Metaphor-constructed Terrorism Discourse

Leiming Wang[1]*, Shanti C Sandaran [2]

[1]Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Johor Bahru, Malaysia
[2]Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Johor Bahru, Malaysia

Abstract. The US launched “war on terror” has stirred hot debate globally. However, it seems that nobody has stopped to think about the nature of terrorism, and it appears that very few people including quite a few scholars have not realized the discourse nature of terrorism. Therefore, this paper will study the production mechanism of terrorism discourse. The discourse analysis thoey and metaphor theory will be used to make a detailed analysis of the former US president’s speeches and relevant data to disclose the discourse nature of terrorism and anti-terrorism with an aim to finding out the production mechanism of terrorism discourse through varied discourse strategies and tactics.

1. Introduction

Political rhetoric is actually the use of rhetoric in the political process. What distinguishes it from general rhetoric mainly lies in the rhetorical activities that political subjects take political affairs as the content and revolve around political power, whose purpose is to achieve political persuasion and achieve a certain political purpose.The reason why this paper puts forward and forms such problems as political rhetoric is that rhetoric is indispensable, universal and plays an important role in the political process, especially in the operation of political power, and therefore,let social members recognize the legitimacy of political power, its ways and methods, but one of the important ways is to convince them that the political power is legitimate, this way of specific rhetoric to express political views is the legitimacy process of political rhetoric, namely political subject using political language of appropriate wording, myth, metaphor, tradition, ideology, etc., or adopt various rhetoric means of political persuasion.[1] Political rhetoric rules out all the possible terrorism discourses to legitimize the so-called anti-terrorism war together with all the concomitant operations.

2. Literature Review

The US "War on Terror" began in the War in Afghanistan in 2001. The study of the political rhetoric of the US "war on terrorism" has certainly followed. In a few years, there were not many academic works specializing in the political rhetoric of the American "war on terror", but several academic works did study political language and political rhetoric from the perspective of language, symbols and politics, and war relations. These works include:《Collateral Language: Guide to America New War, edited by John Collins and Ross Gloff, and Joseph S. Tuman's 《Communicating Terror: the Rhetorical Dimensions of Terrorism》, Sandra Silberstein:《War of Words: Language, Politics and 911》, Richard Jackson: 《Writing the War on Terrorism: Language, Politics and Counter-terrorism》.John Collins and Ross Gloff argue that language is a terrorist constitution; that the legitimacy of the "new American War" stems from linguistic tyranny.Sandra Silberstein believes that in the war on terror, all the familiar images and arguments serve the Bush administration and the support for the war in Afghanistan. While the American people are not just blind followers of government and media propaganda, the media are increasingly focused on the elaboration of rhetoric and image, and, through multicultural interactions, generate consensus among the public around the war. In short, political rhetoric is essentially a rhetorical activity of political subjects around political power with political affairs as the content. Its purpose is to realize political persuasion and give full play to political influence.The US "war on terror" was the first protracted and massive war of the 21st century. The "war on terror" launched by the United States, like any war in world history, deserves its legitimacy. In order to justify the "war on terror", the United States must prove the necessity of war that the United States needs war and has to conduct war. To prove the necessity of war began with the American government constructing an "age of terror," where the US was in a dangerous era of terrorism surrounded by terrorism. At the heart of this "age of terror" is the "threat", a threat to terrorism. The American government constructs the terrorist "threat" through political rhetoric, making the American society in the general extreme fear, so as to persuade the American people to support its war policy, and thus obtain the legitimacy of the "war on terror". Why should the US government construct a "threat" to put the American society in widespread

* wlmsufe@126.com

© The Authors, published by EDP Sciences. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

extreme fear to gain the legitimacy of the "war on terror"? This should start with the relationship between fear and legitimacy.

In order to launch a "war on terrorism", the United States first through the construction of terrorist political discourse, to create the upcoming, will lead to great pain or destruction of the disaster, to create a general fear in the American society, to prove the legitimacy of its "war on terror", to obtain the people's recognition to launch a "war on terror". Popular recognition is an important pillar of the legitimacy of modern countries. The higher the public identity, the lower the cost of ruling the country, and the lower the public identity, the higher the cost of ruling the country. Therefore, modern countries want to get the best of their people based on the cost of ruling. If the tool of violence is an explicit rule, then obtaining the psychological recognition of the explicit rule is an inevitable trend of modern politics; to realize the implicit rule of public psychological identity, it is necessary to persuade the people through political rhetoric.[3]Especially for the United States the strong sense of civil rights, has the precedent of the Vietnam war, the Bush administration launched the "war on terrorism" especially need to win the general recognition, especially need to construct through the political discourse extremely frightening state of emergency, to persuade people generally agree that the "war on terrorism" is justified.

