LANGUAGE AND LOGIC OF WAR WITH SPECIAL REFRENCE TO WAR ON TERROR IN AFGHANISTAN: APPEARANCE AND REALITY

Shuja Ahmad

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITY OF PESHAWAR
(AUGUST 2010)

LANGUAGE AND LOGIC OF WAR WITH SPECIAL REFRENCE TO WAR ON TERROR IN AFGHANISTAN: APPEARANCE AND REALITY

Shuja Ahmad

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITY OF PESHAWAR
(AUGUST 2010)

Thesis 9947

303.625
S562L

Ph.D

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITY OF PESHAWAR

APPROVAL SHEET

This is to certify that we have read the dissertation submitted by Mr. Shuja Ahmad and it is our judgment that this is of sufficient standard to warrant its acceptance by the University of Peshawar, for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Internal Examiner (Supervisor): Sarfraz

Name: SARFRAZ KHAN

Designation: PROFESSOR

Institution: Area Study Centere
University of Peshawar

External Examiner: _____

Name: Prof. Dr. Sajid Ali

Designation: Professor

Institution: Philosophy Dept: Punjab University

Date 11/9/2012 Controller of Exam: UOP

LANGUAGE AND LOGIC OF WAR WITH SPECIAL REFRENCE TO WAR ON TERROR IN AFGHANISTAN: APPEARANCE AND REALITY



A dissertation submitted to the University of Peshawar in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

(AUGUST 2010)

LANGUAGE AND LOGIC OF WAR WITH SPECIAL REFRENCE TO WAR ON TERROR IN AFGHANISTAN: APPEARANCE AND REALITY



A dissertation submitted to the University of Peshawar in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

(AUGUST 2010)

ABSTRACT

Philosophy attempts to differentiate appearance from reality and helps in thinking clearly and critically. In the context of war, people at the helm of affairs (leaders/politicians) make it difficult for public to differentiate appearance from reality, using ambiguous and vague words, persuasive definitions, metaphors, framing/reframing, and also by forwarding fallacious arguments. Employing language and logic of war as tools of war they attempt to make people feel, think, argue, and act the way, they want them to. Moreover, language and logic of war also attempt to block rational/critical and clear thinking, and silence criticism.

Introduction of this work, comprising eight sections, discusses: language and logic of war; specific aims of work; methodology; research questions; justifications, plan of work and literature review.

Chapter two, comprising four sections, reveals the way language: shapes judgments, perceptions and actions; block rational/critical thinking and silence criticism. It briefly discusses: theories of language; role of context in language; functions of language; intentions of speaker; ambiguity; vagueness; definitions; emotive words and persuasive definitions. Fourth section of this chapter elaborates Lakoff and Johnson's methodology of analysis of metaphors. It focuses on framing and reframing too, as explained by Lakoff and other scholars, to develop a methodology to understand the way language can be instrumental in the context of war.

Chapter three, comprising two sections, introduces key terms such as: logic; argument; fallacy; deductive and inductive arguments; formal and informal logic; formal and informal fallacies. Explaining informal fallacies, it establishes that fallacious arguments may shape judgment, block rational/critical thinking and silence critics. It also establishes that an informal fallacy may be committed owing to its content, context, or both. Some major fallacies and their types have been discussed. This chapter delineates a methodology to detect informal fallacies in discourse.

Chapter four demonstrates that language used in the context of war i.e., language of war, is ambiguous, vague, metaphorical, frames and reframes war discourse and forwards persuasive definitions. Leaders/politicians use this language to manipulate public judgments, perceptions, actions; to block rational thinking and silence critics. This chapter establishes that use of the word, 'War', has been incorrect

in the context of 9/11, since no war till 10/7 actually occurred. However, using language of war, politicians/ leaders misled many people that terrorist acts of 9/11 were acts of war. Moreover, it demonstrates that using language of war politicians/leaders evoke metaphors and frames such as: good versus evil; believers versus infidel; hero versus villain; Faroon versus Musa (Pharaoh versus Muses) and loss versus gain, to manipulate public opinion.

Chapter five establishes that logic of war used by leaders/politicians as a tool of war, has been instrumental in blocking rational/critical and clear thinking, silencing policy criticism and in shaping judgments, perceptions and behavior of people, in war in general and War on Terror in particular.

This work concludes that in the context of war, leaders/politicians use language and logic of war as tools of war making it difficult for public to differentiate appearance of war from reality. Using language and logic of war, they attempt to make people think, argue, and act the way, they want them to. Moreover, they use language and logic of war to block rational thinking and silence criticism.

DEDICATIONS

Dedicated to the innocent victims of 9/11 and War on Terror

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

At last I am writing acknowledgments. I am thankful to my teachers, Prof. Dr. Saleem, Prof. Dr. Ashraf Adeel, Prof. Dr. Khurshed Anwar, Mr. Sher Wahab, Mr. Shoahil Ahmad Mian and my Socrates: Prof. Dr. Intisar ul Haq (late). They introduced me to Philosophy.

I am extremely thankful to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Sarfraz Khan. He very passionately supervised my work and gave me full opportunity to grow and develop my own ideas. I shall never forget the way he smiled when he caught me committing serious mistakes.

Many thanks to Prof. Dr. Garrett for helping in strengthening my research proposal and suggesting to use Lakoff's methodology in my work. I believe, people like him construct stronger and durable bridges between nations than politicians and diplomats.

I am extremely thankful to Zainab Azmat for going through the final proof. I am thankful to my friends: Imran Aziz, Dr. Ali, Salim Gul, Dr. Rafique, Shahid Ali, Dr. Atta, Amer Hussain and Sohail Ahmad. Although, their areas of academic interest are different, yet, they listened to my arguments and gave valuable suggestions.

I am grateful to my friends, Manzoor Ahmad, Zaib ullah Khan and Tariq and to my students, Ahmad Ali and Mobeen. They helped me in gathering research material. I am also thankful to HEC for providing access to research generals through digital library.

Many thanks to my mother, brother and sister, they always motivated and encouraged me. I am highly indebted to my best friends, critics and my teachers: my Baba (father and my hero) and my loving wife. Both Baba and my wife were always there to support me: academically, socially and financially.

Of course, this work is possible because my kids, Eman (five) and Aleem (three) allowed me to work. I always wondered, what to say when they asked: Baba why do you go to your office in the evenings, why don't you stay and play with us?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT 4

DEDICATIONS 6

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 7

TABLE OF CONTENTS 8

ABRIVIATIONS 11

GLOSSARY 12

NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION 13

CHAPTER 1 14

INTRODUCTION 14

1.1 LANGUAGE OF WAR 17

1.2 LOGIC OF WAR 22

1.3 SPECIFIC AIMS OF THIS STUDY 26

1.4 METHODOLOGY 26

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS 27

Hypotheses: *27*

1.6 JUSTIFICATIONS 28

1.7 PLAN OF WORK 28

1.8 LITRATURE REVIEW 28

CHAPTER 2 39

LANGUAGE 39

2.1 A BRIEF INTRODUCTION OF SOME IMPORTANT THEORIES OF LANGUAGE 39

2.2 ROLE OF CONTEXT IN LANGAUGE 47

2.2.1 Context- Functions of language and intentions of speaker *48*

2.2.2 Ambiguity and Vagueness *53*

2.3 DEFINITION- PERSUASIVE DEFINITIONS 55

2.3.1 Definition *55*

2.3.2 Emotive Words and Persuasive Definition *59*

2.4 METAPHORS, FRAMING AND REFRAMING 63

2.4.1 Conventional Metaphors *63*

2.4.2 New Metaphors *67*

2.4.3 Framing *69*

2.4.4 Reframing *77*

CHAPTER 3 79

INFORMAL FALLACIES: IMPEDIMENTS TO CLEAR THINKING 79

3.1 A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO KEY TERMS 79

3.2 INFORMAL FALLACIES 86

3.2.1 Argument from Ignorance 86

3.2.2 Argument against man 88

3.2.3 Slippery Slope 91

3.2.4 Appeal to Wrong Authority 91

3.2.5 Complex Question and Loaded Question 92

3.2.6 False Dilemma/ False Dichotomy/ False Either-Or 94

3.2.7 Straw Man 95

3.2.8 Appeal to Force and Appeal to Fear 96

3.2.9 Appeal to Pity 98

3.2.10 Irrelevant Conclusion- Missing the Point 99

3.2.11 Red Herring 100

3.2.12 False Cause 101

3.2.13 Fallacies of Generalization 104

3.2.14 Fallacies of Ambiguity 106

3.2.15 Begging the Question- Petitio Principii 109

3.2.16 Weak Analogy 110

3.2.17 Definitional Retreat 111

3.2.18 Fallacies of Positive and Negative Consequences 111

3.2.19 Suppressed evidence 113

CHAPTER 4 115

LANGUAGE OF WAR WITH SPECIAL REFRENCE TO WAR ON TERROR 115

4.1 WHAT IS WAR? 115

4.2 LANGUAGE OF WAR WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO WAR ON TERROR IN AFGHANISTAN 118

4.2.1 'War' on 'Terror' 118

4.2.2 When did War on Terror really begin: 9/11 or 10/7 (Appearance and Reality)?. 127

4.3 MAJOR METAPHORS AND FRAMING IN THE CONTEXT OF WAR ON TERROR 131

4.3.1 Good versus Evil 132

4.3.2 Believers versus infidels (Good versus evil) 142

4.3.3 Hero versus Villain: Fairy Tales and Moral and Religious Justifications of War... 152

4.3.3.a. Hero versus Villain (part two) 166

4.3.3.b. Hero versus Villain- Taliban's Version 169

4.3.4 Loss Gain Framing *173*

CHAPTER 5 178

WAR ON TERROR AND FALLACIOUS ARGUMENTS 178

5.1 WAR AND FALLACIES: A BRIEF EXPOSITION 178

5.2 WAR ON TERROR AND INFORMAL FALLACIES 182

5.4 FALLACIOUS ARGUMENTS THAT LED TO PREEMPTIVE WAR 210

5.5 IRAQ WAR 217

5.6 FALLACIOUS ARGUMENTS OF TALIBAN AND AL QAEDA 226

CHAPTER 6 233

CONCLUSION 233

DISCUSSION 234

BIBLIOGRAPHY 239

INTERNET SOURCES 249

NEWS PAPERS 250

CDS 250

ABRIVIATIONS

CLS: Critical Language Study

FATA: Federally Administered Tribal Area

GWOT: Global War on Terror

IAEA: International Atomic Energy Agency

NGO: Non Governmental Organization

OEF: Operation Enduring Freedom

PTV: Pakistan Television

UAE: United Arab Emirates

UFM: Unfair Means

UN: United Nations

USA: United States of America

WAD: Weapons of Assured Destruction

WAPDA: Water and Power Development Authority

WMD: Weapons of Mass destruction

WOT: War on Terror

GLOSSARY

Badal: Revenge

Dajjal: Anti Christ

Fidayeen: Singular, Fidayee, One who sacrifices his/her head, lover

Faroun: Pharaoh

Fatwa: [Religious] Edict

Ghazi: A returnee alive from Jihad

Ghyrat: Honor

Ghyratmand/Ghyratee: Honorable

Hoor: Beautiful girls in the Paradise

Jihad: Struggle, Holy war

Kafir: Infidel, Non believer

Melmastia: Hospitality

Mujahideen: Singular Mujahid, Holy warrior

Munafiq: Hypocrite

Musa: Moses

Murtad: Apostate

Panah: Sanctuary

Peghore: Taunt

Riba: Interest, effortless profit

Shaheed: Martyr

Sharia: From shara, meaning path/way, Islamic Law

Ulama: Singular Alim, Religious scholars

Ummah: [Muslim] community/nation

Yazid: The Muslim ruler in whose reign Hussain, Prophet Muhammad's grandson, was killed

Zalim: Oppressor

NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

It is almost impossible to be consistent in transliteration in a study using a variety of languages. The simplest forms of transliteration have been used avoiding diacritics and glottal stops, for example, 'Jihad' rather than 'Jihād' and 'Munafiq' rather than 'Munāfiq'.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Philosophy, besides other activities, attempts to differentiate appearance from reality and helps in thinking critically and clearly. In the context of war, people at the helm of affairs (leaders/politicians) make it difficult for public to differentiate appearance from reality by using ambiguous and vague words, persuasive definitions, metaphors, framing and reframing, and by forwarding fallacious arguments which are obstacles to clear thinking. Using language of war and logic of war[1] as tools of war they attempt to make people think, feel, argue, and act the way, they want them to. Moreover, language and logic of war also attempt to block rational/critical and clear thinking and silence criticism: some other causalities of war.

One way a philosopher can contribute in society is by sharing his/her analytical tools, helping public think clearly about the confusing and complex issues,

> … sorting good from bad arguments, supporting the good ones and combating the bad ones.[2]

In times of war, value of philosophical tools is manifold, for language and fallacious arguments in time of war may be: confusing; complex; misleading; emotionally charged; aim at hiding reality; heighten fear and patriotism; harm people; shape judgments, perceptions, attitudes and behavior of people and block criticism of war policies and rational thinking.

Since war brings mass human suffering and murder, mass displacement of people, mass destruction, economic recession and a great harm to the environment etc., therefore, it has always been an important issue in philosophy. From Plato to modern times very many philosophers have discussed: What is war? What causes war? What moral values should be followed in war? What makes a war just? However, there are many other aspects of war and philosophers should explore and

---

[1] By Language of War the researcher means language used by politicians/leaders, in times of war to manipulate judgment, perception and behavior of people and to block rational/critical thinking and to silence the critics using: ambiguous, vague and emotive words; persuasive definitions; metaphors and framing/reframing.
Similarly, by Logic of War the researcher means fallacious arguments forwarded by politicians/leaders in times of war to manipulate judgment, perception and behavior of people and to block rational thinking and criticism of their policies of war.

[2] Borradori, Giovanna, Philosophy in a Time of Terror- Dialogues with Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida : The University of Chicago Press, 2003, p.6

discuss those aspects too[3]. This work discusses two such aspects: language of war and logic of war.

War, according to Moseley is,

> ... a state of organized open- ended collective conflict.[4]

For Clausewitz, war, a political instrument, is used by states and political entities to continue their policies with other means and,

> [It] is an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will.[5]

War is widespread, actual and, intentional armed conflict that occurs only,

> .... between political communities, defined as those entities which either are states or intend to become states (in order to allow for civil war).[6]

In the context of war, through public addresses and press conferences, politicians manipulate public judgment. The language of war they use and the fallacious arguments they present attempt to manipulate judgment of people, shaping their perceptions, behaviors, attitudes and actions. This work, making ample of references to the relevant texts and speeches that were generated in the context of war in general and War on Terror in particular, highlights the way language and logic of war have been instrumental in shaping judgments and blocking rational/critical thinking.

On September 11, 2001, four American planes were hijacked. Hijackers crashed two of the planes into World Trade Center, one into the Pentagon and the last one crashed in Pennsylvania[7]. These attacks were declared acts of war, and world heard,

---

[3] Moseley, Alexander, A Philosophy of War: Algora Publishing New York, 2002, p.1-5
[4] Moseley (2002) p.14
[5] Clausewitz, Carl Von, On War (1832): Translated by Howard, Michael and Peter Paret, Oxford University Press, (2007), p. 13
[6] *War*, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/war/
[7] Attacks on 9/11, resulting in loss of innocent civilian lives, are condemnable.

…people have declared war on America.[8]

On September the 11th, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country.[9]

…evil has returned.[10]

The world was informed that the reason (cause) America has been attacked is,

We're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world.[11]

Moreover, it was argued, every nation of the world will decide, either they are with America or with terrorists, since:

No nation can be neutral in this conflict.[12]

Many critics argue: it was not an attack on freedom and democracy; by saying that no country can remain neutral America presented a limited choice to the nations of the world; by using metaphors of evil and infidels, etc. the war has been framed as a struggle between good and evil, believers and infidels (Us versus Them) etc. Above all, use of the word, 'war' was incorrect, since no country had declared war on America.

George Lakoff and Evan Frisch in, *Five Years After 9/11: Drop the War Metaphor,* opine,

Language matters, because it can determine how we think and act.[13]

They argue that war metaphor, in the context of 9/11, was used for domestic political purpose. It was defined as the only way to defend the country; hence, arguing against it can be taken as unpatriotic. David Zarefsky in, *Strategic Maneuvering*

---

[8] Bush, Remarks by the President upon Arrival: September 16, 2001. All documents related to G.W Bush are available online on http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news. (accessed January 10, 2009)

[9] Bush, Address to a Joint Session of the Congress and the American People: September 20,2001

[10] Bush, President Speaks to the United Nations: November 10, 2001

[11] Bush, Statement by the President in his Address to the Nation: September 11, 2001

[12] Bush, President: "No Nation can be Neutral in this Conflict": November 6, 2009

[13] Lakoff , George and Evan Frisch, *By George Lakoff and Evan Frisch, five years after 9/11: Drop the war metaphor, http://www.rockridgeinstitute.org/research/rockridge/*, September 11, 2006 (accessed April 18, 2009)

through Persuasive Definitions: Implications for Dialectic and Rhetoric, informs that wars are military conflicts that occur between nation-states. Declaring terrorists incidents of September 11, as 'acts of war' is one of the most remarkable case of persuasive definition for no country claimed responsibility for the 9/11 attacks, not even Afghanistan.

> No nation declared war against the United States; neither did the United States against any other nation.[14]

The September 11 events were defined and framed in such a language and fallacious arguments were forwarded so widely that it appears as if the attacks were really acts of war and it was reasonable to begin a war against terror.

1.1 LANGUAGE OF WAR

All arguments, presented by politicians in war, are in ordinary language; therefore, understanding of language plays a very important role in sorting good arguments from bad ones.

Language, a tool of communication, is a social institution. Wittgenstein in, Philosophical Investigations, informs,

> … speaking language is a part of an activity, or a form of life.[15]

The words we use may be ambiguous, that is, they may have more than one meaning, and the context may not clarify intended meaning. Wittgenstein suggests to solves this problem by stating,

> …the meaning of a word is its use in the language.[16]

This reveals that in order to understand the intended meaning of a word or sentence one must first understand the context in which they have been used.

George Lakoff, explaining language, informs that through language, we express ideas and thoughts. Every word in language is defined with respect to a frame.

---

[14] Zarefsky, David, *Strategic Maneuvering Through Persuasive Definitions: Implications for Dialectic and Rhetoric*: Argumentation 2006, 399- 461, p 409. (accessed September 16, 2007)
[15] Wittgenstein, Ludwig, Philosophical Investigations: Translated by G.E.M Anscombe: Blackwell publishers, First Published in 1953. p 11
[16] ibid page 20

A frame is a conceptual structure, according to Lakoff, used in thinking.[17] It is a system of concepts related to each other in such a way that in order to understand one of the concept one has to understand the whole structure in which this concept fits.[18] For example, with the use of the word, 'enemy' a whole conceptual structure is evoked in one's mind. We think and act according to our conceptual structures, for if someone is told that 'our enemy is helping us', he/she will not accept it, since this is against the enemy frame. This may imply that truth and facts must fit into the frame people have. For Lakoff,

> If the facts do not fit a frame, the frame stays and the facts bounce off.[19]

Perhaps, this is the reason that if one informs a suicide bomber that suicide bombing is religiously and ethically wrong, he may not respect and listen to such information, since such information is against his framing.

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson reveal, our conceptual system i.e., our understanding of the reality, we live by, is metaphorical in nature and we are not normally aware of it. One way to understand it is through language.[20] By metaphorical understanding they mean,

> …understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.[21]

For example, we understand time in terms of money- don't waste your time. This metaphorical understanding, sometimes, provides us with incomplete and inappropriate understanding of reality, since it may highlights some aspects of a thing but hides some other aspects.[22]

Metaphors and frames may be seen as complete units that connect meanings,

---

[17] Lakoff George, www.rockridgeinstiture.org: last modified Thursday, February 14, 2006, (accessed December 10, 2007)

[18] Fillmore Charles J. *Frame Semantics*: Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Reading: edited by Dirk Geeraerts, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York (2006). p. 273 (originally published in 1982 in *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, Linguistic Society of Korea (ed.), 111-137. Seoul: Hanshin publishing. Reprinted with permission)

[19] Lakoff , Don't think of an Elephant: Chelsea Green Publishing Company , 2004, p. 17(accessed April 6, 2009)

[20] Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson, Metaphors We Live By: The University of Chicago Press, 1980 p. 3

[21] Lakoff and Johnson (1980) p. 5

[22] Lakoff and Johnson (1980) pp. 11-13

feelings and doings. They may be used as effective tools in shaping behavior and thinking of a targeted audience. Lakoff and Evan Frisch inform,

> Metaphors cannot be seen or touched but they create a massive effect and political intimidation is one of them.[23]

This exhibits that metaphors and frames shape our judgments, thinking and actions, their skilful use can make others share our view about a particular experience. In times of war, they help politicians to maneuver public judgments, and actions.

There exists abundant literature that exhibits how politicians use words and sentences metaphorically and ambiguously in the context of war.

The word, 'war', can be used metaphorically, i.e., when used against diseases, poverty, illiteracy, and the context makes it clear that the word has been used as a metaphor. Such wars will never end. Many writers believe that the word 'war' in the context of war on terrorism is not correct, as Susan Sontag in, *Real Battles Empty Metaphors,* opines, that real wars are not metaphors and real wars have a beginning and an end, but this war on terrorism will never end. She thinks that, war on terror is not a war but, rather, a mandate for expanding the use of American power.[24]

In the context of war, politicians/leaders also use such metaphors and frames that evoke fairy tales. These stories attempt to shape the way people see the war. Common stories in times of war are: good versus evil; believer versus infidel; hero versus villain; Faroun Versus Musa and loss gain framing etc.

Lakoff discussing the role of metaphors in the Iraq war (1991) informs, 'Metaphors can kill'. He reveals that Bush (senior) presented before American public a rescue scenario in which America was the hero, Saddam Hussain was the Villain (nation as a person metaphor), Kuwait was the innocent Victim and the crime had been kidnapping and raping of innocent victim. This way Bush and his administration made people understand the situation shaping their perception and behavior in favor of war.[25]

---

[23] Lakoff , George and Evan Frisch, *By George Lakoff and Evan Frisch, five years after 9/11: Drop the war metaphor*

[24] Sontag, *Susan, Real Battles and Empty Metaphors*: The New York Times, September 10, 2002, www.nytimes.com. (accessed January 29, 2010)

[25] Lakoff George, *Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System to Justify War in the Gulf* : Viet Nam Generation Journal and Newsletter V3, N3, November 1991 (accessed October 21, 2007), available online on:
http://www2.iath.virginia.edu/sixties/HTML_docs/Texts/Scholarly/Lakoff_Gulf_Metaphor_2.html

Jonathan Charteris- Black reveals Churchill during World War II, creating a heroic myth representing Hitler and his allies as forces of Evil and Britain and her allies as forces of Good.[26] He further informs that Toney Blair widely used metaphor of Good versus Evil after 9/11 to wage war against Afghanistan and Iraq.[27]

Societies, where people mostly think in term of cost/benefit and loss/ gain, politicians use loss/gain framing. They use metaphors that entail that not going into war is not an option, for to avoid future losses we have to fight war. Moreover, such farming also entails that critics are unpatriotic, for they have no concern for human and/or economic losses. Wojtek Mackiewicz Wolfe utilizing public opinion and some fifteen thousand presidential speeches over a period of four years argues that using threat and loss framing, American policy makers mobilized domestic support for war in Afghanistan and Iraq. Moreover, threats and loss framing, he informs, was instrumental in reelection of President Bush.[28]

Tony Blair, persuading British citizenry for war, informed that terrorists are selling drugs on British streets and the price is lives of British youth. Moreover, money, the terrorist earn by selling drugs, is used in buying weapons which are used against us.[29] The metaphorical understanding was that terrorists are merchants who deal in drugs and death. Entailment effect of this understanding may be: if terrorists are not stopped then we will suffer great economic and human losses; the price of indifference may be the lives of British citizenry and anyone not in favour of war to crush terrorists is serving enemy's interest.

Metaphors, as discussed earlier, sometimes provide us with incomplete and inappropriate understanding of reality, for they hide some aspects of a thing and highlight some other. For instance, the much discussed metaphor, WMD in recent wars, is seriously confusing. Stephen P. Lee argues that including chemical, biological and nuclear weapons in WMD is too broad, misleading and dangerous.[30] 'WMD', magnifies the lethal nature of chemical and biological weapons and hides the reality that they are not as dangerous as nuclear weapons are. Perhaps, 'WMD' played

---

[26]Black, Jonathan Charteris, Politician and Rhetoric- The Persuasive Power of Metaphor: published by Palgrave Macmillan New York (2005) p. 34

[27] Black, Jonathan Charteris (2005) p. 150

[28] For more details see: Wolfe, Mackiewicz Wojtek, Winning the War of Wards- Selling Terror from Afghanistan to Iraq: Praeger Security International, 2008

[29] Blair, Full Text: Tony Blair's Speech, www.gurdian.co.uk, October2 , 2001

[30] Lee, Stephen P., *Weapons of Mass destruction- Are the Morally Special*: in War- Essays in Political Philosophy: Edited by Larry May, Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 165-169

a vital role in persuading people for extending war on terror from Afghanistan to Iraq.

In times of war, language may also be used as a tool of propaganda. Vincent Barry reveals, in every war that USA has been engaged in, America uses a propaganda machine that serves both at home and abroad,

> Propagandists invariably select facts according to their views of reality. Then they use language designed to produce a favourable emotional response to that view.[31]

This reveals that propagandist chose only those facts which support their view, and suppress rest of the facts that are against their views,[32] and then they use emotive language, which produces a favourable response to that view. [33]

Another way politicians maneuver public opinion is by using ambiguous and vague language. J. Michael Sproule in, Argument- Lan guage and its Influence , referring to White, writes that in the 1968 presidential campaign, Nixon argued so ambiguously against Johnson administration's Vietnam policy that people holding conflicting opinions (both doves and hawks) about war thought, Nixon was representing them.[34]

Cyrus Safdari in, *Rhetoric of War: First Iraq, then Iran?*, under subtitle, 'Ambiguity', demonstrates that, when America failed to find WMD in Iraq, Bush administration's justification for war wa s reformulated as, ' Iraqi WMD-program-related activities'. After some time they reformulated it as Saddam's 'intent to reconstitute WMD'.

> The justification for the invasion of Iraq became more and more vague with each step, to smooth over the fact that Iraqi WMD had failed to materialise.[35]

This exhibits that ambiguity is created in the context of war to seek support of

---

[31]Barry, Vincent, Looking at ourselves: An introduction to Philosophy: *Wadsworth publishing Company, Inc. Belmont, California.* Page 42

[32] This way they commit fallacy of suppressing the evidence too.

[33] Taliban also use emotionally charged terms. For example, they use 'Fidayeen' (Singular 'Fidayee', from Arabic 'Fida', meaning, one who sacrifices his/her head, lover) for suicide bombers. It produces a favourable response in listeners, in a religious community.

[34] Sproule , J. Michael, Argument- Language and its influence: McGraw- Hill Book Company, 1980, p 37

[35] Safdari, Cyrus, *Rhetoric of War: First Iraq, then Iran?* : Global Dialogue, Volume 8, No. 1-2, Winter-Spring 2006, http://www.worlddialogue.org/dialogue.htm (accessed March 20, 2009)

public by presenting false justification in an ambiguous language. It also reveals that how issues are framed and reframed accordingly.

Similarly, the words 'Islam', 'Jihad' (From Arabic, meaning Struggle, Holy war) and 'Fatwa' (From Arabic, meaning Edict) etc., have been used in a persuasive manner in the War on Terror. Ziauddin Sardar, in, *My Fatwa on the Fanatics,* writes,

> Why have we allowed the sacred terms of Islam, such as fatwa and jihad, to be hijacked by obscurantist, fanatic extremists?[36]

This, perhaps, reveals that these words are not used in their real meanings; rather hijacked by the people who use them rhetorically.

It seems that the language of war that the politicians have been using is metaphorical, emotionally charged and ambiguous. It has been used as a tool of War to shape judgments, perceptions and behavior of people. Moreover, this language of war blocks rational thinking and silence critics.

1.2 LOGIC OF WAR

Logic may be defined as the science that evaluates arguments.[37] An argument comprises a group of statements,[38] having a conclusion claiming to be followed by one or more premises. For Polycarp Ikuenobe,

> Argumentation involves the method of persuading or establishing for ourselves and others that a proposition, as the conclusion of an argument, has adequate evidential basis for its acceptance.[39]

Sproule reveals that arguments can change the direction of one's thinking and judgment. Moreover, besides changing the direction of one's judgment, he informs, arguments can have belief effects, attitude effects, and value effects.[40] An argument that changes the direction of one's thinking and affects one's belief, attitude and

---

[36] Ziaudin Sardar, *My Fatwa on Fanatics:* http://observer.guardian.co.uk/islam/story/0,,576698,00.html (accessed March 20, 2009)
[37] Hurley, Patrick J, A Concise Introduction to Logic: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, Eighth Edition, 2003, p. 1
[38] Statement is a sentence that is either true or false.
[39] Ikuenobe, Polycarp, *In Search of Criteria for 'Fallacies' and 'Begging the Question*: Argumentation16: 421–441, 2002. (accessed October 16, 2008)
[40] Sproule , J. Michael, Argument- Language and its Influence: McGraw- Hill Book Company, 1980,pp 230-231

values, may also shape one's judgments, perceptions, behaviours and actions.

Every argument claims that its premises support its conclusion. However, an argument in which premises do not support the conclusion commits a fallacy.

> ...fallacy is a failure to provide adequate proof for a belief. However, the failure is disguised in various forms using different strategies to make a proof look adequate.[41]

Fallacies are obstacles in clear thinking. Politicians/leaders may use them as tools of war to shape public judgments. For instance, use of appeal to force is very common in wars. It is committed when an arguer uses force/threat to make the conclusion accepted. Noam Chomsky in, *The* War *in Afghanistan,* informs that the argument: first to provide Taliban with an evidence that Osama has a link with 9/11 attacks, then employing diplomatic pressure to hand him over to UN, and finally prosecuting him and other terrorists according to international law, was completely ignored by Washington.[42] They instead, appealed to force. This exhibits that U.S., instead of giving reasons to attack Afghanistan, appealed to force, therefore, U.S., committed the fallacy of appeal to force.

Fallacy of false dilemma/ false dichotomy/ false either-or is another tool used in war. Public/enemy is informed that we/you have only two choices, ignoring rest of the options. For example, Hitler in Second World War declared fighting the war as a duty,

> But anybody who tries to evade this duty has no claim to be regarded in our midst as a fellow German.[43]

Germans were given only two choices: do the duty, i.e. participate in the war or, one is not a fellow German. In the same speech Hitler appealed to threat to silence the critics.

One of the favorite methods of the current American administration is to put

---

[41] Ikuenobe, Polycarp: 2002

[42] Chomsky, Noam. *The War in Afghanistan:* Z Magazine. February 1, 2002, http://www.chomsky.info/articles/20020201.htm (accessed November 9, 2006)

[43] Hitler, Declaration of war on US by Hitler, December 11, 1941, http://www.famousquotes.me.uk/speeches/Adolf_Hitler/index.htm (accessed March 4, 2010)

forward a false dilemma/ bifurcation.[44] For instance, after 9/11 President Bush argued that nations will be held accountable for inactivity.[45]

He further said,

> Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.[46]

In reality, other options were there, such as; countries could be both against terrorism and not an ally of the U.S. 'Inactivity', in this context, meant 'not joining U.S. in war against terrorism', 'against us' meant 'with terrorists'. The hidden claim in this argument is that if a country is not with U.S. in war against terror, then she is with enemies and will face the music. Such arguments also silence domestic critics, for criticizing Bush may imply that critic is not buying Bush's argument, perhaps the critic is not with Bush, and therefore, he/she is with terrorists.

A similar argument was presented by Osama Bin laden in an interview conducted by Al Jazeera and televised by CNN,

> We will work to continue this battle, God permitting, until victory or until we meet God.[47]

In this argument, he assumed that there is no other option between fighting till victory and dying; no room for dialogue or some other option.

A fallacy committed before war on Iraq was the argument from ignorance[48]. We heard Iraq has not shown that they do not have Weapons of Mass Destruction, therefore, they do. The real burden of proof is on the party making the claim. The U.S. and/or U.N. must have proved before the war that Iraq has WMD. It was impossible for Iraq to prove that they do not have WMD. This fallacious argument was repeated again and again by Bush and his friends for framing purpose.

Another very effective way of political leaders to persuade public in favour of

---

[44] See Silberstein, Sandra, War of Words- language, Politics and 9/11: Routledge London and New York, 2002, pp. 136-137

[45] CNN.com November 6, 2001. http://archives.cnn.com/2001/US/11/06/gen.attack.on.terror/ (accessed November 21, 2007)

[46] Bush, Address to a Joint session of the Congress and the American People: September 20, 2001

[47] CNN.com ; http://edition.cnn.com/2002/US/01/31/gen.binladen.interview/ (accessed January 3, 2008)

[48] This fallacious argument claims that what has not been proved false is true, and, what has not been proved true is false.

war is the use of 'good versus evil', metaphor in argument. George Lakoff in, *Metaphors of Terror,* explains, how the use the of metaphor 'evil' works in an argument,

> The enemy of evil is good. If our enemy is evil, we are inherently good. Good is our essential nature and what we do in the battle against evil is good.[49]

He informs, during war, many cruel actions can be framed as lesser evil. List of lesser evil in context of war includes: curtailing individual liberties, sanctioning political assassinations, regime change, collateral damages, torturing the enemy and hiring and supporting criminals etc.[50] Such an argument also silence the critics blocking rational/critical thinking, since arguing against such argument may imply: one is evil or has been dominated by evil.

In recent wars, both the parties have been using this argument: Bush tried to link Sadam Hussain and al Qaeda by using an emotionally charged metaphor 'axis of evil' and for allies of U.S., 'coalition forces'.[51] He and his allies argue that an attack on Afghanistan/Iraq means, Americans and allies are fighting against an alliance of evil forces, and many countries are with US in this war (while actually there are only two main players, i.e. America and England). They introduced another word that Iraq is engaged in making 'WMD'. Words like, 'Weapon of Mass Destruction' are enough to make people afraid of Iraq. The conclusion drawn from the above two premises was that Iraq is going to make WMD and it has a link with al Qaeda (axis of evil). After making weapons, Iraq shall handover these weapons to al Qaeda which will become more dangerous and destructive, not only for American people but also for the rest of the civilized world. Hence, there is a strong reason to attack Iraq. Not buying this argument means one does not want peace and security in the world probably one is siding terrorists. From, Ron Paul's, *Phony Justification for war,*[52] it appears that almost all the arguments to attack Iraq were based on false premises, hence, fallacious.

---

[49] Lakoff, George. *Metaphors of Terror*: http://www.press.uchicago.edu/News/911lakoff.html, 2001 (accessed on October 22, 2007)
[50] ibid
[51] President Bush, State of the Union Address: January 29,2002
[52] Paul, Ron, *Phony Justifications for War*: July 21, 2003, http://www.lewrockwell.com/paul/paul113.html

Al Qaeda and Taliban, also claim that they are fighting against infidels and the world's most evil force.

> These events have divided the whole world into two sides. The side of believers and the side of infidels, may God keep you away from them.[53]

Like Bush and his allies, Osama also argued that the whole world has been divided into believers and infidels. In the context of war on terror the hidden message in such arguments has been: our enemies are evil and infidels, therefore, fighting against them is a religious duty, and since the fight is against evil, therefore, dying in war means martyrdom, going to heaven. Also, whatever we do to damage our enemy will be morally correct and religiously right. Moreover, critics are with infidels.

It seems that the arguments presented in war, to persuade people, are fallacious. Most of them commit informal fallacies, since, premises do not really support the conclusion; they just appear to do so.

1.3 SPECIFIC AIMS OF THIS STUDY

1. To demonstrate that the language used in war in general and War on Terror in Afghanistan, in particular, has been metaphorical, ambiguous and emotionally charged; hence, misleading. Therefore, appearance of language of war is different from reality.

2. To demonstrate that in the context of war in general and War on Terror in Afghanistan, in particular, politicians have been presenting fallacious arguments to obstruct clear thinking and to shape public judgments. Therefore, appearance of war arguments is different from reality.

3. To demonstrate that language of war and fallacies committed in times of war block rational and critical thinking and silence the critics.

1.4 METHODOLOGY

A work like this needs more than one methodologies, since it attempts thorough analysis of language and arguments used in war (as shown in the

---

[53] Osama Bin Laden, Osama Bin Laden Speeches, October 7, 2001: http://www.september11news.com/OsamaSpeeches.htm (accessed January 22, 2010)

introduction).

Descriptive and analytical methodologies are developed, in chapter two, to exhibit the way language shapes judgments, perception, behavior/action and blocks criticism, including: an analysis of context of communication act; functions of language and intentions of speaker in a context; problems of ambiguity and vagueness; emotive words and persuasive definitions. Moreover, George Lakoff's methodology of metaphors, framing and reframing has also been delineated and applied to demonstrate the way language works in war.

In chapter three, a methodology, that takes into account both context and contents of an argument, has been delineated that analyses, interprets, evaluates, constructs, and criticises arguments in natural/ordinary language to demonstrates that arguments can change the direction of thinking, shaping judgments, perception and actions etc., and obstruct rational/critical thinking and block criticism. It comprises of description of informal fallacies and the way informal fallacies change the direction of thinking and shape judgments etc. This methodology has been applied to demonstrate the way fallacious arguments work in war.

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Is appearance of Language of war the same, as its reality?
2. Is appearance of Logic of war arguments the same, as their reality?
3. Has the word, War, been correctly used in the context of 9/11 incidents?
4. Have the language and logic of War on Terror been shaping public judgment, perception and behavior?
5. Do language and logic of war block criticism and rational thinking?

Hypotheses:

1. It seems appearance of Language of war is not the same as its reality.
2. It seems appearance of war arguments is not the same as their reality.
3. In the context of 9/ 11 incidents, use of word, War, seems incorrect.
4. It seems Language and logic of War on Terror, have been shaping public judgment, perception and behavior.
5. It seems language and logic of war block criticism and rational thinking.

1.6 JUSTIFICATIONS

This research argues that philosophy has practical significance in our day to day life. It can help us in distinguishing reality from appearance and in thinking rationally/critically and clearly. This is an original work. Philosophers around the world are demonstrating that politicians have been using language and arguments as tools of War, to shape public opinion and to block rational and critical thinking, but there is no coherent, focused and comprehensive work on this topic, especially about language and arguments of both the parties in War on Terror.

The work shall assist both policy makers and general public in sorting good arguments from bad/fallacious arguments, presented by politicians, in times of war. It shall demonstrate that nature of most of the disagreements is related with language, therefore, in order to resolve such disagreement a clear understanding of language is necessary. This work shall also assist policy makers and public, wanting peace, in framing and reframing the war debate leading to creation of language of peace. Moreover, philosophical insight i.e., distinguishing appearance from reality, may equip us better to understand the situation clearly and in resolving conflicts.

1.7 PLAN OF WORK

The plan of work of this thesis goes as:

Chapter 1. Introduction

Chapter 2. Language

Chapter 3. Informal Fallacies: Impediments to Clear Thinking

Chapter 4. Language of War with Special Reference to War on Terror

Chapter 5. War on Terror and Fallacious Arguments

Chapter 6. Conclusion

1.8 LITRATURE REVIEW

1. David Zarefsky in *Strategic Maneuvering through Persuasive Definitions: implications for Dialectic and Rhetoric,* (Argumentation -2006), on page 403, demonstrates as to how persuasive definitions work and how they represent strategic maneuvering. He explains that strategic maneuvering means, firstly, taking advantage of connotative meanings, i.e. using language in a way that will support your point of view, he calls this, 'loaded language'. Secondly, putting forward claims and

evidences, which are acceptable, and, according to the demands of a particular audience, and which may not be acceptable to another audience, he calls this, 'pandering'. He, referring to other writers, demonstrates that both 'loaded language' and 'pandering' are sometimes fallacious. Zarefsky argues that the task of an argument analyst is to clarify when strategic maneuvering is sound and when it is fallacious.

On page 409, he demonstrates, how persuasive definitions were forwarded after 11 September to persuade the public, by declaring the event as an 'act of war', 'we are at war', 'war has been waged against us by stealth and deceit and murder.' He has analyzed that all these statements and phrases were ambiguous, because neither Afghanistan nor any other country was at war with United States.

It is an instructive article. It raises an important question: whether terrorist attacks of 9/11 were acts of war? It also discusses persuasive definitions used in War on Terror. However, it does not discuss other important issues such as: metaphors, framing, reframing etc. in the context of war.

2. J. Michael Sproule, in Argument -Language and its influence, (McGraw- Hill Book Company, 1980) on page 37 has demonstrated how Nixon argued and persuaded the public against Lyndon Johnson administration's Vietnam policy of war. From page 89-92 he has applied the definition of rhetorical validity to the 'aggression thesis' used by the Johnson administration to justify the American military commitment to Vietnam. It is a very comprehensive book as for as understanding and analysis of arguments and language is concerned (1-101). Although this book does not directly deals with the language and logic of war, but is very instructive for understanding of language and arguments.

3. Cyrus Safdari in, Rhetoric of war: first Iraq, then Iran?, (Global Dialogue, Volume 8, No. 1-2, winter- spring 2006, has discussed informal fallacies in the context of War on Terror. On page 2 of his article he defines, *The Enthymeme,* as an argument in which a premise or a conclusion is left unsaid, allowing the audience to fill in the gap itself using their own preconceptions. As an example of the enthymeme, he analyzes the argument: Major premise: Terrorists attacked us on 11 September. Unstated minor premise: Iraq was responsible for the attacks of 11 September. Conclusion: So we justifiably went to war on Iraq. Note that the minor premise-that Iraq was somehow responsible for the attacks of 11 September, was never clearly explained, it was left up to the audience to fill in that gap for themselves. Other informal fallacies discussed

in the context of War on Terror are Begging the Question (page4), Subverted Support (page 7), Argumentum ad Ignorantiam (page8), Shifting the Burden of Proof (page8), Slippery Slope (page9-) Red Herring (page10), False Comparison (page11) etc.

This work takes into account some fallacies but does not fully discuss the role of fallacious arguments as obstacles in clear thinking in the context of war.

4. Dr. Ron Paul is a Republican member of Congress from Texas. His following work is relevant to my research:

Big Lies and Little Lies November 2, 2005; *Suicide Terrorism July* 14, 2005*; Phony Justifications for War July* 21, 2003*; Another United Nations War?* February 28, 2003; *Iraq: Claim vs. Reality* October 8, 2002.

Ron Paul's work is very informative; however, his work does not deal with logic and language of war.

5. Avram Noam Chomsky, PhD is a Professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His following works are relevant to this research:

9-11; *What Americans Have Learnt --and not Learnt- Since 9/11*(The Age, September 7, 2002) *The new war against terror* (Human Nature Review – Volume 1, 2001, Page 37-58); The *War in Afghanistan* (10 pages); *Preventive War 'the Supreme Crime'* (Chomsky. Info, August 11, 2003- 1-6); *Wars of Terror*; *Who are the Global Terrorists?* (Chomsky. Info; May 19, 2002 6 pages).

6. Ziauddin Sardar, a visiting Professor at City University London, opines in, *My Fatwa on the Fanatics,* that many sacred terms like fatwa, jihad, 'Shaheed (Arabic, meaning martyr) have been hijacked by fanatics. He, in his fatwa declares that a Muslim who is involved in the planning, financing, training, recruiting, support or harboring of those who commit acts of indiscriminate violence against persons or the apparatus or infrastructure of states is guilty of terror and no part of the 'Ummah' (From Arabic, [Muslim] community/nation).

7. John Hospers in, An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis, (second edition: Unwin Brothers limited, the Gresham Press, England, 1978), deals with meaning, definition, vagueness and ambiguity. The topics relevant to this research are ambiguity (14-16), verbal disputes (36-39), connotation and persuasive definitions (48-54) and Vagueness (67-76).

8. Vincent Barry in, Looking at Ourselves- An introduction to Philosophy, (Wadsworth publishing Company, Inc. Belmont, California. 1977), second chapter of this book (33-66) deals with Language and Perception. It discusses problems like

word-meaning, language as a tool of propaganda, how words and sentences structure the perception. On page 42, he gives an example of Thomas Paine's work 'The American Crises' and argues that propagandist chose only those facts which support their view, and then they use emotive language, which produces a favourable emotional response to that view.

9. George Lakoff is professor of linguistics at the University of California at Berkeley and a senior fellow of the Rockridge Institute. His following work is relevant to my research:

Metaphors We Live By (Lakoff and Johnson); Philosophy in the Flesh (Lakoff and Johnson); Don't Think of an Elephant; Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think, *The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf* (November 1991); *Metaphors of Terror* (September 16, 2001); *G. Lakoff dissects the War on Terror* (August 25, 2004); *How Language is Used to Dominate in Politics* (October 27, 2003); *Five Years After 9/11: Drop the War Metaphor* (by Lakoff and Evan Frisch, September 11, 2006) etc. George Lakoff and others work do not focus on the way Taliban use language to persuade people for war. This work attempts to fill this gape in literature.

10. Roshan Ara, a Professor in Aligarh University, in, *Wittgenstein's Concept of Language Games*(Published in Al- Hikmat Volume 26, 2006), explains Wittgenstein's notion of language games, meaning as use in a context, family resemblance, job of philosophy and language as form of life. She argues that Wittgenstein's Philosophical Investigation, rejects his early thoughts such as: language has a clear and firm structure, the only purpose of language is to picture the facts and meaning of a sentence is the fact pictured by it. She argues that the central problem discussed in, Philosophical Investigation, is the concept of meaning, which she believes, is context dependent. Not only meaning but the intentions of a speech act are also determined by the context. She argues, even orders are given and obeyed, about something, within a social context. In the end she opines, language designs trap and the linguistic analysis frees a philosopher from linguistic traps.

11. Robert L. Ivie (Indiana University) and Oscar Giner (Arizona State University) in, *Hunting the Devil: Democracy's Rhetorical Impulse of War* (published in Presidential Studies Quarterly 37. No. 4 December) inform that the rhetoric of evil that has been used in Presidential address is the basic reason and motivation for the war on terror. They argue that the President in his address has been projecting that democracy is

threatened by evil and in order to save it we must, will, should, have to fight and defeat the evil of terror. Otherwise, we will become evils, submit to evil and we will be exposed to evil. The President using concept of evil, Americans already have, successfully framed war on terror as a war against evil- evil that hates democracy and wants to destroy it. The President, reporting the people that enemy is barbaric, irrational and satanic told that he wants to fight and defeat the evil enemy of democracy, portraying himself St. George. Moreover, the President appealed to morality and Christian ideals informing people that Taliban, Al- Qaeda and Sadam Hussain are killing innocent people and brutalizing them and informed that we, the Americans, not only drop bombs on terrorists but also drop food and medicine for innocent weak people. Bush reveals that it is their moral and religious responsibility to help and protect weak people from evil tyrants, arguing that he is not a conqueror, he is a liberator. Although this work discusses use of language that evokes evil, but does not deal with other metaphors such as: hero, villain, infidels, believers, Faroun versus Musa etc.

12. Winkler Carol K. in, *Encroachment on State Sovereignty: The Argumentation Strategies of George W. Bush administration* (Published in Argumentation volume 22, November 4, 2008- Springer Science+ Business Media B.V. 2008), reveals that since the globalization is increasing, powerful countries in order to secure their interest are encroaching the traditional boarders of other countries using arguments by definition as a tool to gain public support for their actions. For example argument by definition was instrumental in gaining public support to change Taliban regime.

He, citing Zarefsky, informs that in an argument by definition, definitional moves are presented as facts that are indisputable and not open to contestation. Two of its types are definition by association and disassociation.

By citing other philosopher, he informs that in definition by association two separate elements, in order to establish a unity, are brought together organizing and evaluating them positively or negatively. Definition by dissociation is converse of definition by association. Applying definition by association Bush and his administration associated Taliban with Al- Qaeda this way they did not actually provide Taliban a choice to remain in power. And for rest of the countries, he opines, bush and his administration used argument by dissociation.

This article also informs about three combinations of terrorism and state functioning as argument by definition: state- sponsorship of terrorism, terrorist states,

and terrorist- supported states. These three combinations have been used by USA to overthrow regime and gaining public support for such actions.

13. Geoffrey R. Skoll in, *Meaning of Terrorism* (Published in International Journal of Semiotics of Law, Springer 2006), focuses on the shift of meaning of terrorism. On page 107, he argues that meaning of terrorism depend on the user, audience and the political context. Moreover, states, through laws, shape meaning and public discourse. He argues that meaning of terrorism has been changing, especially in US, with changes is US policies and enemies. He, citing Alex Schmid, informs that there were 109 definitions identified by Alex Schmid which have been increased over the years. Since there is no consensus on the meaning of terrorism therefore, no international law against terrorism exists (p.115).

Many American presidents used this term for political gains. For example, he reveals that probably by calling certain events terrorism Regan became president. Same is true for Carter who gained support from Iranian hostage crises. During the cold war whatever USSR did was termed terrorism (p.113). In the mid of 20th century civil unrest was terrorism etc. American, now call any event that is against the interests of America, terrorism. For example, the incidents of 9/11 were acts of terrorism and war against America. This way, Skoll argues Americans repress any other interpretation of events. For instance, the 9/11 events can be 'attacks on global capitalism' and 'global militarism' but calling them 'terrorist attacks', suppresses any alternative meanings (p.126).

14. Peter Liberman in, *An Eye for an Eye: Public Support for War Against Evildoers* (Published in International Organization 60, Summer 2006) informs that Predispositions like retributions and humanitarianism that shape moral and criminal punishment judgments, also shape an individual's judgment on war against evildoers. On page 687 he reveals that 'Axis of evil', metaphor used by Bush linked Al-Qaeda with Saddam Hussain. On page 496 he exhibits that public normally does not take interest in foreign affairs. Politicians inform them that foreign victims are like their kin and adversaries as alien and using good versus evil frame motivate public for war. On page 697 he informs that senior Bush who could not motivate public for first Iraq war by giving arguments that highlighted balance-of-power and other energy supply related arguments framed the situation as a struggle between good and evil. Liberman informs that senior Bush, almost every day, compared Saddam with Hitler. Moreover, senior Bush using metaphors of violent burglary and rape shaped the perception of the

public against Saddam. On page 704-706 he demonstrates that Bush in 2002 again convinced American people for another war against Iraq using metaphors like axis of evil and presenting augments that Iraq has WMD and that Iraq also has links with Al-Qaeda and will make Al-Qaeda more dangerous, for US people, by giving Al-Qaeda WMDs. Moreover, Bush informed people that Saddam is a ruthless dictator killing and torturing people especially women and children. This way, Liberman, reveals Bush prepared people for war. After listening to such stories, public wants the aggressors and evildoers to be punished since they believe that, 'violence unpunished encourages more violence'.

15. Stephen D. Biddle (Associate Professor of National Studies at U.S. Army College Strategic Studies) in, *American Grand Strategy after 9/11: An Assessment*, suggests that policymakers should give a clear definition of enemy and clearly mention the aim of war on terrorism in order to avoid ambiguities. On page 6-8 he questions the present policy makers of USA stating that without identifying the enemy how can they know and exploit the weaknesses of enemy. Since, he believes, terrorism is not an enemy it's a tactic. Moreover, he criticizes the phrase, 'terrorists of global reach used by US administration and other ambiguous and vague details about the war on terror. The broad definitions of enemy, he opines, may include many terrorist in the class of enemies of USA who are not threats to America such as: Israeli militant group, Tamil Tigers etc.

On page 13- 15 he informs that statements and phrases like, the goal of war on terror will be achieved when civilized people will live their lives without fear from any terrorist attack, zero tolerance for terrorism, are vague and unclear. Moreover, he informs that many people after 9/11 argued that terrorism should be treated as a crime.

He, in the end, reveals cost of this American ambitious and ambiguous strategy is getting higher and higher. He suggests that America should adopt policies of roll back and constraint.

