

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
MOULOUD MAMMERI UNIVERSITY OF TIZI-OUZOU

Department of English



**A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for a
Master's Degree in English**

Option: Literature and Interdisciplinary Approaches

Title

**Contrasting J. Biden's and V. Putin's Selected Speeches about
the Ukraine Conflict (2022-2024) from a Dialogic Perspective.**

Submitted by

- ▶ Nazim BOUTGOUMAS
- ▶ Kahina BOUALAM

Supervised by

- ▶ Dr. Rafik LACEB

Board of Examiners

- Arezki Khelifa, MCA, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou, **Chair**
- Rafik LACEB, MCA, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou, **Supervisor**
- Saïd Gada, MCA, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou, **Examiner.**

Academic Year: 2023-2024

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA MINISTRY OF HIGHER
EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

**Contrasting J. Biden's and V. Putin's Selected Speeches about the
Ukraine Conflict (2022-2024) from a Dialogic Perspective.**

Nazim BOUTGOUMAS and Kahina BOUALAM

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
a Master's Degree in English



MOULOUD MAMMERI UNIVERSITY OF TIZI-OUZOU



Department of English

Option: Literature and Interdisciplinary Approaches

Supervised by

Dr. Rafik LACEB

Board of Examiners

- Arezki Khelifa ,MCA, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou, Chair
- Rafik LACEB, MCA, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou, Supervisor
- Saïd Gada, MCA, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou, Examiner.

Academic Year: 2023-2024

Abstract

This study presents an in-depth comparative analysis of the speeches delivered by Joe Biden and Vladimir Putin throughout the ongoing Ukraine conflict from 2022 to 2024. Leaning on dialogic perspectives, the research has examined the political speeches of both leaders, aiming to uncover the underlying messages and implications within their political speeches. In order to complete this, we have applied Bakhtin's concepts of *hidden polemics* and *parody* formulated in his book *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984). Given the reliability of this theoretical framework, this dissertation has followed specific steps so as to achieve the intended results. The present research consists of two important results. The first chapter titled 'unveiling power relations' has focalized on presenting, analyzing, then deciphering the manifestation of power as a broad concept and recurring theme often associated with the political leaders such as Putin and Biden. The second, entitled 'manipulation of historical narratives', has been dedicated to set the spotlight on covering the areas of historical narratives as an instrument of political manipulation. These steps we have gone through to study the six speeches of the previously mentioned presidents have mainly allowed us to understand the extent to which power has emerged from Foucauldian power leading up to military threats. In addition, our dissertation has recognized the impact of historical narrative tactics in reinforcing certain policies over others. The findings reveal distinct rhetorical appeals that reflect each leader's political stance, power relations, and efforts to influence the global narrative.

Keywords: political discourse analysis, comparative analysis, Ukraine conflict, dialogism, rhetorical appeals, Joseph Robinette Biden, Vladimir Putin

Dedication

To the two irreplaceable people whom God has chosen to gift me, the unique pearls, the light

that never disappears, my dear sons Amazigh and Jugurtha.

To my parents who have encouraged and supported me all along this work.

To my beloved family "BOUALAM".

To my supervisor Rafik Lceb who made the accomplishment of this work possible

To the best companion with whom I shared this work Nazim Boutgoumas.

At last, to all my friends, colleagues, and teachers who helped in a way or another to
accomplish this study.

Mrs. Kahina BOUALAM

To my ever-supportive father, Mohamed, and my exceptional mother, Malika Latef.

To my unique brother Abdelhadi, with whom I shared everything with.

To my outstanding teammate, Kahina Boualam.

To my methodology teacher, Sarah Aflihaou.

To my uncle Messaoud who made the experience of being a student in Tizi Ouzou come true.

Finally, to my friends Brahim, Oussama, Said, Moukrane, Fazia, Suha, Celine, and Katia

whose contribution and moral support were significant to me.

At least to all my friends I knew during my university journey and my high school friends.

Mr. Nazim BOUTGOUMAS

Acknowledgements

We are grateful and thankful for the almighty God for giving us energy, power and strength to finish and accomplish this humble piece of research. This challenging experience embedded in our dissertation came to be achieved thanks to the help of many people. We are deeply thankful for our supervisor Dr. Rafik LACEB for allowing us to work in his suggested topic. The help, guidance and support he provided throughout the realization of this work are priceless and endless. We acknowledge that without his guidance this work would have never been easily accomplished and realized. We would like to give our due thanks to the panel of examiners who generously accepted to read and examine our dissertation respectively. We would like also to express our gratefulness to our inspiring and role model teachers, Mr. Mohamed Ameziane BIA and Mrs. Sara AFLIHAOU, for their insightful and help concerning methodology. Our last but not least thankfulness and appreciation go for all the teachers and staff of the English department who made our journey exciting.

Declaration

We sincerely declare that our topic of dissertation is suggestively proposed by our supervisor Dr. Rafik Laced. Thus, our analysis we conducted is grounded upon a combination of synthesis and objective interpretation. We attempted to properly adhere to the APA guidelines with particular focus on the 7th edition. We also show case that the second cover page follows the same edition.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Dedication.....	3
Acknowledgements.....	5
Declaration.....	6
Introduction.....	8
Review of the Literature.....	10
Issue and Working Hypothesis	15
Methodological Outline	16
Methods and Materials.....	17
Methods and Theoretical Framework	17
Critical Discourse Analysis	17
Bakhtin’s Theory	18
Materials.....	21
Vladimir Putin’s Discourses.....	21
Joe Biden Discourses.....	23
Historical Background of the Ukraine War of 2022.....	26
Post-Soviet Ukraine	26
Euromaidan Protests (2013-2014)	26
Annexation of Crimea (2014)	27
Increased Tensions (2021)	27
Invasion of Ukraine (February 24, 2022).....	28
Results and Discussion	29
Chapter 1: Unveiling Power Relations	32
Foucault’s Definition of Power.....	32
Dialogic Analysis of 2022 Speeches.....	33
Dialogic Analysis of 2023 Speeches.....	36
Dialogic Analysis of 2024 Speeches.....	39
Chapter 2: Manipulation of Historical Narratives	43
Dialogic Analysis of 2022 Speeches.....	43
Dialogic Analysis of 2023 Speeches.....	47
Dialogic Analysis of 2024 Speeches.....	51
Conclusion	56
References.....	58

Contrasting J. Biden's and V. Putin's Selected Speeches about the Ukraine Conflict from a Dialogic Perspective

In a world where international political conflicts grow, the power of language extends far beyond mere words. It plays an essential role in demonstrating the struggle for power in a given geopolitical period, revealing opposing ideologies, and reflecting on their implications in other domains. The continuous Ukraine war that emerged in the period between 2022 and 2024, which portrays itself as a geopolitical impact between Russia and Ukraine extending to reach far global areas, represents a significant area where the impact of political discourse on developments takes place. In his proposed article, Frackman (2022) suggests that “As we observe with the war in Ukraine, humanities skills are crucial for understanding 21st-century problems” (conclusion). In this period of geopolitical tension, each nation involved in the dispute has seen its leader use the power of discourse, a concept defined by Cole (2019) as “The power of discourse lies in its ability to provide legitimacy for certain kinds of knowledge while undermining others; and, in its ability to create subject positions, and, to turn people into objects that that can be controlled” (The Power of Discourse). In terms of political discourse, its primary purpose is to legitimize actions, influence global perspectives, and attempt to manipulate people’s minds to fit certain advantages. Both President Putin and President Biden, as the world’s most influential political figures, have made numerous televised speeches addressing the Ukraine conflict. In this respect, our subject of study sheds light on analyzing the most selected speeches. In doing so, we attempt to understand the current issue in relation to the role of language and discourse to convey and manipulate their expressed and implied positions.

The war in Ukraine has further increased international tensions. This resulted in the ultimate reinforcement of power by all means. The end justifies the means is the statement both presidents would denote to normalize their policies. As such, there is quite a relevance

to studying the current president of the US, Joe Biden, and the Russian head of state, Vladimir Putin speeches. As these countries are crucial players in this crisis as well as their provided speeches, Dialogism as a framework concerns itself with digging through the possible voices that would govern a given discourse constantly influencing and shaping each other. With that said, it is significant to draw upon so as to analyze implied discourses and compare them in a dialogic manner for a deeper examination of the conflict. As a form of communication, discourse and rhetoric have immense strength in shaping public attitudes and opinions. In the age of mass media, messages are communicated instantly around the globe, and national leaders are able to address foreign publics. Theorists argue that the language and rhetoric used not only reflect political objectives and strategies but also shape foreign policy and the decision-making process. In his *Rhetoric*, Aristotle (2012) states “Rhetoric may be defined as the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion” (p.6). As can be seen, it is common that political rhetoric evokes emotion to make a certain issue resonate with public opinions or, in some cases, to persuade the public into a different line of thinking.

This critical discourse analysis is purposely exhibiting an attempt to apply aspects of *hidden polemics* and parodic elements as introduced in Bakhtin’s *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* (1984) in correlation with what we perceive as opposing ideas reflected in the presidents’ literature. By placing the previously stated concepts in the context of political discourse, it is quite understandable that the role of language in affirming a political position is firmly rooted in the mechanisms through which it is constructed. Considering the fact that language is a powerful instrument in paving the way for how international relations and affairs are handled. The importance of such analysis can be recognized in the ability to drill through texts used in political speeches within the context of war to find the ideas lurking behind them such as power, political manipulation, and dominance of the conflicting parties.

Thus, such study of political discourse analysis is designed to uncover the hidden agendas behind the actual meaning of a text.

Review of the Literature

Leaning on critical discourse, President Joe Biden and Vladimir Putin speeches are but an illustrative example that has been the subject of extensive research over the past three years. Many different arguments were brought into sharp focus in an attempt to apply the key aspects of discourse analysis and its distinctive rhetoric to the above-mentioned speeches. As deduced from prior studies, academic papers have been mainly dedicated to exploring the multifaceted realities and nature of political language constructed by the president himself. In an interest to do so, academics relied upon numerous theories better known in the field of discourse studies.