3. Research methods and theoretical analysis

It should be noted that when the US government constructs the legal legitimacy of the war reasons for attacking Afghanistan, it is achieved through the defining function of political rhetoric. The United States officially invoked Chapter VII, Article 51 of the UN Charter, and Security Council Resolution 1368. The problem is that the official US political rhetoric constructs the 9 / 11 events as an "act of war". The entire composition of American official discourse is based on building terrorist attacks into "acts of war."It is the "act of war" political rhetoric construction of the "911" incident into the category of international law, so that the United States can properly quoted the relevant provisions of the UN charter, and according to the relevant provisions of the UN charter, make the United States can freely choose what time to attack, who attack, how to attack, this is the exercise of the right to self-defense.[2]On the one hand, the US official use the moral justification of post-punishment to illustrate the justify the "war on terror". US officials have repeatedly stressed that the purpose of "anti-war-terrorism" is to give terrorists their due punishment and achieve justice. Mr.Bush's most famous expression of justice is: " Whether we punish our enemies with justice, or whether we punish our enemies with justice, justice will be done."While then Deputy Secretary of State Mark Grossman affirmed that the war was consistent with international law and had legal legitimacy, he did not forget to construct the legitimacy of morality: I think what we do met the legal requirements, and what we do met the moral requirements of..... The right to self-defense covers all of this. On the other hand, US officials use the moral justification of punishment to the fore to justify the "war on terror". If the reason for the war in Afghanistan is the legitimacy of the punishment after the event-because the perpetrator of 9.11, al Qaeda is in Afghanistan, then the reason for the war in Iraq is the legitimacy of the punishment in advance. Because "evil regimes" like Iraq have the potential to provide weapons of mass destruction to terrorists, which could do far more harm to the American people than the 9.11 incident. This kind of moral and legitimate political discourse of prior punishment has often appeared in the speeches of the US president, Secretary of State and other US officials at different times and on different occasions.

Citing international support for war further illustrates the legitimacy of war. On the one hand, the political discourse that terrorist attacks are an "act of war" persuaded not only the majority of the United States, but also the majority of Congress, thus gaining domestic legal support and public opinion support, and making the Bush administration as a legitimate authority the subject of the declaration of war. At the same time, the Bush administration also showed through the political term "coalition forces" that the legitimacy of the war reasons can also be justified by the joint actions of the international community. It shows that the United States is not fighting for the "war on terrorism". It has won the support of international public opinion, and it has real international political and military support.

In the following text, the U. S. government arouses legal support around the world. A strong coalition of nations is "said" to "support American action," anti-war fear " is not unilateral action, but the world solidarity:

We have support around the world, not just verbal support, but real support. Whatever happens ahead, this support is firm. It is a full league, it is a trustworthy league.

More than forty countries from the Middle East, Africa, Europe and Asia have granted us the right to use their airspace and territories. More countries are sharing their intelligence. We are supported by the collective will of the whole world.

In this cause, the world is united... and in this cause, our partners represent countries and peoples of all cultures, of all religions, and of all races.

This is a powerful political discourse that clearly marks the "war on terror" as a just war. Here, it is no longer an American war, nor a simple conflict between a single civilization, but an expression of the common will of all cultures, all religions, and all races, including all civilizations, and a symbol of human civilization and progress. The enemy of this common will is the "extremely dangerous enemy of terrorism", the "axis of evil". Through this construction of political discourse, the "war on terror" has a strong moral power. It is no longer a unilateral military action, but a "joint military action" formed by the international support and good cooperation of many countries in the world.

From "right to self-defense", "the legitimacy of

punishment" to all cultures, all religions and all races of the expression of the "common will", the American government's political discourse has a clear logical level, the legitimacy of the war reason gradually revealed, and constantly strengthen, finally complete the legitimacy of "famous" construction.

