that kind of nation. The way forward is to recognize the truth and to live by it.

The strategy of utilizing metaphor is there in Excerpt (6) below: "to preserve the flame of democracy" and "to keep the promise of America alive". Once again, Biden makes a comparison between good and bad at which he expresses the situation as a struggle between democracy and autocracy. This conflict is inflected in the history of America. Thus, he hits the target of managing public opinions and succeeds to ideologies a specific sociopolitical attitude and stance.

Excerpt (6) Look, folks, now it's up to all of us — to "We the People" — to stand for the rule of law, to preserve the flame of democracy, to keep the promise of America alive.

Make no mistake about it: We're living at an inflection point in history.

Both at home and abroad, we're engaged anew in a struggle between democracy and autocracy, between the aspirations of the many and the greed of the few, between the people's right of self-determination and self- — the self-seeking autocrat.

Conclusion

In view of the aims of the present study of examining the discursive strategies United States President Joe Biden applies to strategize the First Anniversary of U.S. Capitol Assault to construct and reproduce stance in his speech and in accordance with the results of analyzing the full transcript of that speech, the researcher arrived at the following conclusions:

1. The mostly used strategy by United States President Joe Biden in his speech is the strategy of 'Positive Self-presentation'. It has the highest frequency of occurrence.
2. The second deployed strategy is 'Lexicalization' whereas the third is that of 'Negative Other-presentation'.
3. The strategies of 'National Self- Glorification', 'Authority' and 'Generalization' are used with the lowest frequency of occurrence.
4. The utilization of a variety of strategies brings into service the speaker's sociopolitical capability of constructing and reproducing stance in light of the contextualized event of U.S. Capitol Assault. On the other side, this reflects how loaded language or infused discourse with ideologies plays a key role in constituting and shaping reality.
5. A formal commemorative anniversary of a specific event is a stance construction and reproduction in itself.

Bibliography

Beard, A. (2000). *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge

- Conrad, S. and D. Biber (2000). "Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing". In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds.), *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 56–73.
- Cramer, J.M. (2009). "Critical Discourse Analysis" In. Littlejohn, Stephen W., and Foss, Karen A. *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory*. London: Sage.
- Downing, A. (2002). "Surely you knew': Surely as a marker of evidentiality and stance". *Functions of Language* 8 (2): 253–285
- Du Bois, J. (2007). "The Stance Triangle". In R. Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. pp. 139-182.
- Englebretson, R. (2007). *Stancetaking in Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Fairclough, N. (1989): *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1981). "Footings". In E. Goffman (ed.), *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. pp. 124–159.
- Hunston, S. and G. Thompson (eds.) (2000) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaffe, A. M. (2009). *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1993). "Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective". *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26(3), 287–306.
- Oktar, L. (2001) "The ideological organisation of representational processes in the presentation of us and them". *Discourse & Society*, 12(3): 313-346
- Reisigl, M. (2008). "Rhetoric of Political Speeches". In R. Wodak and V. Koller (Eds), *Handbook of Communication in Public Sphere* (pp. 243-269). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Reyes, A. (2011). "Strategies of legitimation in political discourse: From words to actions". *Discourse & Society* 22 (6): 781–807.
- Richardson, K., & Corner, J. (2011). "Sketchwriting, political "colour" and the sociolinguistics of stance". *Journal of Language and Politics*, 10(2), pp. 248-269.
- Schäffner, C. (ed) (1997). *Analyzing Political Speeches*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Van Dijk TA (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Sage.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2001). "Critical Discourse Analysis". In D. Tannen, D. Schillrin & H. Hamilton (eds.) *Handbook of Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell, 352~371.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). *Policies Ideology and Discourse*. Retrieved 29th Mar., 2013 from <http://www.discoursein.society.org/teun.html>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). "Ideology and discourse analysis". *Journal of political ideologies*, 11(2), 115-140.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Second Edition. London. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Wodak R. (1989). *Language power and ideology: Studies in political discourse*. London, England: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Woods, Nicola (2006). *Describing Discourse: A Practical Guide to Discourse Analysis*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Appendix

The transcript of Biden's full speech to Mark One Year Since the January 6th Deadly Assault on The U.S. Capitol

WASHINGTON - President Joe Biden marked one year since the Capitol attack of Jan. 6, 2021, with a speech in Statuary Hall in the U.S. Capitol on Thursday.