Some categories developed their ideas around decoding the uncovered ideologies of the president using the design of Van Dijk's Ideological Square Model (1998). In their research article, Mahfoud and Khaldouï (2023) subject the first speech delivered on February 24, 2022 by Joe Biden to an extensive study. They underline how President Biden portrays himself and his allies as advocates of liberalism, humanitarianism, and democracy as opposed to Russia's initiation of the war on Ukraine. As stated before, the Ideological Square Model (1998) is constructed as a tool by scholars to shed light on analyzing the positive connotations President Biden attributed to himself. The former sets the stage for them to denote the power of connotation through language. Furthermore, they attempt to exhibit how Biden's speech is subject to compelling juxtapositions of the selected aspects of the theory and the president's political language. The research paper titled *Discourse and language of war: A comparison of the linguistic and rhetorical strategies employed in Russian, United States, and Ukrainian presidential speeches* by Abbadi, Kreishan and Al-Saidat (2024) is a comparative study that supplies a comprehensive analysis of the rhetorical and linguistic

strategies that Biden uses within the same speech of 2022. The study shows Biden's strategic use of powerful vocabulary and semantic structures. Biden chooses cruel terms to report a sense of urgency and moral clarity. Terms like "premeditated attack," "brutal assault," and "flagrant violation" (Biden, 2022) are employed to describe the cruelty of Russian actions and to drive public opinion against them. Biden's speech is full of emotional language to persuade his audience and evoke strong emotional responses. The authors state "Biden appeals emotionally to the audience's feelings and evokes their feelings of anger and pity from the beginning of his speech" (Abadi et al, 2024, p 54). Comparing Biden's rhetoric with that of Russian President Vladimir Putin and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy, the research notes that Biden focuses on moral imperatives and democratic values. His words are crafted to influence beliefs, attitudes, and emotions; thereby he reinforces his political objectives and targets international support for Ukraine.

In her analytical article titled *Euphemisms in Modern Political Discourse: Joseph Biden's Speeches in the War in Ukraine*, Tymoshchuk (2023) goes deeper into the linguistic study of euphemisms in political language, particularly in the context of President Biden's speeches related to the war in Ukraine. At first glance, the ideas revolve around raising questions concerning the rhetorical use of euphemisms as an instrument to shape public perception of the Ukraine war through mitigating expressions (Tymoshchuk, 2023). The scholar highlights that "According to research data, 47.2% of euphemisms have a veiling function, 38.9% of euphemisms perform a cooperative function and 8.3% of euphemisms have a preventive function in Joseph Biden's speeches" (P.220). As far as this data is concerned, Tymoshchuk (2023) suggests a rather qualitative approach towards critical discourse as a means to interpret the euphemistic appeals employed by Joe Biden in his speech on 2023.

Many web articles have tackled Biden's speech delivered on March 7th, 2024 from different perspectives. On the next day of the speech, *Stimson* online journal published an article titled *Biden's State of the Union In Focus* by Preble, Slavin, Sun, Fiertz, Cronin, Decker, and Lee provide many significant rhetorical strategies and themes in Biden's speech. They show that the speech serves to build up his 2024 reelection campaign as Biden focuses on critical issues like the war in Ukraine, January 6th insurrection, and reproductive rights, contrasting his vision with Donald Trump's. The report states "The president turned his State of the Union address into a muscular campaign kickoff... as a fiery Biden laid out three challenges... that would be further imperiled if his predecessor returned to office" (Preble et al., 2024). Biden focuses on themes of freedom, democracy, and unity condemning the events of January 6th. Biden seeks bipartisan support to defend democracy and rebuild trust in institutions. He connects this appeal to a historical narrative of American resilience and recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and economic crisis. He describes these achievements as part of a collective comeback story for the nation.

The rhetoric in Putin's speeches about the Ukrainian conflict has been a subject of many previous studies that have pointed up the strategic use of language to shape perceptions and gain support. Scholars have analyzed how Putin frames the conflict as a civilizational clash using historical narratives and national identity to justify Russia's actions in Ukraine. The researches mainly focus on Putin's skillful manipulation of symbols and emotional language to maintain domestic and international support.

In her qualitative work "*A Critical Discourse Analysis Of Vlademir Putin's Speech Announcing Special Military Operation In Ukraine*", Kadim (2023) tries to analyse the speech of president Vladimir Putin delivered on February 24, 2022, concerning the crises of Ukraine by adopting critical discourse analysis of (CDA) particularly the ideological discursive devices of Van Dijk. (1995, 1999, 2004, and 2006) that she defines as:

Technically, it refers to utterances or linguistic sentences between the writer -speaker on the one hand, and the reader-hearer, on the other. Therefore, analysing sentences and words can help understanding the speaker's ideological background and how he uses language techniques to persuade and manipulate peoples' minds (p.425)

Kadim analyzed and interpreted the political dimensions of the ideology of Putin's speech, during the crisis of the Ukraine in three different categories; the category of meaning, the category of argumentation, and the category of rhetoric. The study highlights and marks the strategies Vladimir Putin's speech used to persuade his audiences with his ideas and thoughts and earn support to achieve his goals and plans in the near future. This study aims to find how Putin manipulated and used these strategies in his speech. Kadim (2023) finds out:

The announcement of the president Vladimir Putin about the military operation in Ukraine was a historic speech in the world. From the beginning to the end of Putin's speech which was rational since it consists of many facts and evidences about the events which were occurred in many countries in front of the eyes of the international community, nearly there was no such a speech from a political prominent person or political leader with such an elite important position uttering the facts. (p.441)

On their research "*Rhetorical Characteristics Of Vlademir Putin's Speeches At The Announcement Of Military Operations In Ukraine*" Stanojević and Mirkov (2023) analyzed the same speech. They examined the rhetorical devices including textual analysis of the content of the text, its structure, applied style, and the silent speech like diction, pauses, and non-verbal aspects of communication etc. The study aims to give deeper understanding of the underlying motivations and justifications presented by the Russian leader. Stanojević, and Mirkov (2022) state:

The structural rhetorical analysis established that the desired disposition structure was fully implemented, and that all its levels were thoroughly prepared and explained with stylistic-rhetorical figures adequate for shaping such an argument or narrative.

Moreover, non-verbal communication and diction tools were used designedly, with intention and in the service of a better understanding of what was said. Apart from the rhetorical example, there are many figures in the speeches such as repetition, contrast, anaphora and, in terms of genre (p.584).

Among the studies that analyzed Putin's speech delivered on February 21, 2023 stands Safitri thesis *An Analysis Of Mood And Modality In Vlademir Putin's Speech To Russian Genaral Assembly* (2024) . The study used qualitative approach by applying descriptive qualitative design. Then, they examined and evaluated using Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics theory. SFL theory views that language has two primary aspects, they are Systemic and Functional. In Systemic, language is about the phonology, discourse semantics and the structure of a text. Then, in Functional, language can be used to express the purposes or the function of social process in situation context and cultural context. (Halliday, 1985, p101). The research detects that declarative sentences are the most dominant ones in the speech as they represent 95% of the speech. Safitri (2024) indicates that these sentences "serve to assert and establish facts, positioning the speaker's statements as indisputable truths." (p 3). This choice of mood helps to create a sense of authority and credibility by making the audience more likely to accept the presented information without question. This is followed by imperative mood (3%) and interrogative mood (2%). The research also highlights the use of modality to express certainty and obligation. Some expressions such as "must" and "will," are frequently used to "convey a sense of inevitability and strong commitment to the proposed actions," (Safitri, 2024). The author indicates that Putin's speech contains "emotive language aimed at fostering a sense of unity and patriotism among

the audience." The emotional appeal is an important aspect in Putin's rhetoric that he uses to strengthen national belonging and support his policies.

On February 29, 2024 after few hours of Vladimir Putin's speech, Bailey, Wolkov, Evans, Mappes, and Kagan provided an analysis of the current state and strategies of Russian military operations on a research paper titled *Russian Offensive Campaign Assessment*. The research focuses on the dynamics of the ongoing Ukrainian conflict and the boarder implications for regional and global security. This dual approach aims to seek strategic objectives while decreasing direct confrontation with superior forces. The research paper notes that "the integration of cyber warfare and information operations has been a key element in disrupting enemy communications and command structures" (Bailey, R et al.2024). Concerning Putin's rhetoric, the authors state "Putin's rhetoric includes tired claims about negotiations and nuclear saber-rattling during his Federal Assembly speech, likely to seize on Western attention to the speech to promote ongoing Kremlin information operations" (Bailey et al., 2024). Putin has not deviated from his original goals in Ukraine. He used consistently maximalist language to justify the invasion, aiming for significant territorial gains. While he often includes nuclear threat rhetoric to instill fear in Western audiences and weaken their support for Ukraine. The Kremlin's rhetoric has framed these goals to allow Putin to introduce new objectives as he thinks fit.

Issue and Working Hypothesis

As mentioned beforehand, though many academic studies have investigated the rhetoric of Joe Biden and Vladimir Putin's speeches following the periods from 2022 to 2024, few have delved into the manifestations of dialogic analysis in the discourses. Expanding upon the fact that critical discourse analysis has been applied to the speeches individually; a meaningful dialogic comparison is needed to be brought to the surface. As deduced from the literature review, studies have primarily focused on perceiving the speeches

as two discursive points to be analyzed through the lens of ideological implications and unveiling linguistic styles. It can be argued that the emphasis on these notions is because of scholars' greater concern to capture independently the particular essence of underlying messages, with little importance given to Dialogism. Drawing on this, our selected approach aims to extend our knowledge as regards political speeches. Therefore, emphasizing the comparison between Putin's rhetoric and the rhetoric of the US president during a specific event, such as the Ukraine conflict. Finally, yet importantly, the current literature is to be labeled as a tool that takes into account both the complexities in the language of the two leaders and the potential implications for an understanding of international revolutionary processes.

Methodological Outline

Relying on the theory of dialogism as a valuable tool to CDA, the purpose of this research is an attempt to provide further qualitative insights on the interconnectedness of political languages when endowed with constructed ideologies. The dissertation in question adheres to a traditional model of outlining. Whereby it is organized into five parts. The first chapter is dedicated to offering a general overview where we have introduced our subject matter, emphasizing the chosen theoretical approach. Then, we have expanded upon the previous literature surrounding our study. After establishing our research hypothesis, we proceed to the second chapter throughout which we provide a thorough understanding of Michael Bakhtin's theory within the context of our research as well as the synopsis of the speeches. Then, we followed it with providing an overview of the issue involved in the third chapter. The fourth chapter, however, is carried out on results. The fifth is divided into two subchapters that begin with an in-depth analysis of the most selected speeches of Biden and Putin following the Ukraine war. While the first will be devoted to the application of the concepts of *hidden polemics* and *parody* on the six speeches in a dialogic analysis, the second

will be dealing with the ways in which historical narratives are manipulated for specific purposes leaning on *hidden polemics* and *parody* as well.