16. Murray Edelman in, *Language, Myths and Rhetoric* (Published in Society, Publisher Springer New York, Volume 35, number 2, January 1998) reveals that, 'Political language can evoke a set of mythic beliefs in subtle and powerful way'. She argues that there are some myths that help us coping with problems in lives. Government is one amongst them. People see government to rescue them from poverty, dangers both foreign and internal, food shortage. Political language, in her

opinion, used by politicians shape many public beliefs. It excites and pacifies fear i.e. it arouses and soothes fear in public at the same time. For example, on page 131, she writes that Department of Defense repeatedly informed public (perhaps during cold war) that Russia has beat us in making weapons but at the same times informs that our forces are also prepared to defend the country. This way politician arouses and pacifies fear.

On page 134 she reveals that through metaphors, metonymy and syntax language evokes myths in people's mind. Ambiguous situations that concern public are defined in a manner that the focus remains on one part of the situation or by comparing ambiguous situation with other situations. (Taliban were compared with Nazis in order to understand who Taliban are).

On page 136 she opines that politician's statements about the public are often either false or impossible to verify. For example, she informs that during Vietnam War, President Nixon to shape public opinion referred to a 'silent majority', that supported his polices of war. (President Musharaf also used same term when he wanted public to support him for his policies)

17. Philosophical Perspectives on the 'war on Terrorism', edited by, Gail M. Presbey, Published by Rodopi Amsterdam New York (2007), is very instructive book as for as understanding War on Terrorism is concerned. It's a book written by philosophers who have a concern for peace. It is comprised of five parts and twenty articles written by different philosophers.

The five parts of the book are: Terrorism Analyzed, Democracy as a Remedy for Terrorism, The United States' 'War on Terrorism', Terrorism case studies and The Ethics of War.

The topics this book cover are: defining Weapons of Mass destruction, war on terrorism and international peace, the conditions for terrorism, the anti democratic logic of USA, criticism on USA neo imperialism, United States' doctrine of preventive wars, is war on Iraq as an extension of war on terrorism, ethics of terrorism, role of Central Asia in war against terrorism, war and peace in Christian Tradition, Jihad or the beloved community etc.

On page xix, it discusses the nature of war on terrorism and raises questions like: can we have a war against a tactic? Would it be a war or something else? What is the identity of the terrorists? How and when will we win this war? The author opines that perhaps it is an unending war. On page 24 it discusses that language becomes a

tool of military and political leaders to make people accept which they (people) would not if they know the true character of what they are accepting. On page 56-58 the author opines, in order to make sense of 9/11 attacks, 'war' and 'terrorism are invoked, however, these terms are ineffective and harmful. Moreover, 'patriotism' in the context of war on terrorism invokes unconditional obedience to authorities ignoring one's moral responsibilities. The argument, 'either you are with us or with enemies', was used for both domestic and international criticism. The citizens of USA were to choose between evil and lesser evil: evil (terrorism) versus lesser evil (compromising civil liberties and violence in the name of national security).

18. Winning the War of Words: Selling the War on terror from Afghanistan to Iraq, written by Wojtek Mackiewicz Wolfe is very instructive in understanding how presidential framing in America sets the foreign policy tone for the US public. The book, utilizing public opinion and some fifteen thousand presidential speeches over a period of four years argues that using threat and loss framing, policy makers, mobilized domestic support for war in Afghanistan and Iraq. Moreover, threats and loss framing was instrumental in reelection of the President Bush.

Wolfe revealing about the relationship between framing and approval rating of war writes on page 85, "In October 2001, Bush mentioned terrorism 283 times, a peak for 2001. In October 2002, leading up to the Iraq war, he mentioned terrorism 263 times, a record for that year. In October 2003, immediately after the 1000-casualty milestone, he mentioned terrorism 434 times. However, in October 2004, just prior to the elections, mention of terrorism hit an all-time high of 933 times. This was indicative of Bush's latest and most concentrated war marketing campaign. As the data will show, discussion of having won the war on terror was negligible. At the same time, we see that according to some polls, as the rhetoric increased so did the approval ratings, regardless of mounting casualties. According to a *Washington Post* - ABC News poll, the percentage of Americans polled that approved of the war on terror increased by 10 percent to a total of 60 percent from June to August 2004."[54]

One page 18, he mentioned the terms that he used as search terms for loss and gain using software (concordance v. 3.2) have been: "Gain: accept, accomplish, accumulate, achieve, acquire, acquisition, addition, advance, advancement, advantage, appreciate, appreciation, approach, attain, awake, bag, benefit, blessing, boom,

[54] Wolfe, Mackiewicz Wojtek, Winning the War of Wards- Selling Terror from Afghanistan to Iraq: Praeger Security International, 2008, p. 85

breakthrough, bring, buildup, capitalize, capture, carry, clear, compass, compensation, delay, derive, deserve, dividend, earn, earnings, educe, enter, familiarize, fatten, find, gain, gather, gathering, get, good, grow, growth, haul, have, hit, hope, improve, improvement, increase, incur, interest, jump, land, learn, look, make, master, mend, obtain, output, overtake, pay, perk, pick, plus, prevail, prize, proceeds, procrastinate, procure, produce, progress, prosper, pull, purchase, purpose, reach, realize, reap, receipts, receive, recover, recruit, recuperate, regain, return, revenue, reward, sake, score, secure, seize, snatch, spoils, succeed, success, take, triumph, victory, win.
Loss: bankruptcy, bottom casualty, consumption, cost, costly, death, decline, decrease, defeat, deficiency, deficit, deprivation, destruction, detriment, devastation, disappearance, expense, failure, fall, fat, fatality, forfeit, harm, havoc, hurt, injury, lack, leak, lose, loss, illness, misfortune, miss, passing, relapse, ruin, fright, toll, tied, waste, wear."[55]

This work does not deal with other framings and metaphors such as: hero, villain, good, evil, believers, and infidels etc.

19. Mein Kampf, an autobiography of Adolf Hitler, is very instructive as for as understanding the use of propaganda, in politics in general and in war in particular, is concerned. Chapter VI (Vol. I, page 167- 177), War Propaganda, reveals that propaganda is a very important weapon of war. Hitler, in this chapter, confesses that German's propaganda had been weaker than the propaganda of their opponents. Moreover, he explains that how propaganda should be used as an instrument of war. In chapter XI (Vol. II, page 517-531), Propaganda and Organization, he informs that the job of the propagandist is to make people, 'followers' of a political doctrine. The job of an organizer is to select members from the followers.

20. Peter L. Bergen in, Holy War Inc.-Inside the Secret World of Osama bin laden, reveals that he has been working on Afghanistan since USSR invasion of Afghanistan. He tells his story of how he met Osama in Afghanistan. He discusses, in detail, his interviews with Osama (page 18- 23) and many other important leaders. (It is an informative book, but it does not discuss logic and language of war.)

He argues that 9/11 attack was actually not a surprise, Osama had been planning and indicating that such attacks will occur if USA does not discontinue its aggressive and phony policies against Muslims.

---

[55] Wolfe, Mackiewicz Wojtek (2008) p. 18

He, in the end, demonstrates that it is wrong to say, as Bush and his team said again and again, that the attacks of 9/11 were actually attacks on way of life or on freedom and democracy and American culture. He argues, in reality, Osama has nothing to do with culture, or the way of life. These are not the reasons of his hatred. The actual reasons, he informs have been: US policies in Middle East, American military Presence in Saudi Arab, American bombing on Iraq and its support to the regimes in Egypt and Saudi Arab (page 221-223). This raises a problem that the causes mentioned by Bush and his administration were actually false cause. Perhaps, they were committing fallacy of false cause all the way.

21. Douglas Walton has published many papers and books on argumentation. Following book and papers are taken into account:

Informal Logic, A Pragmatic Approach; *Deceptive Arguments Containing Persuasive language and Persuasive Definitions; Reasoning from Classifications and Definitions*; *The Appeal to ignorance, or Argumentum Ad Ignorantiam*; *Poisoning the Well; Rethinking Fallacy of Hasty Generalization; The Fallacy of Many Questions: On the Notions of Complexity, Loadedness and Unfair Entrapment in Interrogative Theory.*

CHAPTER 2

LANGUAGE

If knowledge is power, language too is power; those who control the language of war and peace exercise an enormous influence on how we perceive war and peace and what behaviors we accept in relation to war and peace. (William C. Gay)

Aims: This chapter explains that language can be instrumental in shaping judgment, perception and behavior of people and in blocking rational thinking and criticism. It discusses: the role of Context in Language, Emotive Words and Persuasive Definitions, Metaphors, Framing and Reframing. Section one very briefly introduces some important theories of language. Section two explains context of language, ambiguity, vagueness and functions of language. Section three discusses definitions, emotive words and persuasive definitions. Section four explains metaphors, framing and reframing.

2.1 A BRIEF INTRODUCTION OF SOME IMPORTANT THEORIES OF LANGUAGE

Aim: This section aims at briefly introducing some important theories of language.

Language is a tool of communication, a social institution and an expression of thoughts. The most basic issues related to language are Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics. Syntax studies how words are related to one another in a sentence-grammar. Semantics (theory of meaning) studies how words are related to the things they refer to i.e., words and world relationship- meanings of the words and sentences. Pragmatics studies the use of language and gives importance to the speaker audience relations in a social context.[56]

Philosophers, in the 19th and 20th centuries, gave much importance to language and its understanding, a development known as 'linguistic turn'. For some, many problems in philosophy were not solved, since their language was not clear. For

[56] Fairclough, Norman (Edited by), Language and Power: Second Edition (2001) Pearson Education Limited, England, p 4-7, Floistad Guttorm, Contemporary Philosophy Volume 1. Philosophy of Language & Philosophy of Logic, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers Dordrecht/ Boston/ Lancaster (1986) p. 1-10 also see Teays, Wanda (1996) p.145

example, early Wittgenstein in the preface to Tractatus Logico Philosophicus, informs that Tractatus deals with problems of philosophy and reveals,

> ...the reason why these problems are posed is that logic of our language is misunderstood.[57]

Some philosophers gave importance to syntax, other to semantics and to pragmatics. Moreover, numerous theories of meanings, i.e., how words are related to the world itself have been propounded.

To begin with, Referential theory of meaning claims that every word we use stands for an object in the world. We come to understand objects only by experience. The meaning of sentence means: understanding individual words in a sentence and objects these words stand for. The theory was rejected because it could not address many problems related to words and their references, for many of the words do not refer to objects, and for one object there can be more than one words. Frege tried to solve this problem and argued; in order to understand a word we have to understand it in the context of sentence. However, he also believes that

> ... the referent of sentence may always be sought, whenever the referents of its components are involved: and this is the case when and only when we are inquiring after the truth value.[58]

Moreover, a sentence, he believes, expresses a thought and a thought loses its value the moment we come to know that one part of it has no reference or the reference is missing.[59] Wittgenstein, deeply influenced by Frege's work, claimed the purpose of language is to picture the facts. The sense or meaning of a proposition is the fact pictured by that proposition, and truth or falsity of a proposition depends on agreement or disagreement of its meaning with reality.[60] A sentence that fails to picture a fact is meaningless. Statements can be either meaningful or meaningless, where meaningless does not imply, false. A meaningless statement fails to picture any

---

[57] Wittgenstein, Ludwig, Tractatus Logico- Philosophicus, translated by Pears, D. F and B. F. McGuiness, Routledge Classics 2001, New York. This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-library 2002, p.3

[58] Frege, Gottlob, *Sense and Reference*: The Philosophical Review, Vol. 57, No. 3(May, 1948) Publisher Duke University Press on Behalf of Philosophical Review. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2181485. p.216 (accessed 21 July 2009)

[59] Frege (1948) p. 215

[60] Wittgenstein, Tractatus Logico Philosophicus : p. 12

state of affair (fact) whether actual or possible. Facts are combination of objects. Different combinations of objects give different facts. For example, if A and B are two different objects, then AB will be a different fact than BA. 'Ali Loves Salma' and 'Salma loves Ali' are two different facts. Not all possible facts are, actual. For Wittgenstein, the world is a totality of actual state of affairs. Language pictures these facts. A sentence that succeeds in picturing a fact is meaningful, otherwise meaningless. A meaningful sentence that pictures just possible state of affair, not an actual state of affair, is false.

> A proposition can be true or false only in virtue of picture of reality.[61]

A meaningful sentence picturing actual state of affairs is true. That is how, Wittgenstein believes, language is related with the world. For him, limits of language, logic and the world are same. Russell also argues that it is the fact in the world which makes propositions true or false. However, Wittgenstein in later work argued, picturing reality is not the only purpose of language, for there are many other functions as well. In his later work he claimed that words are like tools and meaning of words and sentences are actually related to their use in a context.

Following early Wittgenstein, logical positivists also claimed that in order for a statement to be meaningful, it must either be analytic or verifiable. A. J. Ayer argues in, Language, Truth and Logic,

> The criterion which we use to test the genuineness of apparent statements of fact is the criterion of verifiability. We say that a sentence is factually significant to any given person, if, and only if he knows how to verify the proposition which it purports to express- that is , if he knows what observations would lead him, under certain conditions, to accept the proposition being true, or reject it as being false. If, on the other hand, the putative proposition is of such a character that the assumption of its truth, or falsehood, is consistent with any assumption whatsoever concerning the nature of his future experience, then, as far as he is concerned, it is, if not a tautology, a

[61] Wittgenstein, Tractatus Logico- Philosophicus: p. 27

mere pseudo-proposition.[62]

This criterion, known as principle of verification, excluded metaphysical, religious, ethical and aesthetical statements from the class of factually meaningful statements. For logical positivists, linguistic analysis is necessary before going into the details of any problem. If a problem is not posed in analytic or verifiable statement then it needs no philosophical consideration, for it is pseudo. This way logical positivists excluded metaphysics, ethics etc., from the class of meaningful knowledge. There has been a lot of criticism on logical positivist's principle of verification. For example, the principle itself is a statement, but it is neither analytic nor verifiable and it could not exclude metaphysics and other discipline from the class of meaningful successfully, which was the main intention of the logical positivists.

Most of the theories in these two centuries fall into analytic tradition[63]. These theories tried to find, as we have seen in the above discussion, those conditions in which statements can be declared true or false, and they argued, it is the fact in the world that makes a proposition true or false.

> The majority of philosophers of language working in the analytical tradition share Frege's intuition that we know the meaning of a word when we know the role it plays in a sentence and we know the meaning of a sentence when we know the conditions under which it would be true…Truth-conditional theories generally begin with the assumption that something is a language or a linguistic expression if and only if its significant parts can represent the facts of the world. Sentences represent facts or states of affairs in the world, names refer to objects, and so forth.[64]

This reveals that most of the philosophers, as we have noticed in the discussion, were following Frege's philosophy: we know meanings of words and sentences by knowing what role words play in the context of a given sentence. And something cannot be declared as a linguistic expression unless its significant part

---

[62] Ayer, A.J, Language Truth and Logic: Penguin Books Ltd, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, 1986, page 48

[63] A tradition that stresses on logical analysis of concepts and clarifies the language these concepts are expressed in.

[64] http://www.iep.utm.edu/l/lang-phi.htm

represents the facts out there in the world. This position has been criticized by many philosophers.

Quine in, *Two Dogmas of Empiricism*, attacked all such views about language specially the logical positivist's view. He informs that modern empiricism is based on two dogmas which are: Analytic Synthetic distinction of statements and the belief (as we have seen in Frege, A. J Ayer, logical positivists and early Wittgenstein etc.) that

> … each meaningful statement is equivalent to some logical constructs upon term which refer to immediate experience.[65]

Quine argues that both dogmas of empiricism are ill founded and at roots are identical. Analytic- synthetic division is an artificial one and,

> …statements about the external world face the tribunal of sense experience not individually but only as a corporate body.[66]

He recommends: Sentences can be verified as true or false not individually but in a system of experiences, this way he presents a holistic view of language.

Later Wittgenstein criticized his early position and all other similar philosophies of language by arguing: the meaning of a sentence is use of the sentence in a context, moreover,

> ... *speaking* language is part of an activity, or of a form of life.[67]

No activity in society can be performed without this integral part. He compares language with game. Since we perform a lot of activities while living in a society, therefore, there is a multiplicity of language games such as:

> Giving orders, and obeying them- Describing the appearance of an object or giving its measurements- Constructing an object from a description (a drawing)- Reporting the event- Speculating about an event- Forming and testing a hypothesis-Presenting the results of an

---

[65] Quine, W.V, *Main Trends in Recent Philosophy: Two Dogmas of Empiricism*: The Philosophical Review, Vol. 60 No. 1(January 1951) Published by Duke University Press on behalf of philosophical review. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2181906 p. 20 (accessed 21 July 2009)

[66] Quine, (1951) p. 38

[67] Wittgenstein, Ludwig, Philosophical Investigations: Translated by G.E.M Anscombe. Blackwell Publishers, First published 1953. p. 11

> experiment in tables and diagrams- Making up a story; and reading it- Play- acting-Singing catches- Guessing riddles- Making a joke; telling it-Solving a problem in practical arithmetic- Translating from one language into another- Asking, thinking, cursing, greeting, and prayer.[68]

In a language game, we make moves with words under certain rules. By rules or rule following Wittgenstein did not mean the traditional concept of rule following. In fact, he rejected the traditional notion of rule following. For later Wittgenstein, following a rule is an activity with a social reference. Rules cannot be followed privately. Wittgenstein, this way, also rejected the idea of private language. Since rules cannot be followed privately; therefore, language cannot be private, for language involves rule following in a social context.[69]

For Chomsky, Language reveals that humans are creative in nature. Use of language is not just informative rather it can be used,

> ...to inform or mislead, to clarify one's own thought or to display one's cleverness, or simply for play.[70]

He argues that language which is mathematical in nature has a pure form. This form is universal and innate. We have an inborn capacity to learn language. Chomsky calls it 'Universal grammar'. Any particular grammar, according to Chomsky, must confirm the rules of universal grammar.[71] Francis Lin summarizes the basic views of Chomsky as,

> ... according to Chomsky there is a distinct language faculty in the brain, much of the linguistic knowledge is innate, linguistic knowledge consists of abstract and unconscious principles, and a language is not

---

[68] Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1953) p. 11-12
[69] ibid p. 81-82
Ara, Roshan, *Wittgenstein's Concept of Language Games*: Al- Hikmat, Volume 26 (pp. 47-62), 2006, p. 2
[70] Chomsky, Noam, *Linguistic Contributions to the Study of Mind*: Language and Mind, publ. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. 1968
[71] Chomsky (1968)

learnt but rather 'acquired' etc.[72]

This further suggests that for Chomsky we are able to learn language since we have a natural and inborn capacity to do so. This capacity is innate, i.e. it is not learnt. It is very obvious that empiricist will not agree with this view, for this view of language relies more on innate ideas instead of learning language through experience.

Austin and Searle discussed the basic functions of language, and presented speech act theory. They and other philosophers, following latter Wittgenstein emphasize use of language in a context. Searle disagrees with Wittgenstein's philosophy of language games. He argues in, Expression And Meaning, the idea that language has indefinite or infinite uses is wrong. There are limited uses of language:

> We tell people how things are, we try to get them do to things, we commit ourselves to do things, we express our feelings and attitudes, and we bring about changes through our utterances. Often, we do more than one of these in the same utterance.[73]

Searle names these uses of language or general categories of illocutionary acts: Assertives, Directives, Commissives, Expressives and Declarations, respectively.[74]This informs that language has some specific uses, they are not infinite. In a given context a sentence can mean more than its literal meanings i.e., it can serve more than one purpose.

For example: It is raining today.

This sentence can be a report, it can be a warning to take an umbrella, or it may be a remainder in a context where two people have decided: whenever there will be rain they will go to cinema and watch a movie.

Searle, Austin and other philosophers, instead of rejecting conventional theories of meaning, argue; apart from conventional meaning, language serves other purposes. This way, modern theories of language extend the understanding of language. For Scott Jacobs,

> …modern theories of discourse tell us that there is a lot more to the

---

[72] Lin, y, Francis, *Chomsky on the 'Ordinary language' view of language*: Syntheses Vol. 120 No 2 Published by Springer (1999) p.152 (accessed July 20, 2009)

[73] Searle, John, R, Expression And Meaning: Cambridge University Press 1981 p. 29

[74] Ibid p. viii

meaning of a message than what can be extracted from a collection of sentences by rules of syntax, semantics, and logic.[75]

Besides semantic meaning, a sentence may say many things, and sometimes semantic meaning of a sentence can be very different from the intended meanings of the speaker.

Norman Fairclough in, Language and Power, criticizes the mainstream theories of language and demonstrates that if we examine them critically, we come to know that they all have limitations. The approach he adopts is critical language study (CLS). For him, language is a form of social practice.[76] He, taking language as a part of society and linguistic phenomena as social phenomena and social phenomena (in part) as linguistic phenomena, argues there is an internal and dialectical relation between language and society.[77]

This reveals that, like later Wittgenstein, Norman believes: language is an activity in a social context and no activity in society can be performed without using language. Society is like a whole having many parts. Language is one of its part i.e., language is not something different and external from the society. All linguistic phenomena are social but all social phenomena are, in part, linguistic in nature. Since, language is a socially conditioned process, therefore, everything in a social context influences language and vice versa.

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson reveal in, Metaphors We Live By,

> Our conceptual system, in term of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature.[78]

They inform that although we are not normally aware of our conceptual system but language can help us in understanding it, for

> …communication is based on same conceptual system that we use in thinking and acting, language is an important source of evidence for

---

[75] Jacobs, Scott, *Rhetoric and Dialectic from the Standpoint of Normative Pragmatics*: Argumentation, 2000, p. 272 Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands(accessed April 02, 2008)
[76] Fairclough, Norman (2001) p. 18
[77] Ibid pp. 4-5
[78] Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson (1980) p. 3

what that system is like.[79]

They state:

> *The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.*[80]

For example, they opine, our understanding of arguments, love and time etc. is metaphorical: Argument is war, love is a journey, time is money etc. This becomes clear when we hear sentences: My argument has been demolished by him; I shot down all his arguments; Don't waste my time etc.

They criticize the traditional theories of meaning, for traditional theories, they believe, depend on a false assumption about truth i.e., truth is independent of human understanding; therefore, an explanation of truth in itself is possible. Lakoff and Johnson argue that truth is never independent of human understanding; therefore, meaning depends on understanding. A sentence means anything to a person only if the person understands the sentence.

> There is no such thing as a meaning of a sentence in itself, independent of any people. When we speak meaning of a sentence, it is always the meaning of the sentence to someone, a real person or a hypothetical typical member of a speech community.[81]

Words evoke frames. (Metaphors and frames will be discussed in section 4). For example 'Jungle', 'Zoo', evoke a frame. The frame of jungle is comprised of the knowledge about jungle, the animals, trees, etc.[82]

2.2 ROLE OF CONTEXT IN LANGAUGE

Aims: This section, comprising two subsections, is aimed at explaining the role of context in language. Subsection 2.2.1, exhibits the way context determines function of

---

[79] Lakoff and Johnson (1980) p. 3
[80] ibid p. 5
[81] Ibid p.184
[82] Lakoff employing his philosophy on War on Terror argues that use of the phrase 'war on terror' in the context of 9/11 was metaphorical and its purpose was framing the debate, after 9/11, in a desired direction. Lakoff and Johnson's Philosophy of Metaphors, framing/reframing and use of metaphors and framing/reframing in the context of war shall be discussed in chapter four.

language and intentions of speaker. Subsection 2.2.2, discusses problems of ambiguity and vagueness in a context.

2.2.1 Context- Functions of language and intentions of speaker

Context plays an important role in language as Scott Jacobs opining about pragmatic theories of language informs,

> Language use is contextually adjusted as a multifunctional design. All language use occurs against the backdrop of some concrete context in which it faces multiple, competing demands.[83]

For latter Wittgenstein, language is like a game.[84] Words are tools of this game. They have diverse functions and even single words have multiple uses. This multiplicity of uses is neither fixed nor predetermined; it changes with the context of life.[85] In some context single words, even physical objects can play role of sentences. We make moves with words and sentences. These moves are made under certain rules in a context. Sense or meaning of a sentence becomes clear when we understand: how it has been used in a context?

Oswald Hanfling reveals,

> According to Wittgenstein [latter], the use of a word, and hence its meanings, depends on the situation in which it is used…[86]

Sproule also considers that context plays an important role in determining the function of language. He, like speech act theorists, believes that language serves five closely connected functions: the report function, the persuasive function, the attitude-revealing function, the self-revelation function and the relationship function. Report function of language is aimed at communicating information about the world i.e. informing/reporting other people about the way reality in the world is. For example, 'today is Sunday'. The language used to make things happen serves the persuasive

---

[83] Jacobs, Scott, *(2000)*, p. 272
[84] See Wittgenstein, Ludwig, Philosophical Investigations, Translated by G.E.M Anscombe: Blackwell Publishers, 1953.
[85] Ara , Roshan (2006) p. 8
[86] Hanfling, Oswald, Wittgenstein's Latter Philosophy: Published by the Macmillan Press Ltd, 1989 p. 49

function. 'Don't talk', 'leave the room', are examples of persuasive function. When we communicate, we verbally or nonverbally reveal our attitudes too. Language that exhibits the way one feels about things in the world serves attitude revealing function. Eye contact, the way we shake hands, heartbeat, etc., are good indicators of this function. Sproule further informs that language also has self- revelation function, for language reveals many insights about a communicator such as: self esteem, confidence, personality, feelings at time of communication etc. Finally, the relationship function: language not only helps in developing relationship it also reveals the status of relationship between communicators. Moreover, language may be instrumental in changing a relationship.[87]

As mentioned, all these functions are closely connected and one sentence may serve all purposes, for example: Mr. A informs Mr. B, 'do your best else you will be fired'. It is a report/information. It also reveals intentions of speaker for he (speaker) wants the person, to whom this report is communicated, to do some action. Moreover, it also shows attitude of Mr. A, probably, he is not happy with present situation. Furthermore, it reveals confidence/position of the speaker and relationship between Mr. A and Mr. B. This demonstrates that a single communication act may involve all five functions. In such a situation it is very difficult to infer: what is the most intended meaning of this sentence? Sproule informs:

> …the context of the message gives insight into the relative importance of the several functions. The context of a statement is the set of objects and events that precede, surround, and follow the communication act. … The situation helps us to decide what functions a message fulfills at a particular time. Relevant situational elements might include background information about a communicator, the event that immediately preceded the message or physical conditions in effect at the time- such as time of day, location, weather, etc.[88]

This explains the importance and the role of context in understanding a communication act. A single sentence may serve all five functions, but the most intended meaning can be understood by understanding a sentence in its appropriate

---

[87] Sproule (1980), pp.38-44
[88] ibid pp. 43-44

context.

Scott Jacobs argues that 'what was said', is not the only important thing that should be understood while understanding a message, there are other things as well that contribute in understanding a message, such as:

> … the *way* it was said, *when* it was said, *who* it was said *to*, *by whom*;
> all in contrast to what *could* have been said but *was not*.[89]

For Searle too, meaning and intentions of the speaker can be understood in a context. Speech act theories argue: by speaking a sentence a speaker achieves certain goals in a context. John R. Searle and Daniel Vanderveken opine, whenever a sentence is uttered in a context with some intentions, the speaker performs one or more than one illocutionary acts.[90] Every sentence, they inform, has propositional component and illocutionary component. Illocutionary component is the intention of speaker in a given context. In above mentioned example, "It is raining today", one can understand the meaning of the sentence i.e., the propositional component, but one cannot understand the intended meanings without understanding the context, i.e., the understanding between the friends, who have decided that whenever it will rain they will go and watch a movie.[91]

Following analysis has been made in order to explain Context of a communication act:

1. Back ground information about the communicator and the person to whom the message is communicated such as: the relationship between communicator and the one to whom the message is communicated, their profession, authority, race, gender, age, nationality, culture, knowledge, etc.

Communication between parents and children, police officer and a suspect, doctor and patient, lawyer and his/her client, teacher and student, boss and subordinate etc, would be very different from communication between friends, doctors, lawyers or teachers with same authority, for the relationship is different in these two cases. Information given by a kid (age and authority factor) about economic

---

[89] Scott, Jacobs (2000) p. 263

[90] Searle, John, R and Daniel Vanderveken, Logic Thought and Action, Chapter 5, Speech act and Illocutionary Logic, (1985) Cambridge University Press. Printed by Springer, The Netherlands. p.109-115 (accessed February 11, 2009)

[91] Politicians in the context of war tell lies and misguide public with an intention to evoke their feelings and emotions.

condition of a country will have less acceptances in comparison to the same information given by a professor of economics. In some cultures, information/suggestions/recommendations given by women are not considered valuable.

In the context of 9/11 President Bush informed the public that we are at war, and an evil has attacked America. Public, already taken over by fear, were not aware of who attacked the World Trade Centers a nd why, accepted whatever he said, because of his position (the President of USA) and their (public) ignorance (lack of knowledge).

2. All objects and events preceding, surrounding and followed by a communication act.

Objects are the physical conditions like weather, location et c. Events are happenings, before, during and after a communication act. A birthday party, opening of Olympic Games, a funeral or a marriage ceremony and war etc., are examples of events. Saying someone, 'happy birth day', without his/her birthday is inappropriate and can be ridiculed by other people.

Had there been no 9/11, there would have been no war on terror. After 9/11 people were shown, again and again, the planes hitting the twin towers (location and event). They were told, we have been attacked and war has been declared by an evil enemy. In such a context it was easy for Bush and his administration to make people think and act the way they wanted them to.

It is evident from this discussion that sentences can be context sensitive i.e., in order to understand their meaning and intention of speaker we have to see them in their appropriate context.

A context sensitive sentence may communicate different information in different contexts. A sentence can be neutral in one context but can be highly emotionally charged in another context. An emotively charged sentence can evoke positive or negative emotions in different contexts. A sentence that evokes emotions can also make people do certain actions. Moreover, it can also reveal the relationship between the communicators. Let us examine these and other possibilities which will further demonstrate the importance/role of context in understanding language.

"Please sit on the apple-juice seat." Lakoff and Johnson explain that this sentence cannot be understood without understanding its context, for 'apple juice seat' in conventional way does not refer to anything. It will make sense only if we come to

know the context where it was uttered. For example, during breakfast a seat was offered to a guest with apple juice, there were three more seats but with orange juice. And next morning even if there is no apple juice on any of the seat it will be clear, in that context, which seat is the apple juice seat. Similarly they argue, "We need new alternative sources of energy." may communicate different meaning in different contexts.[92] In some situation 'alternative sources', may mean electricity, in some other situations it may mean solar energy etc. This reveals that context sensitive sentences cannot be understood out of their context for they communicate different information in different contexts.

An emotionally charged sentence in one context may be neutral in another context. "Terrorists have demolished another school in Swat", may just be another news for some people in the world. They may hear it and change the TV channel. But it is highly negatively charged information in some other parts of the world. For example, for liberal people of Swat in particular and people of Pakistan in general, it is a very bad news- it evokes fear and negative emotions. This reveals that context sensitive communication acts can evoke feelings in one context but may rema in neutral in another context.

In the context of war, terror and violence, words no more remain just words; they become weapons as Kimberly Theidon informs:

> When terror weaves its way through a community, words are no longer mere information- words become weapons… horrific violence destroys accepted meanings, shared vocabularies…[93]

This informs that words change their meanings in the context of war and other events involving violence. In such contexts, informative statements instead of just communicating information, deliver strong emotions too. "Iraq has weapons of mass destruction and can hand them over to terrorists", is more than an information. Kimberly further exhibits that even a researcher cannot remain neutral observer in the context of war; he/she becomes a participant of war.[94] If a researcher cannot remain neutral, one can imagine, what else can be neutral in the context of war.

---

[92] Lakoff and Johnson (1980), p. 12
[93] Theidon, Kimberly, *"Terror's Talk: Fieldwork and war"*: Dialectical Anthropology 26, Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Netherlands. 2001, p. 20
[94] ibid

9947

An emotionally charged sentence may produce different emotional responses in different contexts. When the world came to know about incidents of 9/11, there were different emotional responses in different contexts. For those people, who cared for innocent lives, it was a bad news; however, for the people who were behind those attacks, it was a success.

2.2.2 Ambiguity and Vagueness

Reason in its search for truth may fall into verbal pitfalls like ambiguity, and vagueness. Most of the words in language have more than one meaning but their meaning can be understood in the appropriate context. However, the context sometimes does not rule out all the meanings of a word but one. Whenever there is a doubt about the meanings of word in a context, ambiguity is present.[95] For Sproule, words that designate more than one referent in a context are ambiguous, and are quite common in language.[96]

The sentence 'I am going to bank' is ambiguous, it will give different meanings if uttered by different people, for 'I' is ambiguous. Moreover, it is not clear which bank I am going to: Money bank, Blood bank or River bank- bank is also ambiguous.

John Hospers argues that many words in dictionary have more than one meaning, but we cannot say that all of them are ambiguous,

> [A word] is ambiguous when one cannot tell from the context what sense is being used.[97]

He discussed three kinds of ambiguity: process-product ambiguity, type-token ambiguity and figurative language. Sometimes we use same word for process and for product, for example, someone says, 'I am writing a letter', and after some time he informs, 'I am going to post the letter'. The word 'letter' in these sentences has been used in two different senses - for process and for product. In first sentence 'I am writing a letter', the person is in process of writing a letter. In second sentence, 'I am going to post the letter', word letter is used in the sense of product. Moreover, 'A

---

[95] Runkle, Gerald, (1985). p.450
[96] Sproule (1980) p. 38
[97] Hospers, john, Philosophical Analysis: Second Edition, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1973, p. 14

country is making weapons of mass destruction' is ambiguous and misleading. It is not clear, in process of making such weapons what stage this country is in. Hospers explaining type-token ambiguity argues that a boy who was punished to write, 'I am a bad boy', hundred times has written one hundred sentences as far as token of the sentence is concerned, but he has written only one sentence as far as type of the sentence is concerned. Hospers further argues that there are words like fox, neck of the bottle etc., which can be used both literally and figuratively. For example in, 'she is a clever fox', the word fox has been used figuratively.[98]

Words may be context sensitive in a different manner too. 'Javed is fast', can only be understood in a context where 'Javed', would be compared with other people, for 'fast' is a vague word and vague words lack precision.

> When ordinary language does not provide or imply a line between a word's application and nonapplication, that word is vague.[99]

Vague words, if not clearly defined in a context may create serious problems. Politicians, in order not to commit themselves often use vague language. For example, a politician says, 'By the end of this year we will be able to provide electricity to most of the towns'. Here, the politician does not want himself/herself to commit, 'how many towns', he/she will provide electricity to. Pakistani politicians often complain about the phrase 'do more', used by American administration. Since 'do more' is vague. Ambiguity and vagueness can be avoided or reduced by defining ambiguous and vague terms. Following section deals with definition.

Conclusion: This discussion clearly explains: Meaning may not be in words alone for the context matters much. Many of the sentences make sense only if we understand them in their appropriate context. If we try to understand such sentences out of the context, we may not be able to understand their exact and intended meanings and the emotive responses attached to and produced by them. The words and sentences used in the context of war communicate more then what they appear to communicate. They communicate and evoke frames and emotions such as: terror, fear, sympathy, hatred, cruelty, conflict, malice, brutality etc.

Moreover, ambiguity and vagueness are two serious problems of language that can be

---

[98] Hospers, john, (1973), p. 15-16

[99] Runkle, Gerald, Theory and Practice- An Introduction to Philosophy: CBS College Publishing New York. 1985. P.452

instrumental in shaping judgment, perception and behavior of audience. (See chapter four that exhibits the way language of war is often ambiguous and vague, therefore, misleading.)

2.3 DEFINITION- PERSUASIVE DEFINITIONS

> *Definitions bring into existence a special sort of social knowledge: a shared understanding among people about themselves, the objects of their world, and how they ought to use language... Calls to adopt new definitions are calls to change our attitudes and behavior.* (Edward Schiappa)

Aims: This section briefly introduces definition its kinds and types, in order to explain the way ambiguity and vagueness can be avoided by providing definition. It aims at understanding emotive words and persuasive definitions.

2.3.1 Definition

Although study of definition is of great importance in philosophy of language but it has not been given deserved scholarly attention in the literature of philosophy.[100]

Ambiguity and vagueness can be avoided or reduced, up to some extent, by defining the words and phrases. Defining a word means to explain how the word will be used in a given context. For Hospers, defining a word means making the rules that determine the conditions in which a word is to be used, clear.[101] For example, a teacher defines 'triangle' to students. Once students learn the definition of a 'triangle' it is expected that they will be able to recognize one when they see one. But defining of terms is not that simple all the time.

Issue of definition is of such a great importance that Schiappa writes,

> Definitions bring into existence a special sort of social knowledge: a shared understanding among people about themselves, the objects of

---

[100] Walton, Douglas, *Deceptive Arguments Containing Persuasive language and Persuasive Definitions*: Argumentation (2005) p.160 (accessed April 18, 2009)
[101] Hospers (1973), p.22

their world, and how they ought to use language…Calls to adopt new definitions are calls to change our attitudes and behavior.[102]

A change in the definition of 'crime' or 'criminal' will change the attitude and behavior of people in a society. Many criminals may no more see themselves as criminals (if the definition has been narrowed down). But many non criminals will start seeing themselves as criminals (if the definition has been broadened). Not only definitions can change the attitude and behavior of the people, behavior and attitude of the people can also change the definition. For instance, Taliban are defined by Pakistanis, especially in tribal area, very differently now, for the attitude of the people towards them have been changed. Before Swat operation many people had sympathies with them and they defined them as heroes. But after a lot of suicide attacks by Taliban on innocent people their definition has been changed.

Words or phrases are defined either by using other words or by pointing/referring to the object the word stands for. However, there are other senses and purposes of definition that will be discussed in the following sub sections.

Three different kinds of definitions have been discussed by philosophers: definition by equivalent words, definition by denotation and ostensive definitions.

2.3.1a. Definition by equivalent words

The most common sense of definition is defining a word or phrase by using equivalent words. For example: 'kilo meter' is defined as 'one thousand meters', one can replace kilo meter with one thousand meters. 'He has traveled one kilometer' can be replaced by 'He has traveled one thousand meters'. Both the sentences have same meanings. While defining a word by using equivalent words one must take care of some pit-falls. A satisfactory definition must include the essential attributes of the thing to be defined, it must not be too broad or too narrow, must not comprise of vague, ambiguous words, it must not be circular and it should be affirmative instead of being negative (see Copi and Cohen, Hospers, Barker). A problem with definition by equivalent words is that when we define a word using other words, these other words if not known to hearer/listener would need other words to define them and if those other words are not known then we need other words to define and so on and

[102] Schiappa, Edward, *Constructing Reality Through Definitions: The Politics of Meanings:* A lecture presented for the center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing and composition, Literacy, and Rhetorical Studies Minor, The Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing, Speakers Series No. 11, 1998

forth. Another problem, especially in case of words used for classes, is of essential attributes. For example: how to define a 'chair'. What are essential attribute that must be present in a thing in order to place it in class of chair. Moreover, defining words like, 'liberty', beauty', 'freedom' etc., is also a problem.

According to Sproule terms can be positive and dialectical. A positive term is a word whose referent can be pointed to e.g., tree, book. It is easy to define such words. On the other hand a dialectical term's referent is vague or unclear like, justice, happiness, independence, terror etc. One cannot refer to independence, justice, terror or happiness. Their meaning can be carefully constructed in a context.[103] For example: a student informs his friend, 'our teacher is not a good person'. In fact this sentence communicates no information unless 'good person' in this context is not properly defined. Meaning of 'good person' will be clear only if the other student asks: what do you mean by a 'good person'? Why he (teacher) is not a good person? etc. Suppose the first student answers, 'because he does nepotism'. Now there is some clarity. The first student believes that their teacher is not a 'good person', for he does nepotism. And all those people who do nepotism are not good people. The meaning of 'good person' has been constructed in this dialogue. A person who believes nepotism is good, will disagree with this definition. While constructing meaning of such terms one can use emotive words and phrases and can mislead the audience. (See persuasive definitions below)

2.3.1b. Definition by Denotation

It is not always possible to define a word or phrase by providing equivalent words. For example it is not easy to define terrorist but it is easy to say that Javed is a terrorist or Michael is a terrorist. Similarly we can define a human being as Einstein was a human being, Newton was a human being, Musharaf is a human being and many human beings have yet to come. Every being to which the word human being apply is denotation of the 'human being'. Present denotation of a word includes all presently existing things detonated by a word. Whereas, entire denotation of a word comprises of all things to which the word can be applied. [104] Socrates is included in the entire denotation of human beings, but the present denotation of human beings does not include Socrates or human beings who are yet to come. Definition by denotation is helpful where providing definition be equivalent words, is difficult.

---

[103] Sproule (1980) p. 33-34
[104] Hospers(1973) p. 40

There are many problems with definition by denotation too such as, some words have meaning but they don't have denotation, as Russell reveals, 'the king of France is bald' has meaning but has no denotation.[105] Moreover there are words that denote but do not designate, for example proper names.[106]

Socrates, apart from being human being, has some other attributes that have been associated with him in the minds of students of philosophy- symbol of wisdom, the wisest man etc. Similarly, the word dove apart from denotation has some other meaning associated with it- symbol of peace. Symbol of wisdom and symbol of peace are the connotations of Socrates and dove respectively. Connotation consists of the associations words have in a particular culture. This reveals that in addition to primary meaning words may have secondary meaning. These secondary meaning can be different in different culture. For example, connotation of owl in some cultures is wisdom and completely opposite to wisdom in some other cultures. The most discussed type of connotation is the emotive meaning of a word or phrase. Some words evoke favorable or unfavorable emotional responses/feelings in the listeners, i.e., apart from cognitive meanings they have emotive meanings too. For example, the word 'politician' in some cultures evokes positive feelings but very negative feelings in some other cultures. Similarly, 'suicide bomber', 'terrorist', etc., evoke fear in some people but pride and revenge in some other.

2.3.1c Ostensive definition

If one is asked to define 'red', one may find oneself in a great difficulty. However, the difficulty will go away if he/she finds a red object around him/her. He/she may point to the object and can inform that 'this object is red', by pointing to the object- connecting word with the object it stands for. 'Language, Truth and Logic, is a book' is a denotative definition but 'This (pointing to a book) is a book' is an ostensive definition.

As there are problems with definition by equivalent words and definition by denotation, there are problems with ostensive definition too. For example, you point to a chair and inform someone that, 'this is a chair'. The listener may infer many things such as: the color of the object is chair, the shape of the object is chair, the stuff the referred object is made of is chair etc.

Five most discussed types of definitions are: Stipulative definitions, Lexical

---

[105] Russell, Bertrand, Logic and Knowledge: Unwin Hyman Limited, 1956, p. 46
[106] Hospers (1973), p.42

definitions, Precising definitions, Theoretical definitions and Persuasive definitions. These five different types of definitions serve different purposes. Whenever a new term is coined or new meaning is given to a word already in use, definition is stipulative. For Schiappa, lexical definitions, found in dictionaries, reveal how words are used by people.[107] The purpose of Lexical definitions is to eliminate ambiguity. Stipulative definitions are neither true nor false, it depends on the users of the language to accept them or not, on the other hand lexical definitions can be true or false. Vagueness, a major source of trouble in communication, can be reduced by providing precising definition. Theoretical definition[108] is a technical/scientific definition of a word.

Persuasive definitions, mostly present in poetry, politics and advertising, are provided when the intention of the speaker is to influence the attitudes and feelings of the listener/reader/audience. For example: Pepsi is the choice of new generation, Gold leaf is the taste of adventure.[109] Persuasive definitions are very common in marketing and in political and religious discourse, for they may be instrumental in shaping and reshaping of emotional responses of people.

2.3.2 Emotive Words and Persuasive Definition

Words and phrases, we use in language, have cognitive meaning/descriptive i.e., literal meanings. However, some words apart from cognitive meanings also have emotive meaning or what Walton and Fabrizio Macagno call an 'emotive force'.[110] A well quoted example is: 'Bureaucrat', 'Government official', and 'Government Servant'. All the three have same cognitive meaning but their emotive meaning is different. 'Bureaucrat' is a negatively charged word. 'Government official' is neutral word while 'Government servant' is positively charged. A negatively charged word evokes feelings/attitude of disapproval while a positively charged word evokes feelings/attitude of approval. Emotive words are very common in poetry, politics, and advertising. President Zardari by repeatedly using the word 'Pukhtunkhwa' won the approval of pukhtuns. Most of the politicians who visit tribal areas in Pakistan use the

---

[107] Schiappa, Edward (1998) p. 6

[108] For example; theoretical definition of a 'water molecule' is 'two atoms of hydrogen and one atom of oxygen.

[109] For further details see Walton, Copi and Cohen, Hospers, Schiappa, Stevenson, Hurley

[110] Walton Douglas and Fabrizio Macagno, *Reasoning from Classifications and Definitions*: Argumentation (2009) 81-107, p. 83 (accessed November 1, 2010). (Also see Stevenson, Schiappa, Aberdein, Walton, Copi and Cohen, Hospers)

phrase 'Ghyur, (honora ble) P ukhtuns', for once you call (most of the) pukhtuns 'ghyur', it becomes very easy to convince them on any point. Emotive words are also very common in times of war. Politicians and army spokesman can hide brutal acts or defeat under the cover of emotive words, for example: when army mistakenly attacks their own army or friends, a grave mistake, they call it 'friendly fire'. Moreover, the most dangerous weapons in Pakistan and India are, 'Ghori Missile', 'Prithavi missile'. These words are emotive in the context of Pakistan and India respectively. Army operations are named, 'Operation Desert storm', 'Operation enduring Freedom', 'Operation Rah Rast (right path)' etc. We hear, 'mother bomb', 'daisy cutter'. Names of the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were 'fat man' and 'little boy'. Iraq has 'Weapons of Mass Destruction', 'Biological and Chemical Weapons', Pakistan has 'Islamic Bomb'.

Attacks on World Trade Center soon became, 'War on America', but whatever Israel has been doing in Gaza for the last few decades, is 'Middle East crises' or 'conflict in the middle east'. The word, 'War', evokes disapproval, fear, hatred, and revenge. 'Conflict' and 'crises' are not that negatively charged terms. Secondly, 'War on America' precisely informs- where the problem is? On the other hand 'crises in the middle east' does not reveal – where the problem is? 'Conflict' and 'crises' are emotive words and have been providing a safe cover, hiding the brutalities of Israel.

The term 'Persuasive definition' was introduced and discussed by Stevenson.[111] His main motive was to understand and explain moral judgments. According to Stevenson a persuasive definitions,

> ... gives a new conceptual meaning to a familiar word without substantially changing its emotive meanings, and which is used with the conscious or unconscious purpose of changing, by this means, the direction of people' interests.[112]

Although, he accepts that opposite change i.e., keeping the conceptual meanings constant and altering the emotive meanings, is also possible and persuasive. However, he does not call the second move a persuasive definition for he believes

---

[111] Aberdein, Andrew, *Persuasive Definition*: available on http://my.fit.edu/~aberdein/Aberde_p.htm, 1998, (accessed July 18, 2009) (also see Schiappa, Walton)

[112] Stevenson, C, L, *Persuasive Definitions*: Mind, New Series, Vol. 47, No. 187(Jul., 1938), Published by: oxford University Press on Behalf of the Mind Association, Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2250337 p. 331 (accessed July 18, 2009)

(like other logical positivists) the word 'definition' is restricted only for the issues where the predominant purpose is to determine the conceptual meanings; a view that has been criticized by modern philosopher (see types of definition above). However, it is clear from the above discussion that persuasive definitions can change people's interest i.e., the way they see reality of different things and events in world and the way they feel these things and events are affecting them. If sunlight is defined as 'having ultraviolet rays which are responsible for many skin diseases', then one will have a negative attitude towards 'sunlight'. And he/she will see sun light as an enemy. But if it is defined as 'the main cause of life on earth' it will evoke different type of feelings and reaction towards sunlight. Schiappa argues that whether a definition will be accepted by people or not is a matter of persuasion.[113]

Stevenson informs that besides emotive words there are other factors too that change people's interest such as: speaker's vigor, tone of voice, gestures, figure of speech and tempo of his accompanying sentence. Furthermore, hearer's /reader's temperament, respect for the speaker, openness to suggestions, hidden prejudices and ideals, and their willingness to change the direction of their interest, are also key factors.[114] He argues interests can be changed by giving any definition. Even a scientific definition can change the direction of interest, but what differentiates persuasive definition from the rest of the definitions is that in persuasive definition strong emotive words are used,

> …with the predominant *intention* of changing people's interests.[115]

David Zarefsky in, *Strategic Maneuvering through persuasive definitions: Implications for Dialectic and Rhetoric*, argues that strategic maneuvering through persuasive definitions involves 'loaded language' and 'pandering'. Loaded language gives boast to one's own position and pandering is making claims and providing evidences which a particular audience wants to hear and see. Persuasive definition, he suggests, are possible because of certain characteristics of language usage such as:
1. Some terms can only be understood by going through a dialectical process in relation to their opposites. For example 'liberal' 'moderate' 'enlightened'. While constructing the meanings of such words one can use emotive words and forward

[113] Schiappa (1998)
[114] Stevenson (1938) p. 337
[115] ibid p.336

persuasive definitions. (Dialectical and positive terms have been discussed above)

2. Some words can evoke picture and images like torture, Jail etc., such word can be instrumental in shaping the perception of people.

3. Most often in order to overcome the ambiguous nature of the issue, analogies are used. For example, to make people understand what the nature of Taliban is, they (Taliban) were compared with Nazis and fascists.[116]

Zarefsky argues:

> ... a persuasive definition is a non-neutral characterization that conveys a positive or negative attitude about something in the course of naming it. The name is, in effect, an implicit argument that one should view the thing in a particular way. But the argument is never actually advanced. Rather, the definition is put forward as if it was uncontroversial and could be easily stipulated. The argument in behalf of the proposed definition is simply 'smuggled in' through the use of a definition itself.[117]

Defining sunlight as 'main cause of life', saying that our manager is not a 'good person' are persuasive. Such definitions involve implicit arguments which can come to surface only if the audience/listener understands the persuasive moves in them. Zarefsky, citing some examples, reveals that such naming is common in the political history of America: Regan named MX Missile as 'peace keepers', G. W. Bush named withdrawal from Iraq as 'cut and run' and torture as 'alternative interrogation techniques', he believes, naming 9/11 terrorists incidents as acts of war, probably is the most major case of persuasive definitions.[118]

Conclusion: This discussion explains that emotive words and phrases can change/shape peoples' attitude and feelings toward something i.e., they influence the behavior and thinking of a person. They are the most commonly used words in the persuasive definitions. Main intention behind persuasive definition is to change people's interest.

Use of persuasive definitions is very common in political discourse, specially, in times of war. Politicians use persuasive definition to manipulate opinion and

---

[116] Zarefsky, David(2006)
[117] Zarefsky, David (2006) p.403
[118] See Zarefsky (2006)

judgments of people. This way they shape perceptions and behavior of people (see chapter four for detailed discussion).

2.4 METAPHORS, FRAMING AND REFRAMING

> *Since much of our social reality is understood in metaphorical terms, and since our conception of the physical world is partly metaphorical, metaphors play a very significant role in determining what is real for us.* (Lakoff and Johnson)

Aims: This section is aimed at explaining Lakoff and Johnson's philosophy of metaphors, as discussed in, Metaphors We live By, Philosophy in the Flesh, Moral Politics, Don't Think of an Elephant and elsewhere. It will also focus on framing and reframing as explained by Lakoff and other scholars.