3.1 The political discourse of the US "war on terror" constructs the legal legitimacy

"Internal enemies" is one of the major battlegrounds of the US "war on terror".In the U. S. government's view, "the new era of terror", "the state of extreme emergency", "extremely dangerous terrorist enemy" and other political words to describe the threat of the terrorist enemy seems to be not huge enough, fear of the last scene in the imagination of American fear: the threat is not only foreign enemies, it also hidden in the United States. As Bush said, it is necessary to "get law enforcement the more means needed to trace the terrorist forces at home."This sentence reinforces the idea that "at home", a comfortable and safe place, has been infiltrated by terrorism. John Ashcroft's construction is even more convincing.This construction of internal enemies has a considerable rhetorical power, which further shrinks the already terrifying psychology of the American people. The success of this political rhetoric built the legitimacy for the United States to launch a "war on terror".In order to prove the legitimacy of the "war on terror", the United States not only proved that the war is necessary against threats, but also constructed the "just war on terrorism" from the perspective of the just war theory.After the "911" incident, on the one hand, the US government constructed a very frightening "era of terror" and justified the "war on terror"; on the other hand, it positively constructed a "just war" in line with the humanitarian principles to prove the legitimacy of the "war on terror". announced in the national speech that the nature of the incident is the "act of war" against the United States, because the terrorists attack is the American way of life and American freedom, not just two civil aircraft crashed into the twin towers, therefore, "our troops at home and abroad have been on high alert". Clearly, Bush sees terrorist attacks as an act of war and put the troops at war. Now that "acts of war" against the United States, the United States has the right to fight a war in self-defense. Because, legally speaking, Article 51 of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations stipulates that: " If Member States of the United Nations are armed attacked, this Charter shall not prohibit Member States from exercising their natural rights of defense alone or collectively until the Security Council takes measures to maintain international peace and security."In this way, the US government is" the most important result of the construction of terrorist attacks is to allow the United States to respond within the framework of correct acts of war in accordance with international law." Therefore, a military strike against Afghanistan is a "self-defense" operation, fully consistent with international law. So, then U. S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld said: " What the United States of America did is what I said, and it is fighting against terrorists to defend the United States."

3.2 The political discourse of the "war on terror" in the United States constructs the moral legitimacy. Morally speaking, the United States defines the "war on terror" as a legitimate punitive measure. In western culture, there are two kinds of punishment legitimacy: one is the legitimacy of later (backward-looking) punishment; the other is the legitimacy of prior (forward-looking) punishment. The legitimacy of later punishment comes from the intentional injury to people has occurred, from the moral (deontology, the Greek "necessary"), it is a legitimate revenge, revenge, tit for tat. Those who intentionally harm others deserve the punishment, and revenge is justified, and it is a necessary act to "correct the wrong behavior" to restore the moral balance. So, the terrorists must be punished. The legitimacy of prior punishment lies in the legitimacy of its results, which is to prevent the possible intentional harm against people, eliminate the risks that people face, and show to the potential criminals that such harm is intolerable.[4]

3.3 The US government cited the international support of the war to further illustrate the legitimacy of the war.The "war on terror" was announced by Bush in the days following the terrorist attacks. His political discourse that terrorist attacks are an "act of war" persuaded not only the majority of the United States, but also the majority of Congress, thus gaining domestic legal support and public opinion support, and making the Bush administration as a legitimate authority become the subject of the declaration of war. At the same time, the Bush administration also showed through the political term "coalition forces" that the legitimacy of the war reasons can also be justified by the joint actions of the international community. It shows that the United States is not fighting the "war on terrorism". It has the support of international public opinion, and it has real international political and military support.The army invested in the war on terror is legally organized, a just division, and the US is not doing a solo performance. So the focus of the official US discourse is on the strong alliances of all the countries collectively involved in the "war on terror."In the daily official discourse, the troops fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq always say "coalition forces," the official words that rarely fail.

In one speech, Bush said the victory is certain, and the only question is when it will happen. Through hard work, he thinks, the day will soon come: " By fighting side by side, we will soon see the day of victory." This authoritative statement of the president of the United States is the most influential symbol of American political power. It gives full play to the character appeal in the political rhetoric, and is full of persuasion, making the victory of the war become a definite understanding of the American government and the people.

The fact that winning the "war on terror" is impossible is just a false metaphor. Conceptually, winning a "war on terror" is similar to winning a victory in suppressing an uprising. One kind of terrorist political

violence is always favorable to certain protagonists (states, dissidents, guerrillas, revolutionaries), and in some circumstances (a nation is under the brutal occupation of a supermilitary power). In fact, the US "war on terror" has never survived by the time when the Bush administration stepped down in 2008. Instead, predictions about a repeat of the Vietnam War are coming true. Today, the security situation in Afghanistan and Iraq shows that the "war on terror" is impossible. However, no matter what the result is, the US government has established a firm belief in the justice of the war by the US government and the American people through the construction of the political rhetoric, which has obtained the political guarantee for the smooth implementation of the "war on terror".[5]

4. Research results and conclusions

4.1.Character appealing

The character argument in the political rhetoric of the war on terrorism is mainly the credibility of the US government. The subject of political rhetoric, the United States government includes the president of the United States and officials at all levels of the United States government. Therefore, the character of the US government actually contains the credibility of the US president and US government officials at all levels. The government of any country is credible as long as it enjoys authority among its people. As a national institution of the United States, the United States government enjoys the authority needed for its rule among the American people. Therefore, the United States government has the character needed for political rhetoric.

4.2Rational demands

There is no doubt that reason is also an important argument for the political rhetoric of the US "war on terror". In fact, the US government has been using rational arguments in the process of constructing the "war on terror".