Methods and Materials

Methods and Theoretical Framework

Concerning the theoretical framework, a better understanding of Dialogism and its appeal to critical discourse analysis is needed to be achieved. The critical sphere of the theory has gained momentum by receiving significant amount of attention. Several theorists came to be known as Julia Kristeva, Mikhail Bakhtin, and Norman Fairclough have all contributed greatly to the development of the field. To our knowledge, some of their notions are proved to be influential among scholars. Nevertheless, the present research will set the spotlight on Mikhail Bakhtin's views of Dialogism, which he presents in his famous works, particularly *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984) and *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (1981). This critical theory proved its relevance to our analysis of the speeches, for it provides us with the firm foundation that we can build upon to understand how text and language use operate in ideological and political contexts. To do so, we will lean on Bakhtin's key concepts such as, *hidden polemics*, and *parody*.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Before preceding to define our selected theory, one must offer direct insight into critical discourse analysis (CDA). As a multidisciplinary field, it is of good deal to mention the multiplicity of views devoted to its definition. One of the key figures who seeks to critically define CDA is Van Dijk. In his socio-cognitive approach to the field, Dijk (2001) regards it as "a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social-power abuse and inequality are enacted, reproduced, legitimated, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political contexts" (p.352). With that said, it is specifically utilized to explain the unveiling mechanisms whereby the dominant groups channel discourse into pervasive

means of controlling the minds (Mahfoud & Khaldouï, 2023.p. 133). Similarly, Wodak (2012) affirms that:

CDA can be defined as a problem-orientated interdisciplinary research programme, subsuming a variety of approaches, each with different theoretical models, research methods, and agendas. What unites all approaches is a shared interest in the semiotic dimensions of power, injustice, and political-economic, social, or cultural change in society. The manifold roots of CDA lie in rhetoric, text linguistics, anthropology, philosophy, sociopsychology, cognitive science, literary studies, and sociolinguistics, as well as in applied linguistics and pragmatics (p.627)

To put it simply, critical discourse analysis (CDA) is an interdisciplinary quest for exposing ideologies and power struggle that underlie rhetorical discourses. On the other hand, Fairclough (2013), a pioneer in language studies, elaborated on the matter by saying that CDA is but a form of critical social analysis (p.3). It seeks to deconstruct the interconnectedness of Language use or, as he terms it, discourse and issues of power and ideology (Fairclough, 2013. p.3).

Bakhtin's Theory

Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975) is initially introduced to the literary mainstream as one of the prominent literary scholars in Russia. His profound influence in philosophy and literary criticism became a catalyst for scholars to draw upon. In his influential works, Bakhtin primarily introduced his main theory known under the name Dialogism, from which notions of *hidden polemics* and *parody* emerged as terms.

It is widely believed that the Russian thinker first coined the theory; thus, it is commune sense to say that *Dialogism*, *hidden polemics*, and *parody* cannot be separated. Therefore, before elaborating on Bakhtin's concepts, one might enunciate his vision on Dialogism. The thinker is said to perceive a text or any form of speech as a complex interplay of multiple voices often interacting with each other to create an implicit dialogue. This

Dialogic nature implies that a word or an “utterance”, as Bakhtin terms it, is characterized by its addressability and answerability (Irvin, 2018. p.1). In other words, it is designed in a way that it is always communicatively addressed and expects an answer from a believable receiver. Therefore, discourse, combining a set of utterances, can be recognized as a catalyst for “polyphonic” manifestations and “double-voicedness”. Bakhtin posits that:

The word in living conversation is directly, blatantly, oriented toward a future answer-word: it provokes an answer, anticipates it and structures itself in the answer's direction. Forming itself in an atmosphere of the already spoken, the word is at the same time determined by that which has not yet been said but which is needed and in fact anticipated by the answering word. Such is the situation with any living dialogue. The orientation towards an answer is open, blatant and concrete (p.179)

It suggests that words can only exist by the presence of other words. This interdependence is marked by conflicting voices that breathe new life into a dialogue. It is worth mentioning that the thinker considers the text to be the mere product of its context and prior texts. In Bakhtin’s views, concepts such as *hidden polemics* and *parody* are among the key the ingredients for the development of Dialogism.

Hidden Polemic. It occupies a significant space in Bakhtin’s studies. It is first appeared in his manifest book *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984). Bakhtin sought an approach that would allow him to seek meaning beyond mere words, such in the case of hidden polemics. To put emphasis on the matter, the theorist (1984) declares, “In the third variety, the other person’s discourse remains outside the limits of the author’s speech, but the author’s speech takes it into account and refers to it” (p.195) In doing so, he primarily introduces the concept, among other concepts, as:

In a hidden polemic the author's discourse is directed toward its own referential object, as is any other discourse, but at the same time every statement about the

object is constructed in such a way that, apart from its referential meaning, a polemical blow is struck at the other's discourse on the same theme, at the other's statement about the same object. A word, directed toward its referential object, clashes with another's word within the very object itself (p.195)

In other words, the authorial discourse communicates meaning on two different levels. The first is demonstrated through explicit means and it conveys a meaningful object. Apart from its explicit characteristics, a second meaning, on the other hand, is implicitly being reinforced. It is intentionally oriented to clash with someone else's discourse on the same object or theme. Campos (2021) says "The internal hidden polemic is among the forms of the active type as an active form of dialogism. The polemic is constructed in the confrontation with the words of others that are imposed upon the author" (p.110) This clash creates a hidden polemic which is mainly implied within the same discourse. The latter is then operating consistently in polemical double voicedness

Parody. It is another significant concept displayed in Bakhtin's works. The writer argues that Parody is but a form of dialogic discourse. Words in such discourse are not originally produced, but a mere reproduction of someone else's words imbued with his own ideology. At the end, the purpose it serves is parody. Bakhtin (1984) describes that "The situation is different with parody. Here, as in stylization, the author again speaks in someone else's discourse, but in contrast to stylization parody introduces into that discourse a semantic intention that is directly opposed to the original one" (p.193). This denotes that when it comes to parody, the original discourse is always faced with another discourse that is taking form. This form can be manifested in the doses of exaggeration, irony, humor, and satire. Therefore, the parodied discourse is always represented in a humorous tone and it is extensively mocked.

Materials

This study includes a total of six political discourses; three speeches delivered by President Putin and three speeches given by President Biden. The details of each speech are provided to better illustrate the selection process. We provide the date, the time, the location where the speech is delivered and the identified theme of the speech. The aim of this selection process is to make our study as systematic and transparent as possible, so that a proper consideration of the temporal and spatial dimensions of the conflict can be ensured.

Vladimir Putin's Speeches

Putin's Discourse announcing Special Military Operation against Ukraine [February 24, 2022 in the Kremlin in Moscow at 3:00 am GMT]. In his speech on February 24, 2022, Vladimir Putin discusses the ongoing situation in Donbass and the security concerns that Russia is currently facing. Putin expresses his deep worries about NATO's extensive reach towards the eastern regions as the military stuff is rapidly getting too close to its borders. He mentions his unproductive efforts to come to terms with the USA and its allies on European security and the non-expansion of NATO. Putin also touches upon the invaluable lessons that Russia learned from the collapse of the Soviet Union emphasizing the importance of defending Russia's interests especially within a world where power dynamics are consistently shifting. Putin criticises Western politicians and leaders highlighting their arrogance, lack of consideration for Russia's legitimate interests, and obvious disregard for the profound truth. Putin views that the winners in the Cold War ignored international laws and conventions. He lists Belgrade, Iraq, Libya and Syria among the military campaigns which for him constitute aggression or intervention devoid of requisite legal foundations. He faults the United States of America for using misplaced facts to sanction their attack on Iraq leading to fatalities, losses as well as elevated terrorism.

Putin's Discourse on the One-Year Anniversary of Russia's Invasion of Ukraine
[February 21, 2023 in Gostiny Dvor, Moscow at 10:50 am GMT]. President Putin began his speech by acknowledging the difficult moment that Russia is going through due to, among other issues, the situation around Ukraine conflict and the exacerbation of foreign interference in the country's local affairs. Putin confirms that These circumstances demonstrate, on the one hand, the urgent need to protect Russia's interests and on the other hand the complete failure of the idea of building a world order in which they would occupy a dominant position. Putin declares the situation in the Donbas region of eastern Ukraine is at a "critical, acute stage" and that for Russia, Ukraine is an "inseparable part of our own history, culture and spiritual space". He makes a number of contested historical claims regarding Ukraine and its relationship with Russia, stating that the modern nation of Ukraine was created artificially by the Bolsheviks in 1917, and that mistakes had been made ever since, including by Lenin and Stalin, which ultimately led to the breakup of the Soviet Union. On the conflict, Putin goes on to say Russia is "suspending its participation" in the New START nuclear arms reduction treaty with the US. He emphasizes that the "onus is on the West and the Ukrainian elite" for the security situation, using Ukraine as a "military base to fight against Russia". The president also points out the difficulty for the families of Russian soldiers killed in the conflict and promised to provide support through a new special fund. The Russian President condemns the West for lies and aggression in Ukraine. The West supports a neo-Nazi regime and terror attacks in order to defeat Russia. President Putin expresses his pride in the patriotism and unity of the Russian citizens, thanks them for their support, especially in the course of the special military operation in Donbass and declared that Russia will resist and will be ready.

President Putin's 2024 State of the Nation Address. [February 29, 2024 in Gostiny Dvor, Moscow at 11:27 am GMT]. During his annual state-of the nation address on February 29, 2024, Russian President Vladimir Putin addresses both local and international concerns because of the upcoming Russian presidential election. Focusing on his words about the Ukrainian case, Putin heightens the level of his warnings towards Europe and the U.S.A by warning NATO countries about the potential risks of sending troops to Ukraine. He reminds them that Russia possesses weapons capable of striking targets in Western territories if they intervene in Russia in any way. Putin talks about the gravity of utilizing nuclear weapons as it will result in the demise of the whole world. Putin specifically calls the West to stay away. His speech joins geopolitical justifications with impassioned appeals. Putin presents Russia's troops that have now stretched into its third year as the proactive force in the ongoing war.

Joe Biden Discourses

President Biden's Discourse on Russia's Unprovoked and Unjustified Attack on Ukraine. [FEBRUARY 24, 2022 at the White House in the East Room at 1:43 pm ET]. In his discourse at the white house , Biden expresses that the USA and its allies condemn the use of military power by Russia and the result that Putin is attempting to accomplish. He expresses that Russia's activity targets Ukraine, the international community and takes steps to change the European security. Furthermore, He states that the situation for sure is a demonstration of aggression despite the fact that Russia expresses that its objectives are to resolve the dispute with Ukraine through the utilisation of military means. President Biden mentions the breach of Ukraine's sovereignty and Ukraine's attempts to solve the conflict through dialogue with Russia to solve its internal issues. Instead of using force, Biden mentions that implementing force with the outcome of taking over Ukraine seems to be Russia's way after their repeated attempts at solving international as well as domestic

issues. Biden claims that there was no evidence of massive Russian-speaking populations being harmed in any way, thus making a legitimate reason for Russian incursion. Biden then addresses the U.S.A and European nations to stress the importance of staying unified. He says that Russia's belief in expending backlash to the invasion will fade and in time there will be more divisions to Russia's actions. Time is Russia's worst enemy and it is important that results of sanctions and help to Ukraine should be immediate to prevent further Russian advancement. Finally, President Biden confirms that he speaks with Ukraine's President Zelensky and promises aid in the wake of this invasion.