2.4.1 Conventional Metaphors[119]

Lakoff, Johnson and other cognitive scientists[120] argue that the main assumptions about reason, mind, thought, truth and language etc., philosophers take as true, are actually false. They claim that the most important findings of cognitive science are:

> The mind is inherently embodied. Thought are mostly unconscious. Abstract concepts are largely metaphorical.[121]

They argue: reason in philosophy has always been taken as the essence of human beings and it was thought of as something independent of body, actually,

> …arises from the nature of our brains, bodies, and bodily experiences.[122]

Lakoff and Johnson believe that our ordinary conceptual system that we live

---

[119] Metaphor means metaphorical concepts. [Lakoff and Johnson (1980) p.6]
[120] "Cognitive science is a scientific discipline that studies conceptual systems." Lakoff and Johnson (1999) p. 10
[121] Lakoff George and Mark Johnson, Philosophy in the Flesh- The Embodied Mind and its Challenges to Western Thought: published by Basic Books, A Member of the Perseus Books Group, (1999) p. 3
[122] Lakoff and Johnson (1999) p. 4

by is metaphorical in nature. We are not normally aware of this system, it is unconscious. One way to understand it is through language, for,

> Language is an important source of evidence for what that system is like. Primarily on the basis of linguistic evidence, we have found that most of our conceptual system is metaphorical in nature. And we have found a way to begin to identify in detail just what the metaphors are that structure how we perceive, how we think and what we do.[123]

It reveals that human thought process is mostly unconscious and metaphorical, whatever we do in our lives: the way we think, act and respond to different situations, mostly depends on the metaphors we live by. This does not imply that all of our thoughts are metaphorical; we have nonmetaphorical or literal concepts too. Basic level concepts, like chair (the object you sit in) is literal. Subjective experiences and judgments, sitting in a chair, and, chairs are brown, are literal. Similarly, spatial concepts like up-down, and in-out etc., are also literal.[124] Metaphorical understanding of reality means:

> … understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.[125]

For example, we understand arguments in terms of wars, love in terms of a journey, time in term of money, therefore, we hear people saying:
He shot down my argument.
Look how far we have come in love.
I don't have time to give you.
Don't waste your time.[126]

Understanding arguments in terms of war highlights the winning and losing aspect, but it hides the cooperative, understanding, and explanatory aspects of arguments. This reveals that metaphorical understanding of argument as war may lead to certain inferences like; if you are having an argument with another person then you

---

[123] Lakoff and Johnson (1980) p. 3
[124] Lakoff and Johnson (1999) p. 58
[125] Lakoff and Johnson (1980) p. 5
[126] Most of the examples used in this chapter, are from Metaphors We Live By. Many of the metaphors in western and our culture are same. For example argument, time, love etc., are conceptualized as war, money and journey respectively in both the cultures.

have to win it. Every reason that supports your position weakens your opponent's position. Whoever shares your ideas is your friend and whoever is against your ideas is your enemy. Moreover, this also exhibit that metaphorical understanding provides us with incomplete and sometimes inappropriate (especially in case of new metaphors which are made by politicians and advertisers etc.) understanding of something. It highlights some aspects while conceals some other aspects.[127] Metaphors involving understanding of one kind of object in term of another are structural metaphors. The other kinds of metaphors are Orientational and Ontological.

> [Orientational metaphor] organizes a whole system of concepts with respect to another… most of them have to do with spatial orientation: up-down, in-out, front-back, on-off, deep-shallow, central-peripheral.[128]

For example:
He fell ill.
I am on top of the situation.
The number of students in our department is going up etc.
They explain that we have bodies of a special sort that functions in physical and cultural environment: Orientational metaphors arise from this fact, and they are different in different cultures. An important point to note here is that in-out, on-off, up-down etc., are directly emergent concepts. They are not metaphorical concepts. We develop these concepts through direct interaction with our physical and cultural environment. But more is up is a metaphor. Happy is up and sad is down is a metaphor.
Besides structural and Orientational metaphors, there are Ontological metaphors too. Ontological metaphors are,

> …ways of viewing events, activities, emotions, ideas, etc., as entities and substances.[129]

We learn and make these metaphors while living and experiencing in a culture. Understanding our experiences as substances or entities serve several human purposes

[127] Lakoff and Johnson (1980) p. 11-13
[128] Lakoff and Johnson (1980) p. 14
[129] Lakoff and Johnson (1980) p.25

such as: we can categorize our experiences, we can group them, refer to them, can measure and calculate them and can reason about them. Examples of ontological metaphors are:

Inflation has destroyed all the business.

We declare war against terrorism.

I am in trouble.

This task needs a lot of skills.

Ontological metaphors, like other metaphors, highlight some aspect of an event, object experience or an emotion, etc., and conceal some other aspects.

The metaphorical understanding of events and actions is, as objects, for example, we saw bull fighting yesterday. Activities are conceptualized as substances and states as containers.[130] Following sentences will make these points clear.

He is going to see the match- (match an event is understood as an object.)

Bull fighting is highly appreciated in our culture- (bull fighting an activity is understood as a substance.)

Ali is coming out of the coma- (coma a state is understood as a container.)

Lakoff and Johnson opine that sometimes physical objects and experiences are specified as persons, they call this as personification. By doing this we conceptualize nonhuman entities having characteristics, activities and motivation. Examples of personification are:

Life has given me a lot.

Inflation has destroyed all the business.

Terrorism is our enemy.

Sometimes people treat objects like, their car, some special books, and their computers etc., as their companions and friends.

Politicians, using personification, often deceive the citizenry. For example: If they say, 'terrorism is our enemy', implication of this metaphor can be: it is bad for us, it can grow stronger and stronger, it can destroy us and it can make our lives miserable, therefore, we should fight it and eliminate it.

One thing can be understood by two or more than two metaphors:

Look how far we have come in love- (love is journey.)

Ali is in love- (love is a state.)

---

[130] Lakoff and Johnson (1980) p. 30

Love has ruined her life- (love as a person.)

It depends on the culture (even subculture) and personal experiences how one understands something in terms of another. Lakoff and Johnson inform that domain of experiences that are rich and important, like love, more than one metaphorical mapping is required for one conceptual mapping does not work to understand, reason, and talk about such domains.[131]

They further inform that some metaphors are more apt than others. The aptness of a metaphor depends on: if it plays a significant role in structuring the experience and if it has nonmetaphorical entailment. For example:
Knowledge is power- (significantly explains the nature of knowledge in the modern world.)

We are going in two different direction- (direction is non metaphorical but has been used metaphorically, this precisely explains that the relationship of the people, who are of this view, is not working; probably, they have different goals and commitments etc.[132])

One last point before the discussion moves to New Metaphors: we understand one domain of experiences, through metaphors, in terms of another,

> [This] understanding takes place in terms of entire domains of experience not in terms of isolated concepts.[133]

For example:
One should not waste one's time.

Here time is understood in terms of money. The experiences that are true for money will also be true for time such as: one can budget ones time, time can be saved, it can be spent carelessly etc. Moreover this metaphorical understanding will hide all such concepts that are not true for money. By doing activities in the world we structure this entire domain of experiences.

2.4.2 New Metaphors

The metaphors, we have discussed, are conventional metaphors, according to

---

[131] Lakoff and Johnson (1999) p. 71
[132] Lakoff and Johnson (1999) p. 72
[133] Lakoff and Johnson (1980) p. 117

Lakoff and Johnson. These metaphors are present in our conventional conceptual system. New metaphors are outside of this system, they are imaginative and creative. Like conventional metaphors new metaphors make sense of our experiences,

> …they provide coherent structure, highlighting some things and hiding others.[134]

A change in our cultural and physical experiences brings changes in metaphors and vice versa. How many people now say, 'knowledge is virtue'? Now knowledge is understood as power for we hear people saying, 'knowledge is power'. New metaphors like conventional metaphors have power to define the reality. Knowledge is power defines the reality of knowledge. New metaphors are outcome of our interaction and activities in the world and they evolve within our culture, however, most of these new metaphors are,

> … imposed upon us by people in power- political religious leaders, business leaders, advertisers, the media etc.[135]

This reveals that most of the new metaphors are imposed upon us by the people who are at the helm of affairs. They define for us, what is real and what is not. They can declare wars against, poverty, hunger, drugs and terror. These new metaphors create new realities and become guide for future actions. Although the question of truth arises in a situation where people in power, make us understand one thing in terms of another, but in many of the cases they (people who make new metaphors) portray a situation in such a way that ordinary people believe whatever they are told. (Calling incidents of 9/11 a war is a very good example; it will be discussed in next chapters.) Lakoff and Johnson argue,

> In most cases, what is at issue is not the truth or falsity of a metaphor but the perceptions and inferences that follow from it and the actions that are sanctioned by it. In all aspects of life, not just in politics or in love, we define reality in terms of metaphors and then proceed to act on the basis of metaphors. We draw inferences, set goals, make

[134] Lakoff and Johnson (1980) p. 139
[135] Lakoff and Johnson (1980) p. 159-160

> commitments, and execute plans, all on the basis of how we in part structure our experience, consciously and unconsciously, by mean of metaphor.[136]

This demonstrates the importance of metaphors in our lives. We live a life understood, explained and guided by metaphor. We make plan, decisions, and execute them on the basis of metaphors. Finally new metaphors can change the way we see, understand, reason and argue about things. They have power to change our attitudes and feelings which in turn can change our behavior and action. Lakoff opines that although metaphors cannot be touched or seen but can create a great effect, political intimidation is one of the effects.[137] In times of war, they can be very powerful tools to wage, fight and to win war.

2.4.3 Framing

> *Every word, like elephant, evokes a frame, which can be an image or other kinds of knowledge: Elephants are large, have floppy ears and trunk, are associated with circuses, and so on. The word is defined relative to that frame. When we negate a frame, we evoke the frame. (George Lakoff)*

Aims: This section is aimed at understanding framing and reframing as explained by Lakoff, Fillmore and other philosophers.

Lakoff defines a frame as a conceptual/mental structure that shapes our world view. He writes,

> Frames are mental structures that shape the way we see the world. As a result, they shape the goals we seek, the plans we make, the way we act, and what counts as a good or bad outcome of our actions.[138]

For Fillmore,

> By the term 'frame' I have in mind any system of concepts related in such

---

[136] Lakoff and Johnson (1980) p. 158
[137] Lakoff and Evan Frisch, *Five Years After 9/11: Drop War Metaphor*: 2006
[138] Lakoff, George, Don't think of an Elephant! 2004, p. xv

a way that to understand any one of them you have to understand the whole structure in which it fits; when one of the things in such a structure is introduced into a text, or into a conversation, all of the others are automatically made available.[139]

We can better understand this with following examples: We have a frame (conceptual structure) of 'restaurant'. It is not a simple word; it does not represent a simple experience either. It represents a conceptual structure. The conceptual structure includes a whole set of objects, procedures, activities, experiences, duties, commitments, expectations etc. It is a frame. We go to a restaurant sit, eat, relax and leave it after we pay the bill. There are people who cook food in the restaurant. There are people who serve it and then there are people who charge bills. Moreover, we have objects such as: food, menu, tables, chair, music etc. All these experiences, objects and activities make a coherent structure- a restaurant. Menu, waiter, etc. are defined in and by this conceptual structure. When we hear, see or talk about a restaurant, menu, waiter, home delivery by quick waiters, the whole frame is evoked. If we have a frame of restaurant and we are told that Mr. X is a 'waiter', we can understand: what Mr. X's job is and the place where he works.

Another example may be: A person having a frame of university in his mind is aware of different people do different jobs in a university and different objects are used for different purposes etc. His whole understanding of a university constitutes a frame. He will define, explain, understand, think, expect and act (in a university) according to the frame.

Meaning of words and sentences, Lakoff and Johnson inform, also depend on frames,

> ... the conceptual frames that inhabit our cognitive unconscious *contribute semantically* to the meanings of words and sentences. Thus, a word like *waiter* is defined relative to the restaurant frame.[140]

This explains that meaning of words and sentences are defined and understood

---

[139] Fillmore Charles J. *Frame Semantics*: Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Reading: edited by Dirk Geeraerts, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York (2006). p. 273, (originally published in 1982 in *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, Linguistic Society of Korea (ed.), 111-137. Seoul: Hanshin publishing. Reprinted with permission) (accessed June 22, 2009)

[140] Lakoff and Johnson (1999) p. 116

relative to their respective frames. Moreover, truth or falsity of a sentence may also be determined on the basis of a frame.

For example, a person having a frame of university in his mind is reported:
A Student, during examination, made a UFM[141] case on his teacher.
A student was cheating in exam and teachers made a UFM case on the student.
He/she will be reluctant to accept the first sentence, since it is against the frame. There is no problem in the second sentence. Unlike the first sentence, the second one can be true or false. The first statement can also be true in a context were a student has become a professor, and he is now teaching in university. One of his school teachers got admission in his university and became his student- his teacher has become his student now.

By using frames one can make his/her audience, think, act and argue the way he/she wants them to think, act and argue in a situation. Fillmore opines,

> From a frame semantics point of view, it is frequently possible to show that the same 'facts' can be presented within different framings, framings which make them out as different 'facts'.[142]

This is an important point and it is explained in detail by using the following example.

You have invited a guest to a party, who is a scientist by profession, female (young and beautiful) by gender, has been divorced by her husband since she did not take care of her children and is an author of five books etc. There are many ways to introduce your guest to your friends, who have already arrived at the place where this guest is supposed to come and who will meet your guest for the first time, such as:
Gentleman! We are going to have a scientist in our party.
Guys! A young and beautiful female will soon be our guest.
Folks! We are going to have a guest who has been divorced since she did not take care of her children.
Scholars! Our guest, who is about to come, is an author of five books.

These different ways of introducing your friend will evoke different frames in

---

[141] UFM stands for 'unfair means', like cheating from a book or paper, or using mobile phone etc., during examination.
[142] Fillmore Charles J. *Frame Semantics*: Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Reading: edited by Dirk Geeraerts, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York (2006) p. 387

your audience.

The 'scientist frame', will evoke a whole range of knowledge in the minds of the listeners. They will expect as if a very genius, hard working, dedicated and committed person is coming to the party. Some of them probably will start thinking that they will talk about science and the role of science in the modern world. Some may prepare themselves for a debate between science and religion and so on.

A young and beautiful female frame will evoke a completely different knowledge, thinking and expectations in the minds of the listeners. It can make some very anxious and excited and some uncomfortable.

A divorced woman who did not take care of her children may evoke a feeling of disapproval and a negative attitude in people. And many of guests may disapprove inviting of such a guest.

Author of five books will once again evoke image of a genius and hardworking person. People who are in business of, reading and writing books, may feel good, but those who believe, reading and writing books is wastage of time may not feel comfortable.

All descriptions about the guest are true, but they evoke different frames. These different frames are conceptual structures comprising of a whole set of knowledge, understanding and feeling etc.

Suppose people are told: We are going to have a guest who is living without her children. This will evoke a completely different frame- Probably, the sympathy/pity frame that will mislead the audience, since, one very important part of the fact has been suppressed.

And if the guests are informed: A beautiful young scientist, who has written many books and for the sake of her scientific enquires has even left her family, will be our guest tonight. The situation is quite different from the previous situations- Multiple Framing. More than one frame has been evoked in order to manipulate the situation.

It is evident from the above discussion that same facts can be presented by using different frames. This can manipulate/maneuver the understanding, attitudes and behavior of people. Lakoff informs, framing is neutral by itself, but it can be used honestly by telling the truth or can be used to deceive people. Moreover, facts remain useless and serve no purpose, unless you tell people the significance of the facts by framing the facts.

Lakoff argues that even truth must fit in frames people have in their minds, otherwise it may not be accepted,

> If the facts do not fit a frame, the frame stays and the facts bounce off.[143]

It reveals that, if a fact does not fit into a frame it will not be accepted true. For example, no matter how much you tell a suicide bomber that what he/she is going to do is ethically, religiously, constitutionally wrong. He/she will not listen to you. For him all these are false claims, since, none of them fit into the frames which he has in his mind.

Frames play an important role in politics, for Lakoff informs,

> In politics the frames shape our social policies and the institutions we form to carry out policies. To change our frame is to change all of this. Reframing is social change.[144]

Politicians and people in power, using metaphors, can frame an event/situation in such a way that citizenry don't even think about other dimensions of the problem. They select and prioritize some facts, images and developments about an event or issue over others, this way they promote one particular interpretation of an event and ordinary people cannot notice this.[145] For example: Every time we have a military coup in Pakistan, Pakistan Television (PTV), radio and all media controlled by government (military), starts on airing patriotic songs, showing the performance and sacrifices made by army for Pakistan etc. Moreover, they portray the situation in a way that it appears: Pakistan was in danger (evoking patriotism), army came to rescue it, and now everything is fine. Moreover, they inform people that we have been saved from a great catastrophe. Once frame of patriotism is evoked, it becomes easier to reject and condemn criticism in the name of unpatriotic. This leads us to another very important point: Some frames, accepted or rejected, evoke their opposites. Examples are: Good and Evil, Patriotic and Unpatriotic, Good and Bad, Believer and

---

[143] Lakoff , Don't Think of an Elephant: (2004) p. 17
[144] Ibid. p. xv
[145] Norris Pippa, Montague Kern, and Marion Just; *Framing Terrorism:* Published in, Framing Terrorism- The News Media, the Government and the Public: Edited by Pippa, Montague Kern, and Marion Just. Published by Routledge New York, 2003. p. 11 (accessed April 6, 2009)

Atheist/infidel, Muslim and Non-Muslim, Hero and Villain, Innocent and Guilty, etc.[146]

Lakoff in, *Simple Framing*, discusses four morals of framing. In Moral 1, he, defining frame as a structure used in thinking informs that words evoke frames with certain images and knowledge. For example, word 'restaurant' evokes a frame with certain knowledge and images. Moral 2 is, words that are defined in a frame also evoke the frame. Waiter, menu etc., evoke a restaurant frame i.e., whenever such words are used frame of restaurant will be evoked automatically. Moral 3 is, when a frame is negated it will be evoked. 'Don't think of an elephant', evokes elephant frame. And finally evoking a frame reinforces it. The more a frame is evoked the more it will be reinforced.[147]

We can better understand the notion of simple framing by considering the following discussion. In the context of War on Terror, Taliban and Americans (Bush administration) both framed each other Evil (evil evoke destruction, irrationality, torture etc., in the minds of listeners). The possible entailments were obvious: if our enemy is evil then we are necessarily good. Our friends who support us in war are also good. The friends of evil are evil. Since good people can join hands and share the resources to defeat evil, evil too can share weapons of mass destruction to destroy, good. (See next chapters for detail).

Let us have a cursory look at how a frame is reinforced in war discussion:

When the war on terror was about to start Americans were asking other nations to help them fight this war. They framed the discussion by presenting a very fallacious argument: either you are with us or with enemies. Following are some remarks from the President of United States of America:

> Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.[148]

---

[146] General Pervez Musharraf, in 1999, after toppling the elected government framed the discussion in a manner that most of the citizenry thought the coup was justified. He reported to the nation that our country was in danger and honor of our country was at stake. He, being the Chief of the Army and a very patriotic Pakistani who has fought several battles and have saved and served Pakistan, has saved it once again. When Musharraf said; Pakistan comes first; whatever he was doing was for Pakistan, the possible entailments were: whoever is with me is a patriot and for him 'Pakistan comes first', whoever is against me is unpatriotic and a traitor.

[147] Lakoff, George, *Simple Framing*: available online on http://www.rockridgeinstitute.org/index.html (accessed December 10, 2007)

[148] Bush, President on a radio Address to the Nation September 20, 2001

Either you're for us, or you're against us.[149]

And we have made it clear to the world that we will stand strong on the side of good, and we expect other nations to join us.[150]

Stand with the civilized world, or stand with the terrorists.[151]

Moreover, he warned the nation that if they do not stand with US they will pay a very heavy price (nation as a person metaphor). This way he appealed to force and bad consequences.

Every nation has a choice to make. In this conflict, there is no neutral ground.[152]

He repeatedly threatened that if a country chooses not to stand with USA then there will be consequences. He repeated this argument over and over again to reinforce it.

One can notice how the frame was planted and was repeated again and again to reinforce it. It was not only the President, almost all his administration was busy in framing the issue in Good versus Evil i.e., Us versus Them. Pervez Musharraf then President of Pakistan writes in his book that he and the DG ISI were warned to either join America or face the consequences.[153] The effect of this framing has been that many countries including Pakistan joined them to fight war on terror. Besides other frames one of the framing of the war on terror was: It is a war between good and evil- it's a different war and will take a very long time. It took a very long time and still is not over.[154]

---

[149] Bush, President Unveils Back to Work Plan: October 4, 2001
[150] Bush, President Directs Humanitarian Aid to Afghanistan: October 4, 2001
[151] Bush, Radio address of the President to the Nation: October 6, 2001
[152] Bush, Radio Address of the President to the Nation: 10/7/2001
[153] Musharraf, Pervez, In the Line of Fire: Simon & Schuster UK Ltd, 2006, p. 201
[154] Problem with Pakistani politicians and media is that they are still unable to use one right frame for the people who are fighting against government in different parts of Pakistan, especially, in FATA and Swat area. Probably, they are not clear about the issue; therefore, the public who is looking towards them for a right understanding is also confused. The frames they have been using for the last few years are: Terrorists, Militants, Extremists, Jahadies, Askariat-pasand, Miscreants etc. All these frames convey and evoke very different and sometimes conflicting frames. For example, if they are Jahadies (this frame can evoke a very positive knowledge and attitude in the minds of most of the Pakistanis) then, how come they can be terrorist. Miscreants, and extremists, does not evoke an intense feeling of disapproval, therefore, citizenry is confused: why to use heavy artillery against them? Probably this problem is in search of a right frame so that both government and public understand the nature of the

Lakoff, giving an example, explains the way framing and metaphors work in shaping perception of people: After the arrival of Bush in the White House he started using, 'tax relief'. It was used again and again. 'Relief' is a frame that entails,

> ... an affliction, an afflicted party, and a reliever who removes the affliction and there is a hero.[155]

If someone tries to stop this hero who wants to relive the afflicted party, then that someone is a villain. Moreover, he argues when relief is connected with tax the result is a metaphor: tax relief. It shows that tax is understood in terms of affliction implying that tax is a problem, an affliction. Bush who is talking and presenting tax relief plan, is the hero. Anyone who talks against this plan is a villain. That is how framing works; using language that evokes your world view i.e., the way you want people to see certain facts. This exhibit: Framing is using language that evokes the frames you want to evoke and make people think the way you want them to.[156]

Lakoff discusses two types of framing very common in political debate and usually used to deceive and betray public to gain and maintain political situation favorable for politicians. They are 'spin' and 'propaganda'. Spin is manipulative use of framing to cover something bad or embarrassing i.e. use of a frame to hide something bad or embarrassing under the cover of a good or innocent frame. Propaganda is also manipulative use of framing,

> Propaganda is an attempt to get the public to adopt a frame that is not true and that is not known to be true, for the purpose of gaining or maintaining political order.[157]

For instance, 'friendly fire' hides the embarrassing situation where one mistakenly fire at one's own friends. It's an example of spin. 'Friendly' evokes a frame which is very positive i.e., the knowledge and feelings and expectations

---

problem, only then Pakistanis will be able to make one opinion about this problem.

[155] Lakoff, Don't think of an Elephant: (2004) p.3

[156] President Zardari in his addresses says again and again- Pakistan Khappy. His friends also use this phrase. The word khappy evokes a frame. Something which people wants to live and progress. Anyone who is against this idea actually does not want that thing to live and make progress. Pakistan Khappy is a metaphor. The entailment effects are: The President wants Pakistan to live and make progress. Anyone who is against the President's policies is actually not a patriot. He/she does not want Pakistan Khappe (Sindhi, meaning long live).

[157] Lakoff, Don't Think of an Elephant: p. 100

attached with this frame are so positive that they hide the 'fire' frame. Similarly, calling, 'torture' 'alternate interrogating techniques' is spin. Killing people in the name of religion is also spin. Giving relief to rich people in taxes in the name of 'tax relief' is also spin. Before war on Iraq, Bush and his administration repeatedly told dozens of lies such as: Iraq has Chemical and Biological weapons; they have Weapons of Mass Destruction; they are going to have nuclear weapons soon; the issue of uranium tubes; they have contacts with Al- Qaeda etc., etc. It was all to manipulate the public opinion- a good example of propaganda.

2.4.4 Reframing

Lakoff believes that reframing brings change in the world view of people.

> Reframing is changing the way the public sees the world. It is changing what counts as a common sense. Because language activates frames new language is required for new frames. Thinking differently requires speaking differently.[158]

But it is not an easy thing to do. Frames are wired in brain. Reframing necessitates, rewiring of the brain. It needs a lot of effort, time and new language. Lakoff informs that if you want to get rid of false framing then you have to reframe the debate, reframing involves telling the truth over and over,

> ... telling it forcefully, straightforwardly, articulately, with moral conviction and without hesitation.[159]

Moreover, the language used must fit the conceptual reframing. While reframing, one should not use frames of one's opponents.

An example of reframing is reframing the discourse of War on Terror. We noticed in the above section that the American President framed the discussion that either you are with us or with enemies. This way he made countries to support America in War on Terror. But the framing has been completely changed now. Over the years, the discourse, that nations of the world must help America to fight war has

---

[158] Lakoff , Don't think of an Elephant: (2004) p. xv
[159] Lakoff, George, *Simple Framing*: http://www.rockridgeinstitute.org/index.html (accessed December 10, 2007).

been reframed. These days, we hear American administration saying: they are helping nation including Pakistan to fight their (Pakistan's) war on terror. This frame has been repeated/reinforced so many times that it seems normal that we are in war and America is helping us to fight our war. Now if someone says that this is not Pakistan's war- the frame will stay and the truth will bounce off.

Conclusion: This section explains that the conceptual system we live by is metaphorical in nature. It also explains framing and reframing. Metaphors and frames can be instrumental in shaping judgment, perception and behavior of people. They actually shape the world view of a person. Even truth and falsity depend on framing. If truth does not fit in a frame, Lakoff and Johnson argue, the frame stays and the truth bounce off.

CHAPTER 3

INFORMAL FALLACIES: IMPEDIMENTS TO CLEAR THINKING

The only safeguard against reasoning ill is the habit of reasoning well; familiarity with the principles of correct reasoning, and practice in applying those principles. (John Stuart Mill)

Aim: This chapter briefly introduces some key terms of logic. Its main aim is to explain some informal fallacies as impediments to clear thinking and to illustrate the way fallacious arguments shape judgments and block criticism.

3.1 A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO KEY TERMS

Aim: The aim of this section is to introduce key terms such as: Logic, arguments- deductive and inductive, formal and informal logic, fallacies- formal and informal.

3.1.1 Logic differentiates, what persuades people to accept an argument from what should persuade people to accept an argument. There exists a general consensus that in logical sense of the term, an argument involves reasoning which can be correct or incorrect, and job of logic is to develop such methods and techniques which differentiate correct reasoning from incorrect reasoning.[160] This reveals that logic evaluates arguments to find whether reasoning in argument is correct or incorrect, this in turn, demonstrates whether the argument is good or bad.

J. E Tiles in, An Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, opines that Plato and Aristotle,

> … clearly believed that questions of what *will* as a matter of fact change people's minds *should* be subordinated to questions of what should change people's mind… philosophy was, from a very early stage in its history, bound up with idea that there were better and worse arguments or reasons- where 'better' did not just mean 'effective in changing people's minds'.[161]

---

[160] Copi and Cohan (2001), Hurley (2003), Barekr, Stephen F, The Elements of Logic: McGraw-Hill Company., fourth edition 1985

[161] Tiles, J.E *Logic and its Place in Philosophy*, An Encyclopedia of Philosophy :Edited by Parkinson G.H.R, Routledge- Great Britain , 1988

This further elaborates that logic is a major concern of philosophy; it differentiates good arguments from bad arguments i.e. right way of persuading people to change their minds from wrong way of persuading people to change their minds. Moreover, arguments can change people's mind, i.e. the way they understand reality this way arguments shape judgments. Sproule, in Argument Language and its Influence, opines,

> One possible effect of an argument is to change the direction of our judgment about something.... In most cases the messages were designed with the hope that the symbols would prompt a change in people's thinking and action.[162]

Arguments change the direction of our judgments. Besides changing the direction of one's judgment, he informs, arguments can have belief effects, attitude effects, and value effects.[163] Consequently, if an argument effects and changes ones belief, attitude and values his/her behaviour/action may change too.

3.1.2 An argument is a set of statements.[164] In every argument there must be at least two statements; a conclusion and one or more than one premises. A premise is an assumption on the basis of which we accept or reject a conclusion.[165] Polycarp Ikuenobe informs,

> Argumentation involves the method of persuading or establishing for ourselves and others that a proposition, as the conclusion of an argument, has adequate evidential basis for its acceptance.[166]

He argues by citing Fogelin and Sinott- Armstrong that arguments perform a number of functions which are to justify, refute, explain, simplify, systematize, excuse, persuade, and inform. He further argues, one of the most important elements in all these functions is,

---

[162] Sproule , J. Michael, Argument- Language and its Influence: McGraw- Hill Book Company, 1980, p 231

[163] ibid

[164] Statements are sentences which have truth values. Truth values of statements can be true or false. The truth value of a true statement is true and the truth value of a false statement is false

[165] For more details see, Hitchcock, David, *Informal Logic and the Concept of Argument*: Philosophy of Logic: edited by Dale Jacquette, North Holland Elsevier 2007, p. 111-103

[166] Ikuenobe, Polycarp (2002)

epistemic: to prove a point or make it understandable in order to persuade.[167]

As discussed, an argument involves premises and conclusion; sometimes an arguer may not state all premises with an idea that, listeners already have knowledge about the issue and will supply the missing links. Aristotle calls this idea Enthymeme. He argues in Rhetoric,

> The enthymeme must consist of few propositions…for if any of these propositions is a familiar fact, there is no need even to mention it; the hearer adds it himself.[168]

Enthymeme commits fallacy when the implicit element is not known or is not accepted by the audience/readers.[169] Moreover, sometimes an arguer does not state all premises deliberately, just to create ambiguity and to mislead the audience. Politicians can use these enthymemes in times of war to persuade people to accept fallacious arguments this way they can shape judgements of people.

3.1.3 There are two types of argument: deductive and inductive. Every argument claims that its premises support its conclusion. An argument claiming that its premises provide necessary grounds for its conclusion is deductive, while an argument in which premises do not provide conclusive grounds, they just provide probable grounds is called an inductive. A deductive argument is valid if its premises provide conclusive grounds for conclusion in such a way that, provided its premises are true, its conclusion must be true; invalid, otherwise (see: Copi and Cohen, Hurley, Wanda Teays, Walton, Johnson...). A valid deductive argument, comprising all true statements, is known a sound argument. Inductive arguments, on the other hand, can be less or more probable, depending on the number and relevance of the supporting justifications. However, number and relevance of the supporting premises are not the only criteria there are other criteria as well, but discussing those other criteria is beyond the scope of this introductory section.

3.1.4 Logic can be both formal and informal. Formal logic deals with formal systems of logic. These systems help us in proving validity/invalidity of arguments. Ralph H.

---

[167] Ikuenobe, Polycarp (2002)
[168] Aristotle, Rhetoric , Available online at http://calssics.mit.edu//Aristotle/rhetoric.html
[169] Pirie, Madsen, How to Win Every Argument- The Use and Abuse of Logic: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2006, p. 166

Johnson, in *The Relation between Formal and Informal Logic,* argues that formal logic studies entailment relationship between propositions.[170] Main focus of formal logic is deductive arguments. Formal logic first translates arguments from natural language into a technical formal language and then tests validity/invalidity of an argument.

Informal logic, on the other hand, deals with arguments in natural language. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy describes informal logic,

> the attempt to develop a logic that can analyze and assess the "informal" reasoning that occurs in natural language contexts in, for example, political debate, legal proceedings, social commentary, and the opinion pieces featured in the mass media (in newspapers, magazines, television, the Internet, and so on).[171]

For Johnson and Blair,

> Informal logic designates that branch of logic whose task is to develop non-formal standards, criteria, procedures for the analysis, interpretation, evaluation, criticism and construction of argumentation in everyday discourse.[172]

This argues that informal logic is different from formal logic, because unlike formal logic that evaluates arguments in symbolic language, it evaluates the arguments in natural language- arguments appearing in everyday discourse, like in politics, media, advertising etc.

3.1.5 As discussed earlier, there can be correct and incorrect reasons to persuade audience/readers to accept an argument; the job of logic is to differentiate correct reasoning from incorrect reasoning to persuade the audience to accept an argument. An argument can be bad i.e., commits fallacy when: the form of an argument is not correct; one or more statements of an argument are false; or/and, the premises of an argument are not logically relevant to the conclusion.

---

[170] Johnson, Ralph H, *The Relation between Formal and Informal Logic*: Argumentation 1999 p. 272 Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands. (accessed June 4, 2008)
[171] Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, http://www.seop.leeds.ac.uk/
[172] Johnson, R. H. and J. A. Blair, *The Current State of Informal Logic*: *Informal Logic* 9, 147–151,1987 (accessed November 1, 2010)

Formal logic deals with formal fallacies. A formal fallacy demonstrates that form of an argument is not correct. There is something wrong in structure of an argument[173], therefore, the entailment relation between premises and conclusion cannot be established. Informal logic, on the other hand, discusses informal fallacies. Some important theories of informal fallacies include Pragma- dialectical theory, Bayesian theory and the theory of Polycarp Ikuenobe etc.

Pragma- dialectical theory emphasises more the context of an argument. For Eveline T. Feteris,

> The pragma-dialectical theory offers a systematic theoretical basis for developing a model for the analysis and evaluation of argumentation in particular contexts.[174]

Pragma-dialectical theory treats arguments as dialogue in a context, fallacies arise when one of the participants of the dialogue makes fallacious moves to win the argument (fallacies are discussed in next section).

Bayesian theory not only emphasizes the context of an argument, but argues that contents also play a vital role when it comes to strength and fallaciousness of an argument. Ulrike Hahn and Mike Oaksford inform,

> Pragma-dialectical considerations alone are not sufficient to explain the fallacies… it is not just context that affects the strength of an argument of a particular structure as put forth by pragma-dialectical theories, but rather that strength varies as a function of content.[175]

This argues that an argument can commit an informal fallacy because of the context or the content, or both.

Another theory is forwarded by Polycarp Ikuenobe, he argues,

> My theory of fallacies is fundamentally epistemic: a fallacy is a failure to provide adequate proof for a belief. However, the failure is

---

[173] Pirie Madsen, How to Win Every Argument- Use and Abuse of Logic: Continuum International publishing Group, 2006, p.179

[174] Feteris, Eveline T. *The Pragma-Dialectical Analysis and Evaluation of Teleological Argumentation in a Legal Context*: Argumentation DOI 10.1007/s10503-008-9083-1 2008 (accessed August 4, 2008)

[175] Ulrike Hahn and Mike Oaksford , *A Bayesian Approach to Informal Argument Fallacies*: Syntheses 152: 207-236, 2006 (accessed March 26, 2008)

disguised in various forms using different strategies to make a proof look adequate.[176]

He further explains that it is the nature of strategy or form of disguise – structural or content, which distinguishes formal from informal fallacies.

There are other theories as well. For example Frans H. van Eemeren and Rob Grootendorst have made ten rules of dialogue that they think are the codes of conduct for rational people engaged in critical discussion. Fallacies are the result of violations of these rules.[177]

Whatever the theory of fallacies may be, it is evident from the above discussion that a fallacy is an error in reasoning. The most common categories of informal fallacies discussed in historical literature on informal fallacies have been listed as: Relevance, Presumption, Ambiguity, and Weak Induction.[178]

3.1.6. Fallacies of Relevance are the most common types of informal fallacies. An argument commits fallacy of relevance when its premises are not logically relevant to its conclusion; Copi and Cohen define it as,

> When an argument relies on premises that are not relevant to its conclusion, and that therefore cannot possibly establish its truth, the fallacy committed is one of relevance.[179]

Premises in such fallacious arguments can be psychologically or emotionally relevant, this relevance can make an argument look adequate, but psychological or emotional relevance is not the same as logical relevance.

In fallacies of presumption, premises assume the truth of some un-stated statement/s without any justification, and then a conclusion is drawn on the basis of the un-stated statement/s, as Wanda Teays argues,

> In fallacies of presumption, there are unwarranted assumptions that the

---

[176] Ikuenobe, Polycarp, *In Search of Criteria for 'Fallacies' and 'Begging the Question*: Argumentation 16: 421–441, 2002.
[177] Ikuenobe, Polycarp (2002)
[178] Hurley (2003), p. 113
Teays, Wanda, Second Thoughts- Critical thinking from a Multicultural Perspective: Mayfield Publishing Company- Mountain View California, 1996, page181
Copi, Irving M. and Carl Cohen (2001)
[179] Copi and Cohen (2001)

argument depends upon, causing the fallacy.[180]

Wanda Teays informs that in fallacy of ambiguity,

> There is unclear or improper use of language or sentence structure. This lack of clarity leads to different possible interpretations, and, in turn, an incorrect conclusion is drawn.[181]

This illustrates that whenever an arguer uses language or sentences that are not clear, this unclear language and sentences can be interpreted differently by different people, as a consequence of this confusion audiences can draw incorrect conclusions, and fallacy of ambiguity will be committed.

Hurley informs fallacies of weak induction are committed,

> … because the connection between the premises and the conclusion is not strong enough to support the conclusion.[182]

As stated earlier, in case of inductive arguments, premises provide probable grounds for the conclusion. But, in fallacies of weak induction an arguer presents premises that are too weak to support the conclusion, hence, commits fallacy of weak induction.

There is some disagreement about categorization of informal fallacies. Some writers have mentioned only three categories: Relevance, Presumption and Ambiguity. However some others, on the other hand, have mentioned five categories: Relevance, Presumption, Ambiguity, Weak Induction and Weak Grammatical Analogy. Going into the history and details of the categorization of fallacies is beyond the scope of this work. This work discusses some important fallacies irrespective of their categorization, since the purpose has been understanding fallacies with special reference to their presence in the context of war discourse.

One of the specific aims of this study is to demonstrate that in the context of War in general and War on Terror in Afghanistan in particular politicians have been presenting arguments that commit informal fallacies (logic of war). Moreover, the logic of war shapes judgments and perceptions of people and blocks rational/critical

---

[180] ibid
[181] Teays, Wanda (1996) p.180
[182] Hurley (2003) p.130

thinking and silences critics. Since, the arguments that politicians/leaders forward are in natural language, therefore, this work mostly employs informal logical techniques. This work analyzes, interprets, evaluates, and criticizes some of the arguments put forward in times of war and demonstrates that most commit informal fallacies. To achieve this specific aim, some important informal fallacies are discussed below.

3.2 INFORMAL FALLACIES

Aims: This section aims at discussing some important informal fallacies that are committed in public discourse[183] to bring to light the way these fallacies are impediments to clear thinking.

3.2.1 Argument from Ignorance

In many text books of logic, fallacy of Ignorance is discussed as an argument of the form; any claim X is true because no one has ever proved it false, or, X is false because it has never been proved true i.e., arguing for a conclusion since there is no evidence against it or arguing against a conclusion for there is no evidence in favour of it. For example, the argument, 'there is no life on mars because no one has ever proved that there is life on mars' is fallacious. It argues that: since there is no evidence in favour of the claim, 'there is life on mars'; therefore, it should be rejected.

Walton in, *Argument from ignorance*, argues that lack of knowledge or evidence is not the only way this fallacy is committed there are two other ways: negative evidence and shifting the burden of proof. [184]

3.2.1a. Usually, we think that fallacy of ignorance is committed in a case where the arguer has no knowledge about an issue or the arguer believes that all efforts to find the evidence have already been failed. 'Ghosts do not exist because no one has ever proved that ghosts exist or they exist because no one has ever proved they do not exist', commits fallacy argument from ignorance. The fallacy is that, if something is not known to be true, we say that it's false, or if something is not known to be false, it is accepted as true.

3.2.1b. The other way argument from ignorance is committed is negative evidence.

---

[183] Chapter 5 discusses in detail the way these fallacies are committed in war discourse to shape public opinion etc.

[184] Walton, Douglas, The *Appeal to Ignorance, or Argumentum Ad Ignorantiam*: Argumentation 13: 367-377, 1999. (Accessed April 18, 2009). Also see Ulrike Hahn and Mike Oaksford (2006)

Walton in, *the Appeal to ignorance, or Argumentum Ad Ignorantiam*, argues

> There seems to be agreement that negative results are not worthless but they are generally less worthwhile or less impressive than getting positive results.[185]

Consider following arguments:

Argument 1:

If a country trains terrorist on her soil, then she is a terrorist country or she is sponsoring terrorism. Country X trains terrorist on her soil. Therefore, X is terrorist country or X is sponsoring terrorism

Argument 2:

If a country trains terrorist on her soil, then she is a terrorist country or she is sponsoring terrorism. Country B is not training terrorist on her soil. Therefore she is not a terrorist country or is not sponsoring terrorism

Argument 1 is valid (modus ponens) because there is a positive evidence. Argument 2 commits fallacy of ignorance. From the negative evidence, there is no terrorist training taking place on the soil of the country B; we cannot infer that the country has nothing to do with terrorism. Ulrike Hahn and Mike Oaksford in, *A Bayesian Approach to Informal Argument Fallacies,* argues; reasoning that Drug *A* is not toxic because no toxic effects were observed is fallacious (negative argument, i.e., the argument from ignorance).[186] This demonstrates: inferring that a drug is not toxic because it has not produced toxic effect is fallacious.

3.2.1c. The third variety of argument from ignorance is Shifting the Burden of Proof. Normally, it is committed during dialogue between two parties. Suppose Mr. A is of the opinion that Mr. B is a thief. The Burden of proof is on Mr. A to prove that Mr. B is a thief. It will be fallacious, if Mr. A, instead of proving that Mr. B is a thief, asks Mr. B to prove that he is not a thief. Burden of proof is on the party who makes a claim. It is unreasonable to ask the other party, about whom the claim is made, to reject the claim.

Argument from ignorance is often instrumental in wars. For example, Cyrus Safdari argues in, *Rhetoric of War: First Iraq, then Iran?* , that asking Iraq to prove

---

[185] Walton, Douglas, *The Appeal to Ignorance, or Argumentum Ad Ignorantiam*: (1999).
[186] Ulrike Hahn and Mike Oaksford (2006)

that they do not have Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD), instead of proving that they have WMD, is one of the examples of shifting the burden of proof.[187]

3.2.2 Argument against man

Argument against man is committed when an argument is judged on the basis of the person who puts forward the argument. Argument against man involves two persons: one of them sets forth an argument and the other, in response, instead of directing his or her attention to the first person's argument directs it to the first person himself[188] i.e., the second person instead of attacking the argument, attacks the arguer. Common types of this argument mentioned in the text books of logic are ad hominem abusive, ad hominem circumstantial and the tu quoque. However, Walton in, *Poisoning the Well,* has mentioned two other types; the bias type, and the poisoning the well type.[189]

3.2.2a. Argument against man is ad hominem abusive when the personal character of a person is taken into account, while evaluating an argument. It is directly argued that the arguer has, for instance a bad character, therefore, the argument cannot be accepted. For example 'A argues that xyx leads to pqr. B rejects the argument because; A is a marijuana- smoker.'

Another type of argument against man abusive is Genetic Fallacy. It is committed when the source or the genesis of the opposing position is attacked.[190] For example, if a person/theory/idea is associated with an origin or source with a certain property, then it must have the same property.

If a person is associated with a group of people, and that group of people have a trait Y, it cannot be argued that this person must have the same trait. If X is practiced by some people, and suppose those people are our friends, it cannot be argued, without adequate evidential support, that X is good; similarly, if Y is practiced by our enemies, it cannot be argued that y is bad, without proper reasoning. After the Second World War, many people argued, 'whatever is associated with Nazis is bad.' In the war against terror Bush and his administration refused to negotiate or argue with Taliban since they were friends of Al Qaeda.

---

[187] Safdari, Cyrus (2006)
[188] Hurley (2003) p.118
[189] Walton, Douglas, *Poisoning the Well*: Argumentation (2006) 20: 273-307 (accessed June 15, 2009)
[190] See: Copi and Cohen (2003)

3.2.2b. An argument against man is circumstantial when, special circumstances of an arguer (that have nothing to do with argument) are considered while evaluating his/her argument. If circumstances of the opponent have nothing to do with an argument,

> ...calling attention to them may be psychologically effective in winning assent, or in persuading others.[191]

However, such an argument will be fallacious. For example, if an argument is rejected simply because of arguer's nationality, political affiliation, race, profession, age group will commit fallacy of argument against man - circumstantial.

Examples of argument against man circumstantial are:

Don't listen to this man for he is Indian.

He is right for he belongs to a very noble family.

She must be a great singer for her mother was also a great singer.

3.2.2c. 'Why are you asking me to quit smoking, you yourself have been smoking for the last eight years' is an example of Tu quoque or 'you too'. It is a fallacy in which one rejects the argument /criticism by turning the argument/criticism back against the opponent. It is a very effective fallacy because it puts the opponent on the defensive. Smoking is injurious to health is one thing and the person who is arguing about this fact himself is a smoker is quite another thing. Being a smoker has nothing to do with the fact that smoking is injurious.

3.2.2d. Walton defining the Bias Type of Attack informs,

> ... the arguer is said to have a personal bias, often in the form of a financial interest or something to gain ... This kind of attack is even more powerful when it suggests that the arguer so attacked is not fairly considering the arguments on both sides of the issue, but has made up her mind at the outset, and is always pushing for the one side.[192]

For example, Mr. X's argument about a women freedom bill should not be given importance because, the arguer is a man and he has already made up his mind to reject the bill.

---

[191] Copi and Cohan (2001) p. 168

[192] Walton, Douglas, *Poisoning the Well*: (2006)

3.2.2e. Walton describes poisoning the well as,

> ...a tactic that diffuses a discussion by disqualifying the attacked person from taking further meaningful part in it with any credibility.[193]

It is a pre-emptive type of attack which disqualifies an arguer before he/she says something. This type of fallacy is very common in political debate to silence opponents and critics.

For example, Bush in his third state of the union address argued,

> Some have said we must not act until the threat is imminent. Since when have terrorists and tyrants announced their intentions, politely putting us on notice before they strike? If this threat is permitted to fully and suddenly emerge, all actions, all words, and all recriminations would come too late. Trusting in the sanity and restraint of Saddam Hussein is not a strategy, and it is not an option.[194]

Personal attacks in this argument are terrorist, tyrant, insane. The implicit message in this argument is; since Saddam Hussain has all these traits, it is unreasonable to trust him and those who still believe that we should trust him are either ignorant of these facts or not really aware of the threat and are ignorant that there is no other option. Once this type of move is made, it becomes very difficult for the other arguer to present his/her case because, audience stop listening to him/her: poisoning the well, blocks rational/critical thinking, and silence critics. The above mentioned argument also commits fallacy of complex question.

In times of wars it is very common to declare your enemy; Evil, and yourself; Good. Once an arguer successfully frames his opponents, evils, the audience do not listen to what the opponents have to say in their defence. At the same time, if you are against evil, your audience accepts you as Good. And what you have to say, they normally accept it without any questioning. Such argumentative strategy helps leaders/politicians shaping judgments of people in times of war.[195]

---

[193] Walton, Douglas, P*oisoning the Well*: (2006)
[194] Bush, President Delivers "State of the Union": January 28, 2003
[195] For more details see *Metaphors of Terror,* by George Lakoff.

3.2.3 Slippery Slope

Slippery slope also known 'camel nose' is committed when it is argued that if we accept P it will be followed by Q, and if we accept Q, R will follow, but R is something undesirable/ bad/ unacceptable/ objectionable etc, therefore, P should not be accepted. Although the logical form of a slippery slope may be correct, but argument may be fallacious because of its contents. What makes a slippery slope argument fallacious is the insufficient reason to think that if P is accepted a chain reaction will follow. Volokh, in, *The Mechanisms of the Slippery Slope*, illustrates: if you are a legislator, a commentator, a judge, or a leader and you have to either endorse or reject a decision A. You will commit fallacy of slippery slope if you reject A for,

> You think A, on its own, might be a fairly good idea, or at least not a very bad one. But you're afraid that A might eventually lead other legislators, voters, or judges to support B, which you strongly oppose.[196]

In war against terror a common argument is that one should not negotiate with terrorists for negotiations, although a desirable action, will give time to terrorists. If terrorists gain time they will become more dangerous. So although negotiation is good but it leads to very undesirable consequences.

Slippery slope may not be fallacious all the time, therefore, before declaring that an argument commits this fallacy, one has to examine the contents of the argument carefully. If there is a causal relation between P, Q and R, the argument will not commit this fallacy.

3.2.4 Appeal to Wrong Authority

Right authority is one of the sources of knowledge. There exists abundant literature in Philosophy that discusses this area. Jean Goodwin in, *Forms of Authority and the Real Ad Verecundiam,* has discussed the issue in detail by mentioning three types of authorities which are; authority based on commands, based on expertise and

---

[196] Volokh Eugene, *The Mechanisms of the Slippery Slope*: 116 HARV. L. REV(2003) (accessed June 22, 2008). Also see Lafollette Hugh, *Living on a Slippery slope:* The Journal of Ethics(2005) (accessed June 22, 2008)

based on dignity.[197] Most of the times, we accept judgments on the basis of authorities. For example: a soldier accepts the command of his/her officer because the officer is an authority; a patient, while taking the prescribed medicine, accepts the authority of a doctor. People who follow one or the other religion accept the authority of their respective Prophets.

Appeal to authority, also known as appeal to irrelevant authority or wrong authority is committed when the authority on the basis of which an argument is accepted is not competent/ trustworthy. Hurly, revealing the reasons that make an authority untrustworthy, informs,

> The person might lack requisite expertise, might be biased or prejudiced, might have a motive to lie or disseminate "misinformation", or might lack the requisite ability to perceive or recall.[198]

This clearly illustrates, argument given by a person / group of people or any other source lacking required expertise, or who is biased/ prejudiced will commit fallacy of wrong authority. Moreover, an argument forwarded by a person, who has some physical or mental disability because of which he/she cannot recall, will also commit fallacy of wrong authority.

Many people in Pakistan believe that in-service Army Generals are not right authorities, when they talk or interfere in politics, games and universities etc. The reason is; their expertise are in a specific area related to army, they may be incompetent authorities in other areas like politics education and games etc. Many of the advertisements also commit this fallacy when they show a celebrity arguing in favour of a product, he/she is not an expert in, e.g. we often see a cricket star (who is not a dentist) arguing in favour of a toothpaste, a film actor (who is not a beautician) telling you such and such product is good for your sensitive skin etc.

3.2.5 Complex Question and Loaded Question

Fallacy of complex question, also known as fallacy of many questions is

---

[197] Goodwin, Jean, *Forms of Authority and the Real Ad Verecundiam*: Argumentation12: 267–280, 1998. (accessed June 22, 2008)
[198] Hurley (2003) p. 130

normally of the form, 'have you stopped betraying your friends?' The question is complex because it presupposes; 1. You have friends 2. You betray your friends.

Walton informs,

> complex question – that is, a question having several parts, is asked in such a way that, if the respondent answers it directly, he is trapped into conceding something that would cause him to lose the argument, or otherwise be unfavourable to his side.[199]

Complex questions are tricky in such a way that they presuppose the truth of some hidden agenda and if someone answers them directly (without understanding the trick in it), he/she is trapped in the trick. In case of 'have you stopped betraying your friends?' if the respondent says 'yes or no', he/she will accept that he/she has friends, whom he had betrayed or has been betraying.

In the context of War on Terror a very common question raised in the media was: should Pakistan stop supporting /delivering arms to Taliban. It was a complex question. It presupposed that Pakistan has been supporting and delivering arms to Taliban- a claim that Pakistan used to deny.

A loaded question is of the type, 'if you are a Muslim, then you should vote for me- yes/ no'. It is a complex question, what makes it a loaded question is that the arguer is asking for an answer and the demand is that it should be answered, 'yes or no'. Another example can be, 'was the weapon of murder yours or stolen'. It is a complex question, since it presupposes that one has killed someone, it is also loaded, for the arguer is demanding a reply giving two options: both further imply that one is a killer.

Right way to answer a complex question is to understand the question 'completely' i.e., understanding all the questions in it, and denying all the presuppositions one by one, because if one denies only one presupposition the truth of others may establish.