The rational arguments of political rhetoric are generally accomplished through syllogisms. Bush tried to explain the American attacks by appealing for reason."America is being targeted because our beacon of freedom and opportunity is the brightest and brightest in the world."If the political rhetoric syllogism including premise and conclusions is reconstructed, it can be analyzed as follows:

premise: Terrorists target those who promote freedom and opportunity.

Small premise: America's beacon of freedom and opportunity is the brightest and brightest in the world.

Conclusion: The American beacon of freedom and opportunity is the brightest and brightest in the world, so the terrorists target the United States.

4.3 Emotional rendering

Emotional argument is an important means for political rhetoric to maintain, strengthen or change a certain political attitude of the audience. When creating and developing political discourse, the political rhetorical subject realizes political persuasion on the basis of his character and rationality, but arousing the emotions of the audience is the final embodiment of realizing political persuasion. Whether the political persuasion can be realized, the main criterion is to see whether the political discourse maintains, strengthens or changes the emotions of the audience, so that the audience is in a certain state of mind that the political rhetoric subject wants, so that they can support the political views of the political rhetoric subject.The political rhetoric resources brought about by the 9 / 11 incident are only the first step in the political rhetoric of the war on terrorism. More importantly, the US's "war on terror" also needs to find the target of its military strike, that is, where the enemy is. Through the intersection of rationality and emotion, the US government has not only logically proved that Bin Laden and the rival regimes in Afghanistan, Iraq and Iran are the enemies of the United States, but also demonized and dehumanized the enemy emotionally. In this way, from the 9 / 11 attacks to the war on terror.

4.4Dual-opposed political rhetoric

The political language structure of binary opposition constitutes the political rhetoric of binary opposition. Binary opposition of political rhetoric is the most commonly used and persuasive political persuasion strategy, which can integrate the power of political rhetoric into the system of political language. In the political discourse of the "war on Terror" in the United States, the political rhetoric of binary opposition includes the political cultural framework and the political language framework of binary opposition, which is embodied in the subject opposition, objectives, means and moral appeal in the process of political rhetoric.Like other typical American "war on terror" political rhetoric (for example, the political rhetoric of the Cold War), it adopts a binary and antagonistic political and cultural framework. It opposes and excludes other political cultures different from American political culture, and uses this binary opposing political cultural framework to achieve the purpose of political persuasion, proving the legitimacy and legitimacy of the "war on terror".

The political rhetoric of the "war on terrorism" uses the binary political and cultural framework, but also uses the framework of binary political language.[6] On the one hand, the political expression framework of the binary opposition is the rational expression of the political language, and on the other hand, it is also to construct the political culture that arouses people's hatred and opposition. Political terms of binary opposition in the political rhetoric of the US "war on terror" abound. Here summarizes the opposing political terms used in the political rhetoric of the "war on terror" as grouped as possible. They include: Civilization / barbarism,

Freedom, Despotism, Democratic / authoritarian, Hero / Cowards, Peace / War, Justice / evil, just / evil, Wealth / poor, Advanced / backward, internal / external, domestic / Foreign, self / foreign, Self / Other, we / them, fighters / terrorists, native / foreigners, etc. Although the binary political terms of "war on terrorism" can only be summarized here, they are typical political terms commonly used, which are enough to explain the actual content and political function of the political rhetoric of "war on terrorism". These binary and opposing political terms in political rhetoric are only intended to persuade the audience that "we" are "good" and "kind", while the "enemy" is "bad" and "evil", so that the subject of political rhetoric can obtain the political recognition and political support of the people. When it comes to the political rhetoric of the US "war on Terror", the US government intends to convince the American people that the American government and the American people have the excellent qualities of generosity, generosity, gentleness, wisdom, courage, sacrifice, friendship and unity, while the enemy is barbaric, narrow, evil and cowardly terrorists.In short, through the functional analysis of the political rhetoric of the US "war on terrorism", it can be seen that the US government has constructed the "era of terrorism" and the "just war on terrorism" from two aspects when constructing the "war on terrorism".

References

1. Sandra Silberstein : War of Words : Language, Politics, and 9/11, Routledge, 2004, p.19.
2. Richard Jackson, Writing the War on Terrorism: Language, Politics and Counter-terrorism, Manchester University Press, 2005 , p.125.
3. Rumsfeld and Myers Briefing on Enduring Freedom 2:45 p.m.(EDT) ； October 7, 2001, http ://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/sept_l 1/dod_brief 22. htm.
4. Verna V.Gehring (ed) , War after September 11, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003, pp.ll-12.
5. Remarks by the President to the People of Poland, http://www.whitehouse, gov/ news/releases/2003/05/20030531 -3. html.
6. Joseph S.Tuman, Communicating Terror : the Rhetorical Dimensions of Terrorism, Sage Publications, Inc., 2003, p.90.