Discursive Strategies of Stance Construction and Reproduction: Biden's Speech on the First Anniversary of U.S. Capitol Assault

Sa'id Abdulwahab Jawad

Before a small crowd of congressional staff and journalists, Biden excoriated his predecessor, former President Donald Trump, and his false claims of voter fraud in the 2020 election and vowed to protect democracy.

Here's the full transcript of his speech:

THE PRESIDENT: Madam Vice President, my fellow Americans: To state the obvious, one year ago today, in this sacred place, democracy was attacked — simply attacked. The will of the people was under assault. The Constitution — our Constitution — faced the gravest of threats. Outnumbered and in the face of a brutal attack, the Capitol Police, the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department, the National Guard, and other brave law enforcement officials saved the rule of law.

Our democracy held. We the people endured. And we the people prevailed.

For the first time in our history, a president had not just lost an election; he tried to prevent the peaceful transfer of power as a violent mob breached the Capitol.

But they failed. They failed.

And on this day of remembrance, we must make sure that such an attack never, never happens again.

I'm speaking to you today from Statuary Hall in the United States Capitol. This is where the House of Representatives met for 50 years in the decades leading up to the Civil War. This is — on this floor is where a young congressman of Illinois, Abraham Lincoln, sat at desk 191. Above him — above us, over that door leading into the Rotunda — is a sculpture depicting Clio, the muse of history. In her hands, an open book in which she records the events taking place in this chamber below.

Clio stood watch over this hall one year ago today, as she has for more than 200 years. She recorded what took place. The real history. The real facts. The real truth. The facts and the truth that Vice President Harris just shared and that you and I and the whole world saw with our own eyes.

The Bible tells us that we shall know the truth, and the truth shall make us free. We shall know the truth.

Well, here is the God's truth about January 6th, 2021:

Close your eyes. Go back to that day. What do you see? Rioters rampaging, waving for the first time inside this Capitol a Confederate flag that symbolized the cause to destroy America, to rip us apart.

Even during the Civil War, that never, ever happened. But it happened here in 2021. What else do you see? A mob breaking windows, kicking in doors, breaching the Capitol.

American flags on poles being used as weapons, as spears. Fire extinguishers being thrown at the heads of police officers.

A crowd that professes their love for law enforcement assaulted those police officers, dragged them, sprayed them, stomped on them.

Over 140 police officers were injured.

We've all heard the police officers who were there that day testify to what happened. One officer called it, quote, a med- — "medieval" battle, and that he was more afraid that day than he was fighting the war in Iraq.

They've repeatedly asked since that day: How dare anyone — anyone — diminish, belittle, or deny the hell they were put through?

We saw it with our own eyes. Rioters menaced these halls, threatening the life of the Speaker of the House, literally erecting gallows to hang the Vice President of the United States of America.

But what did we not see?

We didn't see a former president, who had just rallied the mob to attack — sitting in the private dining room off the Oval Office in the White House, watching it all on television and doing nothing for hours as police were assaulted, lives at risk, and the nation's capital under siege.

This wasn't a group of tourists. This was an armed insurrection.

They weren't looking to uphold the will of the people. They were looking to deny the will of the people.

They were looking to uphold — they weren't looking to uphold a free and fair election. They were looking to overturn one.

They weren't looking to save the cause of America. They were looking to subvert the Constitution.

This isn't about being bogged down in the past. This is about making sure the past isn't buried. That's the only way forward. That's what great nations do. They don't bury the truth, they face up to it. Sounds like hyperbole, but that's the truth: They face up to it.

We are a great nation.

My fellow Americans, in life, there's truth and, tragically, there are lies — lies conceived and spread for profit and power.

We must be absolutely clear about what is true and what is a lie.

And here is the truth: The former president of the United States of America has created and spread a web of lies about the 2020 election. He's done so because he values power over principle, because he sees his own interests as more important than his country's interests and America's interests, and because his bruised ego matters more to him than our democracy or our Constitution.

He can't accept he lost, even though that's what 93 United States senators, his own Attorney General, his own Vice President, governors and state officials in every battleground state have all said: He lost.

That's what 81 million of you did as you voted for a new way forward.

He has done what no president in American history — the history of this country — has ever, ever done: He refused to accept the results of an election and the will of the American people. While some courageous men and women in the Republican Party are standing against it, trying to uphold the principles of that party, too many others are transforming that party into something else. They seem no longer to want to be the party — the party of Lincoln, Eisenhower, Reagan, the Bushes.