---

[199] Walton, Douglas, *The Fallacy of Many Questions: On the Notions of Complexity, Loadedness and Unfair Entrapment in Interrogative Theory:* Argumentation 13: 379–383, 1999. (accessed April 18, 2009)

3.2.6 False Dilemma/ False Dichotomy/ False Either-Or

Before we discuss False Dilemma, it is better to understand the notion of contradictory statements. Two statements/ideas are said to be contradictory when both can neither be true nor be false together. If truth value of one is not known the truth value of other cannot be determined. For example, 'A is equal to B' and 'A is not equal to B' are two contradictory statements. If the first one is true/false the second one must be false/true, if the second one is true/false the first one must be false/true. If one of them is not known to be true/false, the truth value of the other one cannot be determined, as there is no third option/alternative.

The argument;

Either 'A equals to B' or 'A not equals to B'

It is not the case that 'A equals to B'

Therefore, 'A not equals to B' - is valid. (Disjunctive Syllogism)

But,

Either today is Monday or today is Tuesday

Today is not Monday

Therefore, today is Tuesday-Commits fallacy of false dilemma.

The problem in the second argument is that 'today is Monday' and 'today is Tuesday' are not contradictory statements, there are other alternatives. Both the statements will be false if 'today is Friday'.

This fallacy, as it is clear from the above example, is committed when an arguer offers an incomplete range of alternatives (normally two- in such a way, that it appears, as if no other alternative exists), and then one is asked to chose one of them. If one chooses one of them, it is tantamount to accept that these choices are the only choices and no other alternatives are available.

It is a commonly committed fallacy in political debate when arguments are forwarded in such a way that they present limited alternatives/choices, usually one of the alternative/choice is preferred by the arguer.

Hurley opines,

> ...in most cases the arguer expresses only the disjunctive premise and

leaves it to the reader or listener to supply the missing statement…[200]

Love Pakistan or leave Pakistan.
Either it is white or black.
You are with us or against us.
All commit fallacy of false dilemma.

3.2.7 Straw Man

In order to understand Straw Man let us consider an example which is very common in our society. Suppose, A is of the opinion, that he/she is suffering from some problems because someone has done magic on him/her. B disagrees with A's opinion; B believes that A is suffering from problems because of some other reason e.g. lack of hard work etc. A instead of rejecting B's disagreement says; you do not believe in magic that means you are not a Muslim, magic has been mentioned in our religion and not-believing that he/she is suffering from problems because of magic implies disbelieving in religion. This type of reasoning commits fallacy of Straw Man. We can say that A has set a straw man. Setting a straw man means that instead of rejecting someone's actual argument you misinterpret/misrepresent someone's argument, and then reject the misinterpreted argument. Let us call A's argument 'P'. B, instead of rejecting P has distorted P, and interpreted/misrepresented P as 'P1'. And then he has demolished P1.

Robret Talisse and Scott F. Alkin inform in, *Two Form of Straw Man,* that this fallacy has two forms, Representation Form and Selection Form, they further argue that both the forms are very common in the contemporary political discourse.[201]

3.2.7a. Representation form is committed, they opine, in a dialogue between two or more arguers, where one arguer misinterprets the opponent's argument strengthening his own argument,

> … what makes the straw man a fallacy is that a speaker who erects a straw man advances an argument that misrepresents to her advantage

---

[200] Hurley (2003) p. 153
[201] Robret Talisse and Scott F. Alkin, *Two forms of Straw Man:* Argumentation (2006) 20: 345-352 (accessed July 18, 2008)

the current dialectical argument.[202]

This illustrates that in representation form one arguer misrepresents the opponent's argument then rejects the misrepresented argument and take the advantage from this situation.

3.2.7b. Another way straw man can be committed, according to Robret Talisse and Scott F. Alkin, is selection form. Suppose B, C, D are opposing A's argument. A, instead of misinterpreting anyone's argument, selects a weak version of argument or inept spokes person's argument against his/her views and rejects it. This way, erecting a straw man, A attempts to convince audience that there is no strong or intelligent opposition to his/her argument.[203] This reveals that in the selection form of straw man an arguer selects the weakest opposition for rejection, and after rejecting it, the arguer claims that his/her position is right. People who argue that all Muslims are terrorists only take into account arguments forwarded by extremists Muslims. Similarly, Muslims who argue that all Americans are war monger take into account those American who prefer war over peace.

3.2.8 Appeal to Force and Appeal to Fear

3.2.8a. Appeal to Force is committed when it is argued that if an argument is not accepted then consequences will follow (against the interest of the listeners/readers), e.g. accept A or face the music. John Woods demonstrates in, *Argumentum ad baculum*, that the general structure of an arguments that involve an appeal to force for the acceptance of conclusion is :

> 1. If you do action A, then consequence C, which lies in my power to exact or which will come about from other factors pertaining to your situation, will also occur.
>
> 2. The occurrence of C would be sufficiently contrary to your interests to make it reasonable for you not to do A.

---

[202] Robret Talisse and Scott F. Alkin (2006)
[203] Robret Talisse and Scott F. Alkin, (2006)

3. Therefore, it is reasonable for you not to do A.[204]

Occurrence C may involve an explicit or implicit threat. The threat can be psychological or physical. Consider the following examples:

Political leader to the WAPDA officer: We want this load shedding to end now, otherwise you can go to the hospital and ask your friend (colleague-who is on bed no xyz), 'what we did to him?'

This type of argument involves physical threat. The missing premises in it are – if you don't accept our argument you will face the consequences (as your friend has already faced, who did not listen to us and now he is in the hospital).

Teacher to the student: you are criticizing *MY* argument, do you think you know better than *ME*. Be very careful next time, after all I mark your papers.

This type of argument has a psychological threat in it. The missing premise/s which the student is supposed to apply is/are- as, I will mark your papers, therefore, you should be careful, I can do whatever I want, I can fail you….

After September 11, 2001, Bush presented a list of demands to Taliban and argued that the demands are not open to negotiations. Taliban were threatened to act or face the consequences.[205] There was an explicit threat in Bush's argument, i.e. fulfill the demands otherwise get ready for the same consequences that our enemies are going to face.

3.2.8b. Appeal to Fear: Many text books of logic classify appeal to fear and appeal to force under argumentum ad Baculum. However, Walton informs that fear appeal arguments are different from threat appeal arguments. He, citing many advertisements, clears the difference. In an appeal to fear, no threat is involved that can be caused be the arguer.[206] Whereas, in an appeal to force; an arguer clearly demonstrate his force/power/threat, to cause the acceptance of his/her conclusion.

Doctors argue that one should not smoke since; smoking causes cancer (and cancer causes death). No threat is involved in this argument since Doctors do not say that if you smoke we will kill you. This is an argument from Fear and it is a reasonable argument. But when an advertiser argue that if you do not use product X

---

[204] Woods, John, *Argumentum ad Baculum*: Argumentation 12: 493–504, 1998. (accessed July 18, 2008)

[205] Bush, Freedom at war with Fear: September 20, 2001.

[206] Douglas, Walton, Informal Logic, A Pragmatic Approach: Cambridge University Press, 2008, p. 119

then you will gain weight (without any evidential support) then his argument commits fallacy of fear.

Aristotle defines fear as,

> … a pain or disturbance due to a mental picture of some destructive or painful evil in the future.[207]

He further reveals that fear is associated with expectations that something bad will happen. A situation where people do not expect that something bad, for instance X, will happen to them then they will not be afraid of X. For example, people who do not expect that smoking will cause cancer will not be afraid of smoking. Similarly, he reveals, people who think that they have gone through all the horrors and difficulties do not feel fear. In such situations, Aristotle suggest, an orator must make audience feel that they are really in trouble and danger and something bad is going to happen to them as it has already happened to other people.[208]

Appeal to fear is a very effective fallacy in war discourse. Very many arguments presented by politicians in times of war commit appeal to fear. For example, Bush and his administration, in order to gain support of the world argued that: if nations of the world do not join Bush in war on terror then attacks likes 9/11 can destroy their cities too. Such arguments effectively block rational thinking and criticism.

3.2.9 Appeal to Pity

Robert H. Kimball, in *Moral and Logical Perspectives on Appealing to Pity,* has done a detailed analysis of, 'Pity' and has differentiated it from other emotions like love, compassion etc. He argues that an arguer evoking pity in audience, may commit fallacy of appeal to pity. He informs:

> Pity is a sympathetic response toward extreme misfortune. A deficiency of pity is indifference, and an excess involves feeling pity toward persons whose situation is really not so bad as to deserve it... possibly the fallacious *appeal to pity* in reasoning involves the

---

[207] Aristotle, Rhetoric.
[208] Aristotle, Rhetoric.

manipulative use of another's good will: her desire to relieve recognized suffering.[209]

He further argues that appeal to pity suppresses judicious thinking for it induces an extreme emotive response; therefore, it is not a reliable guide to right action.[210] This demonstrates when an arguer evokes pity in an argument; it becomes very difficult for the listeners/readers to think rationally/logically. When we come to know that someone is suffering we feel sympathy for him/her. This is a very natural response to the situation. People who do not feel sympathy are considered indifferent to people's suffering and in some cases- immoral. Arguers may exploit this human emotional response. They can make you feel pity about a situation, and once you are taken over by pity, it becomes very difficult to think logically.

Appeal to pity is a very common fallacy in the court of law, advertising and in political debate. Many advertisement on television show that buying a specific product means you are helping poor people, as some of the money from the profit will go in charity.

Politicians argue that people are living a very miserable life under such and such dictator, their life, property, and honour is in danger. They don't have the power of expressing their ideas freely, women have no right to education, children are dying of starvation etc; therefore, it's the responsibility of the international community to act, otherwise the international community will be showing indifference-indifference/criticism that they can easily prove is immoral. Actions against such dictators normally involve; economic sanctions, and in some extreme cases war.

3.2.10 Irrelevant Conclusion- Missing the Point

Irrelevant Conclusion or Fallacy of 'Missing the Point' is committed when an arguer provides ground for one conclusion, but infers a quiet irrelevant conclusion by vaguely relating this new conclusion with the premises.[211] For example:
Heath is something very important in your life. If you are healthy then you can do your work effectively; therefore, this is the most suitable brand of eatable oil since it

---

[209] Kimball, Robert H, *Moral and Logical Perspectives on Appealing to Pity*: Argumentation 15: 331–346, 2001(accessed July 21, 2008)
[210] Kimball (2001)
[211] See Copi and Cohen (2001) p. 172; Hurley (2003) p.123

keeps you healthy.

The moment this democratic government has taken over the charge, nothing is going in the right direction- prices are getting higher and higher, law and order situation is not good etc, therefore, democracy is not the right form of government.

In the first example, the argument was supporting the conclusion that health is important but the advertiser, somehow, inserted the conclusion that this oil is important for your life. In the second argument the premises were supporting the conclusion that the present democratic set up is not effective. The probable conclusions can be; they should give more attention to the prices and law and order situation, or at the most the present government has failed to cope with the situation. The conclusion, 'democracy is not the right form of government' is an irrelevant conclusion; it cannot be logically inferred from the given premises. This argument can persuade the listeners/audience to miss the point by wrongly accepting 'democracy is not the right form of the government' instead of the conclusion that there is something wrong with the present democratic government.

3.2.11 Red Herring

Red herring is committed when an arguer changes the subject of an argument to a different but apparently related issue, diverting the attention of the listener/reader.

> He or she then finishes by either drawing a conclusion about this different issue or by merely presuming that some conclusion has been established. By so doing, the arguer purports to have won the argument.[212]

This exhibits, in Red Herring; the arguer diverts the attention of the reader or listener to a different issue, and then makes a conclusion that has nothing to do with the real argument.

For example, in an argument aimed at proving that a person, X, is guilty of theft, the lawyer instead of proving that X is a thief argues:

X is not a good fellow; he should be punished; because he is a thief. And we all know that theft is a crime. A thief can do anything. Stealing is not only a crime but also a

[212] Hurley (2003) p.124

morally bad action. It is also a sin (he can quote some verses from a Holy book as well). Therefore, X must be punished.

The actual argument has been, whether X is a thief or not, and if he/she is, he/she must be punished. The lawyer instead of proving that X is a thief has been arguing about, 'stealing'.

Another example may be: suppose a student was directed not to sit in the exam, because his/her attendance was short. The student comes to the chairman and presents his/her argument:

Sir, you must allow me to sit in the exam. Because, otherwise my education will suffer, and you know that how much education is important in someone's life. Without education one cannot survive in this world. Think about my future, how will I get a job if I remained an illiterate?

Instead of giving reasons for his/her short attendance, the student has successfully diverted the argument towards 'the role of education in one's life'.

Hurley argues that sometimes red herring is confused with straw man or irrelevant conclusion. But he thinks that this confusion can be avoided by understanding the major difference between these three fallacies.

> In the straw man, the arguer begins by distorting an opponent's argument and concludes by knocking down the distorted argument. In Red herring, on the other hand, the arguer ignores the opponent's argument (if there in one) and subtly changes the subject.[213]

He further explains that both fallacies are different from missing the point on the grounds, that in both (straw man and red herring) the arguer generates a new set of premises but in missing the point the arguer, instead of generating new premises, draws an irrelevant conclusion from the given premises.[214]

3.2.12 False Cause

One thing may be the cause of another, if the first one happened or existed before the second; however, besides this factor, one has to know a great deal

---

[213] Hurley (2003) p. 125
[214] ibid

more.[215]This explains that the first important factor to connect a cause with effect is the temporal succession. Cause always comes first and effect follows, however, this is not the only point there are many other important points as well. Connecting cause with the effect is considered something of great importance not only in sciences, but in all types of inquiries, where the purpose is either to eliminate an effect or achieve the desired effects. In order to eliminate poverty or disease, one has to find causes of poverty or disease, for only by eliminating the causes, poverty or disease can be eliminated.

A former asks another farmer (whose crop was very good this year), what are the reasons of his good crop (reasons here mean the causes of good crop), so that by introducing the same reasons he can also have a good crop next year (good crop next year is the desired effect). The former here is in search of causes which will produce desired effects. There are many other reasons that force us to connect cause with effect such as, in order to eliminate a war you have to find the causes of war, only then you can eliminate a war.

> The fallacy of false cause occurs whenever the link between premises and conclusion depends on some imagined causal connection that probably does not exist.[216]

But this always is not the case. In some cases of false cause, the causal connection exists, but we mistakenly believe that this cause is the sole cause; while in reality there can be numerous causes which may be responsible in producing the effect. In order to understand this point it is important to understand the common ways in which fallacy of false cause is committed.

3.2.12a. Post hoc fallacy is committed when we infer that X causes Y just because X is followed by Y.[217] As said earlier, mere temporal succession does not provide good grounds to accept that X is the cause of Y. for example:

Last time when it was raining, I had good news. Rain brings good news.

Having good news has nothing to do with raining, but it is believed by the arguer on the basis of mere temporal succession.

David Zarefsky in, *Strategic Manoeuvring in Political Argumentation* argues,

---

[215] Barker, Stephen F, The Elements of Logic: McGraw-Hill Company., fourth edition 1985
[216] Hurley (2003) p. 135
[217] http://philosophy.hku.hk/think/

> ...because there have been no terrorist attacks on the United States since September 11, 2001, supporters of President Bush credit his anti-terrorism policies with keeping the nation safe. This view of social knowledge promotes the use of the post hoc fallacy: after this, therefore because of it.[218]

This argues that there have been no terrorist attacks after 9/11 because of Bush's anti-terrorism policies, is wrong - as there can be other causes as well.

3.2.12b. Fallacy of the single cause, over simplified cause, is committed when it is argued that an event has a single cause while there can be many relevant causes, but the arguer ignores other causes selecting only one of them[219], normally this type of fallacy serves some interest of the arguer. For example, Mr. X has committed suicide soon after his marriage. If relatives argue that he has committed suicide because of his marriage, they will be committing Post hoc fallacy, since such reasoning is based on a misconception that the cause of suicide is marriage- temporal succession. However, if they argue that the cause of his death is his wife, they will be committing fallacy of single cause. Since there can be other relevant causes like, the financial and social burden after marriage, some kind of affair of the person, it is also probable that the marriage may have nothing to do with his suicide.

Similarly, it is also fallacious to argue that a cause has only one effect ignoring other effects which this cause will necessarily bring about-Fallacy of neglected effects. Politicians in times of war often argue that war will end such and such problems without mentioning other effects which the war will necessarily cause.

3.2.12c. Another variety of false cause is Reversing causal direction/wrong direction. It is committed when an arguer assumes that A causes B ruling out the possibility of B causing A.

Arguing that failure is the cause of his frustration, without considering, frustration is the cause of his failure. It is often argued that poverty is the cause of lack of education in a society without considering that lack of education can be the cause of poverty.

3.2.12d. Genetic fallacy is committed when argued that, if some item X is associated

---

[218] Zarefsky, David, *Strategic Maneuvering in Political Argumentation*: Published online: 15 April 2008, Argumentation, 317- 330 Springer Science+ Business Media B.V. 2008 (accessed November 1, 2010)

[219] http://philosophy.hku.hk/think/

with a source with a certain property, then X must have the same property as well.[220]

'A friend is known by the company he keeps', commit this fallacy. If a person is associated with a group of people, having a trait Y, it cannot be argued that this person must have the same trait. Similarly if X is practiced by some people, and suppose those people are our friends, it cannot be argued that X is good, without evaluating X on its own merit.

3.2.12e. Another kind of false cause is, confusing good causal consequences with reason for belief. This is committed when it is argued that good causal consequences provide reasons for belief. [221] It is a very common fallacy in advertising, politics and in arguments forwarded by clergy.

Most of the advertisers argue that using their product will bring very healthy changes in one's life. Politicians mostly argue that their policies will be followed by very good effects; hence, it is good to accept their policies. Clergymen argue that accepting the version of religion, they preach, will have very good effects, not only in this life but also in life hereafter.

3.2.13 Fallacies of Generalization

These fallacies are committed when an arguer moves carelessly or too quickly from or towards a generalization.

> When we presume the applicability of a generalization to individual cases that it does not properly govern, we commit the fallacy of accident. When we do the reverse, and carelessly or by design presume that what is true of a particular case is true of the great run of cases we commit the fallacy of converse accident.[222]

3.2.13a. Fallacy of accident is committed when an arguer moves carelessly from a generalization to a particular circumstance, special in character, in such a way that one should not apply generalization to it. For example; traffic police fines an ambulance, since the driver did not stop on red signal, is committing fallacy of accident. An ambulance is a special vehicle carrying sick people, and, since life of a

---

[220] http://philosophy.hku.hk/think/
[221] ibid
[222] Copi and Cohen (2001) pp. 187-189

person is more important than a traffic law, therefore, it is not important for it to obey the law. This reveals that generalization cannot be applied to special particular circumstances.

Aristotle explains this fallacy in, On Sophistically Refutations,

> Fallacies, then, that depend on Accident occur whenever any attribute is claimed to belong in like manner to a thing and to its accident. For since the same thing has many accidents there is no necessity that all the same attributes should belong to all of a thing's predicates and to their subject as well.[223]

3.2.13b. Fallacy of converse accident also known hasty generalization is committed when an arguer carelessly moves from special particular circumstances to generalization. From some terrorists, who were Muslims, one cannot make a generalization that all Muslims are terrorists. Hurley puts this fallacy in the category of fallacies of weak induction. He believes that this fallacy is committed when after analyzing an argument we come to know that the sample from which the generalization is drawn is not the representative of the whole group. This may be because of several reasons, such as: sample can be too small, or it may not be randomly selected.[224]

3.2.13c. Walton argues that most of the literature on this fallacy has failed to consider three different kinds of generalization. Hence, because of this difficulty they have failed to recognize three kinds of fallacy relating to generalization.[225] He believes there are: Universal generalizations, inductive generalizations and presumptive generalizations, hence, there are three different kinds of hasty generalization,

> One type of hasty generalization fallacy is the inadequately supported kind of inductive inference from too small a sample (or it could also be from an 'unrepresentative' or improperly selected sample). Another is the fallacy of overlooking qualifications to a presumptive generalization. This latter could often be based on an inference from such a generalization to a specific case, in which special circumstances

---

[223] Aristotle, On Sophistical Refutation: www.grtbooks.com
[224] Hurley (2003) p. 134-135
[225] Walton, *Douglas, Rethinking Fallacy of Hasty Generalization*: Argumentation 13: 161-182, 1999. (accessed April 18, 2009)

of the case are overlooked.[226]

The third type arises when one carelessly moves from one type of generalization to another type of generalization, for example, an absolute generalization (conclusion) is drawn from a presumptive generalization (premises).[227]

This illustrates that in one type of hasty generalization an arguer moves to a generalization on the basis of a small sample. From some terrorists Muslim, inferring that all Muslims are terrorists is an example of hasty generalization. If we see some people (patients) who have been allowed by the doctors to use drugs, and we make a generalization that everyone is allowed to use drugs, we are committing fallacy of hasty generalization, but here the case is different. We have neglected that sick people are special circumstances. This type of fallacy is also known as neglect of qualification.

If an arguer moves from, one type of generalization to another type of generalization he commits fallacy of hasty generalization of the third type which can be roughly called, fallacy relating to confusions between the types of generalizations. For example; an arguer claims, 'x is true for most of ys' and then tries to infer that 'x is true for all ys'. The arguer is committing fallacy of hasty generalization of the third type. Since according to Walton, "x is true for most ys" is a presumptive generalization, and from this claim we cannot move to "x is true for all ys" which is a universal or absolute generalization.

3.2.14 Fallacies of Ambiguity

An arguer intentionally or unintentionally can shift the meanings of words or phrases within an argument. When a word has two or more distinct meanings, and arguer uses it in one sense in premises, but changes meanings of same word in conclusion or in other premises, he/she commits fallacy of ambiguity. The most common fallacies of ambiguity are: Equivocation, Amphiboly, Accent, Composition and Division.

3.2.14a. Fallacy of Equivocation is committed when some words in an argument are used, deliberately or accidentally, in different meanings. This fallacy is also known as

---

[226] Walton, Douglas, *Rethinking Fallacy of Hasty Generalization*: Argumentation, (1999).
[227] ibid

semantic fallacy.[228] For example; only a man in this world can be ethical. Therefore, she is not ethical, as she is not a man. Here 'man' has been used in two different meanings.

Some argument analysts argue that use of the word 'connection', while providing justification for war on terror, was ambiguous (fallacy of equivocation). As there can be many types of 'connections'.[229]

3.2.14b. 'Ali told Ammer that he should work hard now. We can conclude that Ali has at last realized that he was not working hard and he should work hard now.' This argument commits fallacy of Amphiboly. Amphiboly, also known as fallacy of syntax is committed when ambiguity is created by the use of mistaken grammar or sentence structure.[230] Because of amphiboly a statement may be interpreted in more than one way.[231] For example, I saw him yesterday, he was riding on his horse, he was sick and could not run. It is not clear: who was sick and could not run- horse or the man riding the horse.

Similarly, 'He should work hard now' in the above mentioned argument, is ambiguous it is not clear: Who should work hard- Ali or Ammer.

3.2.14c. for Copi and Cohen fallacy of accent is committed:

> When a premise relies for its apparent meaning on one possible emphasis, but a conclusion is drawn from it that relies on the meaning of the same words accented differently…[232]

For example, 'We should not speak ill of our friends.' Copi argues that five or more than five distinct meanings can be given to this eight word-statement, depending on which word of this statement is emphasized.

The fallacy of accent is mostly used in advertisements and political debates. For example, in most of the advertisements we listen to or read the word **FREE**, spoken loudly or written in bold. But when we move further, we are told, or we find written in tiny print- there are some conditions; like, buy one and get one **Free**, or a limited stock is **Free**, or if you buy something (which normally is very expensive) you will get something **Free** etc.

---

[228] Teays, Wanda (1996) p. 201
[229] http://thenonsequitur.com/
[230] Teays, Wanda (1996) p. 202
[231] Pirie Madsen (2006), p 9-10
[232] Copi and Cohen (2001) pp. 194-196

In newspapers the headlines normally are bold, shocking and attractive, for example, BOMB BLAST NEAR PARLIAMENT HOUSE, or, INCREASE IN ELECTRICITY PRICES etc. But when you read the report you come to know that there was a rumor that there will be a bomb blast near parliament, or some people are of the view that electricity prices should be increased now.

Similarly ambiguity can be created in a context by emphasizing a term, 'Ali did not cheat TODAY'. In a context where people know that Ali cheats every day, this sentence means one thing, out of that context it has different meaning.

3.2.14d. In 1998 FIFA World Cup Final, people were speculating that Brazil will win, because almost every Brazilian player was a world star. On the other hand French team was very good, but very few of its players were world stars. Such type of reasoning, commits fallacy of Composition.

The fallacious reasoning here is that what is true for the parts or members of a group is also true for the whole or the group itself. Brazilian players were very good. Each individual player was a star but not the Brazilian team. The fallacy of composition or fallacy of wrong combination results from unjustified transfer of a property of the individual members of a group, to the group (collection of members).

The other way this fallacy can be committed is when an arguer claims what can be attributed to the parts of a whole can also be attributed to the whole itself.[233]

For example '5' and '3' are odd numbers, '8' is '5+3', therefore, '8' is also an odd number. Similarly, Sodium and Chlorine both are poisonous, from this we infer; sodium chloride (table salt) is also poisonous. All these arguments commit fallacy of composition.

3.2.14e. 'Since Chinese eat more than Pakistanis, therefore, individual Chinese eat more than individual Pakistanis', commits fallacy of Division, which is reverse of fallacy of Composition. Chinese eat more than Pakistanis because they are more in number. Fallacy in this argument is the unjustified transfer of a property of whole (collection) to the parts (members) of the whole.

There are two kinds of this fallacy. In the first kind, an arguer argues that what can be attributed to collection of some members can also be attributed to the individual members. In the second kind it is argued that what can be attributed to the

[233] Copi and Cohen (2001) pp. 196-198

whole can also be attributed to the parts of the whole.[234]

The above cited example is an example of the first kind. The fallacious move in it is unjustified transfer of an attribute from collection of members to the individual members.

Example of the second kind is when it is argued, since a machine is very heavy and complicated therefore its parts are also very heavy and complicated. Here the fallacious move is the claim that what is true for the whole is also true for the parts of that whole.

3.2.15 Begging the Question- Petitio Principii

Begging the question is committed when an arguer provides insufficient support for the conclusion in the premises. Premises and conclusion say the same thing but in somewhat different language. For example; Kant has explained idea of self better than Hume, because philosophers who prefer Kant over Hume, regarding idea of self, argue that Kant's idea of self is very well explained.

Ikuenobe Polycarp explains that begging the question can be committed in two ways,

> (1) when the conclusion, which may be contentious because there is no reasonable evidence to make it acceptable, thus, it is in need of proof, is somehow illegitimately *contained in* or *assumed* by the premises ...
> (2) When the premises assume a controversial belief which is in need of proof as a basis for proving the conclusion.[235]

This reveal that the first way this fallacy can be committed is when conclusion is illegitimately assumed for, this fact makes the point clear, the conclusion has not been proved, and it needs to be proved. The second type also commits begging the question for, when the premises themselves rest on a belief which itself is in need of a proof, the question arises; can such premises provide grounds for a conclusion or not?

Before war on Iraq, Bush and his friends argued that since Saddam Hussain is making Weapons of Mass destruction and planning to hand over WMD to terrorists, therefore Iraq should be attacked for if terrorists get WMD they will ruthlessly attack

---

[234] ibid, page 197-199
[235] Ikuenobe, Polycarp (2002)

America and other allies. All such arguments committed fallacy of begging the question for, the premises that, Iraq really was making such weapons and was really planning to hand over WMD to terrorists, were in need of proof.

3.2.16 Weak Analogy

An argument by Analogy is an argument based on similarity. For example; book A of an author was a very good reading, now you come to know that another book by the same author has arrived in the market. You think that probably this other book, by the same author, will also be a good reading. The argument is analogical in nature, as a conclusion is drawn on the basis of similarity (both entities are books and are written by the same author). Analogical arguments can be weak or strong, depending on the nature, size, and relevance of the similarities.

Hurley informs, fallacy of weak analogy is committed when the comparison is drawn between two or more things by mentioning weak or/and irrelevant similarities, i.e. the similarities mentioned in the argument are so weak that they cannot support the conclusion.

He suggests the methodology to detect this fallacy by forwarding an argument; suppose any entity A has attributes, a, b, c and z, another entity B has attributes a, b, c. Therefore, probably entity B has attribute z too.

He informs that we need two steps procedure to evaluate an argument of this form: 1. Identification of the common attributes (a, b, c ...) 2. Determining, how attribute z, relates to the common attributes.

> If some causal or systematic relation exists between *z* and *a, b, c,* the argument is strong; otherwise it is weak.[236]

Carol K. Winkler in, *Encroachments on State Sovereignty: The Argumentation Strategies of the George W. Bush Administration* notes that Bush administration tried to compare Taliban with Nazis and Soviet of the twentieth century. They tried to establish that Taliban are like previous totalitarian regimes highlighting totalitarian nature of the Taliban. He informs, this way they magnified the threat; moreover, they threatened nations of the world that if they have any form of association with Taliban

[236] Hurley (2003) pp. 139-140

then they will face bad consequences.[237]

This demonstrates that Bush administration tried to draw analogy between Taliban and previous totalitarian regimes inferring: whatever was true for the previous totalitarian regimes is also true for Taliban, and whatever happened to the previous regimes will also happen to Taliban or any other nation sharing the traits of Nazis and Soviets.

3.2.17 Definitional Retreat

Fallacy of Definitional retreat is a commonly committed fallacy in everyday discourse. It is committed when an arguer,

> ...changes the meaning of the words in order to deal with objections raised against the original wordings.[238]

For example:

A: I am not an addict.

B: I saw you smoking marijuana last night.

A: Oh, You cannot call marijuana a drug. It's a part of our culture.

In times of war politicians keep on changing definitions of the words. For example, one of the defining characteristic of 'terrorism' is 'killing non- combatants'. But killing of thousands of non- combatants of Afghanistan and Iraq by Allied forces is not terrorism, since it was to 'free them from tyrants', i.e. killing non-combatants in order to free them from tyrants is not 'terrorism'. Similarly killing of one innocent person, according to Islam, is like killing of the whole humanity. however, a suicide bomber, who kills many people including his/her self, is considered alright by terrorists, since the suicide bomber wants to liberate these people from non- believers who do not let people to practice Islam freely.

3.2.18 Fallacies of Positive and Negative Consequences

Arguments from consequences are very common type of arguments in daily

---

[237] Winkler, Carol K, *Encroachments on state Sovereignty: The Argumentation Strategies of the Bush Administration* : Argumentation Springer Science +Business Media B.V. 2008 (accessed March 23, 2008)

[238] Pirie, Madsen (2006), p.46

life. For example, almost every day, while listening to political debate, we hear: Such and such policy should be adopted otherwise democracy in our country will be derailed. Or, if we go for such and such policy there will be more jobs in the country.

This demonstrates that in an argument from consequences, an arguer, citing positive or negative consequences, argues for or against a conclusion. In an argument from positive consequences it is argued that acceptance of the conclusion will lead to some positive consequences. Whereas, in an argument from negative consequences, it is argued that acceptance or rejection of the conclusion will lead to some negative consequences.

Such argumentation is very common in war discourse. For example, many politicians in War on Terror argued that if we do not fight this war an age of terror will start. Nixon while persuading for his Vietnamization policy argued: if we withdraw from Vietnam our allies will lose confidence in America. Whereas, if we adopt the policy of Vietnamization; people of South Vietnam will be able to protect their own freedom. His argument had been: if we follow the policy positive consequences will follow and if we do not adopt the policy negative consequences will follow.

Walton opines that although argument from consequences is often reasonable, however, in some cases it can be fallacious. He proposes three questions in order to evaluate an argument from consequences. The first one is about the strength of plausibility or probability that the cited consequences, will/may/must, occur. Second one is about the evidential support for the cited consequence. The last one is about the opposite consequences, which he informs, should also be taken into account.[239]

An argument from consequence commits fallacy when an arguer fails to answer any of the above mentioned questions.

In war on terror many of arguments committed fallacies of positive and negative consequences. For example, Bush and his administration time and again argued: if we do not fight this war then future generations will blame us; we will win this war; Iraq will use Weapons of Mass Destruction, if not attacked etc.

---

[239] Walton, Douglas, Informal Logic, A Pragmatic Approach: Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 26-27

3.2.19 Suppressed evidence

A good argument must not ignore or suppress important facts or evidences, by including which an argument may support a different conclusion.

For example, an employee argues: he was absent since he was in hospital, therefore, no disciplinary action should be taken against him/her.

This argument makes sense, since if someone is sick and goes to hospital to see a doctor then he/she should not be punished. But the conclusion of this argument will change dramatically if the employer comes to know that the employee actually went to hospital to see his/her friend. This exhibits that the moment this suppressed evidence comes to surface (included in the argument as a premise), the conclusion of the argument, 'no disciplinary action should be taken against the employee', will change.

Hurley informs that there are several ways this fallacy can be committed. The first and the most common is when an arguer ignores or suppresses the negative evidences. Second way this fallacy is committed when an arguer suppresses occurring of some important events with the passage of time. Another way this fallacy can be committed is when an arguer quotes something, out of context.[240]

The above mentioned argument is an example of the first way this fallacy may be committed since the arguer has suppressed a premise that will go against his/her interest.

Committing fallacy of suppressed evidence, politicians/leaders in times of war inform public about probable gains of war, without informing them the probable losses such as: mass civilian causalities, great harm to the environment etc.

Conclusion: The discussion demonstrates that fallacies are impediments to clear thinking that can manipulate judgments, perception and action of listener/reader. Moreover, fallacious arguments obstruct critical/ rational thinking and block criticism.[241]

The list of fallacies discussed in this chapter comprises: argument from ignorance, argument against man, slippery slope, appeal to wrong authority, complex and loaded questions, false either or, straw man, appeal to force and appeal to fear, appeal to pity, irrelevant conclusion, red herring, false cause, fallacies of generalization, fallacies of

---

[240] Hurley (2003) p.153-156

[241] The methodology discussed in this chapter shall be employed in chapter 5, to demonstrate the way fallacious arguments are used as tools of war to rational/critical thinking and to silence critics.

ambiguity, begging the question, weak analogy, definitional retreat, fallacies of positive and negative consequences and suppressed evidence.

CHAPTER 4

LANGUAGE OF WAR WITH SPECIAL REFRENCE TO WAR ON TERROR

And in war, words trigger terror. Rumor about who was seen where and doing what becomes a matter of life and death. (Kimberly Theidon)

Aims: This chapter discusses language of war and demonstrates that language used by politicians in times of war (language of war) manipulates/shapes judgments, perceptions and behavior of people and block rational/critical thinking and criticism with special reference to War on Terror. To establish these points it makes ample of references to the speeches and text generated in the recent war. Section 4.1, briefly discusses: What is War? ; What differentiates a real war from a metaphorical one? Section 4.2, discusses 'war' and 'terror'. It explains the way 'terror/terrorist/terrorism' was defined and framed in the context of 9/11. Moreover, the way, 'terror', 'war', 'freedom', 'democracy' and other frames, metaphors and persuasive definitions have been instrumental in waging an eternal war against an enemy that was not properly defined. Section 4.3, discusses major metaphors and framing in the context of War on Terror such as: good versus evil, hero versus villain, believers versus infidel, Faroun versus Musa (Pharaoh versus Moses) and loss versus gain.

4.1 WHAT IS WAR?

Whatever the definition of war may be it brings death, destruction and suffering. It not only affects human and other living beings but almost everything in an environment; therefore, it has always been an important issue in philosophy.

War is an ambiguous word and often defined in a way to serve some purposes of leaders. The very definition of war can be persuasive and hence, can manipulate judgments and perceptions of citizenry.[242] Let us focus on some theoretical definitions of war to understand under what circumstances we can call an event, a war.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy reveals war occurs only between political communities- A political community is either a state or wants to become so.

[242] See 2.3 for persuasiveness of definition

Moreover,

> War should be understood as an *actual, intentional and widespread* armed conflict between political communities.[243]

This demonstrates that wars only occur between political communities. Fight between two persons, gangs, mob and police, etc., according to the above definition, are not wars. However, a civil war is a war, for it involves political communities. Furthermore, war should be understood as a real, deliberate and widespread armed conflict. Mumbai attacks were not acts of war for neither they were widespread nor did they involve army, tanks, aerial bombing etc., however, what Israel does in Gaza is war, Pakistan and India were at war in 1965 and 1971, nations of the world were at war in World War I and World War II.

According to Clausewitz, war is a political instrument used by states and political entities,

> *War is nothing but the continuation of policies with other means.*[244]

Moreover,

> *[It] is an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will.*[245]

For him, Objectives of war can either be to overthrow the enemy or to occupy some of enemy's frontiers. Overthrowing enemy makes enemy politically helpless and militarily ineffective. In such a condition enemy can be forced to accept peace agreement. Occupied territory of enemy can either be annexed or can be used for bargaining at peace negotiations. This reveals that wars involve military and other means to compel enemy to surrender and accept some agreements. Moreover, it may also involve overthrowing of enemy and occupying of her frontiers.

Susan Sontag informs:

> Real wars are not metaphors. And real wars have a beginning and an

---

[243] Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy, First published Fri Feb, 2004; substantive revision Thu Jul 28, 2005: Available on line- http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/war/ (accessed September 13, 2009)
[244] Clausewitz, Carl Von, On War (1832): Translated by Howard, Michael and Peter Paret, Oxford University Press, (2007), p.7
[245] Ibid p. 13

end.[246]

This reveals that real war, besides other characteristics, also has beginning and end in time. War on cancer, war on drugs, war on poverty etc. are very long wars and perhaps will never end for all such wars are metaphors. Sheldon Rampton and John Stauber opine that:

> Drug use, poverty, disease and terrorism have all existed for a very long time, and they're not going to disappear simply because some politician declares war against them.[247]

For Susan Sontag war on terror is not a real war; rather it's a way to expand the use of American power.[248]

Moseley opines, although defining war is a philosophical obstacle yet it is important to define it. For him,

> [W]ar is a state of organized open-ended collective conflict.[249]

A short but comprehensive definition: Wars are organized- They are not like unorganized street fights. Wars are open-ended- They are not like cage fighting, boxing or wrestling. Wars are collective- Two persons fighting in an organized manner is not a war. Finally, wars involve conflicts resulting in violent and non-violent hostilities. The cause of war may be just or unjust but it causes destruction, death etc.

Vincenzo Ruggiero defines war as a 'crime of the powerful'. He believes that Iraq was targeted by America not because it was powerful and a threat to the west but because it was weak and extremely vulnerable target.[250] This may exhibit that war helps powerful countries to promote their agenda.

Conclusion: This brief discussion reveals wars can be actual or metaphorical. In 1965, Pakistan's war with India was an actual war. But war on poverty is not an actual

---

[246] Sontag, *Susan,* (2002)

[247] Rampton, Sheldon and John Stauber, Weapons of Mass deception, The Uses of Propaganda in Bush's War on Iraq: Jeremy P. Tracher/ Penguin, A Member of Penguin Group (USA) Inc. New York, 2003, p.128

[248] ibid

[249] Moseley, Alexander (2002) p.14

[250] Ruggiero Vincenzo, *War, Crime and Cosmopolitanism*: Published online: 1 June 2007, Springer Science+ Business Media B.V. 2007 (accessed February 10, 2009)

war for, 'war on poverty', is a metaphor. An actual war involves a widespread, organized, actual, intentional and collective armed conflict between political communities and it has beginning and an end. Through armed conflict political communities initiate, support and continue their agenda what so ever. It causes mass murder, destruction, hunger, economic instability, harm environment and it makes people refugees.

4.2 LANGUAGE OF WAR WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO WAR ON TERROR IN AFGHANISTAN

Aims: This section discusses in detail the way language has been used to wage a very long war against an enemy that was not properly defined. It reveals the way 'war' and 'terror' were defined and framed in the context of 9/11. Moreover, it discusses that what happened on 9/11 was a great disaster, it took thousands of lives; however, it was not an act of war, for no country declared war against America. Therefore, use of the word, 'war' was not correct.

4.2.1 'War' on 'Terror'

> *If you know the enemy and know yourself, you need not fear the result of a hundred battles. If you know yourself but not the enemy, for every victory gained you will also suffer a defeat. (Sun Tzu)*

On 11 September 2001 four American planes, American 11, United 175, United 93 and American 77 were hijacked. Most of the hijackers were from Saudi Arabia, others were from UAE, Egypt and Lebanon. Hijackers crashed two of the planes, American 11 and United 175, into north and south towers of World Trade Center respectively. American 77 was crashed into Pentagon and United 93 in Pennsylvania. All people on board including the terrorists were killed. Many civilian from all over the world and military personal, who were on the ground, were also killed in these acts of terrorists.[251] No civilized person can afford not to condemn incidents of 9/11.

---

[251] See 9/11 Commission Report: Available online on http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf (accessed January 30, 2008)
Also see http://www.wikipedia.org/

After several minutes of the attacks came the first public response from the President of the United States of America. He said, it is a 'difficult moment' and he called these, 'apparent terrorist attack' a 'national tragedy'. He ordered to help the 'victims' and 'hunt down' those who 'committed' this. Moreover, he declared,

> Terrorism against our nation will not stand.[252]

No sign of war in his first public response. It really was a difficult moment and a national tragedy. Moreover, it was natural to show determination to punish those who 'committed' this act of terror. 'Victims' and 'Hunt down' evoke frames that will be discussed shortly.

On the same day, after few hours, the President addressed the nation. In this address and other speeches and addresses employing language of war by using persuasive definitions and metaphor, he farmed the incidents in terms of war then farmed the war in terms of: a war against terrorism, a war between good and evil and a war between hero and a villain etc. The metaphorical understanding of 9/11 incidents in terms of war and then metaphorical understanding of this war in terms of terror had entailment effects, it highlighted some aspects such as, terrorist have declared war on America and hides other aspects such as attacks were on global capitalism and militarism[253], or the attacks were actually an outcome of American policies in the Middle East etc. Let us see how the 9/11 discussion was framed and what were the entailment effects.

President Bush said,

> Good evening. Today, our fellow citizens, our way of life, our very freedom came under attack in a series of deliberate and deadly terrorist acts…. Thousands of lives were suddenly ended by evil, despicable acts of terror.[254]

The President's address was emotively charged, ambiguous and metaphorical. It was not an attack on, 'way of life' or on, 'freedom', for it was a physical attack on

---

[252] Bush, G.W, Remarks of the President after Two Planes Crashed into World Trade Center: September 11, 2001

[253] Skoll Geoffrey R, *Meaning of Terrorism*: International Journal of Semiotics of Law, 2007, Springer 2006, p. 126 (accessed January 10, 2009)

[254] Bush, Statement by the President in his Address to the Nation: September 11, 2001

physical places. Moreover, according to the President it was an attack by 'evil'. He framed the discussion from the very first day as if an 'evil' has attacked America. Frame of evil attack evokes: a good force has been attacked by an evil force,[255] since Evil and Good are conceptualized together i.e. frame of evil also evokes opposite frame and vice versa. The President wanted people to understand the incidents of 9/11 in terms of a 'war' between 'good and evil'. He, recalling pictures and images of the incident, talked about the greatness and glory of America and American people, evoking the emotions of the people.

Within these few lines, Sandra opines, the President accomplished invoking 'fellow citizenry', 'way of life' and 'freedom',

> To invoke those symbols is to invoke precepts for which, I daresay, most Americans would give their/ our lives.[256]

The President argued,

> America was targeted for attack because we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world. And no one will keep that light from shining.[257]

America was attacked for America is the 'brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity'- a persuasive definition of America to evoke patriotism. Both 'targeted' and 'attack' are words used relative to war frame,[258] hence highlight war and hide any other understandings of the incidents that are inconsistent with war. Their entailment effect is an understanding that the nation is at war, moreover, 'attack' further entails that it is not us who wanted war, we have been attacked and we are still on 'target', therefore, we have to retaliate/respond now.

The President said:

> Today, our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature… The search is underway for those who are behind these evil acts…. bring

---

[255] See Lakoff's *Metaphors of Terror*: http://www.press.uchicago.edu/News/911lakoff.html, 2001 (accessed October 22, 2007)

[256] Silberstein, Sandra, War of Words- language, Politics and 9/11: Routledge London and New York, 2002, p.6

[257] Bush, Statement by the President in his Address to the Nation, September 11, 2001

[258] Words defined in a frame also evoke the frame. (see Fillmore and Lakoff section 2.4.3)

them to justice. We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them.[259]

The President continued framing enemy as evil. It seems he either had prior information about the terrorist or he gained handsome information on the same day, since the implicit message here is that someone is, 'harboring' the terrorist enemy-friends of evil. There is a clear threat to those who are harboring terrorists that America will make no distinction between them and the Terrorists- both are enemies of USA. In the same address the President sets out a strategy to fight and win war:

> America and our friends and allies join with all those who want peace and security in the world, and we stand together to win the war against terrorism.[260]

The entailment effect of framing is: if he and his friends stand together fighting for peace and security in the world against an enemy then that enemy does not want peace and security in the world. In the days to come this framing will highlight America and her allies as good people doing good things and their enemy as bad and evil, doing immoral and evil actions- promoting terrorism.

A very important move in American policy: the President defined himself and whoever will support him as people who want peace and security in the world and the enemy as, anyone who promotes terrorism.

Geoffrey Skoll argues that the definition of terrorism changes with political context, audience and users. (For example, People who are fighting in Kashmir against Indian army are, 'terrorist', according to India but, 'freedom fighters', according to Pakistani and Kashmiri people.) According to Skoll, till 19th and early 20th century terrorism was defined in America as individual rebellion against bourgeois power. In the mid of twentieth century it meant civil unrest, class struggles and any tactics used by nationalist. During cold war terrorism was defined as: whatever Soviet Union did, and now USA defines it,

---

[259] Bush, September 11, 2001
[260] Bush, September 11, 2001

...through statutes as any attack against itself or its interests.[261]

This reveals that the definition of terrorism kept on changing according to the interests of America. With changes in definition changed the perception and behavior of the people. For instance, during cold war people thought that Soviet Union is promoting terrorism and hence it is our enemy. Now with the change in definition they think, there are thousands and thousands of terrorists around the globe who are promoting terrorism and the President of the USA wants to defeat and eliminate 'terrorism'- War on Terrorism.

President Bush and other members of his administration kept on using 'war' in order to reinforce the war framing. This framing entailed that USA is in a state of war, for example, he informed:

> On Tuesday morning, September 11, 2001, terrorists attacked America in a series of despicable acts of terror.[262]

> ...people have declared war on America.[263]

One of the main justifications of war on terrorism was that 'people have already declared war on America'. Therefore, in response the President declared 'War on Terrorism' against the people who declared war on America. Habermas considers calling it a 'war against terrorism' is a serious mistake for declaration of war elevated criminals to a status of war enemies and one cannot wage war against a 'network'.[264]

> On September the 11th, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country.[265]

Using war frame he wanted people to understand incidents of 9/11 in terms of war, informing the world: We are at war with terrorism and we have a strategy to fight and win the war on terrorism. The framing effect was an understanding that: civilized, democratic and freedom loving world has been attacked dividing the world

---

[261] Skoll Geoffrey R, *Meaning of Terrorism*: International Journal of Semiotics of Law, 2007, Springer 2006, p. 126 (accessed January 10, 2009)
[262] Bush, National Day of Prayers and Remembrance for the Victims of the Terror Attacks on September 11, 2001: September 13, 2001
[263] Bush, Remarks by the President Upon Arrival: September 16, 2001
[264] Borradori, Giovanna (2003) pp. 34-35
[265] Bush, Address to a Joint Session of the Congress and the American People: September 20, 2001

...through statutes as any attack against itself or its interests.[261]

This reveals that the definition of terrorism kept on changing according to the interests of America. With changes in definition changed the perception and behavior of the people. For instance, during cold war people thought that Soviet Union is promoting terrorism and hence it is our enemy. Now with the change in definition they think, there are thousands and thousands of terrorists around the globe who are promoting terrorism and the President of the USA wants to defeat and eliminate 'terrorism'- War on Terrorism.

President Bush and other members of his administration kept on using 'war' in order to reinforce the war framing. This framing entailed that USA is in a state of war, for example, he informed:

> On Tuesday morning, September 11, 2001, terrorists attacked America in a series of despicable acts of terror.[262]

> ...people have declared war on America.[263]

One of the main justifications of war on terrorism was that 'people have already declared war on America'. Therefore, in response the President declared 'War on Terrorism' against the people who declared war on America. Habermas considers calling it a 'war against terrorism' is a serious mistake for declaration of war elevated criminals to a status of war enemies and one cannot wage war against a 'network'.[264]

> On September the 11th, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country.[265]

Using war frame he wanted people to understand incidents of 9/11 in terms of war, informing the world: We are at war with terrorism and we have a strategy to fight and win the war on terrorism. The framing effect was an understanding that: civilized, democratic and freedom loving world has been attacked dividing the world

---

[261] Skoll Geoffrey R, *Meaning of Terrorism*: International Journal of Semiotics of Law, 2007, Springer 2006, p. 126 (accessed January 10, 2009)
[262] Bush, National Day of Prayers and Remembrance for the Victims of the Terror Attacks on September 11, 2001: September 13, 2001
[263] Bush, Remarks by the President Upon Arrival: September 16, 2001
[264] Borradori, Giovanna (2003) pp. 34-35
[265] Bush, Address to a Joint Session of the Congress and the American People: September 20, 2001

into America and its allies- the good people, and terrorists and its friends- Axis of evil. America with her allies and all those who want good things on earth will fight and win the war against terrorism which actually is a war between good and evil.

It is evident that on September 11, 2001 the President in his very first formal response to the events talked about 'war on terrorism' used 'evil' several times and also made a strategy to fight the war. He continued with the same strategy till his last day in office. In the days to come the President and his administration evoke fear, patriotism and war frame using words and phrases like: destruction, victims, causalities, emergency funding, commander in chief, sons of America, heroes, enemy, terror, hunt down, smoke out, attacks etc., and above all, evil.

Not only the President but his administration was also busy in framing the events as acts of war. For example, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld informed that the President is rallying the nation against terrorism that has attacked American way of life. He further informed that this is a different kind of war with a changed vocabulary. But America will win this war. [266]

David Zarefsky, discussing power of persuasive definitions, argues that declaring terrorists incidents of September 11 as 'acts of war' is one of the most significant case of persuasive definition, since language used in the context of 9/11 was emotive, metaphorical and use of persuasive definitions were so ample that it appears as if the attacks were really acts of war and it was reasonable to start a war against terror. The reality has been, he reveals:

> ...wars are understood as military conflicts between nation-states. Yet no nation, not even Afghanistan, claimed responsibility for the attacks. No nation declared war against the United States; neither did the United States against any other nation.[267]

Wolfe opines that prior to 9/11, 'war' and 'terror' were always mentioned separately,

> By framing war and terror as a single concept, Bush seized the moment

---

[266] Rumsfeld Donald H, www.defense.gov , (accessed December 5, 2009)
[267] Zarefsky, David (2006) p. 409
Also see Hass Michael, George W. Bush, War Criminal? The Bush Administration's Liability for 269 War Crimes: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc 2009, p.22

to combine two traditionally separate forms of foreign policy.[268]

He further argues that framing 9/11 incidents as war on terror was instrumental in gaining public support.

Derrida opines that the expression, 'war on terrorism' is very confusing. Bush, although, speaks of war, but has failed to identify the enemy against whom he has declared war, since he has repeatedly informed that Afghans are not our enemies. Moreover, it is also very difficult to identify, Derrida reveals, the states that 'harbor' terrorists, since,

> The United States and Europe, London and Berlin, are also sanctuaries, places of training or formation and information for all the 'terrorists' of the world.[269]

Since there was no actual war going on; therefore, the President perhaps was finding it difficult to answer some basic questions such as: Which country has attacked America? Who wants Americans to change their ways of life and restrict their freedom? How to convince people that America is at war? He had to answer these basic questions. The President informed, 'terror/terrorism' has attacked America. He in his addresses defined and framed terror as:

I. Terror has no country, it knows no borders; therefore any country, that Americans believe has terrorist on her soil, can be attacked.(See Bush Speeches)

II. Terror has no sense of morality and knows no justice- it represents evil. It ruthlessly slaughters people without differentiating between innocent people and military people, therefore, while killing it no mercy should be shown and if it is captured alive, it needs not be treated as prisoner of war. (Killing civilians and not differentiating between civilian and military targets are normally considered as the defining characteristics of terrorism.)