President Biden's discourse on the One-Year Anniversary of Russia's Invasion of Ukraine. [FEBRUARY 21, 2023 at the Royal Castle Gardens in Warsaw, Poland at 05:39 pm ET]. In his address from Warsaw, Poland, President Biden takes a firm stand on the need to defend sovereignty and democracy. He stresses that respect for these principles is what led to Europe's longest period of peace and prosperity. Putin's aggression is seen as a direct threat to the European Union and NATO. Mr. Biden's speech embodies the West's commitment to Ukraine's fight. It is not merely a cause for Ukraine, but an example of the ideological convictions that nations including the United States and members of NATO still hold. He phrases the conflict in Ukraine as a struggle between the old Soviet style of governing and a new way based on the will of the people: "a Europe whole and free and at peace". This is significant because it is undeniably true given Russia's previous action in the region, and with this ideology, puts forth a clear rationale for why the West should support Ukraine's bid. He does state that this does not require direct military engagement, and while he makes allusion to previous actions against Soviet influence in countries under its sphere of influence, it is a stance that the West should not counter Russia's direct involvement militarily. His opinion for what should be done is that Ukraine should be helped to defend itself and "hold the line" against Russian forces. This can be taken in a military sense or

otherwise, but he's essentially saying that Ukraine should not have to fold to Russian pressure and should be supported until Russian forces disengage.

President Biden's 2024 State of the Union Address. [MARCH 07, 2024 at the House Chamber United States Capitol in Washington, D.C at 9:00 pm ET]. In his 2024 State of the Union address the President Joe Biden emphasises the national issues like the economic agenda, the problem of immigration, women's rights, and other things. Focusing on his words about the ongoing Ukraine-Russia conflict, President Biden confirms that there are no American soldiers on Ukrainian land and so it will remain, but he emphasises the importance of standing with Ukraine and providing the necessary weapons for its defence. He highlights that USA is really in unprecedented times to defend freedom and democracy that are being assaulted not only in his country but in the whole world. In the European region, Putin of Russia is invading Ukraine and has become a cause of unease in and around Europe. He stresses that if nations think that Putin will stop at Ukraine, they are mistaken. Mr. Biden confirms that Putin is seeking expansion beyond Ukraine. Therefore, he encourages the whole Congress to demonstrate their selfishness by making a bipartisan security bill to send off the Wily Putin. He stresses out that history outlives generations and in case of America backs out, it will put Ukraine, Europe and the free world in danger. President Biden's message is clear: Ukraine becomes Putin's enemy and the world supports its power in the fight to maintain the sovereignty and democracy of their country.

Historical Background of the Ukraine War of 2022

Post-Soviet Ukraine

After seventy years as part of the Soviet Union, Ukraine declared its independence on August 24, 1991. The new state faced democratic development from the first day of independence. The country inherited a weak and distorted economy from its communist past and underwent a profound and painful process of economic liberalization and transition to a market economy. Political independence was achieved without a clear national identity and without resolving institutional, economic, and social problems. A fundamental period in Ukraine's democratic development came with the Orange Revolution. That was a series of protests in Ukraine from late November 2004 to January 2005. Triggered by electoral fraud reports, it was directed against the pro-Russian candidate, Viktor Yanukovich. The opposition backed Viktor Yushchenko; a pro-western candidate with prior political and financial experience. This period witnessed Ukraine's deep political divide between those favoring closer ties with the European Union and those advocating stronger connections with Russia.

Euromaidan Protests (2013-2014)

The Euromaidan protests began in November 2013 following the Ukrainian the decision of the government that to suspend an association agreement with the European Union and opt for closer economic ties with Russia. The decision faced mass protests in Kyiv's Maidan Nezalezhnosti (Independence Square) that defend the EU integration. Over the following months, the protests grew increasingly violent into clashes between the protesters and security forces. . In February 2014, the situation reached its extreme point leading to the removal of Yanukovich who escaped to Russia. These political troubles deepened the division within Ukraine between pro-Western and pro-Russian factions. The

interim government was more inclined towards the West faced immediate challenges in stabilizing the country.

Annexation of Crimea (2014)

In the power vacuum that followed Yanukovich's departure, Russia moved quickly to annex Crimea; a region with a majority Russian-speaking population and strategic significance due to its location on the Black Sea. On March 2014, Russia annexed Crimea after a polemic referendum that was not recognized by the international community. The United States, The European Union and many other countries condemned Russia's move, so they impose economic sanctions against Russia. The regional conflict witnessed a significant escalation after the annexation of Crimea .This caused a separatist movement in Eastern Ukraine. Pro-Russian separatists in the regions of Donetsk and Luhansk declared independence causing an armed conflict with Ukrainian forces. The conflict resulted in thousands of victims and displaced people. It increased the region's destabilization and attracted international actors through various forms of support and intervention.

Increased Tensions (2021)

During 2021, tensions between Russia and Ukraine highly escalated as Russia began its troops' mobilization along the Ukrainian border and conducted military exercises there. As a result, alarms about a potential invasion raised. Despite many diplomatic attempts to calm down the situation as holding talks between Russia, Ukraine and Western nations, tensions remained high. Russian President Vladimir Putin demanded security guarantees from NATO including stopping eastward expansion and assurances that Ukraine would not be admitted as a member. The NATO and Western countries rejected Putin's demands and affirmed that Ukraine has the right to pursue its own foreign policy and security arrangements.

Invasion of Ukraine (February 24, 2022)

On February 24, 2022, Russia started a wide invasion on Ukraine. This step made a dramatic escalation in the conflict. The Russian army attacked Ukraine's main cities as Kyiv, Kharkiv, and Mariupol from multiple directions. Putin justified the invasion by claiming the need to "demilitarize and de-Nazify" Ukraine. The United States and the Western nations widely rejected Putin's claims and considered them as baseless propaganda. The international community condemned Russia's invasion immediately. The Western countries led by the United States imposed severe economic sanctions on Russia. These sanctions targeted its financial institutions, main industries, and political elite. They also provided military and humanitarian support to Ukraine including advanced weapon and financial aid to reinforce Ukraine's defense capabilities against the Russian attack.

Results and Discussion

This study aimed at presenting a deep analysis of Biden and Putin's multidimensional perspectives regarding the Ukraine war. In order to fully understand the extent and evolution of their framed ideologies and policies within three distinct years, we have appealed to Bakhtin's theory of Dialogism as introduced in his book *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984). All things considered; we came to understand the multifaceted parallels found in their distinctive body of literature. The total of six speeches served both as a tool for us to fully grasp the complex sphere of geopolitics, and as an instrument for drawing clear inferences. Based on our findings, the speeches equipped us with clear data needed to critically analyze the complexities of political language when denoted in specific frameworks to address certain mechanisms such as power relations and the manipulation of historical narratives.

Our research has mainly displayed two major results that we saw crucial to be presented in our corpus of discussion. On the one hand, we have read the speeches through the lens of hidden polemics. In doing so, we have examined the evolution of power struggle and its policies, shedding light on the particular rhetoric with which it is presented. Then, we attempted to reveal how their texts dialogically interact with each other to make use of language as an instrument of power and social control. Relying on our analysis we conducted, we have deduced that the concept of power struggle evolved through three different forms. Throughout the speeches we have analyzed, we learned that power, within the two first speeches, was first exercised through discourse. We made particular reference to Foucauldian power and to the extent to which knowledge surrounding the Ukraine conflict was dichotomized and subjected to binary relationship. Contextualizing the notion of hidden polemics has paid us the way to uncover the underlying layers of meaning operating in each political leader's thought. In addition, we concluded that both presidents authorized the concept of power through indirect engagement and opposite directions. Furthermore, we saw

an immediate ideological evolution from deliberately focusing on discursive power, with each president perpetuates his dominant discourse, and subverts the other, to manifesting power through economic strength and military means

On the other hand, our study also explored how Russian President Vladimir Putin and U.S. President Joe Biden manipulate historical narratives in their political speeches. Under the perspective of Dialogism by Mikhail Bakhtin, our study revealed the many ways in which Putin and Biden express their historical narratives in order to promote their ideological viewpoints and geopolitical agendas. Dialogism stresses the importance of dialogue and interaction to shape meaning. The hidden polemics and the use of parody have acted as framework for us to understand how these leaders use history as a tool in their rhetorical strategies. According to our analysis, both Putin and Biden constructed historical narratives that both serve to strengthen their own positions and weakens the legitimacy of their adversary. For instance, Vladimir Putin often manipulates historical events to paint Russia's actions as part of a significant struggle for sovereignty and security. He uses these narratives to justify political and military decisions. Putin portrays them as necessary steps to protect national interests. On the other hand, Joe Biden frequently invokes historical narratives of democracy and freedom to perpetuate his policies and to criticize actions that he views as a threat to these values. Finally, our research has expanded our knowledge about the area of political discourse, it shows how powerful leaders use dialogic processes and manipulate historical narratives to achieve their goals in forming geopolitical stances. We learn to understand the role of history to shape political rhetoric and the ways leaders use the past to influence the present and future.

As far as the ultimate important result is concerned. Putin's speeches shifted from subtly reflecting on historical past injustice in 2022 to a strong and direct use of narratives about resilience and conflict in 2023. By February 2024, he gave portrayals of Russia's

historical destiny projecting growth. In contrast, Biden's speeches during the same period shift from reassuring and affirming historical alliances in 2022 to showing determined democratic solidarity and resilience in 2023. By 2024 it ultimately becomes optimistic and visionary about future democratic success.

Chapter 1: Unveiling Power Relations

Foucault's Definition of Power

The present chapter particularly sheds light on the evolution of power struggle and its rhetorical assertion both by Biden and Putin respectively, making use of *hidden polemics* and *parody* by Bakhtin. Given the fact that Power is a complex phenomenon that comes in many different manifestations and forms, Foucault, who we think is crucial to incorporate in our research, seems to be among the well-placed representators to define power within the context of language and discourse. In fact, he sought an approach that would deploy arguments on the ways in which language can gravitate toward creating discourse through which power operates. Foucault sees power as deprived from its coercive form or what he calls *sovereign exercise of power*. Instead, he argues that there is more to it than exercising power by means of ineffective tools as violence (Tomley et al., 2015).