But whatever my other disagreements are with Republicans who support the rule of law and not the rule of a single man, I will always seek to work together with them to find shared solutions where possible. Because if we have a shared belief in democracy, then anything is possible — anything.

And so, at this moment, we must decide: What kind of nation are we going to be?

Are we going to be a nation that accepts political violence as a norm?

Are we going to be a nation where we allow partisan election officials to overturn the legally expressed will of the people?

Are we going to be a nation that lives not by the light of the truth but in the shadow of lies?

We cannot allow ourselves to be that kind of nation. The way forward is to recognize the truth and to live by it.

The Big Lie being told by the former president and many Republicans who fear his wrath is that the insurrection in this country actually took place on Election Day — November 3rd, 2020.

Think about that. Is that what you thought? Is that what you thought when you voted that day? Taking part in an insurrection? Is that what you thought you were doing? Or did you think you were carrying out your highest duty as a citizen and voting?

The former president and his supporters are trying to rewrite history. They want you to see Election Day as the day of insurrection and the riot that took place here on January 6th as the true expression of the will of the people.

Can you think of a more twisted way to look at this country — to look at America? I cannot. Here's the truth: The election of 2020 was the greatest demonstration of democracy in the history of this country.

More of you voted in that election than have ever voted in all of American history. Over 150 million Americans went to the polls and voted that day in a pandemic — some at great risk to their lives. They should be applauded, not attacked.

Right now, in state after state, new laws are being written — not to protect the vote, but to deny it; not only to suppress the vote, but to subvert it; not to strengthen or protect our democracy, but because the former president lost.

Instead of looking at the election results from 2020 and saying they need new ideas or better ideas to win more votes, the former president and his supporters have decided the only way for them to win is to suppress your vote and subvert our elections.

It's wrong. It's undemocratic. And frankly, it's un-American.

The second Big Lie being told by the former President and his supporters is that the results of the election of 2020 can't be trusted.

The truth is that no election — no election in American history has been more closely scrutinized or more carefully counted.

Every legal challenge questioning the results in every court in this country that could have been made was made and was rejected — often rejected by Republican-appointed judges, including judges appointed by the former president himself, from state courts to the United States Supreme Court.

Recounts were undertaken in state after state. Georgia — Georgia counted its results three times, with one recount by hand.

Phony partisan audits were undertaken long after the election in several states. None changed the results. And in some of them, the irony is the margin of victory actually grew slightly.

So, let's speak plainly about what happened in 2020. Even before the first ballot was cast, the former president was preemptively sowing doubt about the election results. He built his lie over months. It wasn't based on any facts. He was just looking for an excuse — a pretext — to cover for the truth.

He's not just a former president. He's a defeated former president — defeated by a margin of over 7 million of your votes in a full and free and fair election.

There is simply zero proof the election results were inaccurate. In fact, in every venue where evidence had to be produced and an oath to tell the truth had to be taken, the former president failed to make his case.

Just think about this: The former president and his supporters have never been able to explain how they accept as accurate the other election results that took place on November 3rd — the elections for governor, United States Senate, the House of Representatives — elections in which they closed the gap in the House.

They challenge none of that. The President's name was first, then we went down the line — governors, senators, House of Representatives. Somehow, those results were accurate on the same ballot, but the presidential race was flawed?

And on the same ballot, the same day, cast by the same voters.

The only difference: The former President didn't lose those races; he just lost the one that was his own.

Finally, the third Big Lie being told by a former President and his supporters is that the mob who sought to impose their will through violence are the nation's true patriots.

Is that what you thought when you looked at the mob ransacking the Capitol, destroying property, literally defecating in the hallways, rifling through desks of senators and representatives, hunting down members of congress? Patriots? Not in my view.

To me, the true patriots were the more than 150 [million] Americans who peacefully expressed their vote at the ballot box, the election workers who protected the integrity of the vote, and the heroes who defended this Capitol.

You can't love your country only when you win.

You can't obey the law only when it's convenient.

You can't be patriotic when you embrace and enable lies.

Those who stormed this Capitol and those who instigated and incited and those who called on them to do so held a dagger at the throat of America — at American democracy.

They didn't come here out of patriotism or principle. They came here in rage — not in service of America, but rather in service of one man.

Those who incited the mob — the real plotters — who were desperate to deny the certification of the election and defy the will of the voters.

But their plot was foiled. Congressmen — Democrats and Republicans — stayed. Senators, representatives, staff — they finished their work the Constitution demanded. They honored their oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Look, folks, now it's up to all of us — to "We the People" — to stand for the rule of law, to preserve the flame of democracy, to keep the promise of America alive.