III. Terror has no rationality, therefore, cannot be argued with. Negotiations with terror will give it more time making it more dangerous.

IV. Terror is a different enemy. It hides in shadows, lives in caves and is shy of

[268] Wolfe, Wojtek Mackiewucz (2008) p. 45
[269] Borradori, Giovanna (2003) p. 101

light. This portrays, it is not like a human enemy- it is like a beast or Dracula. Therefore, war on terror will be a 'different war'. It will end only after eliminating 'all terrorists of global reach'.

V. Terror is an enemy of freedom, democracy and plurality. Therefore, it has declared war on countries enjoying freedom, democracy and plurality.

This way the President framed 'terrorism'- the enemy who attacked America- the enemy whom Americans will fight back and do justice with. After 9/11, 'terror' or 'terrorists' or 'terrorism' evoke/highlighted all these frames. However, there has been a lot of criticism on 'War' on 'Terrorism'. Consider the following discussion.

Jeffrey Record argues, the President and his administration after 9/11 declared a 'war against terrorism of global reach' using terms like, 'war on terror', 'war on global terrorism,' ' global war on terrorism', 'war on terrorism,' ' and 'battle against international terrorism' etc.

> The nature and parameters of the GWOT, however, remain frustratingly unclear.... The challenge of grasping the nature and parameters of the GWOT is certainly not eased by the absence of a commonly accepted definition of terrorism or by the depiction of the GWOT as a Manichaean struggle between good and evil, 'us' versus 'them.'[270]

This demonstrates that there is no single well accepted definition of 'terrorism'. Virginia Held opines, governments, usually define (and modify already present definitions) terrorism in order to put their opponents (those who struggle to change/attack present political system) in the class of terrorists. Killing civilians is claimed to be the defining characteristic of terrorism as Bush and many other people argue. If this is true then US bombing on civilians of Vietnam and atomic bombs dropped by America on civilians of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were also acts of terrorism. But Americans believe that those were acts of war and were instrumental in winning wars.[271]

---

[270] Record Jeffrey, *Bounding The Global War on Terrorism*, Strategic Studies Institute United States Army War College, 2003 http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/2003/record_bounding.pdf (accessed November 1, 2010)

[271] Held Virginia, *Terrorism and War*: The Journal of Ethics, Vol. 8, No. 1, Terrorism 59-75, Published in 2004 by Springer, URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/25115781, p. 62-66 (January 8, 2009)

Coady citing Roger Woddis writes:

> Throwing a bomb is bad,
>
> Dropping a bomb is good;
>
> Terror, no need to add,
>
> Depends on who's wearing the hood.[272]

This further reveals, not only, 'terrorism', has no single well accepted definition but it is defined in different contexts to serve the purposes of the leaders and to manipulate public opinion.

Stephen D. Biddle suggests, Terrorism is not an enemy, it is a tactic and wars can be made on enemies not on methods. Moreover, there are hundreds of groups declared by their states, terrorist, since they are fighting with states for variety of reasons and for different political, religious and social agendas. Obviously, America was not going to fight all of them, since not all of them are threats for American interest.[273]

George Lakoff opines that 'war on terror' metaphor was instrumental in serving many purposes. It evoked a frame that the country is under military attack giving the President the powers which he does not enjoy in normal circumstances, for he becomes Commander in Chief, in times of war. Moreover,

> It forces Congress to give unlimited powers to the President, lest detractors be called unpatriotic.[274]

This reveals, by using war frame The President gained extended powers and any criticism against the President and his policies could be termed unpatriotic, for war frame evokes unquestioned patriotism too.

In the context of 9/11 leaders of allied forces, especially Bush, had to answer, who attacked America? Why it has been attacked etc. Their answers were: America has been attacked by Terrorism, who knows no boarders, who has no rationality and knows no morality. Therefore, America will fight a war against Terrorism- a war that

---

[272] Coady C. A. J p.1

[273] Biddle Stephen D, *American Grand Strategy After 9/11: An Assessment*: Strategic Studies Institute 2005, p.6, Available online www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi (accessed March 23, 2008)

[274] Lakoff, George. *"War on Terror," Rest in Peace*: Available online on http://www.rockridgeinstitute.org/index.html (accessed December 10, 2007)

has no boarders. It will not negotiate with terrorism and will show no mercy.

Conclusion: In the context of 9/11, the American leadership was not talking literally they were talking metaphorically and in an emotionally charged manner using language of war as an instrument of war. One can fight a war, a real not a metaphorical one, with Germans, French, Indians and Pakistanis etc. In such a war enemy is clearly defined- Germans, Indian etc. But one cannot fight a war with poverty, beauty, and terrorism (a tactic) etc. A war on poverty is metaphorical understanding of war. Similarly, war on terror/terrorism/global terrorism is metaphorical. Moreover, they were using some key terms, like enemy and objectives of war without, their proper definitions. Whereas, war is a very serious matter where one has to identify the enemy and must mention a just cause against it before going into war.

How a country or a group of countries can declare war against, 'terror', 'terrorism', 'terrorists of global reach', 'people who harbor terrorism' etc? Perhaps, War on Terror is really a war of words.

4.2.2 When did War on Terror really begin: 9/11 or 10/7 (Appearance and Reality)?

This section argues that there was no war till 10/7 but the President was continuously using war frame. Moreover, using 'War on Terror' metaphor, and framing this war to be 'different' and a 'long' war, he claimed that this war will not end, until every 'terrorist of the world' is dealt with.

Following are some passages to demonstrate that the President using language of war convinced people that America is at war, well before the actual war began:

> The deliberate and deadly attacks which were carried out yesterday against our country were more than acts of terror. They were acts of war… Freedom and democracy are under attack… But we will not allow this enemy to win the war by changing our ways of life or restricting our freedom.[275]

'Deadly attacks' evokes war frame. Bush defined these attacks as 'acts of war'

[275] Bush, Remarks of the President in Photo Opportunity with the National Security Team: September12, 2001

rather than just acts of terror. Obviously if these attacks were acts of war, then the nation must get prepared to fight and win the war. He informed people that 'freedom and democracy', (highlighting the most cherished ideals of the civilized world) are under attack, since they are hated by terror/terrorist/terrorism. These words were used to evoke emotions of people who love freedom and democracy. 'Win the war' strongly evokes the war frame although there was no war.

> On Tuesday morning, September 11, 2001, terrorists attacked America in a series of despicable acts of terror.[276]

'Attack' is a word defined and understood in relation to war frame. 'Terrorist attack', 'despicable acts of terror' connect war with terror making war, 'war on terror'.

> Those who make war against the United States have chosen their own destruction.[277]

This reveals that enemy had already begun war against America by doing so it has chosen, 'destruction' for her. The message is, enemy has begun the war, no justification of going into war is needed- we do not have to justify it we have to hit back.

> As I said yesterday, people have declared war on America, and they have made a terrible mistake …[278]

No country not even Afghanistan had declared war against America[279] but still the President is using 'war' over and over to evoke, reinforce and strengthen war framing.

Vincenzo Ruggiero, declaring war a crime of powerful, opines that war strategies address past and future events. Wars are sometimes waged to erase the humiliation.[280] Incidents of 9/11 were great humiliation; it was a failure of USA's

---

[276] Bush, National Day of Prayers and Remembrance for the Victims of the Terror Attacks on September 11, 2001: September 13,2001

[277] Bush, radio address to the Nation: September 15, 2001

[278] Bush, Remarks by the president Upon arrival: September 16, 2001

[279] See Zarefsky, David (2006) page 409.

[280] Ruggiero Vincenzo, *War, Crime and Cosmopolitanism*: Published online: 1 June 2007, Springer Science+ Business Media B.V. 2007, p.213 (accessed February 10, 2009)

power. Perhaps, in order to erase this humiliation America attacked weak countries like Afghanistan and Iraq.

Bush on September 17, 2001 said:

> They represent evil and war.[281]

They (read terrorist, enemy) are representatives of evil, therefore, no morality, rationality and justice should be expected from them. As mentioned earlier, the President framed terrorists as representative of evil, this way he connected 'war' with 'terror'.

> In the week since the attack, our compassion and generous citizens have led the first phase in the war on terrorism.[282]

American citizens are defined as being compassionate and generous- a persuasive definition with emotive words. The President is stating that the citizens have led 'the first phase in the war'.

On September 20, 2001 the President forcefully evoked and reinforced war framing.

> On September the 11th, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country. Americans have known wars…Americans have known the causalities of war… Americans have known surprise attacks…a world where freedom itself is under attack… Our war on terror begins with al Qaeda, but does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated…. Freedom and fear are at war…. Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them.[283]

'Enemies', 'causalities', 'surprise attacks', 'under attack', and 'cruelty', all evoke 'war on terror'. The President is extending the war by using very vague language, 'terrorist of global reach'. Biddle opines it is not clear who the enemy is

---

[281] Bush, "Islam is Peace" says the President: September 17, 2001
[282] Bush, President Launches Online American Relief and Response Effort: September 18, 2001
[283] Bush, Address to a Joint Session of the Congress and the American People: September 20, 2001

since terrorism per se cannot be enemy. Moreover, any terrorist having internet service or an airline ticket has, 'global reach'.[284] If America is going to find, stop and defeat every 'terrorist of global reach', then one can imagine the reach of war on terror. Perhaps, Susan Sontag's argument appears to be correct that it is not a war but, rather, a mandate for expanding the use of American power.[285]

The President informed, freedom and justice are at war with fear and cruelty- this defines Americans to be freedom loving and just and the enemy to be fearful and cruel. In the end the President evokes religious frame too to further persuade and prepare people for war.

Jeff Lewis opines that the President informed, in his discourse, the real targets of evil terrorists were democracy and freedom just to make people understand why they have been attacked and who attacked them? This discourse helped him to evoke patriotism and a demand for divinely inspired retribution convincing people that now it's the divine responsibility of the good people to punish the attackers. However, Jeff Lewis believes, the real purpose of war has been to control the world oil resources.[286]

Chomsky informs, it was not an issue not to punish the people who were behind 9/11 terrorist attack. The actual argument was how to punish? The argument, first to provide Taliban with an evidence that Osama has a link with 9/11 attacks, then employing diplomatic pressure to hand him over to UN, and finally prosecuting him and other terrorists according to international law, was completely ignored by Washington.[287] This suggests that instead of going for retribution Americans went for revenge.

Conclusion: What happened on 9/11 was a great tragedy, it took thousands of lives, but it was not an act of war, for no country declared war against America. There were no widespread conflicts, enemy was not properly identified, no armies, no tanks etc. Moreover, political communities can be attacked by other political communities, but freedom, democracy and way of life cannot be attacked. Such terms were used just to persuade the public for war. Furthermore, it was an attack by human beings on American territory, but the President portrayed as if an evil has attacked the whole civilized world. And now it is responsibility of the whole civilized world to stand and

---

[284] Biddle Stephen D. 2005, p.6
[285] Sontag , Susan (2002)
[286] Lewis, Jeff, Language Wars- The Role of Media and Culture in Global Terror and Political Violence: Pluto Press London, 2005, page 98
[287] Chomsky, Noam. *The War in Afghanistan*: Z Magazine, February 1, 2002, (available online on www.Chomsky.info)

fight evil, not fighting this war would put a country in the group of uncivilized evil terrorists. Almost, every member of Bush's administration and other leaders of the allied forces especially of Britain were using: war, evil, destruction, good, fight, etc., over and over to strengthen the desired frames. There was no war, but use of framing, metaphors, and persuasive definitions convinced majority of the people that a very long war has already been declared by and from Afghanistan and now America has to fight back and win this war otherwise an age of terror will begin and 'future generations' will 'suffer' and 'blame' us . President Bush kept on using this language even after America and her allies formally attacked Afghanistan.

In fact there had been no war till October 6, 2001. The actual war began on October 7, by America and her Allies. The official name of the war is 'Operation Enduring Freedom'; there are other names too such as, Operation Infinite Justice and Operation Ultimate Justice. All these metaphors highlight that this war will result into everlasting freedom, and it will bring everlasting and permanent justice in the world. However, this framing hides mass civilian causalities, hunger, disease, and the sufferings of IDPs and refuges. With Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) began the War on Terror (WOT) which soon became Global War on Terror (GWOT). Neither did Allied Forces give any timetable, nor did they clearly mention places and countries where this war on terror was to be fought. For Bush, without any evidential support, claimed,

> There are thousands of these terrorists in more than 60 countries.[288]

4.3 MAJOR METAPHORS AND FRAMING IN THE CONTEXT OF WAR ON TERROR

> *In most cases, what is at issue is not the truth or falsity of a metaphor but the perceptions and inferences that follow from it and the actions that are sanctioned by it. In all aspects of life, not just in politics or in love, we define reality in terms of metaphors and then proceed to act on the basis of metaphors. We draw*

[288] Bush (September 20, 2001)

inferences, set goals, make commitments, and execute plans, all on the basis of how we in part structure our experience, consciously and unconsciously, by mean of metaphor. (Lakoff and Johnson)

Aims: This section discusses major metaphors and framing in the context of War on Terror such as: good versus evil, hero versus villain, believers versus infidel, Faroun versus Musa (Pharaoh versus Moses) and loss versus gain. It also discusses the way persuasive definitions, emotive, vague and ambiguous words/phrases have been instrumental in the war to maneuver public opinion.

4.3.1 Good versus Evil[289]

Aims: This subsection briefly discusses that evoking evil frame in the context of war has not been new. It discusses in detail the way good versus evil was instrumental in War on Terror in Afghanistan.

Use of evil frame has always been instrumental in persuading public for war and covering violence and brutalities in the name of lesser evil. Jonathan Charteris-Black informs that Winston Churchill during the Second World War created a heroic myth representing Hitler and his allies as forces of Evil and Britain and her allies as forces of Good. Churchill, using nation/state as person metaphor conceptualized Britain as hero, France and other countries as victims, and Germany as villain. He portrayed that Britain (Hero) was not fighting the war out of self interest, but to save the world (Victims) from barbarianism and evil (Hitler-villain).[290] On the other hand Nazis presented Hitler as a heroic moral leader who was defending western civilization and was fighting against powerful evil enemies of the world.[291] Black informs, Toney Blair also widely used metaphor of Good versus Evil after 9/11 to wage war against Afghanistan and Iraq.[292]

---

[289] For more details see; Khan, Sarfraz and Shuja Ahmad, *Good versus Evil: Argument to Begin Global War on Terrorism*: in Central Asia, 2009, Issue No 64 (An article written by the scholar and his Supervisor)

[290] Black, Jonathan Charteris, Politician and Rhetoric- The Persuasive Power of Metaphor: published by Palgrave Macmillan New York (2005) p. 34

[291] Herf, Jeffrey, The Jewish Enemy, Nazi Propaganda During World war II and the Holocaust: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006, p. 268

[292] Black, Jonathan Charteris, (2005) p. 150

George Lakoff explaining use of evil metaphor in war opines,

> The enemy of evil is good. If our enemy is evil, we are inherently good. Good is our essential nature and what we do in the battle against evil is good.[293]

He informs that many cruel actions can be framed as lesser evil. Lesser evil in context of war means: curtailing individual liberties, sanctioning political assassinations, toppling of governments in different countries, collateral damages, torturing the enemy and hiring and supporting criminals etc.[294]

After 9/11, President Bush and his administration and other allies using good versus evil frame persuaded American people and the rest of the world to wage war. They argued; since Americans are champions of freedom, democracy and pluralism, therefore, they have been attacked by an Evil and his friends (who harbor evil), for evil hate all these values. They also informed, without any evidential support that the attacks of evil are not confined only to America, its targets are around all civilized world. Hence, the whole civilized world must unite and fight this evil.

Following are some excerpts from President Bush's and Prime Minster Toney Blair's speeches revealing the way they used language of war setting forth persuasive definition and evoking the evil frame to shape the perception and behavior of the people:

> Today, our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature…. The search is underway for those who are behind these evil acts.[295]

In his first formal address to the nation on 9/11 the President repeatedly used 'evil' evoking the evil frame and framing the discussion of war as a war between good and evil.

> The American people need to know that we're facing a different enemy…. This enemy hides in shadows, and has no regard for human life…. preys on innocent and unsuspecting people, runs for cover...

---

[293] Lakoff, George. *Metaphors of Terror*: http://www.press.uchicago.edu/News/911lakoff.html, 2001 (accessed October 22, 2007)
[294] ibid
[295] Bush, Statement by the President in His Address to the Nation September 11, 2001

> This enemy attacked not just our people, but all freedom-loving people everywhere in the world.[296]

Here, enemy has been defined in a very persuasive and metaphorical manner: 'different enemy' that hides in 'shadows'. 'Shadows' 'darkness' etc., evoke evil frame while 'light' evokes good frame. The evil enemy has no regard for, 'human life'. 'Preys' evokes animal frame. If enemy 'preys on innocent' then it is necessarily evil. Coady, while defining terrorism, uses non- combatants, instead of, 'innocent', for 'innocent', he argues, is misleading.[297] Enemy has no regard for human life, and it, 'preys on innocent unsuspected people' also evoke negative emotions for the language is highly emotively charged.

> This will be a monumental struggle of good versus evil. But good will prevail.[298]

Fighting War on Terror has been defined in a very profound manner i.e., 'monumental struggle of good versus evil'. Moreover, the President jumped to the conclusion saying, 'Good will prevail'.

Evoking good versus evil was not difficult for leaders, since idea of evil is present in almost all cultures. Children in almost all cultures grow with stories, movies and cartoons telling and showing a war/fight between good and evil. Robert Ivie and Oscar Giner opine, although Americans do not think about devil in its medieval sense, yet the nation has an idea, a concept of evil. They inform,

> In the nation's language and history, in its arts and spirituality, beneath the cornerstone of America's political and economic systems, the devil lies shallowly buried, ready to surface at any moment that he is summoned or conjured.[299]

The President took benefit from this already present frame by using words that evoke this frame over and over again to make people think, understand and act in a

---

[296] Bush (September 12, 2001)

[297] Coady C. A. J, *The Morality of Terrorism*: Philosophy, Vol. 60, No 231, Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of Royal Institute of Philosophy, Stable URL: Http://www.jstore.org/stable/3750562, (accessed August 16, 2009), 1985 p.54

[298] Bush, September 12, 2001

[299] Ivie Robert and Oscar Giner, *Hunting the Devil: Democracy's Rhetorical Impulse to War*: Presidential Studies Quarterly, December, 2007 (accessed April 03, 2008)

manner that our country has been attacked by an evil force and now it is time to fight back and defeat the enemy- and make no mistake good always wins.

> We're facing a new kind of enemy, somebody so barbaric … a new kind of evil.[300]

The enemy is explained in terms of 'barbaric' and a 'new kind of evil'. This metaphorical understanding highlights: the enemy is cruel, ruthless, its enemy of God, good people, and all good things in the world. It knows no justice and morality. Moreover, it hides the possibility of any fruitful negotiations with enemy for barbaric evil enemy is not supposed to be rational.

> We do not know the exact origin of this evil. But, if, as appears likely, it is so- called Islamic fundamentalism …[301]

Blair connected evil with Islamic fundamentalism giving this war a religious flavor.

> …we're too great a nation to allow the evil-doers to affect our soul and our spirit.[302]

This evokes patriotism and good versus evil frame for it is believed that evil attacks, 'soul and spirit' of good people. Moreover, 'barbaric' is a negatively charged term.

> This is a struggle that concerns us all, the whole of the democratic and civilized and free world. And we have to do two things very clearly; we have to bring to account those responsible, and then we have to set about at every single level, in every way that we can, dismantling the apparatus of terror, and eradicating the evil of mass terrorism in our world.[303]

Using Bush's framing, PM Blair also informed that evil of mass terrorism

---

[300] Bush, Remarks by the President on arrival: September 16, 2001
[301] Blair, Statement to the Parliament in Response to the Terrorist Attacks on US: www.number10.gov.uk (9/14/2001)
[302] Bush, President Launches Online American Relief and Response Effort: September 18, 2001
[303] Blair, UK's Blair Pledges Solidarity, September 20, 2001 (white house website)

should be eradicated and punished. Blair emphasized on 'bringing into account those who are responsible'. Peter Lieberman reveals that general perception of public about violence is: if violence remains unpunished then it encourages more violence.[304] Perhaps, this was the reason that a majority of public started supporting war on terror.

'Democratic' and 'civilized' evoke good. The entailment effects are: whatever we do will be good like, bringing to account those who are responsible. 'Apparatus of evil', 'eradicate', 'evil', and 'mass terrorism', evoke evil frame. Entailment effects are: whatever they do and whatever they have is evil and apparatus of terror. It is evident from Blair's remarks that Bush's framing is working and leaders of the other nations are thinking the way Bush wants them to think. These leaders will now talk to people of their countries and manipulate the way their respective citizenry think and act.

> The terrorists' directive commands them to kill Christians and Jews, to kill all Americans, and make no distinction among military and civilians, including women and children.[305]

Enemies of terrorists are: Christians, Jews, Americans, military, civilians, woman and children- almost everyone in the world who is innocent. In the context of 9/11 this lists constitutes the frame of good i.e., whenever any of these words will be used frame of good will be evoked and whenever anyone will attack anyone of the above mentioned group- frame of evil will be evoked.

> This is not, however, just America's fight.... This is civilization's fight. This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism, tolerance and freedom.[306]

The fight has been defined in such a way that it has broadened the war. The war has become a 'civilization's fight'- a fight between progressive civilized world (good) and intolerant dictators (evil). 'Progress', 'pluralism', 'tolerance' and 'freedom' all are positively charged terms used for good people i.e., the American and their friends- obviously the enemy of good is evil.

---

[304] Liberman Peter (2006)
[305] Bush, Address to the Joint Session of Congress and the American People, September 20, 2001
[306] Bush, September 20, 2001

> They're flat evil. That's all they can think about, is evil. And as a nation of good folks, we're going to hunt them down, and we're going to find them, and we will bring them to justice.[307]

Good people are going to 'hunt them down'. Hunt down also evokes an animal frame. The evil enemy is like a wild animal that is destroying the civilized world. It needs to be hunt down. Metaphor of evil and animal jointly evoke the frame of an irrational and immoral enemy. Peter Liberman reveals that political leaders using good versus evil make their enemy appear more dangerous, thus mobilizing citizenry for military competition and war.[308]

> I consider bin Laden an evil man. .... This is a man who's declared war on innocent people... doesn't mind destroying women and children... hates freedom. This is an evil man...He has got evil goals. And it's hard to think in conventional terms about a man so dominated by evil...[309]

A persuasive definition of Bin Laden comprising a list of his attributes: evil man, a man who declared war on innocent, destroy woman and children (innocent people), a man with evil goals, immensely dominated by evil. All these emotive words evoke negative frames. Moreover, 'destroying woman and children' very strongly evokes evil frame since it is an attack on good frame. This further illustrates that Bush portrayed War on Terror as a war between evil and good. James Bovard opines, by evoking good versus evil in war against Afghanistan and Iraq,

> .... he [Bush] represents himself as the Supreme Leader of Goodness.[310]

King Abdullah, perhaps convinced by Bush's framing, said on September 28, 2001,

---

[307] Bush, President: FBI Needs Tools to Track Down terrorists: September 25, 2001
[308] Lieberman Peter, *An Eye for an Eye: Public Support for War Against Evildoers*: International Organization 60, Summer 2006, 687-722, p.687 (accessed February 26, 2010)
[309] Bush, President meets with Muslim leaders: September 26, 2001
[310] Bovard, James, The Bush Betrayal: Palgrave Macmillan, New York, (2004) p. 268

As the President said, this is a fight against evil…[311]

This further reveals that Bush framing was instrumental in shaping the perceptions of his allies. The leaders of the world who were allies of American had started using the language Bush had been using. This demonstrates language of war was instrumental in shaping the world view of the people around the globe.

> We face a brand of evil, the likes of which we haven't seen in a long time in the world. These are people who strike and hide, people who know no borders … people who depend upon others…[312]

Enemy is defined as a new 'brand of evil' the world has never seen before since they 'strike and 'hide', moreover they know no 'border' and they 'depend on others'. 'Depend on others' evokes parasite frame. The entailment effects are: the evil enemy is new and since they know no borders they can go anywhere and since we want to eliminate evil globally; so, we will follow them and we (good) can also go anywhere in the world .

> It was the event of September 11 that marked a turning point in history, where we confront the dangers of the future and assess the choices facing humankind. It was a tragedy. An act of evil…. We are not the ones who waged war on the innocent. We seek the guilty.[313]

The event is defined as a 'turning point in history', (Bush also framed the war, a monumental struggle between good and evil, see above) failing to recognize its importance will endanger human race. Moreover it was an 'act of evil'. We (read the good ones) seek the guilty (read the evil ones).

> We must bring Bin laden and other Al Qaida leaders to justice and eliminate the terrorist threat they pose… if Taliban regime will not comply with that objective, we must bring about change in that regime…. The Taliban regime must yield them up or become our

---

[311] Remarks by President Bush and His majesty King Abdullah, September 28, 2001
[312] Bush, At O'Hare President says "Get on Board": September 27, 2001
[313] Blair, October 2, 2001 www.guardian.co.uk (accessed 24 September, 2009)

enemy…. this evil of mass terrorism….[314]

Bringing Al Qaida leaders (evil terrorist who kill innocent people) to justice evokes: we are just and do justice. They are evil whom we should bring to justice. 'Comply' in this context means 'we are superior/more powerful/just etc. Regime change is a 'lesser evil'- the metaphorical understanding of regime change is: good people in order to eradicate evil can go for lesser evil.

> They understand it's now time to unite to defeat evil. …. Either you're for us, or you're against us…. I will enforce the doctrine that says that if you house a terrorist, you're just as guilty as the terrorists themselves.[315]

'Good people' must unite to defeat 'evil', forcefully evokes good versus evil frame. The struggle should be conceptualized as a struggle between good and evil. The entailment effect of this was very shocking; it divides the world between two forces Good and Evil leaving no neutral grounds. No country after this framing of war can claim that she is neutral for there is no such place. The conceptual understanding of war does not allow neutrality.

> This is a war between good and evil….we expect other nations to join us…It is a war to save the world.[316]

The frame of evil is evoked once again and the war is defined as a war to save the world- a definition of war which surely shaped the perceptions of the people. Moreover, the President expects other nations to join him in saving the world. It demonstrates that whoever is with the President is actually saving the world, but the critics of the President are with evil for they don't want to save and secure the world.

> Today we focus on Afghanistan, but the battle is broader. Every nation has a choice to make. In this conflict, there is no neutral ground.[317]

The President informed that he is 'focused' on Afghanistan. 'Focus' here

---

[314] Blair, Statement to the Parliament: www.number10.gov.uk , October 4, 2001
[315] Bush, President Unveils Back to Work Plan: October 4, 2001
[316] Bush, President Directs Humanitarian Aid to Afghanistan: October 4, 2001
[317] Bush, Radio Address of the President to the Nation: October 7, 2001

means 'an attack'. Perhaps, it will be revealed one day why Americans attacked Afghanistan since none of the terrorist had anything to do with Afghanistan. Simon Harak informs that none of the 17 people who attacked on 9/11 were Afghan. None of them have ever been to Afghanistan, so there is no question of their getting trained in Afghanistan. But USA attacked Afghanistan,

> ... without offering any proof- that the terror perpetrators are hiding out there.[318]

The President from the very outset is defining the war: the battle is not just confined to Afghanistan it is 'broader'. 'Broader' is a vague term, in the context of 9/11.

Moreover, nation as a person metaphor is used- persons have to choose between good and evil, for there is no neutral ground. 'No neutral ground' was used for those nations who were reluctant in going to war, who thought there are other options/solutions of this problem than war. The framing of war will declare all such nations as friends of evil, for there is no neutral ground between good and evil. Furthermore, this framing also silences critics.

Colin Powell using President Bush's language introduced a new metaphor: 'evil merchants of death and destruction'[319].Every word in this metaphor evokes evil frame. The metaphorical understanding is: enemies of America are evil merchants who deal in death and destruction. Entailments effects are: one should not side with these merchants. Whoever does business with them, also deals in death and destruction. And whoever stops them actually saves lives and destruction. This reveals that not only Bush but rest of his administration was also using metaphor of evil to frame the war as good versus evil.

> Terrorists try to operate in the shadows. They try to hide. But we're going to shine the light of justice on them. We list their names, we publicize their pictures, we rob them of their secrecy. Terrorism has a face, and today we expose it for the world to see... The men on the wall here have put themselves on the list because of great acts of evil.

---

[318] Harak G. Simon, Philosophical Perspectives On the 'War on Terrorism': Edited by Gail M. Presbey, Rodopi Amsterdam- New York 2007, p. xiv

[319] Powell, Colin: November 20, 2001, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2001/nov/20/afghanistan.israel

> They plan, promote and commit murder. They fill the minds of others with hate and lies. And by their cruelty and violence, they betray whatever faith they espouse…. Eventually, no corner of the world will be dark enough to hide in… Our war is not against a religion. Our war is against evil.[320]

Besides other words that evoke evil frame, he used 'evil' seven times in this speech- using a frame over and over again, reinforces and strengthens a frame.[321] 'Terrorists', 'shadows', 'hide', 'publicize their pictures', 'rob', 'secrecy', 'terrorism has a face', 'men on the wall', 'acts of evil', 'plan promote and commit murder', 'hate and lies', 'cruelty', 'violence', 'betray', 'dark', and 'evil' all evoke evil frame. Bush and his allies will shine the light of justice on evil. 'Shine', 'light', and 'justice' evoke good.

> The hijackers were instruments of evil who died in vain. Behind them is a cult of evil which seeks to harm the innocent and thrives on human suffering. Theirs is the worst kind of cruelty, the cruelty that is fed, not weakened, by tears. Theirs is the worst kind of violence, pure malice, while daring to claim the authority of God. We cannot fully understand the designs and power of evil. It is enough to know that evil, like goodness, exists. And in the terrorists, evil has found a willing servant.[322]

In the context of 9/11, 'hijackers', 'instruments of evil', 'cult of evil', 'harm the innocent', 'thrives on human suffering', 'cruelty', fed by tears', violence', 'pure malice', 'claim the authority of God', 'power of evil' all evoke evil frame.

'Tears', in almost all cultures of the world, represent weakness, fear etc. The metaphorical understanding is: weakness is bad since our weakness makes evil strong. Hence, to fight evil one should not be weak. One should be strong enough to fight evil.[323] Moreover this evil has found a servant- the terrorists. But this evil has an enemy too- Bush.

---

[320] Bush, President Unveils "Most Wanted" Terrorist: October 10, 2001
[321] See framing, chapter 2.
[322] Bush, President pays Tribute at Pentagon Memorial: October 11, 2001
[323] ' Someone who is morally weak cannot stand up to evil and so will eventually commit evil' Lakoff, George, Moral Politics (1996) p. 73

4.3.2 Believers versus infidels (Good versus evil)

Aims: This subsection briefly reveals that use of believer versus infidel has not been new. It establishes the way Taliban and Osama used language as a tool of war to frame the War on Terror, a struggle between believers and infidels.

Similar to good versus evil framing is Believers versus infidels. What is true for good versus evil is mostly true for believers versus infidels. However, more religious diction has to be used in framing the war, a war between believers and infidels. For instance, President Franklin Roosevelt on May 27, 1941, said that Nazis recognize no God except Hitler. Like communists they ruthlessly deny God. They are threatening even our right of worship. He said

> Today the whole world is divided between human slavery and human freedom -- between pagan brutality and the Christian ideal. We choose human freedom -- which is the Christian ideal. No one of us can waver for a moment in his courage or his faith.[324]

In another speech he narrated the story that if Hitler wins he has planned to abolish all existing religions of the world. This message was for the Prote stant, Catholic, Hindu, Mohammedan, Buddhist, and Jewish i.e., almost all the believers. Moreover, he informed, that property of all the churches will be detained by the Reich and its puppets.

> In the place of the churches of our civilization, there is to be set up an international Nazi church…In the place of the Bible, the words of Mein Kampf will be imposed and enforced as Holy Writ. And in place of the cross of Christ will be put two symbols -- the swastika and the naked sword. The A god of blood and iron will take the place of the God of love and mercy.[325]

> With Thy blessing, we shall prevail over the unholy forces of our

---

[324] Roosevelt Franklin, "We Chose Human Freedom" May 27, 1941: President Franklin Delano Roosevelt Radio Address Announcing the Proclamation of an Unlimited National Emergency available on http://www.usmm.org/fdr/emergency.html (accessed March 16, 2010)

[325] Roosevelt Franklin, "The forward march of Hitler and of Hitlerism can be stopped -- and it will be stopped." October 27, 1941 http://www.usmm.org/fdr/kearny.html (accessed March 16, 2010)

enemy.[326]

All this narrates that infidels/non believers/enemies of God and religion have planned to conquer the world. Their god is Hitler, their holy book is Mein Kampf, and their religious symbols are swastika and naked sword. Moreover, Hitler is defined as 'god of blood and iron': a persuasive definition, enough to evoke fear and hatred. Words that evoke infidel/non believers frame in the above excerpts are: 'human slavery', 'pagan brutality', 'abolish all existing religions', 'Reich and its puppets', 'international Nazi church', 'Mein Kampf', 'swastika and the naked sword', 'god of blood and iron' and 'unholy forces'. Words that evoke believers frame are: 'human freedom', 'Christian ideal', 'courage', 'faith', 'Protestant', 'Catholic', 'Hindu', 'Mohammedan', 'Buddhist', and 'Jewish', 'churches', 'our civilization', 'the Bible', 'Holy Writ', 'cross of Christ', 'God', 'love' and 'mercy'. The metaphorical understanding of his speeches was: Believers all over the world are in danger. If infidels win then they will lose even their right to worship. Churches and other holy places will be replaced by international Nazis churches. Holy religious symbols like cross of the Christ will be replaced by swastika and naked sword- only lawlessness and brutality will rule. The world has been divided into two halves: one dominated by pagan brutality and the other by Christian ideal. Moreover, these unholy forces want to dominate the world ruled by Christian Ideals. To avoid all this believers of the world must unite and defeat the enemy.

On December 24, 2002, Saddam Hussain in Christmas message used, 'evil' four times framing America, Britain, and their allies, evil and infidel. He argued that infidel/evil forces of the world want to dominate the world. He said,

> … [circumstances] have been manufactured by the forces of evil and darkness to create a situation of instability and chaos, dissent and antagonism, and tension in many parts of the world…. the headquarters of evil have begun looking for a new means… our resilient people, in all their faiths, Muslims, Christians and others, take today a strong stand of dignity and pride, armed with faith and high self-confidence, relying on Allah the all-powerful, as they face up to those who have

[326] Roosevelt Franklin, D- Day prayer, June 6, 1944, http://www.historyplace.com/speeches/fdr-prayer.htm (accessed March 16, 2010)

neither faith, nor shame, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, or even the most basic of human values.[327]

Headquarters of allied forces have been defined in a very persuasive manner, 'headquarters of evil'. Supporters of Saddam, on the other hand, are resilient people of all faiths who rely on God having high self- c onfidence. Words that framed America, Britain, and their allies, infidel/evil are: 'forces of evil and dark', 'instability', 'chaos', 'dissent', 'antagonism', 'tension', 'hegemonise', 'lies', 'deception', 'fabrication', 'false accusation', 'threats', 'military aggression', 'inflicted', 'unjust blockade', 'hidden agendas', 'wickedness', 'perfidy', 'wicked goals', 'headquarters of evil', 'enemies of Allah and humanity', 'injustice', 'aggression', 'wickedness of the evil-minded', 'Satan'. Moreover, he portrayed himself and his friends, good people/believers who were fighting against satanic forces. Words at work are: 'great people', 'people of our glorious Arab nation', 'Christians', 'honourable people', 'mankind', 'Jesus Christ', 'Son of Mary', 'Prophet Muhammad son of Abdullah', 'Prophets', 'prayers and peace', 'peace loving people', 'sincerity', 'great people of Iraq', 'reliance on Allah', 'Jihad', 'justice, human values', 'holly faith in Islam', 'noble objectives', and 'honourable aspirations'.[328]

This reveals that Saddam Hussain portrayed himself and his supporters, believers, and his enemies, infidel evils. The metaphorical understanding of his war discourse had been: infidels of the world have made an alliance to dominate the world, to control the world's future and fortune. These forces of evil are enemies of God. They, neither have faith, nor shame, or conscientiousness. Moreover, they do not have the most basic human values. One cannot trust them. Believers of the world must unite and fight them. God will help believers and enemies of God will be defeated. Any criticism of Saddam's policies would have entailed siding evil.

Saddam Hussain, in another address to the nation, said,

> We have always complied, even what is illegitimate and unjust among the demands and allegations of the evil ones…. But when evil comes, armed with deceit and destruction, we must face them with faith and holy struggle in a manner which dignifies us and satisfies God…. Hit

---

[327] Hussain, Saddam, *Saddam Christmas Message: Excerpts*: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/2604699.stm (accessed March 14, 2010)
[328] For more details, see *Saddam Christmas Message Excerpt*

them so that good and its people reign and evil evicted back to its place....[329]

Once again, he framed the war, a war between believers and enemies of God. Enemy who is armed with deceit and destruction will be defeated by people who will face the enemy with faith and holy struggle.

In War on Terror, Bush and his friends framed the discussion of war, as a war between good and evil. Taliban and Osama framed the discussion of war, as a war between believers and infidels. This way they persuaded people to fight back in Afghanistan shaping their judgment, perception and behavior. Following are some excerpts to demonstrate the way Taliban and Osama framed the war as believer versus infidel:

> Hypocrisy stood in force behind the head of infidels worldwide, behind the cowards of this age, America and those who are with it. These events have divided the whole world into two sides. The side of believers and the side of infidels, may God keep you away from them. Every Muslim has to rush to make his religion victorious. The winds of faith have come.[330]

'Hypocrisy', 'infidel', 'traitors', 'cowards', etc., are words that evoke infidel frame, and with infidel frame evokes a whole range of knowledge, understanding, expectations and plans etc. Infidels do not believe in God, do not have any sense of morality specially religious, do not believe in Prophets and in the world here after, neither believe in hell nor heaven, do not believe in accountability before God and are possessed by evil. Evil does not let them see, understand and know the world as God wants us to.

Osama's conceptual understanding of war divides the world into two halves (like Bush- either you are a believer or an infidel). This also rules out any neutral place. God is with believers. The entailment effects are: if you are with Osama, then God is with you, all your actions are good and it is your religious responsibility to fight this war. However, if you are against him then you are with Bush- the

---

[329] Hussain, Saddam 24, March 2003: available online on www.gaurdian.co.uk (accessed September 24, 2009)

[330] Osama Bin Laden, Osama Bin Laden Speeches, October 7, 2001: http://www.september11news.com/OsamaSpeeches.htm (accessed January 22, 2010)

representative of infidels and you are fighting against God.

The only country that can be declared an Islamic state, according to Osama, is Afghanistan for he informed,

> Only Afghanistan is an Islamic country. Pakistan follows the English law. I don't consider Saudi Arabia an Islamic country.[331]

The only place, in the whole world, ruled by believers is Afghanistan. This framing excludes even Pakistan and Saudi Arabia from the land of believers. However, in fact, Saudi Arabia, governed on the basis 'Sharia' (from Arabic word shara meaning path/way mostly used for Islamic law), claims Quran as the constitution of the country.[332] Preamble of the constitution of Pakistan declares that Muslims of Pakistan shall be allowed to live their lives according to teachings and requirement of Holy Quran and Sunnah. Moreover it proclaims,

> Sovereignty over the entire universe belongs to Allah alone.[333]

Omer in an interview framed Afghan government, a government of wrong doers. He said,

> We will not accept a government of wrong-doers. We prefer death than to be a part of an evil government.[334]

The Afghan government is defined as a 'government of wrong doers'. A persuasive definition indented to evoke negative sentiments against it. Moreover, it is an evil government too- A government of evil wrong doers i.e., infidels. The entailment effects are obvious: anyone who supports it is also evil, wrong- doer and infidel. However, people who are fighting against afghan government are good people. Whoever will support them will be good and fiddle.

There is America, hit by God in one of its softest spots. Its greatest

---

[331] Mir, Hamid, *Osama claims he has nukes: if US uses N- Bombs it will get same response*: November 10, 2001: www.dawn.com (accessed November 22, 2009)
[332] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia
[333] Haq-Mazhar-Ul, The 1973 Constitution of Pakistan: Published by Mr. Tariq Khursheed for Bookland, Urdu Bazaar Lahore, fifth edition (2003) pp. 19-20
[334] Mullah Omer, Interview with Mullah Omer: www.bbc.co.uk, November 15, 2001(accessed February 23, 2007)

> buildings were destroyed, thank God for that. Our nation (the Islamic world) has tasted this humiliation and this degradation for more than 80 years. Its sons are killed, its blood is shed, its sanctuaries are attacked, and no one hears and no one heeds. When God blessed one of the groups of Islam, vanguards of Islam, they destroyed America.[335]

The framing of 9/11 events is that it was God who hit the towers. God hit America is a metaphorical understanding of incidents of 9/11- America, a Person, hit on his 'softest spots' by God. The entailment effects are: whoever has done it was servant/sent by God. They gave their lives in service of God. And whoever was attacked was infidel and evil i.e. enemy of God. This way the events were defined and framed. This framing hides the civilian causalities and highlights divine retribution.

They have been degrading and humiliating believers and now they have faced the consequence. 'Believers', 'sons were killed', 'sanctuaries were attacked' evokes infidel frame. The definition of the group who carried out 9/11 incidents, is: God blessed group of Islam. This framing hides that they hijacked the planes and killed innocent people and highlights that they were heroes who died while doing a great service for God and for believers.

Muhammad Tahir said in a CD,

> Twin towers were hit on head by an Angel, for this had not been humanly possible to demolish such a construction, I believe.[336] (Translation, mine)[337]

A metaphorical understanding of the 9/11 events giving it a new meaning- Either the 'group of blessed' was a 'group of angels' or angles were helping the group for it was not 'humanly possible' to put such a destruction on infidels. Whatever the case may be, it was a great sacrifice for and of believers.

> When the sword comes down (on America), after 80 years, hypocrisy

---

[335] Osama Bin Laden, Osama Bin Laden Speeches, October 7, 2001: http://www.september11news.com/OsamaSpeeches.htm (accessed January 22, 2010)

[336] Muhammad Tahir. World Trade Center (CD)

[337] Taliban after October 7, 2001 do not have a formal media. They communicate in local languages through FM or through audio and video cassettes, CDs and small pamphlets. They, in order to win public support, distribute this material in areas where possible support is available. Most of the material about what they say is from such cassettes and CDs. Usually, these CDs and audio cassettes have no names.

> rears its ugly head. …The least that can be said about those people is that they are debauched. They have followed injustice. They supported the butcher over the victim, the oppressor over the innocent child. …the head of infidels worldwide, Bush, and those with him. They have come out in force with their men and have turned even the countries that belong to Islam to this treachery, and they want to wag their tail at God, to fight Islam, to suppress people in the name of terrorism.[338]

'Sword', comes down (from up) means come from God. 'ugly', 'hypocrisy', 'debauched', 'injustice', 'butcher', 'oppressor over innocent', 'infidel', 'treachery', 'wag their tail', 'fight Islam' all evoke evil infidel frame. War on terror is actually a war to suppress innocent victims. It is to suppress believers- Islam. Moreover, any country that is supporting infidels is deceiving and betraying believers and is fighting against Islam. This evokes, 'either you are with us or against us' framing. Conceptual understanding of the war is that it is a war between followers of God and infidels.

> I am considering two promises. One is the promise of God, the other is that of Bush. The promise of God is that my land is vast. If you start a journey on God's path, you can reside anywhere on this earth and will be protected... The promise of Bush is that there is no place on earth where you can hide that I cannot find you. We will see which one of these two promises is fulfilled.[339]

Entailment effects of this framing are: God has promised us that He will protect us; this strongly evokes Infidel versus Believer frame. It entails tha t we believers will be protected by God. Enemy of God, Bush, the leader of evil infidels, has made a promise that is contradictory to God's promise. Whoever, will help Taliban, is fulfilling God's Promise and is also believer/good. However, whoever helps Bush are infidel and supporters of infidel/evil.

> Almighty God... is helping the believers and the Muslims. God says he will never be satisfied with the infidels. In terms of worldly affairs,

---

[338] Osama Bin Laden, Osama Bin Laden Speeches, October 7, 2001: http://www.september11news.com/OsamaSpeeches.htm (accessed January 22, 2010)
[339] Mullah Omar, Mullah Omer- In His own Words, September 26, 2001: http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2001/sep/26/afghanistan.features11 (accessed January 22, 2010)

> America is very strong. Even if it were twice as strong or twice that, it could not be strong enough to defeat us. We are confident that no one can harm us if God is with us.[340]

Since God is with Taliban and Taliban are fighting a great evil power; therefore, they are good. No matter how much strong the enemy of infidels may be it cannot fight believers.

> The infidels, Jews, crusaders, and Hindus are killing Muslims and they play with our honor.[341] (Translation, mine)

The list of infidel evil comprises: Jews, crusaders and Hindus etc. They are defined as people who play with the honor of Muslims- A persuasive definition that evokes sentiments of hatred and revenge. 'Honor' evokes a frame in Pukhtun Culture. It is one of the most cherished ideal. Pukhtuns can sacrifice their lives for honor. An attack on honor triggers revenge.

Molvi Jumma khan evoking believers versus infidels informed:

> Believers have always dominated infidels. They have never been dominated by them. This government [Karzai's Government] does whatever infidels want. Don't obey this government.[342] (Translation, mine)

After framing enemy as infidel and evil, one of the entailment effect is whoever works for, and serve enemy is also infidel (in the context of war on terror, most probably, he is referring to Hamid Karzai). The government supported by America is also infidel and a government of traitors. It is polluting the minds of people making them immoral and irreligious. Zarb-e Momin writes on November 22-28, 2006, America has filled Afghan welfare institutes with liquor. American and her Afghan allies drink and enjoy liquor. On November 22-28, 2006, the same news paper informs: in order to spread nudity and pornography, the Karzai government has made the cable system very common. It has also opened western style beauty parlors to gain aid from western countries. This entails that: Karzai government is supporting infidels

---

[340] Mullah Omar, Mullah Omer- In His own Words: September 26, 2001
[341] Sheik Dost Muhammad, Nooristan War (CD)
[342] Molvi Jumma Khan, Nooristan War (CD)

and making people infidel. Moreover, western countries give aid to get us away from our own culture and religion and want to spread their own culture and religion in Afghanistan. This evokes very negative sentiments, hatred and revenge, for this informs that our culture and honor are under attack

> We will fight the infidels- oh Muslim, come and take part in Jihad.[343]
> (Translation, mine)

There are lots of poems and songs that portray allied forces as forces of infidel, evil enemy and people are persuaded to kill them. These poems evoke the frame of Paradise saying that whoever will die in this war will go to paradise. This way, suicide bombers are trained too, telling them stories of Hoor (Arabic, meaning beautiful girls in the Paradise) and life on Paradise full of joys a human being can think of.

> Don't let them go ghazis- teach them a lesson worst than Vietnam.[344]
> (Translation, mine)

Words evoking intense feelings of pride and revenge- Such poems tell the people that we are more brave than anyone else on earth, for God's help is with us. The common words to evoke bravery and revenge are: 'Loins of God', 'Servants of Prophet', 'Ghazi' (From Arabic, meaning returnee alive from Jihad), 'Ghyratmand/ghyratee' (From Pashto, meaning honorable man), and 'Mujahideen' (Singular, Mujahid, from Arabic, meaning Holy warrior).

Words that evoke evil and infidel frames in such poems are: 'Faroun', 'Yazid' (From Arabic, The ruler in whose reign Hussain, Prophet Muhammad's grandson, was killed), 'Kafir' (From Arabic, meaning Infidel, non believer), 'Munafiq' (From Arabic, meaning Hypocrite), 'Zalim' (From Arabic, meaning Oppressor), 'Murtad' (From Arabic, meaning Apostate), Army of 'Dajjal' (From Arabic, meaning Anti Christ), 'people of hell', etc.

> For every Faroun there is a Musa (Moses)…. This new Faroun has

---

[343] Nooristan War
[344] Da Ghaziano Karwan (CD)

claimed that he is God and his strength is his magic i.e. technology.[345] (Translation, mine)

A very common way in eastern Islamic tradition is to frame infidel/evil enemy as Faroun, this evokes Faroun versus Moses. The metaphorical understanding of Faroun versus Moses is: If a person's enemy is like Faroun then that person is like Moses since for every Faroun there is a Moses. The allied army is an army of Faroun, since Taliban are fighting against them they are army of Moses. Entailment effects are very clear: whoever will side Taliban will actually side Moses and God, and will go to paradise if they die during the war, but, whoever is fighting against Taliban is actually a supporter of Faroun and will go to hell.

Bush in his addresses also claimed that Taliban wants us to change our way of life. Taliban also have same complaint.

> America wants us to change our lives and accept their religion…. On September 11 magic of America has come to an end.[346] (Translation, mine)

Taliban are also complaining that enemy wants them to change their way of life. Magic of America evokes Faroun frame.

This discussion demonstrates that beside other metaphors and frames, believer versus infidel was instrumental in shaping the judgments, perception and behavior of the people. The framing of believer versus infidel is:

I. Enemy of believer is infidel. Their power is their magic- the technology they have. Their power comes from evil.
II. Enemy of infidel is inherently good. Their power comes from God. God only help believers. Moreover, God has promised that He will protect believers.
III. Supporters of Believers are good and supporters of infidel are infidels. If a Muslim supports infidel then he/she is a traitor.
IV. Hell is waiting for infidels while Believers will go to Heaven- no question about that.

The above discussion reveals that both sides, in War on Terror, were using metaphors, frames, emotive words and persuasive definitions to shape judgments,

---

[345] Muhammad Tahir, CD- World Trade Center
[346] Muhammad Tahir.

perception and behavior of people and block criticism using language as an instrument of war. Bush and his allies framed the war as a monumental struggle between good and evil and they informed good will win. Taliban and al Qaeda using metaphors framed the war discussion as a war between believers and infidels and they informed that believers will win.

4.3.3 Hero versus Villain: Fairy Tales and Moral and Religious Justifications of War

Aims: This subsection reveals that language may be used to evoke fairy tales. It demonstrates that this framing has been instrumental in war in general and war on terror in particular.

In times of war, politicians/leaders use metaphors that evoke fairy tale frames. A fairy tale frame comprises villain, victim, hero and crime.

> The fairy tale has an asymmetry built into it. The hero is moral and courageous, while the villain is amoral and vicious. The hero is rational, but though the villain may be cunning and calculating, he cannot be reasoned with. Heroes thus cannot negotiate with villains; they must defeat them. The enemy-as-demon metaphor arises as a consequence of the fact that we understand what a just war is in terms of this fairy tale.[347]

Leaders, while waging war, set forth a verity of scenarios evoking fairy tale, such as:

Villain, taking victim hostage, perpetrates violence. Hero, without self interests, saves the victim after taking much trouble and sacrifice. (Kuwait Iraq war, World War II)[348]

Villain has killed some of the victims and wants to harm other. He possesses dangerous weapons to carry out his evil plan. Hero snatches weapon and saves the victim after great sacrifice. (Iraq has WMD)

---

[347] Lakoff George, Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System to Justify War in the Gulf: Viet Nam generation Journal & Newsletter, V3, N3 (November 1991) available online on http://www2.iath.virgina.edu/sixties/HTML_docs/journal.html (accessed 25 September, 2009)

[348] For more details see Lakoff, *Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System to Justify War in the Gulf* (1991)

Villain and his friends (Axis of evil) want to dominate the whole world. Hero, with his friends, saves the world from villains, etc. etc. (Terrorists of Afghanistan want to dominate the world/ America and her allies want to dominate the whole world)

Villain has killed or harmed hero's family or friends. Or villain has captured hero's land/country. Or villain is going to rape hero's family's women. Hero's ghyrat (From Arabic meaning honor) triggers into action. He has to take revenge 'badal' (From Pashto, meaning revenge) otherwise people will laugh and taunt at him 'peghore' (From Pashto, meaning taunt) and call him 'bayghyrat' (From Arabic, meaning one who has no honor)

These stories are present in almost all cultures of the world. In all such stories, hero fights and defeat villains out of moral and religious responsibility. He enters into the scenario as a savior. All of his actions are morally justified since he puts his own life in danger for a just cause.