For Foucault, power can work in the extreme subtleties possible. Discourses that are often labelled as accepted truth can be, in fact, perceived as a direct manifestation of power. The latter is reinforced by discursive means used to perpetuate certain thoughts, conducts, and subtly excludes others deeming them unthinkable. To put it simply, Foucault (1990) says “Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it” (p.66). This means that the set of knowledge produced through discourse is utilized as a vehicle for exerting power. Similarly, power itself provides a mechanism for certain forms of knowledge.

In the context of Biden and Putin policies, the use of power through discourse seems to intrigue our thought. To elaborate on the matter, we might bring its significance to shaping international opinion to the fore. In an attempt to shape the common discourse around the Ukraine war, both presidents embody their first speeches with a constructive body of information surrounding the conflicts.

Dialogic Analysis of 2022 Speeches

Putin's speech he addressed as regard the Ukraine war is consistently linked to power. Kadim(2023) regards the display of power as "linked to speeches because speeches are ways of representing and constructing reality, so that power relations are constructed, maintained and contested via discourses"(p.429). To draw upon this, it is safe to say that power is displayed in Putin's discourse through an implicit polemic, particularly struck at Biden's words. One might work to analyze these excerpts to better understand such a hidden polemic backed by the side of Putin "Why is this happening? Where did this insolent manner of talking down from the height of their exceptionalism, infallibility and all-permissiveness come from? What is the explanation for this contemptuous and disdainful attitude to our interests and absolutely legitimate demands? " (Putin, 2022).

To contextualize Bakhtin's concept of *hidden polemics*, it becomes clear that the president is arguing strongly against Biden's accusations as well as his views of the war as aggressive and unnecessary. Although it is not explicitly reproduced, it is mainly implied (Bakhtin, 1984.p, 195). This implication resorts to the use of certain utterances such as "exceptionalism", "all-permissiveness", "infallibility", "contemptuous", and "disdainful attitude" These expressions worked in tandem to help avoid referencing the explicit information of Biden and to contradict his imposed policies.

As it can be seen, it became clear that this indirect clash of ideas colliding with each other act as a tool to claim an authority of power without direct engagement. It can be claimed that Putin is killing off the other political opposition by claiming authority among his audience. In doing so, he resorts to manipulate logic in two directions. One possible direction can be seen in his attempt to demonize the US making people think of them as unjustifiably intervening in other's affairs. This can be seen in another extract where he indicates that "those who aspire to global dominance have publicly designated Russia as their enemy they

did so with impunity. Make no mistake, they had no reason to act this way” (Biden, 2022). The insertion of “those” in this case may be implied to refer to Biden and his allies. Another direction is demonstrated in picturing the situation to the national and international community as to the legitimacy of the war. He strikes them with a persuasive declaration to have a maximum impact.

Similarly, Foucault highlights that there is always a necessary emergence of a new discourse capable to contradict the other opposing discourse. In this respect, we see a hidden counter-discourse emerging to devalue Putin’s manifested discourse. In his first speech, Biden provides his audience with an in-depth recount of the common events. His first descriptions of Russia’s military preparations are but a call to action for a more global unity and a mobilizing political support. The course of actions that Russia took as regards the war is manifested through his speech. To our knowledge, the investigation of such implications is necessary. One way to achieve this is by making the best of Bakhtin’s notion of *hidden polemics* to unveil the hidden arguments that lie in his descriptive rhetoric he follows in this matter.

By focusing on the specific choice of words and rhetorical language Biden adapts, it is worth mentioning that the president assertion of power through discourse is portrayed in his first representation of the war. On the one hand, As Bakhtin ensures that a deeper meaning is always actively operating under the surface level of any presented discourse, the portrayal of the war as “premeditated attack”, “brutal assault”, and “flagrant violation” can work in tandem with this. In fact, this portrayal reflects both a denoted and connoted meaning. The connoted one lies in the fact that Biden calls for a factual condemnation of the Russian severe attacks and the special military operation. On the surface, the president may seem to be denouncing a direct aggression, as he puts it “Putin is the aggressor”, against Ukrainian people by outlaw actions, and his support for them.

However, deep down, another denoted meaning is surfacing out of the connoted meaning. It can be interpreted through the way Biden is indirectly confronting the other disseminated narrative reshaping it all along. This strategy is clearly used to counter the discourse of Putin resisting it with another form of knowledge. To reinforce this knowledge, the president regards the other discourse first as a clear propaganda, as can be seen in this excerpt “The Russian propaganda outlets will keep trying to hide the truth and claim success for its military operation against a made-up threat”. According to Oxford’s learner dictionary, propaganda is defined as “ideas or statements that may be false or present only one side of an argument that are used in order to gain support for a political leader, party, etc”. Thus, the mentioning of the word in Biden’s context helps him to even perpetuate the belief among his audience. The hidden intention here is to glorify his idea debasing all along the opposing one in relation to the audience.

On the other hand, the utterances given by Biden seem to subtly counter the other side narrative which arguably creates a polemical tension. This is manifested in him mirroring the first details of the war by saying:

Vladimir Putin has been planning this for months, as I’ve been — as we’ve been saying all along. He moved more than 175,000 troops, military equipment into positions along the Ukrainian border. He moved blood supplies into position and built a field hospital, which tells you all you need to know about his intentions all along (Biden, 2022).

It can be debated that this particular insight, among others, is not merely addressed to refer to its object, that of reciting it to the audience. It is also intentionally, although implicitly, crafted to work in opposition with Putin’s *regime of truth*. The latter is framed in the well claimed legitimacy of defense against Ukraine. So, in order to distort the current realities of the political situation, he is countering against the idea of a justified war under the umbrella

of defense. The latter is indirectly rejected, and implied in a way that it paints Putin as the criminal by aggressively violating human rights. By the victimization of Ukraine people, he is attempting to Claim the moral high ground as a means to emotionally appeal to the public. Therefore, by changing people's system of belief using discourse, he may also change their conduct towards their views of the war. Mahfoud and Khaldouï (2023) make a comprehensive inference in this light by asserting that "This 'Russian-phobic' representation in President Biden's speech mobilizes his audience against President Putin, especially since the speech is delivered by the head of a super power" (pp.139-140). This explains that Biden's attempt to leave a negative impression on Russia may become obvious that it can act as a mechanism of claiming power and winning over Putin.

In order to study the dynamics of evolution of how power is exercised through the president speeches, one might proceed to ultimately analyze the content of the next speeches provided. A critical reflection on them can provide us the tool that we can rely on to understand the possible forms of power through discourse manifested in the chosen speeches.

Dialogic Analysis of 2023 Speeches

Foucauldian power can also be seen through the lens of Biden and Putin's deliverances of their second speeches. To begin with, to show a better understanding of the hidden polemic that we are analyzing, one might contextualize it in relation to the given discourse of Putin. As deduced from our investigation, we come to realize that Biden delivers hidden responses that allow him to engage indirectly with the other leader ideologies. The latter are reflected in Putin highlighting:

None of them cares about human casualties and tragedies because many trillions of dollars are at stake, of course. They can also continue to rob everyone under the guise of democracy and freedoms, to impose neoliberal and essentially totalitarian values, to brand entire countries and nations, to publicly insult their leaders, to suppress

dissent in their own countries and to divert attention from corruption scandals by creating an enemy image (Biden, 2023)

From the above passage, it can be mentioned that the politician portrays America as “Indeed, the Western elites have become a symbol of total, unprincipled lies” (Biden, 2023) to accuse its leaders for using the notions of democracy in the context of the Ukraine war for their own self-interests and own gain only. We can see this reflected in his words as his speech unfolds by saying “They do not do anything without a reason, as we know” (Biden, 2023). It can be stated that the immediate synthesis we can dissect is that these passages, formulated in an ideological discourse, are implemented in way that they anticipate an answer from someone else, Biden in our case.

The use of words such as “the west”, “western leaders”, and “western elites” are the traces that are left which may point out to the real subject of the polemic. He is predicting what the US would claim, challenging the anticipated answer of its president concerning moral claims of democracy protectors. Therefore, he shapes the narrative of the other side, distorting its realities, and eventually exercising power through discourse. By appealing to people, he puts out a negative image of the west to remove the spotlight from them. To perpetuate his discourse, he appealed to certain notions such as “neoliberal” and “totalitarian”. According to Oxford’s learner dictionary, totalitarianism refers to “the principles and practices of a political system in which there is only one party, which has complete power and control over the people”. As for neoliberal, it is “who de-emphasizes traditional liberal doctrines in order to seek progress by more pragmatic methods” according to Meriam -Webster. Thus, diplomatically speaking, he frames his opponents, by implication, the US and its allies in this picture to subtly arguing again against their presence or intervention before resorting to direct threats. He perpetuates his discourse to influence the general audience.

Throughout Biden speech, we come to see a recurrent idea that we perceive as adequate to decipher in terms of discursive power. Drawing on what Bakhtin (1984) denotes in his saying “In a hidden polemic, on the other hand, the other’s words are treated antagonistically, and this antagonism, no less than the very topic being discussed, is what determines the author’s discourse” (p.195). We might read the politician words as being antagonistically answering to the president Putin’s words. When Biden addresses the policies of democracy and sovereignty in the light of the Ukraine war, one conclusion we may draw is that Biden is painting the Us and its allies as protectors of these notions. It is commonsense to say that he seems to be describing what he thinks is the essential nature of America.

By doing so, he is as though dialoguing with the other side discourse shaping it all along. These claims of moral stands are not just meant to be exposed to the public or to merely show support for the people of Ukraine, but also to clash with the information that Putin propagandizes. It is an indirect confrontation to counter the knowledge Putin uses when explicitly accuses the west of lies. To implicitly attack the Russian president, he is reclaiming again the US position to somehow restore the power as regards influencing public perception which might be distorted by Putin, as Foucault (1990) explains in his theory “where there is power there is resistance” (p.95). It is a kind of resistance Biden used to challenge the other discourse. So, resisting the discourse means resisting the power imposition at play.

To illustrate, the following excerpts serve as an instrument for us to expand upon the conveyed polemical discourse in question:

We also faced fundamental questions about the commitment to the most basic of principles. Would we stand up for the sovereignty of nations? Would we stand up for the right of people to live free from naked aggression? Would we stand up for democracy? One year later, we know the answers. Yes, we would stand up for sovereignty. And we did. Yes, we would stand up for the right of people to live free

from aggression. And we did. And we would stand up for democracy. And we did (Biden, 2023).