That promise is at risk, targeted by the forces that value brute strength over the sanctity of democracy, fear over hope, personal gain over public good.

Make no mistake about it: We're living at an inflection point in history.

Both at home and abroad, we're engaged anew in a struggle between democracy and autocracy, between the aspirations of the many and the greed of the few, between the people's right of self-determination and self- — the self-seeking autocrat.

From China to Russia and beyond, they're betting that democracy's days are numbered.

They've actually told me democracy is too slow, too bogged down by division to succeed in today's rapidly changing, complicated world.

And they're betting — they're betting America will become more like them and less like us.

They're betting that America is a place for the autocrat, the dictator, the strongman.

Discursive Strategies of Stance Construction and Reproduction: Biden's Speech on the First Anniversary of U.S. Capitol Assault

Sa'id Abdulwahab Jawad

I do not believe that. That is not who we are. That is not who we have ever been. And that is not who we should ever, ever be.

Our Founding Fathers, as imperfect as they were, set in motion an experiment that changed the world — literally changed the world.

Here in America, the people would rule, power would be transferred peacefully — never at the tip of a spear or the barrel of a gun.

And they committed to paper an idea that couldn't live up to — they couldn't live up to but an idea that couldn't be constrained: Yes, in America all people are created equal.

We reject the view that if you succeed, I fail; if you get ahead, I fall behind; if I hold you down, I somehow lift myself up.

The former President, who lies about this election, and the mob that attacked this Capitol could not be further away from the core American values.

They want to rule or they will ruin — ruin what our country fought for at Lexington and Concord; at Gettysburg; at Omaha Beach; Seneca Falls; Selma, Alabama. What — and what we were fighting for: the right to vote, the right to govern ourselves, the right to determine our own destiny.

And with rights come responsibilities: the responsibility to see each other as neighbors — maybe we disagree with that neighbor, but they're not an adversary; the responsibility to accept defeat then get back in the arena and try again the next time to make your case; the responsibility to see that America is an idea — an idea that requires vigilant stewardship.

As we stand here today — one year since January 6th, 2021 — the lies that drove the anger and madness we saw in this place, they have not abated.

So, we have to be firm, resolute, and unyielding in our defense of the right to vote and to have that vote counted.

Some have already made the ultimate sacrifice in this sacred effort.

Jill and I have mourned police officers in this Capitol Rotunda not once but twice in the wake of January 6th: once to honor Officer Brian Sicknick, who lost his life the day after the attack, and a second time to honor Officer Billy Evans, who lost his life defending this Capitol as well.

We think about the others who lost their lives and were injured and everyone living with the trauma of that day — from those defending this Capitol to members of Congress in both parties and their staffs, to reporters, cafeteria workers, custodial workers, and their families.

Don't kid yourself: The pain and scars from that day run deep.

I said it many times and it's no more true or real than when we think about the events of January 6th: We are in a battle for the soul of America. A battle that, by the grace of God and the goodness and gracious — and greatness of this nation, we will win.

Believe me, I know how difficult democracy is. And I'm crystal clear about the threats America faces. But I also know that our darkest days can lead to light and hope.

From the death and destruction, as the Vice President referenced, in Pearl Harbor came the triumph over the forces of fascism.

From the brutality of Bloody Sunday on the Edmund Pettus Bridge came historic voting rights legislation.

So, now let us step up, write the next chapter in American history where January 6th marks not the end of democracy, but the beginning of a renaissance of liberty and fair play.

I did not seek this fight brought to this Capitol one year ago today, but I will not shrink from it either.

I will stand in this breach. I will defend this nation. And I will allow no one to place a dagger at the throat of our democracy.

We will make sure the will of the people is heard; that the ballot prevails, not violence; that authority in this nation will always be peacefully transferred.

I believe the power of the presidency and the purpose is to unite this nation, not divide it; to lift us up, not tear us apart; to be about us — about us, not about “me.”

Deep in the heart of America burns a flame lit almost 250 years ago — of liberty, freedom, and equality.

This is not a land of kings or dictators or autocrats. We’re a nation of laws; of order, not chaos; of peace, not violence.

Here in America, the people rule through the ballot, and their will prevails.

So, let us remember: Together, we’re one nation, under God, indivisible; that today, tomorrow, and forever, at our best, we are the United States of America.

God bless you all. May God protect our troops. And may God bless those who stand watch over our democracy.