Following war on Afghanistan, President Bush and his allies started using language of war against Iraq. They conceptualized, Saddam Hussain as Iraq (state as person metaphor). Most of the times, instead of saying Iraq, they used Saddam, for example, on March 1, 2003 Bush said:

> America is determined to enforce the demands of the United Nation Security council by confronting the grave and growing danger of Saddam Hussein and his weapons of mass destruction. This dictator will not be allowed to intimidate and blackmail the civilized world, or to supply his terrible weapons to terrorist groups, who would not hesitate to use them against us.[349]

This small passage is a complete fairy tale story full of metaphors and frames. 'Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)' evokes a frame, something very terrible and lethal capable of bringing destruction and suffering on a very large scale. These weapons are with Saddam Hussain - the villain (as if he possesses them and keeps them with him, as if he carries these weapons). The friends of villain are an evil force (Al Qaeda and Taliban- Axis of Evil) with whom Bush (hero) is already at war. (Peter Liberman opines Bush using 'Axis of Evil' metaphor linked Saddam Hussain with

[349] Bush, President's Radio Address: March 1, 2003

9/11 and Al- Qaeda.[350])This bad guy, the villain, is going to hand these WMD over to evil- A crime villain intends to commit. Evil villains will ruthlessly use WMD on innocent people. Hero will not let this happen declaring war on Saddam Hussain- OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM. Anyone who stops hero (critics of war) is also a villain, for they do not want Americans' safety and freedom of innocent Iraqis. Anyone who is supporting Bush is good.

George Lakoff discussing the use of metaphors in first Iraq war, says, "Metaphors can kill." He informs that the whole discourse over war on Iraq was a panorama of metaphors. The statements by President Bush (senior) and other members of Bush administration were metaphorical, for example: Saddam is 'sitting on our economic lifeline', he has 'stranglehold' our economy, and occupation of Kuwait was a 'rape', America will 'push Saddam back', in order to protect, 'freedom, future and innocent'. He reveals that Bush presented before American public a Rescue Scenario in which Iraq was the Villain, America was the Hero, Kuwait was the innocent Victim and the crime has been kidnapping and raping of innocent victim. This way Bush made people understand the situation shaping their perception and behavior in favor of war.[351] For example, on January 16, 1991 Bush (senior) said,

> While the world waited, Saddam Hussein systematically raped, pillaged, and plundered a tiny nation no threat to his own. He subjected the people of Kuwait to unspeakable atrocities, and among those, maimed and murdered innocent children. While the world waited, Saddam sought to add to the chemical weapons arsenal he now possesses an infinitely more dangerous weapon of mass destruction--a nuclear weapon. And while the world waited, while the world talked peace and withdrawal, Saddam Hussein dug in and moved massive forces into Kuwait.... Our goal is not the conquest of Iraq. It is the liberation of Kuwait. It is my hope that somehow the Iraqi people can, even now, convince their dictator that he must lay down his arms, leave Kuwait, and let Iraq itself rejoin the family of peace-loving nations.... No President can easily commit our sons and daughters to

---

[350] Lieberman Peter (2006) p.687

[351] Lakoff George, *Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System to Justify War in the Gulf* (1991)

war.[352]

This excerpt comprises villain, his crime, victims, and a hero who will stop the villain from committing more crimes and restore the balance.

Villain: Sadam Hussain. A State as a person metaphor is used here.

Crimes: 1. Systematic rape, pillages, and plunders of a tiny nation which was no threat to villain. 2. Subjecting Kuwaiti People (victims) to unspeakable atrocities, maimed and murder of innocent children. 3. Possessing of chemical weapons arsenal, infinitely more dangerous weapon of mass destruction and a nuclear weapon. 4. While the world talked peace and withdrawal, villain, Saddam Hussein, moved massive forces into Kuwait.

Victims: Kuwait, innocent people of Kuwait, people of the world who wanted peace and were deceived by the villain.

Hero: President Bush (senior), who is very carefully committing sons and daughters to war. (Nation as a family metaphor)[353]

Besides good versus evil, hero versus villain was also forwarded in war on Afghanistan (2001) and war on Iraq (2003) to maneuver public judgment and to block policy criticism. To establish this point following excerpts from speeches of the leaders, in the context of 9/11, have been taken into account.

> America is determined to oppose the state sponsors of terror. Yet we are equally determined to respect and help the men and women those regimes oppress. Our enemy is not the Arab world. Many friendly Arab governments are themselves, the targets of extremist terror. Our enemy is not Islam, a good and peace-loving faith that brings direction and comfort to over one billion people, including millions of Americans. And our enemy is not the people of any nation, even when their leaders harbor terrorists. Our enemy is the terrorists themselves, and the regimes that shelter and sustain them.[354]

The President in a very persuasive manner defined the enemy. The enemy is

---

[352] Bush (senior) Attack on Iraq speech by President George Bush, Washington DC, January 16, 1991, http://www.famousquotes.me.uk/speeches/George_Bush/index.htm, (accessed March 4, 2010)

[353] For more details see Lakoff, *Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System to Justify War in the Gulf* (1991)

[354] Bush, Radio Address of The President: October 6, 2001

neither Arab world nor Islam or innocent people of nations who are harboring evils. In fact, Arab world, Islam and innocent people of Afghanistan and Iraq are victims. In the context of this war, it was very important to demonstrate that Arabs and Islam are not the enemies rather they are victims.

'Friendly' Arab countries are 'targets' of 'extremist terror', evoking rescue frame, the President is setting out another objective of war (in order to justify the war): Rescue friends who are in need. 'Friend' evokes a whole set of knowledge, expectations and emotions. In almost all cultures of the world helping ones friends in time of need is morally desirable. 'Target' evokes danger, fear, death, threat etc. Metaphorical understanding is: A friend has been targeted by terrorists and is in danger- can be killed or harmed. It is our duty to rescue our friend. This rescue story is an attempt to justify war.

> Its Taliban regime has made that nation into a sanctuary and training ground for international terrorists -- terrorists who have killed innocent citizens of many nations, including our own. The Taliban promotes terror abroad, and practices terror against its people, oppressing women and persecuting all who dissent. The Taliban has been given the opportunity to surrender all the terrorists in Afghanistan and to close down their camps and operations. Full warning has been given, and time is running out. The Afghan people, however, are the victims of oppression, famine and misrule. Many refugees from that unfortunate nation are on the move, and sadly, many Afghans are on the verge of starvation. America respects the Afghan people, their long tradition and their proud independence. And we will help them in this time of confusion and crisis in their country. America has long been the largest source of food and humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan. This week I announced an additional $320 million in aid to the Afghan people, to those within Afghanistan and those who have fled across borders. Despite efforts by the Taliban to disrupt these critical aid shipments, we will deliver food and seeds, vaccines and medicines by truck, and even by draft animals. Conditions permitting, we will bring help directly to the people of Afghanistan by air drops. This aid will help Afghans make it through the upcoming winter. For the longer-

term, I urge Congress to make funds available so that one day the United States can contribute, along with other friends of Afghanistan, to the reconstruction and development of that troubled nation. Helping people in great need is a central part of the Jewish, Christian and Islamic traditions, as well as many other faiths. It is also a central part of the American tradition. Even as we fight evil regimes we are generous to the people they oppress. Following World War II, America fed and rebuilt Japan and Germany, and their people became some of our closest friends in the world. In the struggle ahead, we will act in accordance with American ideals. We're offering help and friendship to the Afghan people. It is their Taliban rulers, and the terrorists they harbor, who have much to fear.[355]

This is a complete story, revealing:

1. Who the villains (enemies) are? 2. What is their crime and what are their intentions?? 3. Who are innocent victims and how Villain is treating them?? 4. Who is the hero and what are his moral and religious responsibilities??

The Villain: Words and phrases in the passage evoke frame of a very brutal villain- the Taliban. Villain (Taliban) is defined as terrorist rulers of Afghanistan who have made lives of their citizens (read victims) very difficult. The President in this small text used terror, terrorist etc., six times in order to evoke and reinforce frame of villain, a terrorist, who promotes and sponsors terrorism. He narrates, villain has made Afghanistan a training camp for international terrorism to kill innocent citizens of all nations of the world, he also practices terror against his own people specially against women (an action which is against international human rights and civilized people take it very seriously), he persecute whoever does not agree with him. Moreover, he stops all humanitarian aid (provided by hero) to the innocent people. It is the responsibility of the hero to make villain surrender closing all terrorist training camps.

Victims: Afghan people, victims of oppression', 'famine and misrule', 'refugees' 'unfortunate' 'on the move', 'sadly', 'verge of starvation', 'confusion and crisis, 'food and humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan', 'aid to the Afghan people' 'critical aid shipments', 'vaccines and medicines', 'help' 'aid will help Afghans' 'the

[355] Bush, October 6, 2001

upcoming winter' 'reconstruction and development of that troubled nation', 'oppress' etc., evoke frame of an innocent victim.

The President in a very persuasive and emotional manner describes the victim. Above mentioned word, phrases and sentences evoke victim frame, Afghans, victims who have been oppressed by villain. They are facing, famine, misrule, starvation. They have become refugees. Oppression, famine, misrule, humanitarian aid, unfortunate, and specially refugee evoke frame of pity too. Moreover, villain is so cruel that it does not let good people help the suffering people of Afghanistan. The story is enough for good people to act, for no good man can shut his/her eyes from these facts.

The crime: Words and phrases that define and evoke crime frame are: 'training ground for international terrorists', 'killed innocent citizens', 'promotes terror abroad', 'practices terror against its people', 'oppressing women and persecuting all who dissent' and 'disrupt critical aid shipments'.

The crime is killing innocent people of the whole world, harboring and training terrorists and making lives of innocent victims (especially women and children) miserable. Moreover, villain is so cruel that he has made lives of innocent victims miserable and does not let hero help the victims.

Hero, his religious and moral responsibilities: Words and phrases evoking the hero are: 'Given the opportunity to surrender', 'full warning has been given', 'respects the Afghan people', 'proud independence', 'help' 'largest source of food and humanitarian assistance', '$320 million aid to the Afghan people', 'deliver food and seeds', 'delivers vaccines and medicines', 'help directly', 'aid will help Afghans (read victims) to make it through the upcoming winter', 'contribute', 'friends of Afghanistan', 'reconstruction and development', 'helping people in great need', 'Jewish, Christian and Islamic traditions', 'faiths', 'fight evil regimes', 'generous to the people they (villain) oppress', 'fed and rebuilt Japan and Germany', 'ideals', 'offering help and friendship to the Afghan people, 'Taliban ... the terrorists they harbor... have much to fear'.

Language is instrumental here to define and frame Americans and her allies as heroes, who have been helping oppressed nations of the world and have made oppressed people their friends. It evokes Ideals of Christianity, Judaism and Islam-religious framing: The President informed that we are not fighting this war out of self interest or revenge, it is our moral and religious responsibility to fight and defeat

villain and to help victims.

The President, hero in the context of war, is offering an opportunity to the villain to surrender- heroes are open hearted and generous, they never begin wars, they just retaliate. Although victims are weak and cannot help themselves yet hero respects their traditions and independence and offers his friendship. Hero, the largest source of humanitarian assistance, wants to contribute, develop, rebuilt and reconstructs Afghanistan. He is helping innocent victims against all odds. This is not the first time he is doing all this; he has done this before, making enemies his friends. He is so kind hearted that he has made a short term plan for victims to help them in this winter and is planning to help them in future. Hero is not doing all this out of some personal interest, this is what his Ideals and religion preaches and expects of him. This demonstrates he is doing all this out of moral and religious responsibility- Since he is a good man, he should do all this for he has no other choice. Last but not the least; hero is a friend of innocent people only villain has to fear him- he is a Superman.

Black opines that War on Terror gave the President,

> ...the moral authority to become a truly heroic wartime leader and metaphor provided a powerful rhetorical strategy for overcoming the most literal of events.[356]

On October 7, 2001, Bush informed the Afghans,

> ...the oppressed people of Afghanistan will know the generosity of America and our allies. As we strike military targets, we'll also drop food, medicine and supplies to the starving and suffering men and women and children of Afghanistan.[357]

The President kept on using the same language over and over again for framing purposes. 'The oppressed people of Afghanistan', 'starving and suffering men, women and children' evokes victim frame. 'Generosity' evokes hero frame. Hero, while striking military (villain) targets, does not forget victim. He drops food, medicine and other things, things that innocent victims need.

---

[356] Black, Jonathan Charteris, Politician and Rhetoric- The Persuasive Power of Metaphor: Published by Palgrave Macmillan New York (2005) p. 172

[357] Bush, Presidential Address to the Nation: October 7, 2001.

> The United States of America is an enemy of those who aid terrorists and of the barbaric criminals who profane a great religion [Islam] by committing murder in its name.... We're a peaceful nation…. have learned, so suddenly and so tragically, there can be no peace in a world of sudden terror… the only way to pursue peace is to pursue those who threaten it. …The name of today's military operation is Enduring Freedom. We defend not only our precious freedoms, but also the freedom of people everywhere to live and raise their children free from fear…. strengthen the protection of our homeland… sacrifices are being made by members of our Armed Forces …. A Commander-in-Chief sends America's sons and daughters into a battle in a foreign land only after the greatest care and a lot of prayer. We ask a lot of those who wear our uniform. We ask them to leave their loved ones, to travel great distances, to risk injury, even to be prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice of their lives… they represent the best of our country. And we are grateful…. your objectives are clear; your goal is just.[358]

The villain has made lives of Afghans miserable and has 'profaned' a 'great religion'- the religion of hero's friends. Do not forget that villain has also attacked the 'homeland'. Hero is going to war and going to make 'sacrifice', for he has been attacked by 'barbaric criminal'. He is a 'peace' loving person but 'terror' has made him realize that in order to live in 'peace' and 'freedom' he has to go after and kill terrorists.

As discussed earlier, war metaphor gave a lot of powers to a President which he/she does not enjoy in normal circumstances.[359] Using these powers, the President (Hero, the Commander-in-Chief) is sending 'sons and daughters' to the 'foreign land' with much 'care', 'prayers' and 'confidence' in order to 'strengthen' the 'protection' of 'home' land security- Nation as family metaphor. The President kept on switching from 'nation as a person', to 'nation as a family' metaphor shaping perception and behavior of people. For example, Iraq, and Afghanistan are villains (persons) but America is a family with sons and daughters etc. Moreover, army men and women are

---

[358] Bush, Presidential Address to the Nation: October 7, 2001
[359] See Lakoff *"War on Terror," Rest in Peace*

defined in a very persuasive manner: sons and daughters. Here, 'sons and daughters' are highly emotively charged, after this, whoever criticizes the war is serving the interest of enemies by undermining the confidence of 'sons and daughters'.

A note about the name of the Operation Enduring Freedom- 'Enduring freedom' evokes a frame: freedom that will last forever, for it is permanent and durable. Hero wants this world to have a stable freedom. Operation enduring freedom is a metaphor. An operation that will be carried out with an intention to make this world live in peace forever. Critics of the operation are people who do not want peace. Probably they want everlasting war, chaos and terror.

> [Taliban regime] is undemocratic… no sport allowed, or television or photography. No art or culture is permitted. All other faiths, all other interpretations of Islam are ruthlessly suppressed. Those who practice their faith are imprisoned. Women are treated in a way almost too revolting to be credible… girls not allowed to go to school; no legal rights; unable to go out of doors without a man. Those that disobey are stoned…no contact permitted with western agencies, even those delivering food. The people live in abject poverty… a regime founded on fear and funded on the drugs trade. The biggest drugs hoard in the world is in Afghanistan, controlled by the Taliban. Ninety per cent of the heroin on British streets originates in Afghanistan. The arms the Taliban are buying today are paid for with the lives of young British people buying their drugs on British streets…..let there be no moral ambiguity about this: nothing could ever justify the events of 11 September, and it is to turn justice on its head to pretend it could. The action we take will be proportionate; targeted; we will do all we humanly can to avoid civilian casualties. But understand what we are dealing with… Think of the cruelty beyond our comprehension as amongst the screams and the anguish of the innocent, those hijackers drove at full throttle planes laden with fuel into buildings where tens of thousands worked. They have no moral inhibition on the slaughter of the innocent. If they could have murdered not 7,000 but 70,000 does

anyone doubt they would have done so and rejoiced in it.[360]

Tony Blair, following Bush, narrated the same story in a very emotionally charged language. He had to be more persuasive, since none of the terrorist incident had happened on his soil till then. His very definition of the Taliban regime is, 'it is undemocratic'. A definition, which is enough to make British people think, Afghans are ruled by tyrants.

Fairy tale: Taliban are harboring terrorists- they are villains. Their crimes have been: They are 'undemocratic' hate all kinds of 'freedom'. They do not let people to watch TV or play sports. 'Women and girls' have no 'legal rights', cannot attend 'school', or 'go out (cannot move freely) from their homes 'without a man' (male dominated society- a society where powerful rules the weak). Whoever 'disobeys' them is 'stoned' to 'death'. They do not allow the 'western countries (heroes) to 'help innocent people' who are living in 'abject poverty'. Taliban have no 'moral inhibition'. This defines the morality of Taliban- they have no sense of morality what so ever. They 'slaughter' innocent people. 'Slaughter' evokes cruelty and ruthlessness, fear and terror. The language here is evoking terror and fear. Perhaps, more terror was implanted in the minds of people by these words than by the terrorist acts on 9/11. The Prime minister is framing from the outset that civilian causalities are 'lesser evil' for they are dealing with a villain, brutal and ruthless, who ruthlessly carried out 9/11 attacks. This speech is also full of complex question; a logical fallacy that will be discussed in the next chapter.

Taliban regime is founded on 'fear' and 'drug trade'. Blair's language seems more effective in shaping perception of British citizens. He, by introducing 'drug trade', 'the biggest drugs hoard', and 'heroin on British streets' originates in Afghanistan, introduced more emotionally charged frames convincing the citizenry for war. 'Drug trade' evokes hatred, 'drug traders' sell 'heroin' on 'British streets' and the cost is 'lives of young British people', benefit to the trader is: he buys arms from the drug money and uses them against the civilized world. This reveals that beside Americans and poor Afghans, British people are also victims. Villain's crimes are, according to Tony Blair: carrying out attacks of 9/11, suppressing Afghans, and selling heroin on British streets making people of British youth addict. Heroes, Bush and Blair, will punish Taliban for all these crimes. The conceptual understanding for

[360] Blair, Full Text: Tony Blair's Speech, www.gurdian.co.uk, October2 , 2001

British people is: Villain is a merchant and his business is harming British citizens in two ways: He is selling drugs making British youth addicts and from the money that he earns he buys arms and then uses them against people of England. One way to persuade people for war is cost- benefit framing- tell the people that going to war has less cost and more benefit (gain) to us otherwise the benefit will go to the villain and we will pay the price.[361]

> We have also seen the true nature of these terrorists in the nature of the regime they support in Afghanistan -- and it's terrifying. Women are imprisoned in their homes, and are denied access to basic health care and education. Food sent to help starving people is stolen by their leaders. The religious monuments of other faiths are destroyed. Children are forbidden to fly kites, or sing songs, or build snowmen. A girl of seven is beaten for wearing white shoes. Our enemies have brought only misery and terror to the people of Afghanistan -- and now they are trying to export that terror throughout the world.[362]

True nature of the villain is that he has oppressed women, children, and everyone else who is not with him. Villain's other crimes include: He does not allow civilians to basic health and education facilities- Does not allow anyone else to help starving people- destroys monuments of other faiths- does not allow children to play and sing- forces and beats young girls. He is expert in bringing misery and terror. Moreover, villain is planning to export this misery to other parts of the world too. Therefore, it is the responsibility of hero to stop him.

President Bush addressing at the United Nations portrayed American and allied forces as judges. He spoke:

> The United States, supported by many nations, is bringing justice to the terrorists in Afghanistan. We're making progress against military targets, and that is our objective. Unlike the enemy, we seek to minimize, not maximize, the loss of innocent life. I'm proud of the honorable conduct of the American military. And my country grieves

---

[361] See Loss Gain Framing below.
[362] Bush, "No Nation can be Neutral in this Conflict": November 6, 2001

> for all the suffering the Taliban have brought upon Afghanistan, including the terrible burden of war. The Afghan people do not deserve their present rulers…. Taliban misrule have brought nothing but misery and starvation…. Afghans depended on food from the United States and other nations, and millions of Afghans were refugees from Taliban oppression. I make this promise to all the victims of that regime: The Taliban's days of harboring terrorists and dealing in heroin and brutalizing women are drawing to a close. And when that regime is gone, the people of Afghanistan will say with the rest of the world: good riddance. I can promise, too, that America will join the world in helping the people of Afghanistan rebuild their country. Many nations, including mine, are sending food and medicine to help Afghans through the winter.[363]

Hero is bringing 'justice' to (villain) 'terrorists' and making 'progress' against 'military targets' in an 'honorable' manner, keeping 'civilian casualties' to minimum level- lesser evil that cannot be avoided. On the other hand villain preys on innocent people, he has brought 'starvation and suffering' and 'burden of war', has made 'millions' of 'men, women and children' 'refugees', 'harbor terrorists' and 'deal in heroin' 'brutalizes women', and 'steals food' which hero sends for victims. The President informed that his country 'grieves' on the 'suffering' of victims who do not 'deserve' this brutal regime; therefore, hero promises to 'regime change' - another lesser evil.

The phrase, 'regime change', was also instrumental in Iraq war for overthrowing,

> …a foreign government through a military invasion….The phrase makes it possible to talk about invading Iraq without even thinking about the human consequences: assassination, occupation or the deaths of thousands of innocents.[364]

This demonstrates the language used in war covers/hides many actions that may be considered bad, such as: occupation and overthrowing of foreign

---

[363] Bush President Bush Speaks to the United Nations: November 10, 2001
[364] Rampton, Sheldon and John Stauber (2003) p.127

governments, assassinations and killing of innocent.

The president also promises sending 'food and medicine' to 'help' suffering victim', and continue providing 'humanitarian aid' and 'rebuilt' their (victim's) country. In the same address the President informed that the help that they have been providing against all odds includes '1.3 million packages of rations', '20,000 blankets' and more than '200 tons of provisions into the region'.[365]

> Americans have aided the families of victims, and the starving children of Afghanistan, half a world away. This country has a good and generous heart…. We are thankful for new heroes -- police officers and firefighters and emergency workers, who have renewed our respect for public service and provided lasting lessons in courage.[366]

Hero is so generous and caring that he is helping victims that are living 'half a world away'. This highlights that hero is helping innocent people. However, it hides a very serious issue: America has attacked a country 'half a world away' from America.

Following are some more passages from President Bush's speeches to demonstrate that he kept on using language of war even after attack and capturing Afghanistan.

> … our nation has comforted the victims…rebuild New York and the Pentagon, rallied a great coalition, captured, arrested, and rid the world of thousands of terrorists, destroyed Afghanistan's terrorist training camps, saved a people from starvation, and freed a country from brutal oppression… the mothers and daughters of Afghanistan were captives in their own homes….Today women are free, and are part of Afghanistan's new government.[367]

Words that have been helping the President to frame himself a hero, enemies as villain and Afghans as victims in this speech have been: 'our nation', 'comforted the victims', 'begun to rebuild' 'captured', 'arrested', 'rid the world of thousands of terrorists', 'saved a people from starvation', 'freed a country from brutal oppression', 'mothers and daughters of Afghanistan were captives' 'forbidden from working',

[365] Bush November 10, 2001
[366] Bush, November 24, 2001
[367] Bush, President Delivers State of the Union Address: January 29, 2002

'women are free', 'winning', 'caves', 'escape', 'justice'.

In the same speech the President has started using the same language against Iraq. Bush and his friends repeatedly used 'Weapons of Mass Destruction', in their public discourse. WMD is a very broad term that includes chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. This creates a very wrong perception: all the three weapons are equally dangerous and destructive. However, this is not the case. Nuclear weapons are much dangerous and destructive than chemical weapons. They are WAD- weapons of assured destruction.[368]

> Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop anthrax, and nerve gas, and nuclear weapons for over a decade. This is a regime that has already used poison gas to murder thousands of its own citizens -- leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over their dead children. This is a regime that agreed to international inspections -- then kicked out the inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world.[369]

Notice these words: 'Iraq' 'hostility', 'support terror', 'Iraqi regime', 'plotted to develop anthrax', 'nerve gas', 'nuclear weapons', 'poison gas', 'murder thousands of its own citizens', 'leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over their dead children', 'kicked out the inspectors', 'hide'. This way he paved the road to attack Iraq.

The President did not have to do much; he, in his story, introduced another villain who, he claimed, was a friend of the first villain. These villains, he claimed, have made an axis of evil. Iraq, he informed, has weapons of mass destruction and will hand over these weapons to the villain in Afghanistan and elsewhere making all evil villains more dangerous for the rest of the civilized world. The following discussion will make this point clear.

4.3.3.a. Hero versus Villain (part two)

Villain: Saddam Hussain (Iraq) - another villain who is a friend of the first villain. Like the first one, he has made lives of his own people miserable and wants to

---

[368] Lee, Stephen P (2008) p. 180
[369] Bush, President Delivers State of the Union Address: January 29, 2002

harm the civilized world.

Victims: People of Iraq in particular and Arabs and rest of the world in general.

Crime: Making WMD and planning to hand these WMD over to terrorists. Killing and brutalizing people of Iraq.

Hero: George W. Bush (America), the man is already fighting a war without any fear and self interest. This brave hero, has promised to eliminate the evil from world, he shall fight this war too. Since he knows the true nature of evil terrorists, therefore, it is prudent to reelect him as president. Reelecting him will make the good people win over evil villain.

> States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States.[370]

The President and his allies kept on telling this story all the way. They informed that evil nations have made an alliance-Axis of evil. 'Axis' is a frame that evokes an idea of a group working together and supporting each other. 'Axis of evil' is a metaphor. The evil of the world have united and have made a group, an alliance. Obviously this alliance is against good nations of the world. They are supporting each other. One of the evil has WMD. He will hand over these to other evils, making them more destructive. It is better to kill and hunt this evil before he succeeds in his evil designs. Thomas Hurka argues that it is not a justification of war that country has weapons of mass destruction and may use them aggressively in future, therefore, it should be attacked.[371]

> [Saddam] is assembling the world's most dangerous weapons has already used them on whole villages -- leaving thousands of his own citizens dead, blind, or disfigured… forced confessions are obtained -- by torturing children while their parents are made to watch…. methods

---

[370] Bush (January 29, 2002)

[371] Hurka, Thomas, *Proportionality and* Necessity: In, War- Essays in Political Philosophy: Edited by Larry May, Cambridge University Press, 2008, P. 131

used in the torture chambers of Iraq: electric shock, burning with hot irons, dripping acid on the skin, mutilation with electric drills, cutting out tongues, and rape. If this is not evil, then evil has no meaning….a message for the brave and oppressed people of Iraq: Your enemy is not surrounding your country -- your enemy is ruling your country…the day he and his regime are removed from power will be the day of your liberation….America will not accept a serious and mounting threat to our country, and our friends and our allies….If Saddam Hussein does not fully disarm, for the safety of our people and for the peace of the world, we will lead a coalition to disarm him….Your [Referring to American Armed Forces] honor will guide you. You believe in America, and America believes in you…. no victory is free from sorrow….We seek peace. We strive for peace….peace must be defended….as we and our coalition partners are doing in Afghanistan, we will bring to the Iraqi people food and medicines and supplies -- and freedom.[372]

Villain: The 'dictator', Sadam Hussain.

Crime of villain and his past record: Assembling 'world most dangerous weapons', using these weapons on villages killing thousands of 'citizens', and making others 'blind or disfigured'. Villain tortures 'children before their parents'. Moreover, tortures others with, 'electric shock', 'burning with hot irons', 'dripping acid on the skin', 'mutilation with electric drills', 'cutting out tongues', and 'rape'. Furthermore, Villain is threatening, 'USA, allies and friends', with world 'most dangerous weapons'.

Victims: Innocent people of Iraq, Middle East, America, allies and friends of America.

Hero, his responsibilities and past record: Hero and his friends have a past record of liberating innocent Afghan victims from villain and delivering them food and medicine. Hero intends to do the same in Iraq. The dictator in Iraq is killing and torturing innocent 'citizens'. He has WMDs and intends to destroy the whole civilized world as Taliban wanted to. Hero is sending honorable men and women to save the world.

---

[372] Bush, President Delivers "State of the Union": January 28, 2003

This demonstrates that by using Hero versus Villain framing, Bush convinced the citizenry that Saddam has WMD and that he has used these WMD on his own citizens. An evil dictator, who has used, 'the world's most dangerous weapons' on his own citizens, cannot be argued with, since he is irrational and immoral. Besides fear, this evokes a frame of a ruthless villain that Bush wants to fight with.

This metaphorical understanding has some entailment effects such as: No negotiations with Saddam Hussain will be fruitful. He is deceiving the world hiding WMD to dominate the world. Bush actually wants to save the world. He wants to make Saddam surrender, making world a safer place. He is sending troops not to capture Iraq but to secure and liberate Iraqi people. It hides that Bush in order to attack Iraq is shifting the burden of proof[373]. It is impossible for Iraq to prove that she does not have WMD; the burden of proof was on America to prove that Iraq has WMDs.

Saddam Husain versus Bush has been instrumental in waging war on Iraq and reelection of Bush.

4.3.3.b. Hero versus Villain- Taliban's Version

Osama and Taliban used almost similar metaphors and frames, for such stories are prevalent in almost every culture. However, as freedom and democracy are the most cherished ideals of West, 'Ghyrat', 'Badal' and 'Melmastia' (From Pashto, meaning hospitality), 'Panah' (from Persian, meaning Sanctuary, in Pukhtun culture offering asylum/ protecting guests) are the most cherished ideals in this part of the world, especially in Pukhtun culture. A hero is supposed to be a 'Ghyratmand/Ghyratee' who bravely takes his revenge and restores his honor. If A kills B's brother, then in revenge B kills A or A's kith or kens or any other person related to A (A's brother kith or kens etc., may not have anything to do with this problem). A Pukhtun may delay badal, but never forgets it.[374] Moreover, whatever the cost may be, a ghyratmand offers asylum and protect his guests.

Following are some excerpts to demonstrate how Taliban framed the discussion evoking hero versus villain.

---

[373] Walton, Douglas, *The Appeal to Ignorance, or Argumentum Ad Ignorantiam:* Argumentation (1999). Also see Ulrike Hahn and Mike Oaksford (2006)

[374] Khattak, Raj Wali Shah, Fida Mohammad and Richard Lee: *The Pashtun Code of Honour.* In Central Asia, Issue N. 65 Winter 2009, p. 13

> Everyone is afraid of America and wants to please it. But Americans will not be able to prevent such acts like the one that has just occurred because America has taken Islam hostage. If you look at Islamic countries, the people are in despair. They are complaining that Islam is gone. But people remain firm in their Islamic beliefs. In their pain and frustration, some of them commit suicide acts. They feel they have nothing to lose.[375]

America is a villain- nation as person metaphor. His crime is that he has taken Islam hostage. Victims are Muslims, who are in despair, complaining that their religion has gone, since it has been taken as hostage by America- religion as a person metaphor, a victim. Moreover, Muslims all over the world are in pain and are frustrated and committing suicide, for they have nothing to lose. Heroes will keep on hitting America as they hit on 9/11 to take revenge and to free Islam and Muslims from America. The entailment effects are: acts like 9/11 are justified, for they were carried out to save and free hostages. Such acts will keep on occurring. America has committed a crime by taking Islam and Muslims hostage. No friendship or negotiations are possible with him unless he frees hostages/victims.

> America controls the governments of the Islamic countries. The people ask to follow Islam, but the governments do not listen because they are in the grip of the United States. If someone follows the path of Islam, the government arrests him, tortures him or kills him. This is the doing of America. If it stops supporting those governments and lets the people deal with them, then such things won't happen. America has created the evil that is attacking it. The evil will not disappear even if I die and Osama dies and others die. The US should step back and review its policy. It should stop trying to impose its empire on the rest of the world, especially on Islamic countries.[376]

Villain: United States of America and rulers of Muslim states.

---

[375] Mullah Omar, Mullah Omer- in his own words, September 26, 2001: http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2001/sep/26/afghanistan.features11 (accessed January 22, 2010)

[376] Mullah Omar, Mullah Omer- in his own words, September 26, 2001: http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2001/sep/26/afghanistan.features11 (accessed January 22, 2010)

Crime: Controlling governments of Islamic countries; don't let people to follow Islam; arrest tortures and kill those who follow Islam; imposing its empire on the whole world especially Islamic countries and has created an evil too.

Victims: Innocent people living in Islamic countries who cannot practice their religion for they are arrested, tortured and killed by American controlled governments for practicing Islam.

Hero: Anyone, who stops America from this crime. Hero is suggesting that in order to avoid conflict, villain should revisit his policies. Otherwise events like 9/11 will happen again. Moreover, there is no shortage of heroes. Osama and Omer are just two of them. Killing them will not mean 'end of the story', for heroes are in abundance.

> We ourselves are the target of killings, destruction and atrocities. We are only defending ourselves. This is defensive Jihad. We want to defend our people and our land. That is why I say that if we don't get security, the Americans, too would not get security.[377]

The story says: we are victims, America is the villain. The crime is killing destruction and atrocities. Heroes are not offensive they just defend themselves. If they are not secure, in revenge, they will make villain insecure. 'Killing', 'destruction', 'atrocities' evoke villain frame. 'Jihad' and 'defend our people and land', evoke hero frame. The framing effect is: an understanding of the war that villain is targeting, killing, slaughtering and destroying innocent victims. Now the responsibility of the hero is to stand and defend his people and land. Bush and his friends were informing their people that Taliban and Al Qaeda attacked us, since they hate freedom and democracy. Osama, on the contrary is informing that we ourselves are victims. Both framed themselves as victims and their opponents as villains mentioning crimes committed by the villain and heroic action done by the hero

After Lal Masjid[378] operation a CD was released. It shows and narrates the story of Lal Masjid Operation. The story goes as follows:

> The infidels have spared no masque- this is their mission. The story defines rulers: Aghyar (foreigners), Murtad, Munafiq, Yazid, beasts

---

[377] Mir, Hamid, *Osama claims he has nukes: If US uses N- Bombs it will get same response*: November 10, 2001: www.dawn.com

[378] Lal Masjid is one of the oldest Mosques in Islamabad.

and animals who are fed on human blood, people of hell, people who have no honor left in them, murderers, people who talk in God's tone, killers of innocent mothers, sisters and daughters, people who play game of blood and fire. It further says that mothers, sisters, and daughters are calling you. They are asking: who will take their revenge? Is there no one who can listen to their cries? Do we have brothers who take our revenge?[379] (Translation, mine)

Victims: Mothers, sisters, daughters, Masque, and other innocent people.
Villain: Rulers of Pakistan and whoever supported them in Lal Masjid operation.
Crime: Killing of victims.
Heroes: Brothers of innocent women who were victimized in the operation.

A lot of emotive words have been used in this CD to evoke emotions of the people. The Pakistani officials have been defined in a very negative way persuading people to rise against them. For example, 'beasts' evokes that they have no morality in them. Mother, daughters, sisters have been used in a very persuasive manner to shape the perception and attitudes of the people. The metaphorical understanding is: Villains and whoever supported Lal Masjid operation are infidels. Their crime is killing of innocent women. Victims are daughters and sisters and masques. Heroes are brothers of innocent women who will take revenge from the villains. This conceptual understanding evokes knowledge, attitudes and emotions persuading people to stand against Pakistani government. Words like 'infidel', 'beasts', especially 'Yazid', evoke that enemy is ruthless. Fighting against it is religious duty. After Lal Masjid operation followed a wave of suicide bombers and many other operations, by Pakistani Taliban, killing thousands of people. Another CD about 'Badal' shows how suicide bombers are trained and what they are told and shown? It is full of poems saying:

Ruthless infidels have killed our families. They have destroyed our houses and masques. They have captured our land. Young boys, the heroes, will take revenge and will straight away go to heaven where Hoor are waiting for them. It defines a suicide bomber in a very profound way: Atom bomb of Muslims.

[379] Lal Masjid Operation (CD)

Victims in the CD are innocent Muslims who were targeted by villain. Heroes are the suicide bombers, who will take revenge. Villain: Pakistan/American and whoever supports them in killing victims. Their crime is killing and victimizing innocent people.

Aqeb Malik informs that suicide bombers, 'strategic asset of Taliban', go through an indoctrination process. Besides other factors, motivational talks play an important role in indoctrination process. These motivational talks comprise of: anti-western, anti- material, anti-worldly emotions. Moreover, they are told about the injustice inflicted on Muslims in present and in past. Furthermore, they are told about the punishment (in the hell) that will be imposed on infidels and the reward which is waiting for the believers (in paradise).[380] This reveals that heroes i.e., suicide bombers and other Taliban, are told about the sufferings of Muslims to trigger revenge since, during interrogation some of them have informed that they are sacrificing themselves for Islam and targeting only those who are working against religion.[381] On the contrary, Ron Paul, citing Robert Pape's book, Dying to Win, argues that most of the suicide attacks, in recent years, have come from the countries where US has stationed troops. He argues motivation behind suicide attacks is not religious. The actual motivation is to make foreign troops leave their territory. If America ceases the occupation of foreign lands suicide attacks will cease too.[382]

Conclusion: This discussion reveals that politicians/leaders have been telling fairy tales in times of war in general and War on Terror in particular to shape judgment and perception, to frame and reframe war discourse and to block policy criticism and rational thinking.

4.3.4 Loss Gain Framing

Aims: This subsection aims at establishing that language also evokes loss gain framing. Politicians/ leaders defined and framed War on Terror in a way that it appeared that not going into war would entail great future loses: Going into war is gain and not going into war is loss.

Another way war debate can be framed is loss gain framing. Tell the public:

---

[380] Malik, Aqeb, *The Suicide Dream:* www.dawn.com, May 6, 2009
[381] *Karachi: Into the Mind of a Suicide Bomber:* www.dawn.com, July 21, 2007
[382] Paul, Ron, *Ending Suicide Terrorism*: July 21, 2005, http://www.antiwar.com/paul/?articleid=6712, (accessed March 31, 2010).

going into war is gain and not going is loss; winning war is gain and losing war is loss; status quo is a risk, enemy's loss is our gain and our gain is enemy's loss etc. Gain and loss framing, writes Wolfe, influences the way people define situational outcomes. For example, objectives of Operation Enduring Freedom were to eliminate terrorist targets in Afghanistan to prevent future losses.[383] Similarly, in case of Iraq war, public was told that Iraq has WMDs and is a threat to USA and to rest of the world. Not attacking Iraq would mean great losses in future. Moreover, War on Terror was framed as a war that will end future wars making the world, particularly America, a safer place; moreover, it would promote democracy and freedom- Gains of the war.

According to Wolfe, Positive self- concept and positive national or social identity are psychological needs of human beings. Most of the human beings like to think of themselves as good people doing things for right reasons. This may explain, Wolfe argues, the use of loss/gain framing in justifying war. Loss framing is works since we, being rational, want to protect ourselves, and gain framing persuades us on emotional level justifying war to save and help other human beings and to spread democracy.[384]

There exists abundant literature that reveals that loss gain framing was instrumental in War on Terror. Following speeches will help understanding loss gain framing and its entailments effects in the context of War on Terror.

Tony Blair, using loss gain framing, informed British citizenry on October 2, 2001:

> The biggest drugs hoard in the world is in Afghanistan, controlled by the Taliban. Ninety per cent of the heroin on British streets originates in Afghanistan. The arms the Taliban are buying today are paid for with the lives of young British people buying their drugs on British streets.[385]

This reveals that one of the justifications Tony Blair presented before British citizenry has been: we are in loss. Taliban are in gain in two ways: they sell drugs and make our youth suffer and then they buy arms from the money earned by selling these drugs. This highlights Taliban as enemies of British people who deal in drugs. Britain

---

[383] Wolfe, Mackiewicz Wojtek (2008) p. 45
[384] ibid p. 46
[385] Blair, Full Text: Tony Blair's Speech, www.gurdian.co.uk, October2 , 2001

is paying the price of heroin in the form of lives of British youth. Taliban buy weapons from drug money and kill innocent people and threaten British people. This framing highlights the losses to Britain because of Taliban.

On October 8, 2001, the Prime Minister said:

> We in Britain have the most direct interest in defeating such terror….if not stopped, the terrorists will do it again, this time possibly in Britain. We know that it was an attack on economic confidence…eradicating this threat is crucial to global economic confidence …the Taliban regime is largely funded by the drugs trade, and that 90 per cent of the heroin on British streets originates in Afghanistan… this military action …is to protect our country, our people, our economy, our way of life. It is not a struggle remote from our everyday concerns. It touches them intimately.[386]

It was difficult for the Prime Minster to persuade British citizenry to enter into a war that had nothing to do with them directly. The PM framed the war on terror as something that has 'intimate' effects on British people in their everyday concerns; for once again he informed that Taliban are responsible for the 90 percent of the heroin that British people are addicted to, since it originates in Afghanistan. The list of losses after 9/11, besides other losses, includes an attack on global economic confidence. Highlighting, again, how 9/11 is closely related with ordinary British citizens, for an attack on 'global' economy will surely affect British people. Moreover, if Taliban are not defeated, they will hit the world again. The PM informed, possibly the next target of terrorists is Britain- a great future loss. Gains after waging a war and defeating Taliban includes: global economic confidence will be regained; drugs will go away; our country, our economy and our way of life will be protected. Not going to war will risk them all. Moreover, critics of war do not want to avoid future losses. Perhaps, they want enemy to gain. They are not patriots and do not want to save British youth etc. The entailment effect, perhaps, is: do not listen to them.

President Bush on January 29, 2002 said:

---

[386] Blair, Prime Minister's Statements to the House of Common, October 8, 2001, www.number10.gov.uk

> By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists…. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic.[387]

The President informed people that terrorist regimes are seeking WMD. If they 'gain' WMDs then the 'loss' of USA and the rest of the world will be catastrophic. Losses include: an attack on USA or an ally with WMD, blackmailing of America. Blackmailing, in this context, also evokes a frame: enemy is trying to get strength which will become our weakness. They will exploit us and make us do whatever they want to. We will have to surrender before them. The entailment effects are that if we remain indifferent and do not fight them there will be big loss in future. But if we fight and win this war we can avoid losses, which obviously is a gain. Besides other gains, Bush and his allies informed the world that the war will save not only America and her allies, but also the people of Afghanistan and Iraq, since, people of these countries are ruled by tyrants and living a very miserable life.

A pro Taliban News paper, besides other framing, framed the discussion as the loss of our enemy is our gain i.e., if our enemy is suffering losses especially financial then it is getting weaker and weaker and finally it will be defeated. Following are some excerpts to exhibit how the news paper framed the discussion. Words at work have been: 'declined', 'shocked', 'bankrupt', 'unemployed', 'bearish', 'destruction', 'indebted' etc.

> American oil reserves have declined up to 246 million barrels. America experts are shocked to notice a decline of 37 million barrel of refined oil.[388] (Translation, mine)

> America could not absorb the shock of 9/11. American company World Com bankrupt, 85 thousand unemployed. [389](Translation, mine)

> American, European and Asian markets show bearish trend. London, Tokyo, Frankfurt, Paris, stock markets cannot be saved from

[387] Bush (January 29, 2002)
[388] Zarb – e- Momin: December 6-12, 2002
[389] Zarb-e Momin July 26- August 1, 2002

destruction.[390] (Translation, mine)

After 9/11 western world is facing the problem of unemployment. French Telecommunication Company has fired 13 thousand employees and next year it will fire another 39 thousand.[391] (Translation, mine)

Effect of America policies- American export declined 94 billion dollars.[392] (Translation, mine)

America will lose 10 trillion dollars in Iraq war.[393] (Translation, mine)

America has lost 2 trillion dollar in Iraq war. Another news says, America is the most indebted country- debt is 1400 billion.[394] (Translation, mine)

All these excerpts demonstrate that America and allies are facing great financial losses. These losses were somehow connected to 9/11. The framing effects are: if someone is losing money then he/she is getting weaker. If a country is losing money and her citizens are getting unemployed then the country is getting weaker day by day. Her citizens will criticize the policies. This situation is a gain situation for the enemy. The more the enemy gets weaker the easier is to defeat it.

Conclusion: Politicians have to use different metaphors and frames to persuade people of different world views. For example, they use language that evokes religious frame to persuade religious people. People, w ho think in terms of morality and politics, are framed by moral politics and war metaphors. Those who get influenced by movies and stories, villain versus hero frame are used and for those who believe in evil, good versus evil frames are there. For those who do not believe in evil and think in terms of economics, they have to use loss-gain metaphors.

This demonstrates that in the context of war in general and War on Terror in particular language of war has been instrumental in shaping judgments, perceptions and behavior of people and silencing the critics.

---

[390] Zarb-e Momin July 26- August 1, 2002
[391] Zarb-e Momin: September 27- October 3, 2002
[392] Zarb-e Momin: July 11-17, 2003
[393] Zarb-e Momin: February 28- March 6, 2003
[394] Zarb-e Momin: November 5-11, 2004

CHAPTER 5

WAR ON TERROR AND FALLACIOUS ARGUMENTS

Our judgments when we are pleased and friendly are not the same as when we are pained and hostile. (Aristotle)

Aims: This chapter aims at demonstrating that politicians/leaders commit informal fallacies when they discuss war to shape judgments, to silence critics and to obstruct/block clear and rational/critical thinking.[395] It also reveals that using metaphors and framing (such as: good versus evil, hero versus villain, believer versus infidel etc.) politicians set out a scenario, and then they present fallacious arguments. In such scenarios their fallacious arguments may make sense to people and people may accept whatever they say. Moreover, some fallacies are committed over and over again for framing public opinion in favour of their war policies and to silence critics. To establish these points plenty of references have been made to the text and speeches that have been generated during war in general and War on Terror in particular.

5.1 WAR AND FALLACIES: A BRIEF EXPOSITION

Aims: This section briefly discusses that politicians/leaders have been committing informal fallacies to persuade public for war and to block rational thing and silencing critics.

In times of war, politicians in order to win public support and silence critics put forth arguments; many of their arguments commit informal fallacies.

For example, President Roosevelt on May 27, 1941 argued:

> Anyone with an atlas, anyone with a reasonable knowledge of the sudden striking force of modern war, knows that it is stupid to wait until a probable enemy has gained a foothold from which to attack.[396]

Context of this argument is: perhaps, the President wants to enter into the

---

[395] For understanding key term and concepts see chapter 3 that discusses: what is logic, what is an argument, inductive and deductive arguments, formal and informal logic, formal and informal fallacies, general categories of informal fallacies, and many informal fallacies.

[396] Roosevelt Franklin, "We Chose Human Freedom" May 27, 1941: President Franklin Delano Roosevelt Radio Address Announcing the Proclamation of an Unlimited National Emergency available on http://www.usmm.org/fdr/emergency.html (accessed March 16, 2010)

Second World War. He wants America to strike before the 'probable enemy' gains a 'foothold'- Preemptive war. Critics are opposing his policy. He puts forth this and many other arguments to silence them. The argument cited above commits more than one fallacies. Only a stupid, according to the President, can reject his policy. Those who reject the President's policies do not even have an atlas and they are ignorant of modern war's 'sudden striking force'. The unstated conclusion is: A stupid person who has no knowledge of modern wars has no right to criticize President's policies- argument against man. The President has poisoned the well and perhaps public will not listen to critics. Moreover, if his policies are not adopted then the enemy will gain a foothold and from this foothold they will attack America- appeal to bad consequences. All this implies that the president's arguments should be accepted without criticism.

In the same address, he argued, those who say that we should preserve peace are 'timid ones'. If we listen to them we will lose our liberty.

> ... some timid ones among us who say that we must preserve peace at any price -- lest we lose our liberties forever.[397]

Dubbing them enemies of democracy and people supported by Bandits, the Fascists, and Communists, he informed public that such people confuse and divide public and destroy public confidence in Government. He, committed fallacy of argument against man- poisoning the well[398], tried to silence critics and shaped public opinion against the critics of his war policies. Moreover, any criticism, he argued, will weaken the government and will support enemies of democracies- false cause, type: reversing causal direction. Perhaps the opposite is true; actually enemies of democracies do not let people to criticize their policies. He argued, in another speech,

> All of us Americans, of all opinions, are faced with the choice between the kind of world we want to live in and the kind of world which Hitler and his hordes would impose upon us.[399]

A very common fallacy committed in war is false dilemma/false/either-

---

[397] Roosevelt Franklin, "We Chose Human Freedom" May 27, 1941

[398] See 3.2.2e

[399] Roosevelt Franklin, "The forward march of Hitler and of Hitlerism can be stopped -- and it will be stopped." October 27, 1941 http://www.usmm.org/fdr/kearny.html (accessed March 16, 2010)

or/false dichotomy[400], Presenting before public/enemy incomplete range of choices/alternatives (normally only two) and telling them, these are the only choices we have; ignoring other possible alternatives. The President argued that all American people, whatever their opinion may be, have only two choices: either to live in a world they want to live in or to live in a world which is dominated by Hitler and his gang. The argument is: we are left with only two choices- either fight and defeat Hitler or do not fight (as critics were suggesting) and be dominated by Hitler. As if there is no other option. Moreover, people who do not support war and are in favour of peace actually want Hitler to conquer us and impose his world on us.

Hitler, while declaring war on America, argued that fighting this war is a great duty. He informed Germans about provocative steps taken by the President of America. Germany does not want a war with America, it is America who is waging war on Germany and Germans should stand and teach America a lesson, he argued:

> But anybody who tries to evade this duty has no claim to be regarded in our midst as a fellow German. Just as we were unmercifully hard in our struggle for power we shall be unmercifully hard in the struggle to maintain our nation. At a time when thousands of our best men are dying nobody must expect to live who tries to depreciate the sacrifices made at the Front. Immaterial under what camouflage he tries to disturb this German Front, to undermine the resistance of our people, to weaken the authority of the regime, to sabotage the achievements of the Home Front, he shall die for it![401]

The unstated premise in this argument is: this war is a duty. Fighting this war, for Germans, is performing national duty. Anybody who escapes from this war is escaping from this great duty. Such a person will not be considered a German- this excludes critics from the class of Germans. The conclusion is: he is an enemy. Moreover, this argument involves a clear threat for those, who in anyway, devalue the 'sacrifices made at the front'. All those Germans, who are not with Hitler, actually: disturb German Front, weaken the resistance of German people, weaken the authority of the regime, and damage the achievements of the Home Front. They are traitors and

---

[400] See 3.2.6

[401] Hitler, Declaration of war on US by Hitler, December 11, 1941, http://www.famousquotes.me.uk/speeches/Adolf_Hitler/index.htm (accessed March 4, 2010)

do not want Germans to win a war against her enemies who want to destroy Germany and the whole Europe. They shall die for it (read, shall be killed) - appeal to force.

Richard Nixon explaining his Vietnam policy, argued:

> .... we really only have two choices open to us if we want to end this war. I can order an immediate, precipitate withdrawal of all Americans from Vietnam without regard to the effects of that action. Or we can persist in our search for a just peace through a negotiated settlement if possible, or through continued implementation of our plan for Vietnamization if necessary -- a plan in which we will withdraw all of our forces from Vietnam on a schedule in accordance with our program, as the South Vietnamese become strong enough to defend their own freedom. I have chosen the second course. It is not the easy way. It is a plan which will end the war and serve the cause of peace -- not just in Vietnam but in the Pacific and in the world. In speaking of the consequences of a precipitate withdrawal, I mentioned that our allies would lose confidence in America.....[402]

Many fallacies have been committed in this argument. Context of this augment is that the President wants to change American policy regarding Vietnam. Although, the President has committed that America will keep on supporting her allies but instead of committing more troops and staying long in Vietnam he wants to train South Vietnamese to fight their own war to save their freedom- Vietnamization. He puts forth this argument to: convince people for his policies, demonstrate that America is not losing Vietnam War, and to silence the critics.