As we can see, rhetorical questions are the specific linguistics features Biden employs to announce his claimed support of democracy and sovereignty. He refers to the fundamental protection of these principles after deeming them as universal duties. In the meantime, he exposes the other discourse, which claims the opposite, to add a third meaning to what is explicitly said. Also, we see the expression “naked aggression” constantly used which we may refer to as the visible hint left to decipher the meaning of the implied subject. Bakhtin (1984) claims that “every statement about the object is constructed in such a way that, apart from its referential meaning, a polemical blow is struck at the other’s discourse on the same theme, at the other’s statement about the same object” (p. 195) . This means that a polemical blow is striking at the heart of the president Putin’s discourse on the views of democracy and sovereignty as regards the US.

Dialogic Analysis of 2024 Speeches

In his speech on February 24, 2024 address, Putin demonstrates another form of power. Through careful analysis of the rhetoric he adopts this time, we come to see the clear evolution of power embodied in his threatening tone. The first half of his speech is dedicated to readdressing the Ukraine conflict. This time the emphasis is put on introducing the idea of nuclear capability and its possible outcomes if it is ever come to using them. Before resuming to carrying out his potential threat of nuclear weapons, he arguably refers to what the US implies concerning direct attacks by means of military contingents. To illustrate, Putin declares “And at the same time, they are selecting targets to strike on our territory and contemplating the most efficient means of destruction. Now they have started talking about the possibility of deploying NATO military contingents to Ukraine” (Putin, 2024). This particular reference to a possible military action allows for a more conceived meaning of his

discourse. It can be argued that it is implied in way that it paves the way for him to legitimately perpetuates his thought of immediate threat.

In parodist discourse, Bakhtin (1984) asserts “One can parody another person’s style as a style; one can parody another’s socially typical or individually characterological manner of seeing, thinking, and speaking” (p.194). To contextualize this, the Russian leader goes beyond parodying style as the philosopher Bakhtin puts it “...but one can also parody the very deepest principles governing another’s discourse” (p.194). Instead, he intends to parody the very underlying view governing Biden’s discourse on nuclear weapons. Throughout this quote:

Everything they are inventing now, spooking the world with the threat of a conflict involving nuclear weapons, which potentially means the end of civilisation – don’t they realise this? The problem is that these are people who have never faced profound adversity; they have no conception of the horrors of war. We – even the younger generation of Russians – have endured such trials during the fight against international terrorism in the Caucasus, and now, in the conflict in Ukraine. But they continue to think of this as a kind of action cartoon (Putin, 2024).

We come to see an exhibition of words such as “spooking” and “action cartoon” which are presented to mock Biden’s oversimplified perspective on such a serious and delicate subject as nuclear weapons. The words such as “action cartoon” often carry certain connotations. In the context of Putin’s rhetoric, his employment of the words can be attempted to subject Biden’s viewpoint to ridicule. Such exaggerated language serves as satire to disprove the other president’s position.

As can be seen, we can only understand the text of Putin by the existence of Biden’s text. This allows for an implied polemic mostly demonstrated in the following excerpts

But we remember what happened to those who sent their contingents to the territory of our country once before. Today, any potential aggressors will face far graver consequences. They must grasp that we also have weapons – yes, they know this, as I have just said – capable of striking targets on their territory (Putin, 2024).

In this passage, we are introduced to Putin's side of the argument wherein he makes appeal to the past consequences suffered by those who aggressed Russia as a reminder. In order to understand the double-voicedness in this excerpt, it is important to note that the explicit thought we have explained previously can be confronted with another hidden thought. The latter can be directed to clash with Biden's. At first glance, The US president's words are not reproduced, but implied in way that it signifies an intentional hidden threat expecting possible refutation. We can see the exercising of power through the involvement of weapons. Hidden threats can be confronted with possible answers. He is not explicitly addressing these threats, but we still can see how power is now shifted to more direct actions. Now discourse is even more reinforced to address the uncertainty of the geopolitical situation at play.

In opposition, Biden also subjects his discourse to engage in a hidden polemic striking it at Putin regarding his responses to the implied threat. The following quotes illustrates this:

Overseas, Putin of Russia is on the march, invading Ukraine and sowing chaos throughout Europe and beyond. If anybody in this room thinks Putin will stop at Ukraine, I assure you: He will not. But Ukraine — Ukraine can stop Putin. Ukraine can stop Putin if we stand with Ukraine and provide the weapons that it needs to defend itself. That is all — that is all Ukraine is asking. They're not asking for American soldiers. In fact, there are no American soldiers at war in Ukraine, and I'm determined to keep it that way (Biden, 2024).

Outwardly, Putin seems to express again his renewal expressions of long-lasting support for the Ukraine cause. However, alongside this particular support, he is now describing a situation where he addresses to the public the inevitability to have Ukraine equipped with necessary weapons. Inwardly, a different intention is imposing itself within what is openly announced. The polemical blow is now clashing with Putin's threats and actions. We can now read this excerpt "In fact, there are no American soldiers at war in Ukraine, and I'm determined to keep it that way" (Biden, 2024) as a response to the previous discourse of Putin. It demonstrates how his speech is influenced by prior ideas.

To sum up, this chapter explored the concept of power in relation to Biden and Putin's delivered speeches from 2022 to 2024 reflecting on the Ukraine dispute. We attempted to understand it by the help of Bakhtin's concepts of *hidden polemics* and *parody*. As far as these notions are concerned, we critically paid attention to their significant application as to how the presidents formed their ideologies of power in hidden implications. The beginning of our analysis is marked by exploring power relations as defined and stated by Foucault. Throughout this, we explained how power is constructed and manipulated through discourse by means of implication and indirect response. Concerning the evolution of power we attended to display, it is mainly visible in the shift of how power works from discursive strategies to military and extreme threats.

Chapter 2: Manipulation of Historical Narratives

A historical narrative is a process through which the past and the present are passed through the dialogue of history and memory shaping collective identities and national traumas. The analysts and recipients of news on historical events come to the discourse with a set of expectations, experiences, and beliefs in the lens of the historical events that kind of retell in their mind as new events they are believed to witness and how they relate to the current situation. Our study provides a comprehensive analysis of the manipulation and representation of historical narratives in the political discourses of the two predominantly powerful leaders employing Bakhtin's dialogic approach in analyzing the multiple utterances in their discourses to illuminate the hidden polemics and parody use.

Dialogic Analysis of 2022 Speeches

On the second day after Putin recognizes and starts his military attack on the eastern regions of Ukraine, Putin holds an address to the people of Russia justifying his decision. The address relies on historical narrative manipulation using Russian historical concepts. Putin outlines the efforts that Russia makes to seek an agreement on equal and indivisible security in Europe from the end of the Cold War (1991) until now. He portrays NATO's expansion and the ongoing tension between NATO and Russia as a threat to Russia's security. Thus, he shifts blame to Western countries, suggesting they were responsible for escalating tensions.

I am referring to the eastward expansion of NATO, which is moving its military infrastructure ever closer to the Russian border. It is a fact that over the past 30 years we have been patiently trying to come to an agreement with the leading NATO countries regarding the principles of equal and indivisible security in Europe.

In response to our proposals, we invariably faced either cynical deception and lies or attempts at pressure and blackmail, while the North Atlantic alliance continued

to expand despite our protests and concerns. Its military machine is moving and, as I said, is approaching our very border (Putin, 2022).

Putin's reference to a 30-year period of Russian patience invokes historical injustice, suggesting a long-standing pattern of Western betrayal and aggression. This historical context aims to deepen the audience's emotional response and strengthen the narrative of continuous Western hostility towards Russia. Putin represents Russia as a historical victim of Western aggression and holds a historical theory that claims to encompass the whole past of humanity in its previous development. This view allows him to paint the present in the colors of the past. By doing this, Putin draws a parallel between the modern political situation and historical events.

In response to Vladimir Putin's declaration of war in Ukraine, US President Joe Biden delivers an address few hours later. He states that the US and the global community are once again witnessing the Kremlin inventing new fake pretexts for a premeditated war, fully aware that its claims do not stand up to credible examination.

Rus- --- the Russian government has perpetrated cyberattacks against Ukraine. We saw a staged political theater in Moscow — outlandish and baseless claims that Ukraine was — Ukraine was about to invade and launch a war against Russia, that Ukraine was prepared to use chemical weapons, that Ukraine committed a genocide — without any evidence (Biden, 2022).

President Biden directly addresses the false pretexts that Putin uses to justify his invasion of Ukraine such as claims that Ukraine planned to attack Russia or planned to use chemical weapons without any evidence to support his utterances. From a Bakhtinian dialogism perspective, we notice that Biden engaging with the many voices and narratives around the Russia-Ukraine conflict. The most authoritative one is Putin's justifications of the invasion that Biden challenges and mocks as in the terms of "*outlandish and baseless claims.*"

By mocking Putin's justifications, Biden positions his rhetoric in a kind of parody using the

direct language of Putin. He portrays Putin's statements as absurd and fictional, using strong terms like *"outlandish"* to undermine their power and sincerity. By employing such parody, Biden draws attention on Putin's authoritative narrative's nature that he presents as an absolute truth. Biden's statements portray Putin's motivations as absurd and unreliable lies. By contrasting *"baseless claims"* with serious issues like chemical weapons, Biden creates an absurd, almost comedic effect. He makes it clear that Russia's actions are a *"calculated and premeditated decision for war,"* not a response to justifiable worries. He creates a different narrative presenting Putin's supposed defence of Russian interests as a pretext and excuse for disrupting the peaceful global system.

It is important to consider the historical context of World War II as Bakhtin's dialogism recognizes that any utterance emerges from a complex web of interactions. President Putin frames the war as an undeniable, moral mission, and historical obligation. Putin's statement refers to the period before the World War II (1940-1941) when the Soviet Union faced the threat of aggression to emphasize its role as a peace-seeking nation. He selectively focuses on efforts that his country does to avoid conflict:

If history is any guide, we know that in 1940 and early 1941 the Soviet Union went to great lengths to prevent war or at least delay its outbreak. To this end, the USSR sought not to provoke the potential aggressor until the very end by refraining or postponing the most urgent and obvious preparations it had to make to defend itself from an imminent attack. When it finally acted, it was too late (Putin, 2022).