President Nixon, in the above mentioned excerpt, argued that America is left with only two choices:

All American immediately, precipitately, withdrawal from Vietnam, without thinking of the effects, that action can produce.

Or

Through negotiations, searching for a just peace, if possible, or through Vietnamization making South Vietnamese stronger, enabling them to defend their

---

[402] Nixon, Richard, Vietnamization- War in Vietnam Speech, by Richard Nixon, Address to the Nation- November 3, 1969, http://www.famousquotes.me.uk/speeches/Richard_Nixon/2.htm, (accessed March 4, 2010)

own freedom, if necessary.

Obviously the first choice is not acceptable, since people first see the effects and then go for a choice and the effect of the first choice is, 'allies will lose confidence in America'- appeal bad consequence. Hence, most probably, a large number of citizenry will go for the second one. Second choice also comprises two choices. The first one is negotiations. Although it seems to be the best one, but the President has already ruled out negotiations.[403] Hence, the President concluded that the only choice left is Vietnamization, which he believes, is the 'right way', otherwise, the allies of America will lose confidence in America- Appeal to bad/negative consequences[404]. Any criticism against the President's policy would mean: the critic does not want the 'right way', and wants American allies to lose confidence in America- poisoning the well.[405] Moreover, the President, committing fallacy of appeal to good consequences argued that his policy will bring peace in Pacific and in the world.

Sproule, citing others, informs that during his election campaign too, Nixon argued about his opponent's Vietnam policies so ambiguously, that both hawks and doves believed that Nixon is representing them. He argues that Nixon's statements such as: 'we fail to use our military power effectively'; 'fail to use our diplomatic power wisely', and 'an honorable end to war in Vietnam', were very ambiguous and misleading, since some amongst the public thought that Nixon wants to escalate the war (hawks) and some thought that he wants to withdraw (doves).[406] This demonstrates that using arguments that committed fallacies of ambiguity, Nixon misled people and won the election.

Conclusion: Arguments presented in times of war commit informal fallacies. These fallacious not only persuade people for war but also silence critics in the name of patriotism or by threatening them.

5.2 WAR ON TERROR AND INFORMAL FALLACIES

Aims: The following discussion aims to demonstrate that politicians in times of war

---

[403] For more details see the speech available on http://www.famousquotes.me.uk/speeches/Richard_Nixon/2.htm).

[404] See 3.2.18

[405] See 3.2.2e

[406] Sproule , J. Michael, Argument- Language and its influence: McGraw- Hill Book Company, 1980, p. 37

commit informal fallacies with special reference to War on Terror in Afghanistan. It also discusses the use of metaphors and framing that help them committing fallacies to shape judgments, perceptions and attitudes of public and to obstruct rational/critical thinking.

5.2.1 To begin with, a question is analyzed that was asked twice in a press conference, on September 19, 2001, from G.W. Bush. An important question about an irrefutable evidence that linked Al Qaeda and Taliban to 9/11(a justification to begin war in Afghanistan) and about other polices of Bush.

> Q Mr. President, since you've declared war against terrorism, there are a number of countries who seem to be saying, not so fast. China, in particular, said that any strike must be preceded by irrefutable evidence. Others have raised concerns about civilian casualties. So the first question is, are you now prepared to provide such irrefutable evidence to countries, and what in your mind is the biggest challenge that you face in trying to construct this coalition?[407]

If we analyze the question, the journalist whose name is David, is asking for:

a) Why America is going so fast? (critics of the then American policy)
b) Where is the irrefutable evidence (justification for war- Just cause)
c) How to minimize Civilian Casualties? (effects the war will produce)
d) What is the biggest challenge in constructing a coalition?

In the context of 9/11, behind each question mentioned above, there should be an argument. For example, the first question, 'why so fast' stands for an argument, since many countries were arguing that America should not go so fast in the absence of an irrefutable evidence. It was a very strong criticism. The President must have argued against it defending his policies by presenting reasons against this argument and reasons in favor of his argument by mentioning: these are the evidences; therefore, we are going so fast. When we analyze the answer we find no sign of such argumentation. He instead erected a straw man (fallacy of straw man)[408] by misinterpreting what David was asking for. He argued, as if David was arguing against/about the objectives of war, as if he was arguing: objectives of war are not

---

[407] Bush, President Building Worldwide Campaign Against Terrorism: September19, 2001
[408] See 3.2.7

clear.

The President of the United States of America:

> Well, first of all, we'll do what we need to do to achieve the first objective of a long campaign. And the first objective is to bring people to justice who we feel like committed this particular set of atrocities, and to hold the organization accountable and to hold those who harbor them accountable. That's the first objective of a very long campaign.[409]

David did not ask for: what are the objectives of the war? The President misinterpreting his question and changed the direction of argument- he committed fallacy of red herring.[410] Moreover, he made three points: there are organizations that are helping terrorists, there are people (Taliban) who are harboring them and it is going to be a very long campaign. There are organizations and people who are harboring terrorists make some sense but he knew, from the outset, that it will be a very long campaign is beyond understanding- he made a hasty conclusion.

President continued saying,

> David, I think that the real challenge for America and our allies in this effort is to do a couple of things: One, condition the world, starting with our own country, that this will be a different kind of battle, series of battles; that they will be fought visibly sometimes, and sometimes we'll never see what may be taking place; that the -- and that we fully understand that some nations will be comfortable supporting overt activities, some nations will be comfortable supporting covert activities, some nations will only be comfortable in providing information, others will be helpful and only feel comfortable helping on financial matters. I understand that. Thirdly, as these various -- as the campaign evolves, some nations may take a more active role than others.[411]

No irrefutable evidence so for. However the President in a very vague way

---

[409] Bush, President Building Worldwide Campaign Against Terrorism: September 19, 2001
[410] See 3.2.11
[411] Bush, President Building Worldwide Campaign Against Terrorism: September 19, 2001

argued, how this big coalition will be formed and how it will work.

> The mind-set of war must change. It is a different type of battle. It's a different type of battlefield… the mission is to root out terrorist activities.[412]

Since there had been a lot of debate, whether the incidents of 9/11 were acts of war? Should America declare war against Afghanistan?[413] The President committing fallacy of definitional retreat redefined the war.[414] He kept on using this definition since this definition persuaded people for war and provided an opportunity to the President to begin an eternal war against all evil forces of the world. It also silences critics: Critics are not aware (they are ignorant) of the fact that it is new type of war. They, critics, have been judging it in the light of previous wars therefore, their criticism is not relevant.

> Clearly, one of our focuses is to get people out of their caves, smoke them out, get them moving and get them … But we're also focused, and we recognize that the al Qaeda organization exists in some 60-plus countries, and we're beginning to work with other nations that are receptive to the notion of fighting terrorism…We fully understand that certain NGOs, nongovernmental organizations, serve as fronts, as a funding mechanism for terrorist organizations. We expect there to be activity on those fronts, as well.[415]

The President evoked evil frame and also committed fallacy of begging the question.[416] The problem of irrefutable evidence against Afghanistan was already in need of a proof, he making things more complicates informed (in order to argue for a very long campaign) Al Qaeda exists in more than 60 countries. This premise was enough to make War on Terror, a Global War on Terror; however, it is a very serious case of begging the question[417]. This is not a small claim, it is a very big claim made by the President of USA without any evidential support. The President repeated this

---

[412] Ibid
[413] See: What is war? See 5.1
[414] See 4.2.17
[415] Bush, President Building Worldwide Campaign Against Terrorism: September 19, 2001
[416] See 3.2.15
[417] See 3.2.15

claim many times for example on, September 20, 2001, he informed, that thousands of these terrorists are in more than 60 countries.[418]

[Not only Bush but his closest ally, Blair also argued for a very long war,

> We are in this for the long haul. Even when Al Qaida is dealt with, the job is not over. The network of international terrorism is not confined to it.[419]

This reveals that the Prime Minster Blair also knew from the very beginning that it is going to be a very long war, since 'international terrorism' (an ambiguous term) is not just confined to Al Qaeda.)]

Answering David's question, the President further argued:

> So the challenge is to redefine the terms of the conflict, the campaign… There's certain impatience with war of the past. People demand a certain clarity of a specific battlefield… this is a new type of struggle… terrorism knows no borders… but it does have a common ideology, and that is they hate freedom, and they hate freedom-loving people. And they particularly hate America at this moment. But many leaders understand that what happened in New York City and Washington, D.C. could have easily have happened in their capital, as well. It's a long answer to a short question.[420]

Fallacy of definitional retreat: don't see, judge and understand this battle in the light of previous definitions of war, don't ask for evidence, don't be impatient, don't even ask for clarity, for it is a new type of war.

Committing fallacy of false cause (type: fallacy of single cause) the President argued that America has been attacked because terrorists hate freedom loving people particularly Americans- as if there is no other cause.[421] 'Terrorist hate freedom loving people' also exaggerates the threat.

Here and elsewhere, the President and his team argued that the cause America

---

[418] Bush, Address to the Joint Session of Congress and American People: September 20, 2001
[419] Blair, Prime Minister's Statements to the House of Common, October 8, 2001, www.number10.gov.uk
[420] Bush, President Building Worldwide Campaign Against Terrorism: September 19, 2001
[421] See 4.2.12b

has been attacked is that Osama and other terrorists hate our culture, way of life etc. Peter L. Bergen argues that if we see tens and thousands of Osama's statements, we come to know that he has nothing to do with American culture or American way of life, since none of his statement is about/against Hollywood movies, same sex marriages, Madonna or pornography protected by American constitution. The actual reasons of his hatred have been: American presence in Middle East, bombing on Iraq, support of Israel, and America backing of regimes such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia.[422]

The President also committed fallacy of appeal to fear[423], to manipulate judgments of rest of the world: what happened in USA can easily happen to other countries as well.

None of the questions have been answered, yet the President argued he has answered a short question in detail.

It was not a short question; it was a long question comprising at least four questions. He again misinterpreted David's question. Moreover, none of the question was answered- whatever he said had nothing to do with the questions- it was all irrelevant.

Since Mr. President was committing fallacies all the way, therefore, David, who was obviously not satisfied with the answers, repeated the question. This time he was clearer and to the point. He asked, whether the president has, in his mind, an irrefutable evidence that links al Qaeda and Osama to 9/11 attacks.[424]

Bush and his administration had been arguing that Osama Bin laden was behind 9/11 attacks and he had been harbored by Taliban. America was asking Taliban to handover Osama to America but Taliban were asking for evidence that linked Osama to 9/11 incidents. Mullah Omer in an interview informed that their stand, not to hand over Osama, is based on principles and America should use reason and logic instead of threats.[425] Reason and logic in that context meant: evidence that linked Al Qaeda to 911.

It was very important and reasonable to link Osama with 9/11 incidents before declaring war on Afghanistan. Hence, not only David but rest of the people, who thought rationally and not emotionally, argued that America should first link Osama

---

[422] Bergen, Peter. L, Holy War, Inc.: Inside the Secret World of Osama Bin Laden: The Free Press, New York, 2001, p.222

[423] See 3.2.8b

[424] Bush, President Building Worldwide Campaign Against Terrorism: September 19, 2001

[425] Khan, Ismail, *Omer threatens to intensify war, Talks with Karzai govt ruled out*: www.dawn.com January 4, 2007 (accessed November 22, 2009)

to 9/11 and then must go according to the international law. Let us see how The President links Osama with 9/11:

> When we take action, we will take action because we believe -- because we know we'll be on the right. And I want to remind people that there have been terrorist activities on America in the past, as well...It is a war against terrorist activities. Our nation must do everything we can to protect the homeland.... But the best way to make sure that America is safe, the people of Indonesia are safe, is to find terrorism at its roots and to root it out, to get them out of their caves and get them moving, cut off their finances, and hold them accountable.[426]

President argued that he feels and believes that he is right; therefore, no need of evidence- President's feeling is enough evidence- False cause. Moreover, President wants to fight against an activity a tactic. There is no clear definition of the enemy. Biddle suggests that the ambiguities in the present war policies should be eliminated. For example, he argues, terrorism is a tactic, it is not an enemy.[427] How one can fight a war against a tactic?

No sign of even a vague and ambiguous answer. However, in this discourse Bush successfully framed and communicated an argument:

The President intends to root out terrorism, terrorists and terrorist activities that are present in more than sixty countries in order to make America and the rest of the world a safe place. War on terror is a new type of war, since it is a war against an enemy, who lives in caves (a metaphorical understanding of enemy as if it is like animals) and it does not need evidential support, it will see no borders and will promise no time table since it will not end until every terrorist of the global reach is not dealt with- Global War on Terror. Therefore, he argued, one should not see, judge, and understand this war in the light of previous wars- Just believe what the President says. Moreover, those who do not want peace, freedom and protection of homeland will criticize the President. Susan Sontag argues war on terror is not a war; it is a way

---

[426] Bush, President Building Worldwide Campaign Against Terrorism: September 19, 2001

[427] Biddle Stephen D, *American Grand Strategy After 9/11: An Assessment*: Strategic Studies Institute 2005, p.6, Available online www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi (accessed March 23, 2008)

to expand the use of American power.[428]

5.3.2 On 9/11 the President informed that the cause America has been attacked is that we love and protect freedom and democracy.

> America was targeted for attack because we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world.[429]

On the very first day The President argued that the cause of attacking America has been that it is the brightest beacon of freedom and opportunity- fallacy of single cause.[430] This might have been one of the causes of the attack, but not be the only cause. Here and elsewhere, The President argued as if the only cause America has been targeted has been that this country enjoys freedom and democracy.

On September 12, 2001, repeating same fallacy and many other fallacies, to persuade people for war he informed and argued:

> The deliberate and deadly attacks which were carried out yesterday against our country were more than acts of terror. They were acts of war. This will require our country to unite in steadfast determination and resolve. Freedom and democracy are under attack….This enemy attacked not just our people, but all freedom-loving people everywhere in the world. The United States of America will use all our resources to conquer this enemy….This battle will take time and resolve. But make no mistake about it: we will win.[431]

The President informed again that freedom and democracy have been attacked. Moreover, to declare war against Afghanistan he had to redefine the attacks of 9/11. He reported that attacks were actually acts of war: a premise enough to conclude that Americans must fight back. Presenting fallacious arguments, he then drew some conclusion, such as:

a) 'Democracy and Freedom are under attack'- An irrelevant conclusion. Although it is psychologically and emotionally persuasive but logically it has nothing to do with the premises. The President argued: Terrorists are enemies of democracy and

---

[428] Sontag , Susan, (2002)
[429] Statement by the President in his Address to the Nation, September 11, 2001
[430] See 3.2.12b
[431] Remarks by the President in Photo Opportunity with the National Security: September 12, 2001

freedom, therefore, they have attacked America, and to save democracy and freedom we have to fight this evil now. This made saving democracy as a purpose and provocation for war.[432] Moreover, freedom and democracy are very broad terms and are enjoyed by many countries of the world. Not all the countries enjoying freedom and democracy were attacked.

Patrick Thornberry opines that terrorists do not come out of hatred of freedom and democracy, there were reasons. He argues that justice, in case of 9/11, not only require deterrence, defense, retribution, and punishment but also elimination of social inequalities such as poverty, social and economic underdevelopment, ignorance etc.[433]

b) The President informed, the enemy attacked all freedom loving people of the world- hasty generalization.[434] It was a limited attack on some particular places, and off course some freedom loving people died in the attacks, yet there were no armies, no tanks, no aerial bombing and no widespread conflict.[435] But the President argued that all freedom loving people of the world have been attacked. It was too small a sample to provide enough/probable grounds for the conclusion- 'all freedom loving people have been attacked'.

c) From the very beginning the President knew that this war will take time. He therefore, jumped to the conclusion.

d) Moreover, the President also knew from the very beginning, 'we will win'-fallacy of good consequences.[436] He argued since consequences are going to be good, therefore, we should fight this war. Tony Blair, one of the main supports on war in Afghanistan, committing same fallacy, also argued in one of his speeches,

> This is a battle with only one outcome: our victory not theirs.[437]

This reveals that not only Bush and his administration but their main ally, Toney Blair, was also trying to convince people that we should wage war against Taliban, since we will win this war.

---

[432] Ivie Robert and Oscar Giner (2007)

[433] Thornberry Patrick, *Invisible Cities:* in 11 September 2001- War, Terror and Judgment, edited by Gokay Bulent and R.B.J. Walker, Frank Cass, London, Portland, OR, This Edition Published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005, p. 23

[434] See 3.2.13b

[435] See 4.1 (what is war?)

[436] See 3.2.12e

[437] Full Text: Tony Blair Speech's: Tuesday 2 October, 2001, www.guardian.co.uk (accessed September 24, 2009)

There was no war going on.[438] No country in the world had declared war on America. However, by committing fallacies the President tried to convince people that America is under attack. Therefore, it should fight back, otherwise we will lose freedom and democracy and the whole world will be conquered by terror.

5.3.3. False or weak Analogy is a commonly committed fallacy in times of war. Let us see how it worked in War on Terror.

> We have seen their kind before. They are the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the 20th century. By sacrificing human life to serve their radical visions -- by abandoning every value except the will to power -- they follow in the path of fascism, and Nazism, and totalitarianism.[439]

Here and elsewhere, The President and his team compared Taliban with Nazis, Fascists and other Totalitarian regimes arguing: what was true for them is also true for Taliban- False Analogy.[440] They tried to establish that Taliban are like previous totalitarian regimes highlighting totalitarian nature of Taliban and magnifying the threat. Moreover, they argued: as friends of Nazis were also like them so whoever is with Taliban or is a friend of Taliban is also like them and will follow their murderous ideology and will face the same consequences.[441] This demonstrates that Bush administration tried to draw analogy between Taliban and previous totalitarian regimes inferring- whatever was true for the previous totalitarian regimes (like killing people without mercy and abandoning other values except will to power) is also true for Taliban, and whatever happened to the previous regimes will also happen to Taliban or any other nation sharing their 'murderous ideologies'. There is also a hidden message for the critics: arguing against Bush's policies means supporting totalitarian regimes.

President informed,

> As Americans did 60 years ago, we have entered a struggle of uncertain duration. But now, as then, we can be certain of the

---

[438] See 4.2.2
[439] Bush, Address to a Joint Session of the Congress and the American People: September 20, 2001
[440] See 4.2.16
[441] Winkler, Carol K (2008)

outcome, because we have a number of decisive assets.[442]

Comparing present war with World War, the President argued that the similarity between this war and World Wars has been, 'uncertain duration', i.e., it is going to be a very long war as the previous wars were. Moreover, he not only drew a wrong analogy, he appealed to force/ threat, too.[443] (America had used decisive assets 60 years ago and can use them again.) 'Decisive assets' have been used ambiguously, most probably, for Atom bombs that America used against Japan.

> In a second world war, we learned there is no isolation from evil. We affirmed that some crimes are so terrible they offend humanity, itself. And we resolved that the aggressions and ambitions of the wicked must be opposed early, decisively, and collectively, before they threaten us all. That evil has returned, and that cause is renewed.[444]

Evoking evil frame, the President once again drew an analogy between War on Terror and World War Two. The similarity between both the wars has been, 'evil enemy'. The President and his administration, kept on comparing this war with World Wars and Taliban with Nazis arguing, since in the World Wars good nations had to make an alliance against the alliance of evil, so this time too, we have to make an alliance, and as Nazis killed innocent people, similarly Taliban also kill innocent people etc. Moreover, the 'evil has returned', is highly emotionally charged. Committing appeal to fear, the President attempted to convince citizenry that evil has returned and if we do not fight, as we fought in previous war, we are gone.

War on terror cannot be compared with Second World War, since in World War: A grand alliance of nations was fighting against another grand alliance of nations. The enemies were well defined. It was a declared war between many states, the conflict was wide spread involving: armies, tanks, fighter planes etc. of many countries on both sides. In war on terror there is a big alliance of nations on one hand but on the other hand there is a tactic, a very ill defined enemy. This reveals that false or weak analogy was instrumental in war discourse and it might have manipulated public opinion.

---

[442] Bush, President Pays Tribute at Pentagon Memorial: October 11, 2001
[443] See 4.2.8
[444] Bush, President Speaks to the United Nations: November 10, 2001

5.3.4 As discussed earlier false dilemma, false bifurcation or a false either or is a common fallacy in times of war.[445] Bush and his allies committed this fallacy for a number of purposes such as: Making a grand coalition; threatening those countries reluctant to join coalition i.e., wanted to remain neutral; to declare pro war policies of Bush good/heroic and declaring his critics, friends of terrorists etc. Moreover, this fallacy was committed over and over again for framing purpose. The framing effect was instrumental in persuading people that the world has been divided into two halves and there is no neutral ground, hence, no nation can remain neutral. After 9/11, Bush presented only two alternatives to Taliban: either to become an ally of US or Al-Qaeda, erasing the possibility of compromise solution as an alternative.[446] Following excerpts are taken into account to establish these points.

On September 20, 2001, Bush argued,

> Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. [447]

It is a false either or: either you are with America or with Terrorists- no country can remain neutral, he argued, as if there is no other alternative. In reality, there existed several other alternatives, such as: a country might have been against Taliban but could advocate settling of the dispute by diplomatic means; a country could have been an enemy of US but not a friend of Taliban, a country could have opposed both US and Taliban's policies etc. But the President ignored all other alternative. In the context of 9/11, this fallacious argument also involves an appeal to force/threat. America is going to root out terrorists of the global reach. If a country is not a part of coalition, then Americans will consider her a part of Axis of evil. And if a country is a part of axis of evil then she will face the consequences.

Tony Blair on October 2, 2001 argued,

> There is no compromise possible with such people, no meeting of minds, no point of understanding with such terror. Just a choice: defeat it or be defeated by it. And defeat it we must.[448]

---

[445] See 4.2.6
[446] Winkler, Carol K (2008)
[447] Bush, Address to a Joint Session of the Congress and the American People: September 20, 2001
[448] Tony Blair, Tuesday 2 October, 2001, www.guardian.co.uk (accessed 24 September 2009)

Tony Blair, like Bush, also argued that terrorist cannot be argued with, since no compromise with them is possible. Moreover, there is nothing common between civilized people and terrorist. Committing false either or, he argued: either we will defeat them or will be defeated. This fallacious reasoning was very persuasive in the context of 9/11. Since the terrorists were framed to be evil, murderers, ruthless, irrational who prey on innocent people. A defeat by terrorist meant, the whole civilized world could be dominated by terror and evil. This way Blair attempted to gain support of his public to wage war on Afghanistan and defeat the terrorists.

President Bush on October 4, 2001 once again committed false either or. However, this time he presented limited choice to banks and financial institutes too:

> ...nations which understand that what happened in New York and Washington could happen to them, as well.... we don't care how you help, just help. Either you're for us, or you're against us. .... we're talking to countries and banks and financial institutions, and saying either you're with us, or against us: cut off their money.[449]

Once again, either you are with us or against us- Bush extended his doctrine to banks and financial institutions too. Here one can notice an appeal to fear and bad consequences too: what happened to American cites could happen to any other city of the world. Bush presented a scenario that world is in danger. An evil force wants to capture the whole world. Nations of the world have only two choices- either to join Bush or to join Al Qaeda and Taliban. And those who do not join Bush there will be a consequence- Appeal to force.

Not only President Bush and Tony Blair, but other members of Bush's administration too, were busy making such arguments. Pervez Musharraf, then President of Pakistan, writes in his book: He and the DG ISI were warned by Colin Powell and Richard Armitage respectively, to either join America or face the consequences. Richard Armitage further warned DG ISI, Pervez Musharraf writes, if we decide not to join USA then we will be Bombed back to stone age.[450]

Connecting this fallacious reasoning with good versus evil and fairy tales, the President said:

---

[449] Bush, President Unveils Back to Work Plan: October 4, 2001

[450] Musharraf, Pervez, In the Line of Fire: Simon & Schuster UK Ltd, 2006, p. 201

> We've said, not only join the coalition, we've said here's what we expect you to do. Here is your assignment.... We expect if you're on our team, that we want your performance. And it's making a difference... This is a war between good and evil... we expect other nations to join us.... This is not a war between our world and their world. It is a war to save the world.[451]

The argument, just like what we saw in fairy tale stories[452], has been, join Bush, show the performance, and do what Bush wants you to do, for Bush is fighting evil. It is a war that will save the world. In this speech Bush's language seems to be very authoritative and demanding. Although, he claimed that terrorists have attacked America because America has been the beacon of freedom and democracy, yet, the President very undemocratically directed other nations: what to do? In case, if a country failed to take the 'assignment', then it would fall into the class of evil. Consequently, to save the world from evil, America and allies were to fight and defeat such country. This demonstrates that the President had been arguing that the alternative of fighting and defeating evil enemy is,

> ... submitting to evil, to become evil, to be exposed to evil.[453]

On October 6, 2001, Bush argued,

> The United States is presenting a clear choice to every nation: Stand with the civilized world, or stand with the terrorists. And for those nations that stand with the terrorists, there will be a heavy price.[454]

Just one day before attacking Afghanistan, the President presented a clear choice to every nation. Joining Bush would mean joining the civilized world and not joining Bush would mean joining terrorists- A classical example of false dilemma. Besides false dilemma, he committed fallacy of appeal to force too: if any country decides not to join the coalition she will have to pay a heavy price. Winkler opines

---

[451] Bush, President Directs Humanitarian Aid To Afghanistan: October 4, 2001
[452] See 4.2.4
[453] Ivie Robert and Oscar Giner (2007)
Lakoff in Moral Politics reveals that conservatives, who follow strict father morality, believe that it is immoral to remain weak in the face of evil. "someone who is morally weak cannot stand up to evil and so eventually commit evil" p. 71- 77
[454] Bush, Radio Address of the President to the Nation: October 6, 2001

that Bush and his team, using arguments by association and dissociation, provided Taliban a choice to either hand over Osama and all other terrorists or they will be treated as friends of terrorists[455]. This further reveals that Bush and his allies argued: whoever is dissociated from us is associated with terrorists.

Perhaps, all these arguments affected the judgment of the nation, for on October 7, the day the real war started, the President confidently announced,

> We are joined in this operation by our staunch friend, Great Britain. Other close friends, including Canada, Australia, Germany and France, have pledged forces as the operation unfolds. More than 40 countries in the Middle East, Africa, Europe and across Asia have granted air transit or landing rights. Many more have shared intelligence. We are supported by the collective will of the world.[456]

Actually every nation had to choose between America and terrorists, according to the President, and they opted for America. Perhaps, it was easier fighting Taliban than America. It seems the President's fallacious arguments made nations of the world think and act the way the President wanted them too.

The President on the same day again argued:

> Today we focus on Afghanistan, but the battle is broader. Every nation has a choice to make. In this conflict, there is no neutral ground. If any government sponsors the outlaws and killers of innocents, they have become outlaws and murderers, themselves. And they will take that lonely path at their own peril.[457]

The President clearly informed that the battle is broader. Probably, it will extend to other nations who did not join Bush, for the President has been arguing again and again (for framing purpose): either you are with us or with terrorist, sponsors of outlaws, murderers and killers of innocent people. Moreover, if any country is not with US, there is a heavy price to pay- attack by USA. This argumentative strategy was also instrumental in silencing critics for criticizing Bush's doctrine would imply supporting terrorists, outlaws, murderers, evil and villain.

---

[455] Winkler Carol k. (2008)
[456] Bush, Presidential Address to the Nation: October 7, 2001
[457] Bush, Radio Address to the Nation: October7, 2001

On October 7, 2001 America launched an attack on Afghanistan. Prior to this date, there was no war. Attacks of September 11, 2001 were serious acts of terror since many innocent people lost their lives. But no country declared war against America. There were no armies, no tanks, no aerial bombing, and no well defined enemy and above all no wide spread conflict. But President Bush and his friends argued: war has been launched by the world's greatest evil force and now they have to respond.[458] The enthymeme was: we have been attacked so, we have to respond to the situation, hence, no justification of war, no irrefutable evidence, is needed.

In this war, Bush argued again and again, no nation can remain neutral. He repeated this many time for framing purpose (repeating a frame over and over reinforces a frame[459]). His language was ambiguous, vague, emotionally charged and metaphorical and his arguments fallacious. These arguments seem to be instrumental in making a coalition and threatening the people who were arguing against Bush's policies. For example, 'friends of evil', those who 'harbor evil', any government who 'sponsor the terrorist', terrorist of the 'global reach' etc. are all very vague and ambiguous ways of referring to someone. Moreover, he time and again informed the world that the battle is broader- a very vague way of defining the borders of the war. After the war on terror on Afghanistan any nations may be declared by America, friend/supporter/sponsor of evil, and may be attacked.

Bush and his team kept on committing this fallacy even after October 7, 2001.

> We gave that regime a choice: Turn over the terrorists, or face your ruin. They chose unwisely.[460]

This is another example of false dilemma and appeal to force in the context of war on terror. There is no other option such as: international law, negotiations, diplomacy, and involvement of a third country. The choice is either 'black or white' as if there is no other color. If the regime i.e., Taliban do not do the way the President wants them to, they will be ruined- Appeal to force.

Bush, not only, used 'either or' argument for other nations of the world, he used the same for citizens of America too. Dianna Taylor informs that the President presented two choices before American people: evil or lesser evil. Not joining Bush

---

[458] Also see 5.1 and 5.2
[459] See Lakoff's, *Simple Framing*: available online on http://www.rockridgeinstitute.org/index.html
[460] Bush, President Pays Tribute at Pentagon Memorial: October 11, 2001

was termed as evil and joining Bush meant compromising civil liberties and violence in the name of national security- lesser evil.[461]

> I will put every nation on notice that these duties involve more than sympathy or words. No nation can be neutral in this conflict, because no civilized nation can be secure in a world threatened by terror.[462]

Once again President's tone seems to be very authoritative, he no more wants sympathy he wants actions. He wants nations to do what he wants them to, for the President wants to make this world a safer place- a world where every nation is civilized (civilized in President's sense of the term). Besides appeal to force and false dilemma, here, he also committed fallacy of bad consequences- Any nation remaining neutral against terrorists will be threatened by terror. Tony Blair also committing fallacy of bad consequences argued:

> Whatever the dangers of the action we take, the dangers of inaction are far, far greater.[463]

In the context of 9/11 this small arguments informs that if we do not wage war on Afghanistan then in future we will face greater dangers; therefore, it is in our best interest to wage war otherwise we will face bad consequences.

This fallacious argumentation was also instrumental in war on Iraq. The President on September 23, 2003, while addressing UN general assembly argued:

> Events during the past two years have set before us the clearest of divides: between those who seek order, and those who spread chaos; between those who work for peaceful change, and those who adopt the methods of gangsters; between those who honor the rights of man, and those who deliberately take the lives of men and women and children without mercy or shame. Between these alternatives there is no neutral

---

[461] Taylor Dianna, *Responsibility And/In Crises*: Philosophical Perspectives on the 'War on Terrorism' , Edited by Presbey Gail M: Rodopi Amsterdam New York NY(2007)
[462] Bush, President: "No Nation can be Neutral in This Conflict": November 6, 2001
[463] Full Text: Tony Blair speech's: Tuesday 2 October, 2001, www.guardian.co.uk (accessed 24 September 2009)

ground.[464]

He argued that the world has been divided into two clearest halves and there is no neutral ground between: those seeking order and those spreading chaos; those working for peace and those for gangsters; those honor man's rights and those taking lives of innocent women and children. This reveals that the President and his allies seek order, work for peace and honor rights of man. They are fighting gangsters, those spreading chaos and killing innocent people without mercy. Since, there is no neutral ground; therefore, either you are on the President's side or with the terrorists. Those who criticize the President's policies are also on the other side- o n the side of terrorists.

This discussion demonstrates that false dilemma is a commonly committed fallacy in times of war. Bush and his friends committed this fallacy many times to shape the judgments, perception and actions of people. Moreover, they committed this fallacy again and again for framing the war as a struggle, without a neutral ground, between good and evil, between heroes and villains etc. Furthermore, this fallacious reasoning was instrumental in silencing his critics.

5.3.6 On September 25, 2001, during a press conference with Prime minister of Japan, a journalist informed Mr. Bush that an opinion poll showed the concern of 90 percent Japanese is that Japan's support to American military operation can cause terrorist attacks in Japan too. The President was asked to comment on this concern of Japanese people.[465]

While addressing Japanese people's concern the President evoked good versus evil frame and committed fallacies of red herring and bad consequences etc. Following excerpt illustrates how the President addressed Japanese concern.

> … I think 100 percent of the Japanese people ought to understand that we're dealing with evil people who hate freedom and legitimate governments, and that now is the time for freedom-loving people to come together to fight terrorist activity…. We can't let terrorism dictate our course of action. And we will not let a terrorist dictate the course of action in the United States; and I'm sure the Prime Minister feels the

---

[464] Bush, President Bush Addresses United Nations General Assembly: September 23, 2003
[465] Bush, International Campaign Against Terrorism Grow: September 25/ 2001

same way about Japan…. And make no mistake about it: This is good versus evil. These are evildoers… The only motivation is evil. And the Prime Minister understands that, and the Japanese people, I think, understand that as well.[466]

100 percent Japanese 'ought' to understand that evil doers hate freedom and legitimate governments. Since, Japanese also love freedom and they have a legitimate government; therefore, terrorists also hate Japanese. This emotionally charged argument may evoke fear, not only in Japanese people but in rest of the world too, and magnifies the threat. The unstated premise is: Japanese, probably, are not aware of the gravity of the situation.

In order to save legitimate governments from this evil, it is time that freedom loving people unite and fight, 'terrorist activity', the President suggests. This implies that Japanese do not know that the President is fighting for Japanese too. Their concern is not genuine.

Terrorists want to dictate American course of action and the President will not let them do this. (No one has ever claimed that they want to dictate American course of action. Moreover, it is beyond imagination how Afghans will do this)

This is a good versus evil war. They are motivated by evil. (Good versus evil- The most common frame used by the President again and again.[467]) The President is sure that the Japanese PM shares the same thoughts.

Instead of addressing Japanese concern he talked for something else, he changed the direction of the argument; therefore, he committed red herring. His argument also commits fallacy of bad consequences- if all the nations of the world do not fight them, terrorist will dictate our course of action i.e., they will capture and rule the whole world. Therefore, the President wants that 100 percent of Japanese ought to understand the gravity of the situation else they will lose both freedom and legitimate government. This way he attempted to shape the judgment of Japanese people.

5.3.7 On September 28, 2001, Bush was asked,

Mr. President, what's your reaction to word today that the Taliban says it has now located Osama bin Laden and has delivered an invitation to

---

[466] Bush, International Campaign Against Terrorism Grow: September 25/ 2001

[467] See 4.2.3

him to leave the country?

> PRESIDENT BUSH: First, there is no negotiations with the Taliban. They heard what I said. And now they can act. And it's not just Mr. bin Laden that we expect to see and brought to justice; it's everybody associated with his organization that's in Afghanistan. And not only those directly associated with Mr. bin Laden, any terrorist that is housed and fed in Afghanistan needs to be handed over. And finally, we expect there to be complete destruction of terrorist camps. That's what I told them; that's what I mean. And we expect them -- we expect them to not only hear what I say, but to do something about it.[468]

It seems that for the President negotiations is not an option; he just wants to attack Afghanistan. Michael Hass informs that the Taliban offered repeatedly to hand over Osama Bin Laden, for trial. However, they first required a proof that Osama was responsible for the 9/11 attacks, Bush did not consider this response sufficient and argued that Taliban government lacked the power to cooperate with USA against al-Qaeda.[469]

In the context of war on terror the President using language of war (frames, metaphor and persuasive definitions) made people think that America is fighting a war with 'evil- terrorism'. The terrorist, the evil enemy, has no sense of morality and rationality.[470] Although negotiations are good and desirable, but in the context of war on terror, negotiations with an evil enemy will make the enemy stronger and bolder- fallacy of Slippery slope.[471] Moreover, he presented a very vague list to Taliban. These demands seem to be very unrealistic. Perhaps, no country in the world can fulfill these demands in such a short time and without any cooperation and negotiation. The following discussion will make things clearer.

On September 20, 2001 the President addressing to the joint session of congress made a list of demands from Taliban such as: Delivering of all al Qaeda leaders hiding in Afghanistan, releasing of all foreign nationals unjustly imprisoned

---

[468] Bush, King of Jordon: "We Will Stand Behind You": September 28, 2001
[469] Hass Michael, George W. Bush, War Criminal? The Bush Administration's Liability for 269 War Crimes: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc 2009, p.22
[470] See 4.2.1 also see 4.2.3
[471] See 3.2.3

by Taliban, Protecting of diplomats, foreign journalists and aid workers, immediately and permanently closing of every terrorist training camp in Afghanistan, handing over every terrorist, every person who is supporting terrorist, complete access to be given to the America to terrorist training camp for the President wanted to ensure they were no longer operational. The President informed,

> These demands are not open to negotiation or discussion. The Taliban must act, and act immediately. They will hand over the terrorists, or they will share in their fate.[472]

It is a very good example of Appeal to force. The leader of the civilized world is not willing to negotiate. He just wants Taliban to follow his directions or face the music. Once again a very vague list of people Americans were demanding from Taliban. Moreover, the President wanted full access to the training camps i.e., full access to Afghanistan.

It is not clear who Taliban should hand over and how many? It seems to be very difficult and time consuming. However, the President wanted Taliban to do all this in a couple of weeks without any help and negotiation. Afghanistan was attacked after 17 days of this declaration.

Committing the same fallacy, he informed the congressional leaders and other people while answering a question, that neither time table nor negotiations, Taliban must turn over al Qaeda organization and destroy all terrorist training camps,

> And they must do so, otherwise there will be a consequence. There are no negotiations, there's no calendar. We'll act on our time, and we'll do it in a manner that not only secures the United States as best as possible, but makes the freedom in the world more likely to exist in the future.[473]

This time, besides appeal to force, he also committed fallacy of good consequences: not negotiating, and doing things as he wants to, will make America secure and will make freedom more likely to exist in the world. Such arguments suppress that other possible effects of the policies will include: mass civilian a

---

[472] Bush, Address to the Joint Session of the Congress, September 20, 2001
[473] Bush, President Meets with the Congressional Leaders: October 2, 2001

casualties, collateral damage, refugee problems, shortage of food and many other human problems. Moreover, such reasoning may also entail that if anybody criticizes his policies; he/she is neither a patriot nor wants freedom to be secure in the world.

5.3.8 The President also committed fallacy of appeal to pity to persuade people for war. On October 6, 2001, he argued that actual enemies of America are terrorist and the regimes that harbor them- the Taliban regime. Moreover, Taliban have made Afghanistan a safe haven for international terrorists who kill innocent people of America and of rest of the world. They, Taliban, promote and practice terror abroad and against Afghans. They oppress women and kill whoever does not agree with them.

> The Afghan people, however, are the victims of oppression, famine and misrule…many Afghans are on the verge of starvation…. And we will help them in this time of confusion and crisis in their country.[474]

This time the President evoked a villain frame and mentioned the crimes of the villain[475]. Moreover, to justify war on terror in Afghanistan, he committed fallacy of appeal to pity.[476] Pity is a natural human response. Most of us extend help when see other human beings, even animals suffering.

The President exploiting this emotional response informed people, in an emotional tone, about the miseries and suffering of Afghans persuading them to fight Taliban. Here and elsewhere, he argued that the life of Afghans is very miserable. They have become refugees, they are dying of starvation, children especially girls are not allowed to attend school, woman cannot move freely, and whoever does not obey Taliban is sentenced to death, therefore, Americans and the rest of the civilized world should come forward and help poor, weak and innocent Afghans- help in this context means attacking Afghanistan. He argued attacking Afghanistan will not only secure American and rest of the free world, but will also free Afghan people from evil rulers. He attempted to convince people that it is the responsibility of the civilized world to take this task; otherwise civilized world would be showing indifference towards something immoral that is going on in Afghanistan. This line of argumentation was

---

[474] Bush, Radio Address to the Nation: October 6, 2001

[475] See 4.2.4

[476] Aristotle defines pity as, "a feeling of pain caused by the sight of some evil, destructive or painful, which befalls one who does not deserve it, and which we might expect to befall ourselves or some friend of ours, and moreover to befall us soon."Aristotle, Rhetoric

very persuasive since many people believe that if something is going wrong around you, then you must come forward and correct it. Moreover, it is not a right/moral course of action that you have power to correct it and you remain indifferent- critics lack morality and moral strength.

Powell on November 20, 2001, in order to justify war, comparing the situation of Afghanistan before and after the attack, argued:

> The Taliban squeezed the life out of Afghanistan - no music, no soccer, no education or jobs for women, nothing - nothing but total support to Osama bin Laden and his gang of al-Qaida murderers. Now, in recent days, as the curtain has been lifted, we have seen on television the joyous pictures of liberated Afghans, of women throwing off their burqas, children happily flying kites.[477]

This reveals that situation before the attacks was very bad. Poor Afghans could not enjoy the basic needs of life. There was no education and jobs for them. They could not enjoy music. They just had to support the 'al- Qaida gang'. Now after coalition attacks, situation is completely different. The burqas are off, children playing and flying kites etc. Such arguments, committing fallacy of suppressing the evidence[478], attempted to convince people that Bush and his allies have actually liberated Afghan people from villains. The actual situation, suppressed from public, was: people were leaving Afghanistan and dying of starvation. Mr. Powell did not bother to inform about thousands of Afghans, especially old people, women and children, who were living in refugee camps, many were lost from their families and dying of starvation.

5.3.9 On October 9, 2001 some questions were asked from the President. Two of them are taken into account:

> … How long do you think it will take? And what do you say to some of these people in the Islamic world who are protesting the campaign?
>
> [The President replied] …our war, the war of freedom-loving people, such as the Germans and the Americans, is against terrorists as a

[477] Powell, Colin: November 20, 2001, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2001/nov/20/afghanistan.israel
[478] See 3.2.19

whole. And this is one part of a large campaign…I say that if they think that the -- fir st of all, I think the message of the al Qaeda organization is one of evil and hate. I understand people's willingness to protest, but they should not protest the decisions our coalition is making, because it is in the best interest of freedom and humankind.[479]

In answer to the first question the President as usual changed the topic changing the direction of the argument- Red Herring. Instead of answering- how long will it take? He said Americans and Germans and all freedom loving people are against terrorists. He once again redefined the war as a war of freedom loving people. He, answering the second question, committed fallacy of poisoning the well.[480] Since, this war is a war of freedom loving people and coalition is fighting in the best interest of humankind and freedom so no one should protest against the decisions made by the coalition- enthymeme (missing premise) is that people who are protesting are against humankind and freedom for they are against the decisions of lovers and defenders of freedom and humankind- an attempt to silence the protestors around the world.

5.3.10 Prime Minster Blair also argued fallaciously to persuade British public for war. Following excerpt reveals that he, committing fallacies of false generalization, bad consequences, appeal to fear and irrelevant conclusion etc. tried to persuade British citizenry for war.

… this attack was an attack not on the West or the US alone. It was an attack on civilised values everywhere. It was an attempt to change by terror what the terrorists knew they couldn't do by reasoned argument….We in Britain have the most direct interest in defeating such terror….We know that if not stopped, the terrorists will do it again, this time possibly in Britain. We know that it was an attack on economic confidence, trying to destroy the strength of our economies and that eradicating this threat is crucial to global economic confidence. We know the Taliban regime is largely funded by the drugs trade, and that 90 per cent of the heroin on British streets originates in Afghanistan. We know that the refugee crisis, 4½ million

[479] Bush, German Leader Reiterates Solidarity With US: October 9, 2001
[480] See 3.2.2e

on the move even before 11September, directly impacts on us here.

> So this military action we are undertaking is not for a just cause alone, though this cause is just. It is to protect our country, our people, our economy, our way of life. It is not a struggle remote from our everyday concerns. It touches them intimately.[481]

Prime Minster wants to convince British people that Britain should participate in this war. His argument involve following fallacies:

He argued that the attack was not only on America, it was an attack on 'civilized values' everywhere- false generalization. 9/11 attacks were on physical places and no one had yet claimed their responsibility. However, the Prime Minster argued that civilized values, everywhere in the world, are under attack- an attempt to exaggerate and magnifying the threat. Moreover, 'civilized values' is ambiguous and emotionally loaded. Putting more emotions and ambiguity in his argument, he informed, terrorists want to change, 'by terror' what they couldn't do by reasoned argument. They (terrorists), he argued, want to see the world in chaos and do not like discipline and debate in the world; he once again exaggerated and magnified the threat.

He argued that Britain has direct interest in defeating terrorist since if they are not stopped; Britain is going to be their next target of terror- appeal to fear and bad consequences. This reveals that terrorists should be stopped (by war) otherwise they will attack Britain.

He also informed that terrorists attacked on, 'economic confidence'; therefore, eradicating them is essential for global economic confidence. 'Economic confidence' is another ambiguous term-another false generalization. Moreover, 'global' is used to magnify the threat.

He informed, since Taliban regime's main source of economy is drugs trade and that 90 per cent of the heroin, effecting British people, originates in Afghanistan; therefore, Taliban should be attacked and eliminated otherwise they will keep on affecting British youth- an irrelevant conclusion. It is the responsibility of British government to stop the sale of heroin on British streets and stop her citizens from the

---

[481] Blair, Prime Minister's Statements to the House of Common, October 8, 2001, www.number10.gov.uk

use of heroin, after all they are the most 'civilized' people in the world with the most 'civilized values'. Taliban have nothing to do with this.

He informed they have attacked Afghanistan, since refugee crisis in Afghanistan has a direct impact on Britain. The fallacy is: has refugee crisis caused the war or war caused the refugee crisis[482]. Perhaps, it is war that causes refugee crisis, refugee crisis never cause war.

From all these fallacious arguments, Tony Blair concluded that Britain's going to war is justified since the war will save: civilized values, an attack on Britain, economic confidence, people of Britain from drugs, and will solve the refugee crisis which is affecting Britain. He committed many fallacies to justify war and to convince British citizenry that Britain is left with no option but to go in war shaping their judgments in favour of war. Moreover, he also attempted to silence the critics, for talking against Blair's policy may entail: the critic does want an attack on Britain, does not want civilized values, does not want global economic confidence, does want the sale of heroin on British streets affecting the youth and does not want a solution of refugee crises.

5.3.11 The Prime Minister of Italy had a press conference with the President on October 15, 2001. What he said reveals that President Bush had, somehow, convinced him about his point of view; therefore, he was now arguing the way Bush wanted everyone in the world to argue.

> .... if the same attack had been -- had occurred on an Italian city we would have felt the same pain as you are. And also I'm here to express to you our desire to be as close as possible and to provide both moral and material support. ...this attack was an attack not only against citizens, but also against freedom and liberty. The U.S. is the defensor of liberty all over the world, and that's what this attack was about.[483]

Key points in Prime Minster Speech were: 1. Same attacks could have occurred in an Italian city- this was what Bush had been arguing again and again. 2. Italy will provide moral and material support- this is what Bush was arguing for. 3. The attacks were not only on citizens but on freedom and liberty too. A metaphorical

---

[482] See 3.2.12c

[483] Prime Minster Berlusconi, President Bush and Italian Prime Minster Discuss War Effort: October 15, 2001

understanding of attacks- Bush's framing was working. 4. America was attacked for she is the defender of freedom and liberty- The President Bush's arguments have completely convinced the Italian Prime Minister and now he is thinking and arguing the way, the President of United States of America wants him to. PM of Italy will go back to his country and his arguments, perhaps, will shape the perception and behavior of his people.

5.3.12 On March 7, 2002 a student asked an important question from Rumsfeld. The question was:

> My government teachers adamantly argue that we're not at war. And I wanted to ask you how you would respond to that. Are we at war, and how is that measured?
>
> SEC. RUMSFELD: …I suppose you'd have to go to the dictionary. And there's no question but that people can characterize the meaning of that word differently. Some people think you're not at war unless there's a declaration of war by the Congress. Others recognize that over many, many years now we haven't had declarations of war by Congress, and we've had a whole series of conflicts where an awful lot of people have been killed, and that has to be one of the characteristics of war.[484]

It was a very important question asked by a student. Not only American people but many critics of the American policies were raising this question. Waging war on other countries is a serious matter. One cannot argue a disagreement like, whether we are at war or not, is a verbal disagreement. Rumsfeld, committing red herring, first changed the direction of the argument- From 'are we at war' to 'although congress had not declared wars since long but still America has had a whole series of war'. Moreover, he admitted that it is difficult to find a perfect term to describe the situation America is in.[485] This reveals the ambiguity created by Bush and his administration. It is wrong to argue: since it is hard to find a perfect word or term that characterizes this situation, therefore, we will call it a war. He further argued,

---

[484] Rumsfeld Donald H. Pentagon Town Hall Meeting with Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld: March 7, 2002, http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=196

[485] Rumsfeld Donald H. (March 7, 2002)

5.4 FALLACIOUS ARGUMENTS THAT LED TO PREEMPTIVE WAR

Aims: This section discusses the argumentative strategy of Bush and his friends that led to preemptive war. The most commonly committed fallacies that were instrumental in shaping public opinion were: begging the question, complex question, appeal to fear, red herring, poisoning the well, shifting the burden of proof, slippery slope and false cause etc.

5.4.1 On January 29, 2002 the President delivered State of the Union address. He forwarded many fallacious arguments: evoking fear in people, he informed them about possessing videos that demonstrates the wickedness, hatred and dangerous nature of the Taliban. They also have detailed instruction for making chemical weapons, diagrams of American nuclear power plants and public water facilities.[487] President Bush evoked fear since, if taken over by fear, one cannot reason well. He argued:

> What we have found in Afghanistan confirms that, far from ending there, our war against terror is only beginning. Thousands of dangerous killers, schooled in the methods of murder, often supported by outlaw regimes, are now spread throughout the world like ticking time bombs, set to go off without warning… tens of thousands of trained terrorists are still at large. These enemies view the entire world as a battlefield… so long as nations harbor terrorists, freedom is at risk. And America and our allies must not, and will not, allow it.[488]

Perhaps, the President wants to expand war on terror to other nations of the world. Premises in his speech are clearly leading to a long and extended war, for he said, 'our war against terror is only a beginning' and the 'ticking bombs' are spread throughout the world. (Ticking bomb is a metaphor used for enemies. The metaphorical understanding is: terrorists are not humans, they are like ticking bombs that are spread throughout the entire world and they will go off anytime without any warning. Kill them without mercy wherever you see them.) Moreover, thousands of terrorists see the whole world as a battlefield. This fallacious reasoning (appeal to fear) seems to be instrumental in changing public opinion and prepared them for a

[487] Bush, President Delivers State of the Union Address: January 29, 2002
[488] Bush, January 29, 2002

very long war. The President made a false generalization, saying that the enemies see the entire world a battlefield. This implies that: enemies of America are the enemies of the entire world. The unstated conclusion is: entire world must stand up and fight against enemies of America.

James Bovard opines that the core fallacy in war on terrorism is to argue that terrorism is worse than anything else conceivable. In fact, he reveals, governments around the world have been more brutal than Al Qaeda or any other terrorist net work. To support this point, referring to US state department, he reveals that from 1980 to 2000, the number of people killed by international terrorist is 7, 745. In the same years governments around the world killed more than ten million people in mass executions, wars and in ethnic cleansing etc.[489] Portraying terrorists to be the worst kind of ruthless evil, perhaps, Bush and his administration hide the crimes committed by the government of United States of America.

Making nations of the world more fearful, he in the same speech informed the world,

> ... we must prevent the terrorists and regimes who seek chemical, biological or nuclear weapons from threatening the United States and the world.[490]

It reveals that there are 'terrorist regimes' and they are after chemical, nuclear and biological weapon. The frame of terrorist/terrorism/terror was already at work in war against terrorism. Bush and his friends just connected it with 'regimes' making a metaphor, 'terrorist regimes'. The metaphorical understanding that was true for terrorist like Al Qaeda and Taliban may also be true for these new terrorist regimes. Hence, people may buy arguments like terrorist regimes are evil irrational and uncivilized: once they (terrorist regimes) get dangerous weapons they may use them ruthlessly against humanity. Thus, they should be stopped before they get these weapons.