Putin's mention of the Soviet Union's delayed defensive actions highlights a recurring theme of external threats to Russia. By comparing past events to present issues, he reinforces the idea that Russia must always stay alert and ready to defend itself from Western threat. Putin uses such narrative to support the justification of military actions in Ukraine and portrays it as essential policies for national security. Putin's manipulation of historical narrative serves as a

strategic and astute rhetorical maneuver skillfully deployed to garner immense and unwavering domestic support for the ongoing war in Ukraine, an undeniable display of his profound leadership. Putin asserts that Russia must recognize and rethink the past, drawing its vital sources from the memory of its history. The nation's spiritual roots and its capacity for good works, the dignity and aggression of its forebears, will not be reduced to silt in a swamp of oblivion and forgetfulness. This portrayal serves to evoke sympathy and legitimize Russia's current security measures as defensive rather than aggressive.

On the other hand, when examined through the lens of dialogism, President Biden's use of historical narratives reveals a different approach. In his speech in 2022, Biden draws a moral comparison between the current geopolitical situation and the key historical narrative of World War II and defended international principles and the post-war global order. Here, the polemic is carefully weaved into the narration with the goal of undermining Putin's historical defences by describing them as distortions of a widely accepted historical perspective. Biden does not directly refute Putin's specific historical claims justifying the invasion. Rather, the polemic against Putin's narratives is subtly woven into Biden's own counter opposing historical narrative, exemplifying what Bakhtin termed the perpetual dialogue and struggle between competing discourses.

Putin has a — has committed an assault on the very principles that uphold global peace. But now the entire world sees clearly what Putin and his Kremlin — and his Kremlin allies are really all about. This was never about genuine security concerns on their part. It was always about naked aggression, about Putin's desire for empire by any means necessary — by bullying Russia's neighbors through coercion and corruption, by changing borders by force, and, ultimately, by choosing a war without a cause (Biden,2022).

When Biden says " Putin has committed an assault on the very principles that uphold global peace..."(Biden,2022). This is never about sincere security concerns on Russia's part, but about "*naked aggression* " that means about Putin's desire for empire. Later on, within his speech, Biden states "He has much larger ambitions in Ukraine. He wants to, in fact, reestablish the former Soviet Union. That's what this is about "(Biden, 2022). He engages in a form of hidden polemic. His statements appear simply covering Putin's motives of the invasion, but at a deeper level, Biden is implicitly contesting and undermining the legitimacy of Putin's professed historical grievances about NATO expansion or threats to Russia from Ukraine. This hidden polemic aims to discredit Putin's historical justifications by reframing the crisis – not as a response to legitimate security threats, but as a violation of the universally endorsed interpretation of history enshrined in the post-WW2 global order's commitment to national sovereignty and non-aggression. In Bakhtinian terms, Biden seeks to undermine Putin's historical justifications and presents Putin's historical narratives as pretensions that violate recognised historical truths.

Dialogic Analysis of 2023 Speeches

In light of the first anniversary of the Ukrainian invasion, both presidents delivered speeches on February 21, 2023. We witness a shift in the way and content in which these political figures manipulate historical narratives to legitimize their positions on the ongoing conflict. Each president reinterprets the past using different strategies to support his own perspectives in order to shape public opinion and policy.

Putin's rhetoric changes over time, moving from obvious historical claims to shape an extensive image of Russia as the defender against Western dominance. He appropriates Western democratic ideals and projects them to make it seem as if Russia is the only democratic state and the entire West is the source of the conflict. One way Putin did this was through repeated invocations of concepts like sovereignty, self-determination, and the will of

the people. For example, stating "The people of the Donbas were subjected to intimidation and genocide by the Kiev regime, and it was necessary to protect these people "(Putin, 2023). This framed Russia's invasion as a mission to protect ethnic Russians' right to self-determination, adopting the democratic principle of respecting the popular will. At the heart of Putin's speech lies a hidden polemic with the West, a delicate rhetorical conflict engaged by manipulating historical narratives. He invokes Russia's "*historical legacy as a great power*," he presents the conflict as an opposition to Western efforts to "*contain and weaken Russia*." Putin defends Russia's rightful status against outside threats by portraying it as the heir apparent to a proud past. By reducing the fight to a simple binary of aggressor and defender, Putin's claim that "they were the ones who started the war, and we used force to stop it" is a parody of the complex geopolitical realities. Putin states:

After the Soviet Union broke up, they began to revise the outcomes of World War II and to build an American-style world ruled by one master. To do this, they began to rudely destroy the foundations of the international order laid down after WWII in order to cross out the legacy of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. Step by step, they proceeded to revise the existing international order, to dismantle security and arms control systems, and plotted and carried out a series of wars around the world (Putin, 2023).

Putin refers to Russia's historical legacy as a World War II victor that influenced the post-war order through the *Yalta and Potsdam conferences*. He presents the West, and especially the United States as aggressively destroying this system and the "*foundations*" set up following World War II in an attempt to construct a "*world ruled by one master*."

By presenting it this way, Putin positions Russia as the heir and defender of the post WWII international system, while he portrays the West as the aggressor seeking imperial

dominance. This polemic creates a narrative about how the West is rewriting the laws and standards that Russia already contributed to develop in order to control and weaken Russia. Putin asserts that the West does not leave another choice to Russia but to respond with force defensively. Furthermore, Putin states:

There are other key aspects. During the years that followed the breakup of the Soviet Union, the West never stopped trying to set the post-Soviet states on fire and, most importantly, finish off Russia as the largest surviving portion of the historical reaches of our state. They encouraged international terrorists to assault us, provoked regional conflicts along the perimeter of our borders, ignored our interests and tried to contain and suppress our economy (Putin, 2023).

Putin's speech highlights his beliefs that the West "ignored our interests and tried to contain and suppress our economy" (Putin, 2023). This statement interacts with different narratives about Russia's economic issues and challenges after the Soviet Union collapsed. He blames the West for Russia's struggles with complex economic factors and policies. Putin uses parody to create a new narrative that opposes the usual Western view of the post-Cold War era. His speech not only outlines past events but also reshapes them to fit Russia's current goals. According to Bakhtin's dialogism, every statement is part of a larger conversation responding to previous comments and anticipating future ones. Putin's manipulation of historical narratives is a strategic move to silence other viewpoints and assert Russia's place in the world.

A few hours after Putin's speech, Biden holds his discourse. He shifts his narrative focus to promote the resistance of democratic institutions and alliances. He portrays the United States and its allies as protectors of a historical legacy threatened by autocratic forces. Biden states:

I spoke at the Royal Castle here in Warsaw, just weeks after Vladimir Putin had unleashed his murderous assault on Ukraine. The largest land war in Europe since World War Two had begun. And the principles that had been the cornerstone of peace, prosperity, and stability on this planet for more than 75 years were at risk of being shattered (Biden, 2023).

In his discourse, President Biden recalls the Cold War rhetoric and describes the current situation as a renewed conflict between democratic and autocratic ideologies. We notice that clearly in his declaration “A dictator bent on rebuilding an empire will never be able to ease [sic] the people love of liberty. Brutality will never grind down the will of the free. And Ukraine — Ukraine will never be a victory for Russia. Never. For free people refuse to live in a world of hopelessness and darkness” (Biden, 2023).

Biden's speech engages in a hidden polemic with Putin's portrayal of Russia as the defender of stability and the victim of Western violation by invoking the familiar tropes of the ideological struggle between democracy and autocracy. This parody of Cold War rhetoric serves as a counterpoint to Putin's narrative which reframes the conflict as a fundamental clash of values and systems of governance rather than a matter of spheres of influence or geopolitical matters.

According to Bakhtin's concept of dialogism, words are a link in a continuous chain that reacts to previous statements and anticipate responses. Biden states “One year ago, the world was bracing for the fall of Kyiv”. Well, I have just come from a visit to Kyiv, and I can report: Kyiv stands strong! Kyiv stands proud. It stands tall. And most important, it stands free” (Biden, 2023). This may refer to the dialogic engagement of the president Putin's justifications for the invasion by honouring Ukraine's strong spirit.

Biden's view of Ukraine's resistance as an ideological struggle for the preservation of “*democratic principles that matters to all of humanity*” represents a strategic dialogic move.

It challenges Putin's historical narratives and his counter-framing of military offensive as an assault on global democratic values that extends beyond the borders of the conflict itself.

Biden's speech was a direct response to Putin's rhetoric. It mixed different voices and ideas. He uses historical narratives and ideological points to counter Putin. Biden aims to gather global support for Western democracy which he portrays as being under threat from Putin's authoritarian Russia by recalling Cold War language and giving it a modern twist.

On the international scene of 2023, we notice that the manipulation of the powerful historical narratives remains a key rhetorical strategy in both presidents' discourses. Our study of their speeches reveals how they use language to gain political advantage and shape public opinion during a time of geopolitical tension.

Dialogic Analysis of 2024 Speeches

On February 29, 2024, Vladimir Putin's rhetoric changes dramatically. He reaches an extent of portraying Russia as an exceptional nation with an inevitable destiny. In his speech, Putin extensively manipulates historical narratives not only to justify Russia's actions, but to portray them as part of an inevitable, glorious destiny. Through the lens of Bakhtin's theory of dialogism, Putin's rhetoric shows an engagement with past discourses while crafting a counter narrative that parodies the idea of historical determinism; a concept typically used by Western powers to justify colonial conquests. However, in Putin's perception it is Russia's manifest destiny to overcome all challenges and achieve supremacy on the world stage. Putin states: "We have already proven that we can deliver on the most challenging objectives and respond to any challenges, even the most formidable ones. For example, there was a time when we fended off international terrorist aggression and preserved our national unity, preventing our country from being torn into pieces" (Putin, 2024). By mentioning Russia's resilience and realizations using glorious historical narratives. Putin suggests that Russia's past successes automatically assure future victories over any obstacles. He continues:

We supported our brothers and sisters; we supported their decision to be with Russia, and this year marks the tenth anniversary of the legendary Russian Spring. But even now, the energy, sincerity and courage of its heroes – the people of Crimea, Sevastopol, and the rebellious Donbass – their love for the Motherland, which they carried through generations, naturally makes one proud. This certainly inspires us and strengthens our confidence that we will overcome anything, that we will be able to do anything together (Putin, 2024).

The reference to the "*legendary Russian Spring*" and praising the courage of groups like those in Crimea serves to praise recent delicate events as heroic and necessary parts of the national narrative. Putin uses such sophisticated historical narratives to strengthen national pride and confidence. That may refer to Bakhtin's concept of hidden polemics as Putin's narrative indirectly criticizes Biden's statements and parodies his actions by contrasting them with Russia's supposed historical righteousness and destiny. In another passage, "We were not the ones who started the war in Donbass, but, as I have already said many times, we will do everything to put an end to it, eradicate Nazism and fulfil all the objectives of the special military operation, as well as defend sovereignty and ensure that our people are safe" (Putin, 2024). Putin manipulates dialogically historical narratives shedding lights on hidden polemics. In his statement "eradicate Nazism and fulfil all the objectives of the special military operation" (Putin, 2024). He refers to World War II as a powerful historical reference. He used the word *Nazism* to portray the conflict as a just war against an evil that is universally acknowledged. Putin indirectly criticizes the Western nations that support Ukraine and portrays their assistance as equivalent to backing Nazism. In such way Putin aims to undermine the morality of Western policy. In Stating "defend sovereignty and ensure that our people are safe" (Putin,2024). President Putin implicitly criticizes Western interventions and justifies the Russian military operation by stating that Western actions pose

a direct threat to Russian sovereignty and the safety of its people. Putin's manipulation of historical narratives does not only strengthen national pride and solidarity but also attempts to reshape international perceptions of Russia's role in global affairs.

Putin presents Russia as the victim of Western historical aggression that it is still right now "The so-called West, with its colonial practices and penchant for inciting ethnic conflicts around the world, not only seeks to impede our progress but also envisions a Russia that is a dependent, declining, and dying space where they can do as they please" (Putin, 2024). Here, Putin paints a narrative of the West having long constant "*colonial practices*" and a history of weakening Russia specifically. This makes Russia's current actions as a justifiable response for being the victim of Western historical oppression. Putin glorifies Russia's sacrifices in past wars to legitimize its military actions "We – even the younger generation of Russians – have endured such trials during the fight against international terrorism in the Caucasus, and now, in the conflict in Ukraine. But they continue to think of this as a kind of action cartoon" (Putin, 2024). Referring to the conflict in Chechnya in order to prove that Russia endured great "*trials*" through past wars against terrorism. He classifies the recent events in Ukraine within an honorable heritage of military struggle and sacrifice for the nation.

On March 7, 2024, a week after Putin's discourse, Joe Biden delivered his State of the Union address. Biden employs the concept of historical progress to contrast between the "progressive" democratic world and Russia's perceived "backward" revisionist position. He states: "Overseas, Putin of Russia is on the march, invading Ukraine and sowing chaos throughout Europe and beyond. If anybody in this room thinks Putin will stop at Ukraine, I assure you: He will not" (Biden, 2024). In an effective polemic, Biden suggests that opposing Russia puts America in the right side of history: "America is a founding member of NATO,

the military alliance of democratic nations created after World War Two prevent — to prevent war and keep the peace” (Biden, 2024).

In his speech, Biden does not only recount past events, but rather uses historical narratives to shape an image of unity and moral superiority for the West. Biden's references to democratic victories, stories of resilience and past struggles aim to connect the United States and its allies with the ongoing fight for freedom and democracy. He shapes history from an American perspective in a way that could counter Putin's narrative. Biden states, Biden states:

In January 1941, Franklin Roosevelt came to this chamber to speak to the nation. and he said, 'I address you at a moment unprecedented in the history of the Union'. Hitler was on the march. War was raging in Europe. President Roosevelt's purpose was to wake up Congress and alert the American people that this was no ordinary time.

Freedom and democracy were under assault in the world (Biden, 2024).

Biden invokes World War II and Franklin Roosevelt's famous 1941 speech about an "unprecedented moment" as Hitler advanced to remind the world of America's historical role in confronting aggression and defending democracy against fascist threats like Nazi Germany. Biden makes an appeal to these historical democratic roots in an attempt to reshape the predominant discourse. This backdrop weakens Putin's attempt to portray Russia as being forced to take defensive actions. Biden continues:

Tonight, I come to the same chamber to address the nation. Now it's we who face an unprecedented moment in the history of the Union. And, yes, my purpose tonight is to wake up the Congress and alert the American people that this is no ordinary moment either. Not since President Lincoln and the Civil War have freedom and democracy been under assault at home as they are today (Biden, 2024).

These historical narratives suggest a clear contrast between the democratic values of the West and the authoritarian actions of Russia. This approach helps Biden strengthen a shared identity for the West, portraying it as the defender of democracy against authoritarian threats. Using Bakhtin's theory of dialogism, we can see how Biden's speech is a part of a bigger conversation. He reuses historical narratives to support current political goals. We notice that Biden's language is designed to respond to today's global issues. He aims to unite his audience and international partners around common democratic values and historical experiences. By using Bakhtin's dialogism, it becomes clear that Biden's statements do not occur in isolation, but they are strategic responses within an ongoing geopolitical discursive landscape.

Our analysis of the mentioned political discourses through the perspective of Bakhtin's dialogism shows how both Putin and Biden strategically manipulate historical narratives to legitimize their positions and advance their interests in the ongoing Russia-Ukraine conflict. Through the concepts of hidden polemic and parody in Bakhtin's dialogism, both presidents engage in a complex discourse of war, each one shapes and reinterprets the past to build opposing moral stances and visions of the present conflict's place in the grand sweep of history.

Conclusion

This dissertation has provided an attempt to comparative discourse analysis as an approach to examine the speeches of Vladimir Putin and Joe Biden from 2022 to 2024, with a specific focus on the Ukraine conflict. To conduct this, we have appealed to Mickael Bakhtin's theory of Dialogism he originated in his work *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984). By giving particular emphasis on certain concepts put forward in the theory, this present research paper has revealed to us the extent to which political leaders channel discourse, given its recognition as a set of knowledge coming together to form a certain ideology, and language into a backdrop for shaping the balance of power and current geopolitical realities through historical narrative.

Our analysis has allowed us to draw a conclusion that a clear evolving political rhetoric has been adopted by both leaders to address their worldviews. It invoked the significant role of language and the mechanisms of hidden ideologies in influencing international thought and multinational relations. We have come to understand a slice of the world of politics where political figures engage with each other, and how this intertwined engagement shape realities of a given issue such in the Ukraine war. Concerning the first chapter, we sought to explore how power relations are constructed by focusing on *hidden polemics* and *parody* to invoke so. We saw how both leaders implicitly manipulate language to engage in certain dialogues filled with hidden agendas. President Biden often claims power by propagating stances on universal notions such as democracy, freedom, and international sovereignty to influence public perception and shape the current narrative around the war. Similarly, we are offered several insights on how Putin responds to western criticism in general, and imposition of ideas in particular. The second chapter throws light on analyzing the use of historical events and the several ways in which they are reflected and perceived.

While the scope of this study offered a focused interpretation within the desired perspective, it is safe to say that certain limitations are to be considered. These limitations give rise to further research and investigations as the topic concerns itself to be open to interpretation. In this matter, we believe that Future research should expand the analysis to include a semiotic analysis alongside a discourse analysis to account for a more deliberate reflection on both the linguistic nature of the existing shifts in political rhetoric as well as the nonverbal communication through a semiotic approach. Such work can be essential in understanding the relationship between verbal messages, nonverbal messages, and power in the context of international conflicts. Another comparative study that we trust to be contributive in the field is a exploring the differences and similarities that lies between the Russia-Ukraine conflict and the e Israeli-Palestinian conflict in a cross comparative discourse analysis.

References

Primary resources

- 1- <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/02/24/remarks-by-president-biden-on-russias-unprovoked-and-unjustified-attack-on-ukraine/>
- 2- <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2023/02/21/remarks-by-president-biden-ahead-of-the-one-year-anniversary-of-russias-brutal-and-unprovoked-invasion-of-ukraine/>
- 3- <https://www.whitehouse.gov/state-of-the-union-2024/>
- 4- <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/67843>
- 5- <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/70565>
- 6- <http://www.en.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/73585>

Secondary resources

- Abbadí, R., Kreishan, L., & Al-Saidat, E. M. (2024). Discourse and language of war: A comparison of the linguistic and rhetorical strategies employed in Russian, United States, and Ukrainian presidential speeches. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 13(1), 40–60.
<https://doi.org/10.55493/5019.v13i1.4957>
- ANGGUN, S. (2024). *An analysis of mood and modality in vladimir putin's speech to russian general assembly* [Diploma, UIN RADEN INTAN LAMPUNG].
<http://repository.radenintan.ac.id/32504/>
- Aristotle. (2012). *Rhetoric*. États-Unis: Dover Publications.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. U of Minnesota Press.
- Campos, M. I. B. (2021). A concepção de polêmica velada em duas edições da obra de Bakhtin sobre Dostoiévski. *Bakhtiniana*, 16(2), 90–108. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2176-457348617>

- Cole, N. L., PhD. (2019, August 7). *Introduction to Discourse in Sociology*. ThoughtCo.
<https://www.thoughtco.com/discourse-definition-3026070>
- Fairclough, N. (2013). Critical Discourse analysis. In *Routledge eBooks*.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315834368>
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: An Introduction*. Vintage.
- Frackman, K. (n.d.). *Humanities are essential in understanding the Russian war against Ukraine*. The Conversation. <https://theconversation.com/humanities-are-essential-in-understanding-the-russian-war-against-ukraine-178760>
- Kadim, E. N. (2023). A Critical Discourse Analysis Of Vladimir Putin’s Speech Announcing ‘Special Military Operation In Ukraine. *International Journal of Humanities and Educational Research*, 5(1), 424–444. <https://doi.org/10.47832/2757-5403.18.23>
- Mahfoud, N., & Khaldouy, R. (2023). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Biden’s First Speech on the War in Ukraine from the Perspective of Ideological Square Model. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 6(3), 132–143.
<https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2023.6.3.15>
- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Dictionary by Merriam-Webster. In *Merriam-Webster*.
<https://www.merriam-webster.com/>
- Oxford Learner’s Dictionaries | Find definitions, translations, and grammar explanations at Oxford Learner’s Dictionaries*. (n.d.). <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/>
- Stanojević, D., & Mirkov, L. (2023). Rhetorical characteristics of Vladimir Putin’s speeches at the announcement of military operations in Ukraine. *Sociološki Pregled/Sociološki Pregled*, 57(2), 562–585. <https://doi.org/10.5937/socpreg57-42988>
- Tomley, S., Hobbs, M., Todd, M., Weeks, M., & Dk. (2015). *The Sociology Book: Big Ideas Simply Explained*. Dorling Kindersley Ltd.

Tymoshchuk, N. M. (2023). EUPHEMISMS IN JOSEPH BIDEN'S MODERN POLITICAL DISCOURSE IN THE WAR IN UKRAINE. *Visnik Unìversitetu Ìm. A. Nobelâ. Serìâ Filologični Nauki*, 2(26/2), 210–224. <https://doi.org/10.32342/2523-4463-2023-2-26/2-13>

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin, & H.

Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Oxford: Blackwell.

Wodak, R. (2012). 21. Critical Discourse Analysis: Overview, challenges, and perspectives.

In G. Andersen & K. Aijmer (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Society* (pp. 627-650). Berlin, Boston: De

Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214420.627>