This is an argument, Bush tried to build: if any terrorist regime has or trying to have weapons of mass destruction then it may become very dangerous, it can destroy America and rest of the civilized world. Thus, it should be stopped before it destroys

---

[489] Bovard, James, Terrorism and Tyranny – Trampling Freedom, Justice, and Peace to Rid the World of Evil : Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, pp. 7-8

[490] Bush: January 29, 2002

America and rest of the world- Preemptive War. Moreover, this way they heighten the fear associated with terrorists or terrorist supported states[491] and attempted to maneuver judgment of the people.

5.4.2 Following excerpt will make road to Iraq war, and to any other country that may be attacked, clear.

> [Terrorist] camps still exist in at least a dozen countries. A terrorist underworld…some governments will be timid in the face of terror. And make no mistake about it: If they do not act, America will….Our second goal is to prevent regimes that sponsor terror from threatening America or our friends and allies with weapons of mass destruction... North Korea is a regime arming with missiles and weapons of mass destruction…. Iran aggressively pursues these weapons and exports terror…. Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop anthrax, and nerve gas, and nuclear weapons for over a decade. This is a regime that has already used poison gas to murder thousands of its own citizens -- leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over their dead children. … This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world.[492]

Governments not taking actions against terrorists are 'timid', as there may be no other reasons of not taking actions against terrorists- false cause. If they do not act as the President wants them to, a clear threat is used for such governments, to 'make them act and comply': If any country does not comply with the demands of America, America will act, since America cannot wait and see growing threats against her. No nation in the world was threatening, either America or any other nation, with Weapons of Mass Destruction, except America[493] (the only country that used atomic bombs against Japan and may use against others). Yet, the President informed some regimes are seeking WMD to threaten America and her allies. The President mentioned names of some countries that may be attacked to save freedom and mankind. Hertzberg argues, using 'Axis of evil' and mentioning names of Korea, Iran

---

[491] Winkler, Carol K (2008)
[492] Bush, President Delivers State of the Union Address: January 29, 2002
[493] see 4.2.4 the President talked about decisive devices

and Iraq was a careful move by the President. Korea was added in the list to give an impression that war on terror is not against Muslim countries only, although Korea has nothing to do with 9/11 and it is not a potential threat to America. Moreover, he opines that there is no possibility that America will go for a war against Iran. This leaves Iraq in the list.[494] This reveals that the whole argument was crafted to launch an attack on Iraq, for Bush argued; Iraq was continuously displaying hostility towards America and was supporting terror by developing anthrax, nerve gas and nuclear weapons. Moreover, Iraq has a record of using these weapons against her own citizens very ruthlessly. Iraq is a villain[495]. This uncivilized and terrorist country has been hiding things (hiding things is ambiguous, it can be anything, and in this context most probably 'things' is used for WMDs) from the civilized world i.e., from coalition. What this country is hiding from the civilized world, and, how this country will prove that she is not hiding anything, are very complicated issues- appeal to ignorance-shifting the burden of proof[496]. In the days to come Bush and his whole administration argued that Iraq is hiding Weapons of Mass Destruction from the world. However, instead of proving that Iraq has these weapons they shifted the burden on Iraq to prove that Iraq does not have WMD. This way they made a case against Iraq. The following discussion will exhibit the argumentative and framing strategy that paved a way for extending war on terror from Afghanistan to Iraq.

The President further argued:

> States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists… They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic.[497]

Since the President has been using, 'evil' since 9/11, 'Axis of evil', linked Saddam Hussain with Al-Qaeda.[498] He argued all these terrorist regimes have made

---

[494] Hertzberg, Hendrik, Politics, Observations and Arguments : The Penguin Press New York, 2004 p.144
[495] See 4.2.4, Hero versus villain part two
[496] See 3.2.1c
[497] Bush, President Delivers State of the Union Address: January 29, 2002
[498] Liberman Peter, 2006, p. 687

an axis of evil. They are one and the same, helping and supporting each other to threaten the peace of the civilized world. One can notice that the President kept on repeating the same argument over and over again for framing purpose. This fallacious reasoning made sense to the people since the War on Terror was conceptualized by the President as a war between good and evil, or a war between a brave hero and a ruthless villain. Hence, it was reasonable to argue that: if evil/villain has WMD then he will obviously use them against his enemies. The enemy of evil/villain is good/hero. This implies that Iraq, villain, will use these weapons against America or will hand these weapons over to the enemies of America who will threaten and blackmail America and her allies. The President is actually terrorizing the whole world shaping their perception and behavior. The President, evoking loss frame, appealed to bad consequences, for he argued that the 'price' of not taking any action would be disastrous.

The President warned:

> …time is not on our side. I will not wait on events, while dangers gather. I will not stand by, as peril draws closer and closer. The United States of America will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons.[499]

This argument actually is a road to any preemptive war in future. Bush informed that he will not let terrorist to have weapons of mass destruction. The unstated argument, in the context of war on terror, is: although preemptive war is not good but if we give a free hand to dangerous regimes: if we do not destroy them they will gather dangerous weapons, like chemical, biological and nuclear weapon; if they get these weapons they will become more dangerous; they will also hand over these weapons to other terrorists; then they will blackmail and threaten us and the rest of the freedom loving world. Therefore, we should attack them before they get these weapons- Slippery Slope.

Before attacking Iraq, a similar argument was forwarded: Iraq is making WMD; if Iraq makes WMD then she will hand them over to terrorists; if she hand over WMD to terrorists they will become more dangerous; they will ruthlessly use WMD against civilized world; hence, Iraq should be attacked before all this happen.

---

[499] Bush, President Delivers State of the Union Address: January 29, 2002

The President kept on repeating these fallacious arguments preparing very reluctant citizenry of the world to attack Iraq.

5.4.3 On 17 March 2003, before attacking Iraq, the President informed,

> The danger is clear: using chemical, biological or, one day, nuclear weapons, obtained with the help of Iraq, the terrorists could fulfill their stated ambitions and kill thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our country, or any other… Before the day of horror can come, before it is too late to act, this danger will be removed.[500]

(Many of the members of Bush administration were also spreading the rumor that Iraq has links with Al Qaeda. In fact, Osama hated infidel regime of Saddam, therefore, an alliance of Al Qaeda and Sadam was unlikely.[501])

This clearly presupposes that Iraq has chemical, biological and nuclear weapons- Begging the question. The premises that: Iraq has WMD; Al Qaeda has links with Iraq and terrorists will obtain these weapons with the help of Iraq are premises which were yet to be proved. However, since citizenry was gripped by fear and patriotism they bought these arguments. All these arguments were enough to convince the world that an attack on Iraq is justified and not attacking Iraq is not an option. Michael Hass informs: both Afghanistan and Iraq wars were not justified; since neither of these two, attacked America.

> … so neither war was based on self-defense. Preemptive war is not an accepted form of self-defense under international law.[502]

The President reiterated,

> Our war on terror is well begun, but it is only begun…We can't stop short. If we stop now -- leaving terror camps intact and terror states unchecked -- our sense of security would be false and temporary. History has called America and our allies to action, and it is both our

---

[500] Bush, President says Saddam must Leave Iraq within 48 hours: March 17, 2003
[501] Rampton, Sheldon and John Stauber (2003) pp. 91-92
[502] Hass Michael (2009) p.22

responsibility and our privilege to fight freedom's fight.[503]

The argument commits fallacies of slippery slope and appeal to fear. The war has just begun but it is very broad: If we stop fighting this war then terrorists will remain unchecked and their camps will remain intact; if they remain unchecked and their camps remain intact then we will not be fulfilling our responsibility since our security will be false and temporary; if we do not fulfill our responsibility we will pay a very big price in the form of our destruction. Therefore, we should not stop fighting this war and extent it to other potential threats.

> Our first priority must always be the security of our nation, and that will be reflected in the budget I send to Congress. My budget supports three great goals for America: We will win this war; we'll protect our homeland; and we will revive our economy.[504]

An argument to increase defense budget- Giving false hopes, we will win and protect our homeland and economy will revive, if we increase our defense budget- appeal to good consequences. The message is clearer in,

> My budget includes the largest increase in defense spending in two decades -- because while the price of freedom and security is high, it is never too high. Whatever it costs to defend our country, we will pay.[505]

Loss gain framing is instrumental here. Moreover, the President again evoked fear arguing: time and distance from 9/11 events and the oceans no more save us. We have to spend more to protect ourselves from danger. There is an implicit argument, for the critics of the President's policies: those who do not support his policies actually do not want freedom and security of American people. They do not want America to be defended from terrorists. They are traitors, they are with terrorists.

5.4.4. On March 19, 2003 the President informed,

> American and coalition forces are in the early stages of military

---

[503] Bush, President Delivers State of the Union Address: January 29, 2002
[504] Bush, January 29, 2002
[505] Bush, President Delivers State of the Union Address: January 29, 2002

> operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people and to defend the world from grave danger....The people of the United States and our friends and allies will not live at the mercy of an outlaw regime that threatens the peace with weapons of mass murder.[506]

Without proofs that Iraq has weapons of mass murder, it has links with al Qaeda and it is going to hand over WMD to terrorists, Iraq was attacked. The main argument to attack Iraq was that Iraq has WMD and is a threat to: USA, neighboring countries almost all the civilized world. This argument commits fallacies of false cause and begging the question. Bush informed that the cause of attacking Iraq has been that America does not want to be threatened with WMD by an outlaw regime threatening- false cause, since Iraq did not have WMD.

5.5 IRAQ WAR

Aims: This section demonstrate that Bush and his friends kept on committing informal fallacies to extend war on terror from Afghanistan to Iraq.

5.5.1 On September 12, 2002 Bush addressed the General Assembly, to convince the nations of the world to wage war against Iraq, he committed fallacies of complex question[507], false either or, and fallacy of ignorance many times.

He argued:

> If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will immediately and unconditionally forswear, disclose, and remove or destroy all weapons of mass destruction, long-range missiles, and all related material.[508]

He presupposes that Iraq has WMD, long range missiles and 'related material'- 'related material', a deliberate use of ambiguous term. It can be anything: a biological weapon, a chemical weapon, even a nuclear weapon. The burden of proof was on US, first to prove that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction and then to ask Iraq to destroy them. US instead presuppose that Iraq has WMD and therefore, Iraq must destroy them if Iraq wishes peace.

This reveals: Bush and his administration, instead of proving that Iraq has

---

[506] Bush, Operation Iraqi Freedom, March 19, 2003
[507] See 3.2.5
[508] Bush, President's Remarks at The General Assembly: September 12, 2002

WMD, kept on repeating that Iraq must demonstrate that she either does not have WMD or she has destroyed these weapons. This way they shifted the bourdon of proof from America to Iraq committing fallacy of shifting the bourdon of proof. It was a proof that Iraq could have never provided to the USA. Moreover, another either or- do what we want you to or war.

In reality, the myth of weapons of mass destruction had been that: By the end of the war in Iraq, the total number of Missiles fired by Iraq was twenty and none of the weapon used by Iraq was a banned weapon.[509]

> If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will immediately end all support for terrorism and act to suppress it...[510]

Another presumption- Iraq is supporting terrorism, therefore, it will be attacked and if they want peace they should stop supporting terrorism. There were other points too. But only these two fallacious arguments may shape the judgments of the world. When we link them together we have reasons to believe that Iraq should be attacked. Iraq has WMD and has been supporting terrorism; Iraq can hand over these weapons to terrorist and they can destroy America and rest of the world; If Iraq is not stopped thousands of innocent people may be killed; therefore, not attacking Iraq is not an option.

5.5.2. On January 28, 2003 President's arguments to attack Iraq reached its peak. Bush informed: Iraq has capability of producing 25, 000 liters of Anthrax, 38,000 liters of botulinum, 500 tons of Sarin, VX nerve agent and mustard, enough to kill and harm millions of people. Saddam has provided no evidence that he has destroyed these dangerous weapons of mass destruction. Iraq (in the late 1990s) had several mobile biological weapons labs that can be moved from one place to another designed to produce germ warfare agents. Moreover, The IAEA confirmed, he informed, that Saddam had an advanced nuclear weapons development program, a design for a nuclear weapon and was working on enriching uranium for a bomb. Saddam has tried to acquire high-strength aluminum tubes for nuclear weapons production. U.S. intelligence, he informed, indicates that Saddam had 30,000 weapons that can deliver chemical agents.[511]

---

[509] Rampton, Sheldon and John Stauber (2003) pp. 90-91
[510] Bush, President's Remarks at The General Assembly: September 12, 2002
[511] Bush, State of the Union Address: January 28, 2003

> …the only possible use he could have for those weapons, is to dominate, intimidate, or attack…. create deadly havoc in that region….another threat. Evidence from intelligence sources, secret communications, and statements by people now in custody reveal that Saddam Hussein aids and protects terrorists, including members of al Qaeda. Secretly, and without fingerprints, he could provide one of his hidden weapons to terrorists, or help them develop their own.[512]

One can notice repeated use of this fallacious argument for framing purpose. The premises to attack Iraq had been: Iraq has capability of producing 25,000 liters of Anthrax; 38,000 liters of Botulinum; 500 tones of Sarin; VX nerve agent; Mobile biological weapons laboratories; an advanced nuclear weapons program; uranium for bomb; trying to acquire high- strength uranium tubes for nuclear bomb; has 30,000 weapons that can deliver chemical agents; Iraq protects terrorists including Al Qaeda. Moreover, the only intention of Iraq is to harm and destroy America and rest of the civilized world with these weapons of terror. Furthermore, Iraq has links with terrorists including Al Qaeda. It may handover WMD to terrorists who would use them against America and her allies. Peter Bergen, Informs that during an interview, Osama opines that Saddam is not a true Muslim leaders and his attack on Kuwait was for oil. This reveals the reality of the relationship between the al Qaeda and Saddam Hussain.[513]

Colin Powell on February 5, 2003, in his address to UN Security Council, put forward a similar but more detailed argument to persuade the world in favour of waging war on Iraq.[514]

5.5.3. Condoleezza Rice, in a column, argued that we (Americans) know from the beginning that Iraq is lying and not cooperating with UN inspectors. Her column seems to be full of lies and fallacies. The very title, 'Why we know Iraq is lying', presupposes that Iraq is lying; hence, commits fallacy of Complex question. One of her argument is taken into account to demonstrate that arguing fallaciously, she manipulated public judgments and perception.

---

[512] Bush: January 28, 2003
[513] Bergen, Peter. L (2001) p.23
[514] For more details see Colin Powell's address to the Security Council available on line on http://georgewbush-hitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/02/20030205-1.html#23 (accessed March 30, 2010)

> Last week's finding by inspectors of 12 chemical warheads not included in Iraq's declaration was particularly troubling. In the past, Iraq has filled this type of warhead with sarin -- a deadly nerve agent used by Japanese terrorists in 1995 to kill 12 Tokyo subway passengers and sicken thousands of others. Richard Butler, the former chief United Nations arms inspector, estimates that if a larger type of warhead that Iraq has made and used in the past were filled with VX (an even deadlier nerve agent) and launched at a major city, it could kill up to one million people. Iraq has also failed to provide United Nations inspectors with documentation of its claim to have destroyed its VX stockpiles.[515]

She informed that: last week inspectors found 12 chemical warheads that were not included in Iraq's declaration. She said this matter is 'troubling'. Then she informed that in past Iraq has filled these warheads with 'sarin'. She did not say that Iraq has used it but to make people understand that it is a terrorist act and how damaging it would be if it is used she connected Iraq war heads with Japanese terrorist's use of sarin- argument by association. Then she assumed that if Iraq had filled (in the past) a larger war head with VX, a more deadly nerve agent, Iraq could have killed a million. (This has never happened- a premise to evoke fear). In the end she informed, that Iraq has also failed to provide UN inspectors 'with documentation of its claim to have destroyed its VX stockpiles.'

The actual issue has been was that had Iraq filled a larger warhead with VX, then it would have been more dangerous. It was never proved that Iraq had VX stockpiles-begging the question. Yet, she in the end informed that Iraq has not destroyed VX stockpiles- a conclusion that is based on a premise which is in need of proof. Moreover, the premises of this argument say one thing but the conclusion says quite another thing. Rest of her column is also filled with such fallacies.

Information given in all such arguments was not true since, there were no weapons of Mass destruction, no nuclear or chemical weapons etc. Ron Paul, a Republican member of Congress in the U.S. House of Representatives, informed,

---

[515] Rice, Condoleezza, *Why We Know Iraq is Lying*: The New York Times, January 23, 2003,http://www.nytimes.com/2003/01/23/opinion/why-we-know-iraq-is-lying.html?pagewanted=1 (accessed March 31, 2010)

> ...the decision to go to war in Iraq was based on information that was not factual. Congress and the people of this country were misled.[516]

This informs that all arguments using these facts as premises were fallacious since their premises were not true.

The President on March 8, 2003, argued,

> Saddam Hussein... possesses weapons of terror. He provides funding and training and safe haven to terrorists who would willingly deliver weapons of mass destruction against America and other peace-loving countries..... We will not wait to see what terrorists or terror states could do with weapons of mass destruction. We are determined to confront threats wherever they arise. And, as a last resort, we must be willing to use military force. We are doing everything we can to avoid war in Iraq. But if Saddam Hussein does not disarm peacefully, he will be disarmed by force.[517]

Repetition of Saddam has WMD. (Villain possesses lethal weapons that can be used against innocent victims, Hero wages war against villain stopping villain from his evil plans.[518]) Without any proof Bush and his administration argued: Saddam has WMD and has links with Al Qaeda. They will hand these WMD over to al Qaeda making it more dangerous for America and rest of the world, therefore, Iraq should be attacked in order to make the world secure. Enthymeme is: those who do not support the policy of attacking Iraq actually want to wait and see how and when Iraq and other terrorist will use these weapons of terror against America and rest of the civilized world. Moreover, any protest, objection and criticism of Iraq war was labeled as unpatriotic since it could send a message to the world that the nation was divided.[519] This way, the President poisoned the well, and blocked all criticism. Whoever says that we should wait and should not go too fast in attacking Iraq, in fact, lacks the President's wisdom and insight into the future, or probably, he/she is not a friend of America and the civilized world- In this case he/she is a terrorist. In the end, the

---

[516] Paul, Ron, *Big Lies and Little Lies*: November 5, 2005, http://www.lewrockwell.com/paul/paul285.html, (accessed March 30, 2010)
[517] Bush, War on Terror: March 8, 2003
[518] See 4.2.2
[519] Taylor Dianna (2007) p. 59

President committed fallacy of appeal to force: America will by force disarm Saddam Hussain if he does not disarm peacefully. In almost all such arguments President and his team used Saddam Hussain instead of Iraq (Nation as a person metaphor) to portray that America is not an enemy of Iraqi people. America only wants to disarm a villain who is not only dangerous for American and the civilized world but for Iraqis too. Besides the argument that Saddam has WMDs, American administration also argued that people of Iraq are suffering under Saddam Hussain[520] and it is the responsibility of the civilized world to save them- appeal to pity.

Stephan P. lee argues that including Chemical, Biological and Nuclear weapons in WMD is too broad, misleading and dangerous. Since, chemical weapons are not as dangerous and destructive as nuclear weapons are, and need suitable environmental conditions to cause destruction; biological weapons are very difficult to make and they also need suitable environmental conditions to cause destruction. Nuclear weapons are WMD par excellence for they certainly cause mass destruction whatever the environmental conditions may be.[521] Bush and his friends informed over and over again (for framing purpose) that Iraq has chemical and biological weapons, specially chemical weapons, without telling people that the expected destructiveness of chemical weapons is many time less than nuclear weapons, moreover, they can cause destruction only if the environmental conditions are suitable- suppressing the evidence. This way they magnified the threat and evoked fear in public convincing them for Iraq war.

5.5.4 The argument for people of Iraq had been that the military campaign of coalition will be against, 'the lawless men' ruling Iraq and not against Iraqis.

> As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free. In a free Iraq, there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms. The tyrant will soon be gone. The day of your liberation is near.[522]

---

[520] Liberman Peter (2006), p.706
[521] Lee, Stephen P (2008) pp. 165-169
[522] Bush, President Says Saddam Must Leave Iraq Within 48 Hours: March 17, 2003

Hero is coming to rescue. Justification of war is: America wants to remove the tyrants who are ruling Iraq and threatening the world with his WMDs. This war will end other wars and violence. Moreover, committing fallacy of false either or, he said: it is better to fight terrorist 'there' rather than 'here'.[523]

Here and elsewhere Bush argued, as he argued in case of Afghanistan, that poor and innocent people of Iraq should be liberated from their ruthless tyrant rulers who have been brutalizing the people of Iraq, killing innocent people raping the woman etc. Moreover, Iraq was a threat and is still a threat to the neighboring countries. To eliminate this threat, Saddam Hussain must be eliminated. And in order to eliminate him Iraq should be attacked- Slippery Slope. Moreover, the attack is to secure people of Iraq from this ruthless tyrant. Bush portrayed himself a liberator, a hero who comes for rescue. He has already rescued Afghanistan from terrorists and now he is planning to rescue Iraqi people who intensely need him. However, beside other arguments, disarming Iraq remained the main justification to attack Iraq.

5.5.5 After many months of war, American and allies failed to find any WMD. Bush and his allies started arguing vaguely and ambiguously about WMDs. 'Iraq has WMDs', was rephrased as, Iraq has WMDs program. When they failed to find any WMD program, they started arguing that they had a WMDs related program. Finally the President said the objective to attack Iraq was to free Iraqi people. Following excerpts will demonstrate this point.

> Q Mr. President, are you surprised the enemy has not used any weapons of mass destruction?
>
> THE PRESIDENT: I am thankful the enemy has not used any weapons of mass destruction. And we will continue employing a strategy to make it difficult for the enemy to use weapons of mass destruction.[524]

(A question arises here: Whom Mr. Bush is thankful to, for he should not be thankful to a ruthless, evil, terrorist, irrational, insane dictator who has ruthlessly killed his own citizens- obviously he was not the one who may have decided not to use weapons of mass destruction against his enemies.)

---

[523] "Our men and women in uniform are fighting terrorists in Iraq, so we do not have to face them here at home." Bush, State of the Union Address: February 25, 2005

[524] Bush, President Discusses Military operation: March 23, 2003

Fallacy of false cause: the President argued as if Iraq has not used any WMD because of American strategy that has made it difficult for enemy to use WMD. The actual reason was they did not have any WMD in the first place.

> Q Sir, is U.S. credibility on the line over weapons of mass destruction in Iraq?
>
> THE PRESIDENT: ...Iraq had a weapons program. Intelligence throughout the decade showed they had a weapons program. I am absolutely convinced with time we'll find out that they did have a weapons program. The credibility of this country is based upon our strong desire to make the world more peaceful and the world is now more peaceful after our decision; the strong desire to make sure free nations are more secure -- our free nations are now more secure; and the strong desire to spread freedom. And the Iraqi people are now free...[525]

The question was about the credibility of Bush and his administration who repeatedly informed the world that Iraq has WMDs (see above Bush, Powell and Condoleezza Rice). The President of the United States of America has changed the argument from 'Iraq has WMD and is threat to the world, therefore Iraq should be attacked', to 'Iraq has weapons program'. (One can notice that the President has stopped using 'mass destruction' with weapons). Since, intelligence for the last 10 years was showing that Iraq has a 'weapons program'- Not WMD. Moreover, according to the President not finding WMD has nothing to do with American credibility, since American credibility depends on a desire to spread freedom throughout the world and making the world a peaceful place. America is doing this, making free nations of the world more free and secure, and spreading freedom in those nations that are ruled by tyrants, America is fulfilling the responsibility- Red herring, since the direction of the argument has been changed.

Cyrus Safdari reveals that when WMD were not found Bush administration reformulated their justification and they started saying, 'Iraqi WMD-program-related activities'. After some time it was reformulated again as Saddam's, 'intent to

---

[525] Bush, President Discusses Middle East, Iraq and the Dollar in Cabinet Meeting: June 9, 2003

Fallacy of false cause: the President argued as if Iraq has not used any WMD because of American strategy that has made it difficult for enemy to use WMD. The actual reason was they did not have any WMD in the first place.

> Q Sir, is U.S. credibility on the line over weapons of mass destruction in Iraq?
>
> THE PRESIDENT: ...Iraq had a weapons program. Intelligence throughout the decade showed they had a weapons program. I am absolutely convinced with time we'll find out that they did have a weapons program. The credibility of this country is based upon our strong desire to make the world more peaceful and the world is now more peaceful after our decision; the strong desire to make sure free nations are more secure -- our free nations are now more secure; and the strong desire to spread freedom. And the Iraqi people are now free...[525]

The question was about the credibility of Bush and his administration who repeatedly informed the world that Iraq has WMDs (see above Bush, Powell and Condoleezza Rice). The President of the United States of America has changed the argument from 'Iraq has WMD and is threat to the world, therefore Iraq should be attacked', to 'Iraq has weapons program'. (One can notice that the President has stopped using 'mass destruction' with weapons). Since, intelligence for the last 10 years was showing that Iraq has a 'weapons program'- Not WMD. Moreover, according to the President not finding WMD has nothing to do with American credibility, since American credibility depends on a desire to spread freedom throughout the world and making the world a peaceful place. America is doing this, making free nations of the world more free and secure, and spreading freedom in those nations that are ruled by tyrants, America is fulfilling the responsibility- Red herring, since the direction of the argument has been changed.

Cyrus Safdari reveals that when WMD were not found Bush administration reformulated their justification and they started saying, 'Iraqi WMD-program-related activities'. After some time it was reformulated again as Saddam's, 'intent to

---

[525] Bush, President Discusses Middle East, Iraq and the Dollar in Cabinet Meeting: June 9, 2003

reconstitute WMD'. And when they failed to find any WMD related activity,

> ... the whole WMD pretext was discarded in favour of a post facto 'promotion of democracy' justification.[526]

The President's argument for the critics have been,

> I know that some people question if America is really in a war at all... After the chaos and carnage of September the 11th, it is not enough to serve our enemies with legal papers. The terrorists and their supporters declared war on the United States, and war is what they got....Some in this chamber, and in our country, did not support the liberation of Iraq... let us be candid about the consequences of leaving Saddam Hussein in power. We're seeking all the facts. Already, the Kay Report identified dozens of weapons of mass destruction-related program activities and significant amounts of equipment that Iraq concealed from the United Nations. Had we failed to act, the dictator's weapons of mass destruction programs would continue to this day. Had we failed to act, Security Council resolutions on Iraq would have been revealed as empty threats, weakening the United Nations and encouraging defiance by dictators around the world. Iraq's torture chambers would still be filled with victims, terrified and innocent.[527]

The President's answer to the criticism that is America really at war is: terrorist declared war on America and America has just responded; hence, America is really at war. No nation, including Iraq, has declared war on America- False cause. It was a preemptive war to stop Iraq from handing over WMD to terrorist. To silence the critics the President argued: Critics who question Bush's policies actually did not want 'liberation of Iraq'- poisoning the well. Whoever does not support American invasion on Iraq does not want 'liberation of Iraq'. The Kay reports, he informed, identified, 'dozens of weapons of mass destruction-related program activities'. A very ambiguous way of referring to what Iraq was engaged in. The argument has been changed. Instead of Iraq has WMDs, now the new argument is Iraq was attacked since

---

[526] Safdari, Cyrus (2006)
[527] Bush, State of the Union Address: January 4, 2004

is was engaged in, 'WMD- related program activities', moreover, the President wanted to liberate people of Iraq. The President then presented a slippery slope: not attacking Iraq would have led Iraq to continue WMD related program activities; Moreover, it would have sent a message to other dictators that UN resolutions are empty- weakening the United Nation and encouraging the dictators around the world; Furthermore, not attacking Iraq would have led to continuation of violence and torture against innocent people of Iraq- bad consequences. Therefore, not attacking Iraq was not an option.

The President in order to block the criticism argued,

> For all who love freedom and peace, the world without Saddam Hussein's regime is a better and safer place.[528]

A false generalization: not all who love freedom and democracy share the President's judgment. Moreover, the hidden conclusion is: those who do not think that world without Saddam is a better and safer place do not love freedom and democracy. Conclusion: This discussion reveals that not only in War on Terror in Afghanistan, but War on Terror in Iraq too, politicians and leaders committed numerous fallacies to change the direction of judgments of people and to silence policy criticism.

9.4 FALLACIOUS ARGUMENTS OF TALIBAN AND AL QAEDA

Claim: Following discussion demonstrates that leader of Al Qaeda and Taliban also committed fallacies to persuade people for war and silence the critics.

9.4.1 On October 7, 2001, like Bush, Osama argued that the world has been divided into two halves. For Bush, the world was divided between good and evil and between brave heroes and ruthless villains. For Osama, the world, after 9/11, has been divided in to believers and infidels.

> These events have divided the whole world into two sides. The side of believers and the side of infidels, may God keep you away from them. Every Muslim has to rush to make his religion victorious.[529]

---

[528] Bush, State of the Union Address: January 4, 2004

[529] Osama Bin Laden, Osama Bin Laden Speeches, October 7, 2001: http://www.september11news.com/OsamaSpeeches.htm (accessed January 22, 2010)

it was engaged in, 'WMD- related program activities', moreover, the President wanted to liberate people of Iraq. The President then presented a slippery slope: not attacking Iraq would have led Iraq to continue WMD related program activities; Moreover, it would have sent a message to other dictators that UN resolutions are empty weakening the United Nation and encouraging the dictators around the world; Furthermore, not attacking Iraq would have led to continuation of violence and torture against innocent people of Iraq- bad consequences. Therefore, not attacking Iraq was not an option.

The President in order to block the criticism argued,

> For all who love freedom and peace, the world without Saddam Hussein's regime is a better and safer place.[528]

A false generalization: not all who love freedom and democracy share the President's judgment. Moreover, the hidden conclusion is: those who do not think that world without Saddam is a better and safer place do not love freedom and democracy.
Conclusion: This discussion reveals that not only in War on Terror in Afghanistan, but War on Terror in Iraq too, politicians and leaders committed numerous fallacies to change the direction of judgments of people and to silence policy criticism.

5.6 FALLACIOUS ARGUMENTS OF TALIBAN AND AL QAEDA

Aims: Following discussion demonstrates that leader of Al Qaeda and Taliban also committed fallacies to persuade people for war and silence the critics.

5.6.1 On October 7, 2001, like Bush, Osama argued that the world has been divided into two halves. For Bush, the world was divided between good and evil and between brave heroes and ruthless villains. For Osama, the world, after 9/11, has been divided in believers and infidels.

> These events have divided the whole world into two sides. The side of believers and the side of infidels, may God keep you away from them. Every Muslim has to rush to make his religion victorious.[529]

---

[528] Bush, State of the Union Address: January 4, 2004
[529] Osama Bin Laden, Osama Bin Laden Speeches, October 7, 2001: http://www.september11news.com/OsamaSpeeches.htm (accessed January 22, 2010)

Context of this argument has been that infidel world, with America as their leader, has been victimizing Muslims. In such a context, Muslims are expected to make their religion victorious, perhaps by fighting the infidels. Either you are with believers or with infidel i.e. either join Osama or join Bush- false either or. The whole world has been divided, as Bush also argued, between believers and infidels. There is no neutral ground. In fact, a Muslim can be both against Bush and Osama. Moreover, most of the Muslims have been against war on terror and also strongly condemned terrorist attacks on 9/11. Both Osama and Bush[530] were arguing that the whole world have been divided into two halves framing the war as a war between Believers and infidels/ Good versus evil. Fallacy of false either- or, has been instrumental in framing and shaping the judgments of the citizenry.

A similar argument was presented by Osama Bin laden in an interview conducted by Al Jazeera and televised by CNN:

> We will work to continue this battle, God permitting, until victory or until we meet God.[531]

This also argues that there is no other alternative for Muslims: fight till victory or die. This closes any possibility of negotiations and dialogue.

5.6.2 On November 10, 2001 Osama was asked that what he had to say about the fatwa issued by the head of Jamia Al- Azhar declaring that beliefs and views of Osama have nothing to do with Islam.

> [Osama]: The fatwa of any official Aalim has no value for me. History is full of such Ulama who justify Riba, who justify the occupation of Palestine by the Jews, who justify the presence of American troops around Harmain Sharifain. These people support the infidels for their personal gain. The true Ulama support the Jihad against America.[532]

Jamia Al-Azhar, one of the world oldest surviving universities, is associated with Al- Azhar mosque in Egypt. Its mission is to propagate Islam and its culture. Moreover, scholars of Jamia- Al- Azhar render fatwa (edicts) on various disputes that

---

[530] For Bush's arguments see 5.2.5 above

[531] CNN.com ; http://edition.cnn.com/2002/US/01/31/gen.binladen.interview/

[532] Mir Hamid, *Osama Claims He Has Nukes: If US Uses N- arms It Will Get Same Response*: www.dawn.com , November 10, 2001 (accessed November 22, 2009)

are submitted to them from all over the Muslim (Sunni) world regarding right conduct of Muslims: both individual and as a society.[533] Osama, instead of defending his views and beliefs, committed fallacies of red herring, false analogy and argument against man. He informed, as a premise, the Aalems of Jamia Al-Azhar are official. That is, they follow the official version of Islam. According to him only Afghanistan is an Islamic country[534]. If Aalims of Jamia Al-Azhar are official then they are not genuine. He then compared them with those who have justified: 'Riba' (From Arabic, meaning Interest, effortless profit) the occupation of Palestine by the Jews, presence of American troops around Holy places like Harmain Sharifain. Obviously, such Alims are disliked by majority of Muslims. This way Osama, presenting a false analogy poisoned the well. Whoever will accept his argument will not listen to those 'Ulama' (Singular Alim, from Arabic, meaning Religious scholar) who are against Osama for they are 'official Alim', who hold Un-Islamic views and beliefs.

True Ulama, according to him, support jihad against America. Hidden conclusion is: whoever does not support jihad against America, the critics of his policies, is not a true Alim. Moreover, since Osama is fighting against America, therefore, he is following true Ulama. He should be followed.

Hamid Mir asked Osama about Pakistan's cooperation with US after 9/11, Osama replied:

> Osama: The government of Pakistan should have the wishes of the people in view. It should not have surrendered to the unjustified demands of America. America does not have solid proof against us. It just has some surmises. It is unjust to start bombing on the basis of those surmises.[535]

A very important question: Osama was asked to comment on Pakistan's participation in war on terror as an ally of USA. Osama, committing fallacy of begging the question, presumed that Pakistan's government is not considering the wishes of Pakistani people. He, without any proof, presumed that people of Pakistan are against war on terror; therefore, Pakistan should not have participated in war as an American ally. Moreover, he shifted the direction of the argument committing red

---

[533] www.wikipedia.org
[534] See Mir, Hamid (2001)
[535] Mir Hamid (2001)

herring. The actual argument was about Pakistan. However, he, changing the direction of argument, argued that America attacked Afghanistan without any proof against him; therefore, it is unjust to bomb Afghanistan.

> Right now a great war of Islamic history is being fought in Afghanistan. All the big powers are united against Muslims.[536]

The war is defined as a great war of Islamic history that is fought between Muslims and big powers that are united against Muslims. In fact, many Muslim countries are also fighting against Taliban and Al Qaeda. For example, Pakistan has declared a war on Taliban. Not even a single Islamic country is supporting Taliban and al Qaeda. Even, not all Afghans support Taliban and al Qaeda. Osama made a big generalization from too small a sample committing fallacy of false generalization.

5.6.3 Omer was asked, what he thinks about his decision, not to hand over Osama, since his decision has distanced Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, two important allies, from Afghanistan.

> I had never agreed to hand over Osama bin Laden to the United States. If someone says that I did, then they must have been dreaming. If we had wanted to hand over Osama, we would not have given such a big sacrifice.[537]

The actual issue was: the decision, not to hand over Osama has distanced Afghanistan from Pakistan and Saudi Arabia (two strong supporters of Taliban government), was right or wrong? Omer, instead of addressing the actual issue, changed the direction of the argument; from not handing over Osama (therefore distancing Afghanistan from Pakistan and Saudi Arabia) to whether he has ever agreed to hand over Osama. Since, he argued, if someone claims that he (Omer) has ever said that he will hand over Osama, is dreaming. The actual argument was about the effect of his decision it was not whether he has ever made this decision or not. In the context of 9/11, it was a very important question, since many people believed that Osama is fighting Middle East's war on Afghan soil and he should leave Afghanistan saving Afghanistan from attack.

---

[536] Mir Hamid (2001)
[537] Khan, Ismail (2007)

Omer was asked about any possibility of a peaceful settlement in Afghanistan and does he agree to third party mediation, moreover, whom he would like to play the role of mediator. He replied,

> There is no permanent government in Afghanistan. Therefore, first, I don't recognise any such set-up that calls itself government. Instead of negotiating with those who have come into power on the backing of foreign powers, it would be appropriate to give them the message to leave Afghanistan along with their [foreign] masters.[538]

Omer, like Bush, does not want negotiations. The reasons are: there is no permanent government to negotiate with; he does not recognize Karzai's government since it is backed by 'foreign masters', he also wants this government and their foreign masters to leave Afghanistan. He did not consider any other option like mediation of a third party. The options are very clear: leave Afghanistan or fight- no other alternative. This and other such arguments, regarding negotiations with Afghan government, also commit fallacy of slippery slope: Negotiations are good but negotiations with Afghan government would imply that we (Taliban) recognize this government. Since this government is backed by foreigners (infidels), negotiations with this government will also lead to recognition of foreign (infidels') role in Afghanistan. But this is very undesirable; therefore, no negotiations with Afghan government.

In war contexts, arguments are presented in such a way that they persuade people that we are left with no option but war ignoring any other option which may lead to a peaceful settlement.

5.6.4 Molvi Mohammad Saeed, in order to silence the critics of Taliban, presents an argument comprising many small arguments[539]. Not only Molvi Saeed but many other supporters of Taliban argued in the same manner. His argument is analyzed as follows:

He writes, actually God wanted to differentiate between true Muslims and traitors. The enthymeme is: This war has differentiated true Muslims from traitors. Taliban are true Muslims and those who side Taliban are also true Muslims, however,

---

[538] Khan, Ismail (2007)
[539] Saeed, Molvi Mohammad, Zarb -e- Momin, November 8-14, 2002

those who criticize them are traitors.

Ordinary people, who were influenced by Qadyani's propaganda, are coming back to Jihad. The hidden premises are: Qadyanies are persuading people not to fight. Those who still are not participating in Jihad are influenced by Qadyani's Propaganda. While Taliban are not influenced by their propaganda, whoever will join them is also not influenced by propaganda.

Taliban have again revived the 'right action' which was buried in books (false cause). This argues that the critics of Taliban do not want to act upon the right course of action that was forgotten by Muslims and is revived by Taliban once again.

The spirit of Iysar (sacrifice) has been revived again. This argues that the spirit of Iysar and sacrifice was forgotten by Muslims. Taliban have revived the forgotten spirit again (false cause). The hidden conclusion is those who criticize Taliban do not want to revive the true spirit of Islam.

He further argued that educated people who were living in the land of infidels are coming back (since Taliban are fighting coalition and the educated people are facing difficulties in the West). With them, money is also coming to Muslim countries making them economically strong and infidel countries weak- Appeal to good consequences. This argument is: this war is making Muslim countries economically strong and western countries weak. In fact, Muslim countries, directly affected by this war are heavily depending on foreign aid and are getting weaker and weaker. There is a slippery slope in this argument too. Those who do not want to come back should see the good consequences. If they come back they will make their Muslim countries strong. Moreover, their coming back will make infidel countries weak. Thus, their coming back is good which implies that the war is good, perhaps a blessing in disguise and since Taliban are fighting this war therefore, they are making Muslim world richer and infidels poorer- Taliban should not be criticized.

Mohammad Saeed further argues that more copies of Quran have been sold in America after 9/11 in comparison to last four years.

From these small arguments, he concludes that, Taliban's sacrifices are blessing and one should stop criticizing them. This argument also commits fallacy of poisoning the well, whoever criticize Taliban: is a traitor, is influenced by Qadyani's propaganda, does not want to revive 'true action' of Islam, does not want Iysar and sacrifice to be revived again, does not want prosperity of Muslim countries and bankruptcy of infidel countries.

Conclusion: This discussion reveals that in order to shape the judgments, perception and thinking of people; to persuade people for war; to silence critics of war policies and to block rational thinking leaders from both the sides, using logic of war set forth fallacious arguments.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

In times of war leaders/politicians use language and logic of war as tools of war. Through these tools they manipulate public judgment and block criticism of their policies and rational thinking. This research aimed to demonstrate:

1. Language used in the context of war in general and War on Terror in Afghanistan in particular, is ambiguous, vague, emotively charged, and metaphorical. Moreover, it evokes frames. Furthermore, most of the definitions forwarded in the context of war are persuasive definitions. The language we call, 'language of war' makes it difficult for people to understand what really goes on. It attempts to shape judgments, perception and actions, of people.
2. Most of the arguments forwarded in this context in general and War on Terror in Afghanistan in particular, are fallacious. These fallacious arguments, which we call, 'Logic of war', also make it difficult for people to differentiate appearance of war from reality. The logic of war also attempt to shape judgments, perceptions and actions of people.
3. Using language and logic of war politicians/leaders attempt to block criticism and rational thinking.

Employing methodologies developed in chapters two and three, in chapters four and five respectively, this research concludes that:

A. Word, War, has been used to shape judgment and opinion of people and played an instrumental role in blocking criticism and rational thinking. Actual war did not begin till 10/6 following America and allied forces attack on Afghanistan. Therefore, use of the word, War, prior to 10/7 has been incorrect.
B. The language of war, politicians has used in context of war in general and in the context of War on Terror in particular, has been ambiguous, vague and metaphorical i.e., it framed and reframed the war discourse. Moreover, it involved persuasive definitions to shape judgment, perception and action of people.
C. Most of the arguments, logic of war, politicians have forwarded in the context of war in general and in the context of War on Terror in particular have been fallacious. They have been instrumental in shaping judgments of people.

D. Both language and logic of war have been instrumental in blocking criticism of war policies and rational thinking.

DISCUSSION

This research establishes that use of the word 'War' was incorrect before 10/7, since there was no war till 10/6. The actual war began on 10/7 after America and allied forces attacked Afghanistan. In chapter four, section 4.1 we discussed in detail, what is war? The discussion concluded that the word, war, can be used metaphorically, such as: war on poverty, drugs etc. However, an actual war involves a widespread, organized, actual, intentional and collective armed conflict between political communities (enemies are properly defined) and it has a beginning and, an end. Through armed conflict these communities initiate, support and continue their agenda whatsoever. It causes mass murder, destruction, hunger, economic instability, environmental degradation and makes people refugees.

After 9/11, Bush, his administration and other leaders of allied forces using language and logic of war made people think that terrorist attacks of 9/11 were actually acts of war and they have to respond to the situation.

Section 4.2.1 discussed that repeated use of words such as, 'war', 'terror', 'deliberate acts of war', 'enemy', 'destruction', 'victims', 'sufferings', 'attacks', 'war on terrorism' and 'global war on terrorism' etc., framed public perceptions. Moreover, it also reveals that the word war in the context of 9/11 was metaphorical, since 'terrorism' is not an enemy rather a tactic. The war was persuasively defined as an everlasting war between good and evil.

It is evident that what happened on 9/11 was a great tragedy, it took thousands of lives; however, it was not an act of war, for no country declared war over America. Sections, 4.2.2 and 5.3.12, reveal that although, there were no widespread conflict, enemy was not properly identified, no armies, no aerial bombing and no tanks were used etc., but politicians/leaders using language and logic of war, attempted to make people think and argue that evil enemy has attacked freedom, democracy, way of life and the whole civilized world, therefore, America should hit back.

We argue that political communities can be attacked by other political communities, but freedom, democracy and way of life cannot be attacked. Such terms were used just to persuade public for war, for there is no evidence that points that

terrorists/enemies of America have been against the way of life of America or any other country. Moreover, it was a terrorist attack by human beings on American territory, but President Bush, his administration and other leaders of allied forces, portrayed as if an evil had declared war on the whole civilized world evoking good versus evil metaphor. They argued that it is responsibility of the whole civilized world to stand up and fight evil, not fighting this war would put a country in the group of uncivilized evil terrorists. Almost, every member of Bush's administration and other leaders of the allied forces, especially of Britain, were using: 'War', 'evil', 'destruction', 'good', 'fight', etc., over and over again to evoke and reinforce war framing. There was no war, but use of framing, metaphors, persuasive definitions and fallacious arguments misled majority of people that a very long war had already been declared by and from Afghanistan and America had to fight back and win this war otherwise an age of terror would begin and 'future generations' would 'suffer' and 'blame' us.

This research also concludes that in the context of war in general and in the context of War on Terror in particular, language of war has been instrumental in framing war as a struggle between: Good versus evil; believers versus infidel; hero versus villain, Faroun versus Musa (Pharaoh versus Moses) etc. Using such metaphors, politicians/leaders shaped judgments, perceptions and actions of the people and blocked criticism of policies and rational thinking. The conclusions were inferred in sections, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6.

Section 4.2.3, argued that there are words that evoke evil frame. Politicians in times of war use them to portray that our enemy is evil. Once they make people believe that their enemy is evil, they, themselves, become good heroes who fight and defeat evil enemy.

This section briefly discusses that use of good versus evil has not been new, for both Churchill and Hitler had already used this framing in World War Two. It discussed in detail the use of metaphors evoking good versus evil frame in the context of War on Terror. The war was defined and framed as a monumental struggle between good and evil. Bush, Blair, Powell and other leaders of the allied forces portrayed themselves as heroes fighting evil enemy. Besides maneuvering public opinion, one of the most useful entailment effects of good versus evil for leaders had been that their policies could not be criticized, since they repeatedly insisted that the world has been divided into two halves, good and evil: Not supporting Bush and his friends

meant that one had joined evil or had been possessed by evil.

Section 4.2.4 briefly discusses the language that evokes believers versus infidels frame. It reveals that President Franklin Roosevelt used this language to frame the Second World War as a struggle between believers and infidels. Moreover, Saddam Hussain also used such language to evoke this frame.

This section discusses in detail the way Taliban and Osama used language as a tool of war to frame the war a struggle, between believers and infidels. It reveals that events on 9/11 had been defined and framed in such a way that it appears as if the people who carried out attacks on 9/11 were heroes and defenders of religion and faith. Such framing persuaded people for war and blocked, in the name of religion, any criticism. Moreover, it established that, like Bush and his friends, Osama and Taliban's framing of war also entailed: the war had divided the world into two halves: believers and infidels. Anyone not with them (with believers) was/with infidel enemy. This way they persuaded people for war and silenced the critics. This section also informed that Faroun versus Musa was also used by some Taliban leaders. This metaphor reinforced believer versus infidel framing.

Section 4.2.5 reveals that in the context of war language may be used to evoke fairy tales. A fairy tale comprises: a hero, a villain, a victim, and a crime. The most common fairy tales told in the context of war had been:

Villain, taking victim hostage, perpetrates violence. Hero, without self interests, saves the victim after taking much trouble and sacrifice. (Kuwait Iraq war, World War II)

Villain has killed some of the victims and wants to harm other. He possesses dangerous weapons to carry out his evil plane. Hero snatches weapon and saves the victim after great sacrifice. (Iraq has weapons of mass destruction)

This section demonstrated that Politicians/leaders used language that evoked fairy tales to manipulate public judgment etc., and blocked criticism and rational thinking in the context of War on Terror. Bush and his friends (heroes) informed the world that Taliban (Villains) have made the lives of innocent Afghans (victims) very miserable (crime). And now, it is the responsibility of the civilized world to free Afghans from evil villain.

Taliban on the other hand framed the war discourse as: America (Villain) has killed or harmed hero's family and friends (crime); has captured hero's land/country (crime); has attacked hero's religion (crime) etc. Hero's ghyrat (honor) and bravery

has been triggered into action. He has to take badal (revenge).

Section 4.2.6 established that for people who think more in terms of money and economy, a language was used that evoked loss gain framing. War was defined and framed in such a way that not going into war entailed great future loses: Going into war was gain and not going into war was great loss.

From the above discussion it is evident that language of war is a tool of war. It shapes judgments, perceptions, and action of people persuading them for war. Moreover, using language of war politicians attempt to block criticism of their war policies and rational thinking. However, when we look into the war debate, using philosophical tools, we come to know that appearance of language of war has not been the same as its reality.

This research further concluded that in the context of war in general and War on Terror in particular, politicians/leaders committing fallacies i.e., using logic of war manipulated judgment, attitudes, values, perceptions and actions of people. Moreover, logic of war had been blocking criticism and rational thinking.

Chapter five, section 5.2 briefly discussed that committing fallacies for manipulating public judgments in times of war, had not been new. It discussed some fallacies committed by President Roosevelt, Hitler, and Nixon.

Section 5.3 discussed in detail fallacies and their entailment effects in the context of 9/11.

After 9/11, It had been argued that an evil had attacked America and an age of terror was about to begin, if the terror had not been stopped. Evil attacked America since America is the champion of freedom and democracy, and evil hates freedom and democracy. All the nations of the world had to choose between America and the evil terrorists. Moreover, it was propagated again and again, for framing purpose and to evoke fear that same attacks could happen to any civilized nation of the world.

Section 5.4 revealed that fallacious arguments were crafted to persuade the world for a preemptive attack on other nations of the world.

Section 5.5 demonstrated the way fallacious arguments for a preemptive war were instrumental in persuading public for war on Iraq. Moreover, it also revealed the way critics were silenced.

Section 5.6 discussed that Taliban and Osama, to persuade people for war and to silence the critics, also forwarded fallacious arguments.

Our work establishes that most commonly committed fallacies in the context

of war have been: straw man, red herring, definitional retreat, begging the question, false cause, appeal to force/threat, irrelevant conclusion, false generalization, appeal to good consequences, appeal to bad consequences, weak analogy, false either or, slippery slope, appeal to pity/ sympathy, suppressing the evidence, argument against man (specially, poisoning the well), shifting the burden of proof, etc.

The logic of war set forth by the leaders helped them in changing and shaping judgment, perception and action of people. Moreover, it had been instrumental in silencing the critics, this way leaders attempted to obstruct critical and rational thinking. However, when we look into the war discourse, we come to know that appearance of logic of war has not been the same as reality.

It is concluded that in the context of war leaders/politicians use language and logic of war as tools of war making it difficult for public to differentiate appearance of war from reality. Using language and logic of war, they attempt to make people think, argue, and act the way, they want them to. Moreover, language and logic of war also block rational/critical thinking and silence criticism.

The present work may be helpful in avoiding inappropriate uses of language and fallacies. It may also be helpful in generating a discourse which takes it to be its objective to bring clarity and avoid confusion: a philosophical objective. Moreover, this work, in the context of War on Terror, not only furthers our understanding of the use of language and fallacies committed by various leaders at the helm of affairs, but also hints in the direction in which one can work for a language of peace with the help of which armed conflicts may be avoided.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ara, Roshan, [2006]: *Wittgenstein's Concept of Language Games.* Al- Hikmat

Aberdein, Andrew, [1998]: *Persuasive Definition.* Available on http://my.fit.edu/~aberdein/Aberde_p.htm

Ayer, A.J, [1986]: Language Truth and Logic. Penguin Books Ltd, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England

Aristotle: Rhetoric. Available online at http://calssics.mit.edu//Aristotle/rhetoric.html

Aristotle: On Sophistical Refutation. www.grtbooks.com

Barekr, Stephen F, [1985]: The Elements of Logic. McGraw-Hill Company

Barry, Vincent, [1977]: Looking at Ourselves: An introduction to Philosophy. Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc. Belmont, California.

Biddle Stephen D, [2005]: *American Grand Strategy After 9/11: An Assessmen.* Strategic Studies Institute, Available online www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi

Borradori, Giovanna, [2003]: Philosophy in a Time of Terror- Dialogues with Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida . The University of Chicago Press

Black, Jonathan Charteris, [2005]: Politician and Rhetoric- The Persuasive Power of Metaphor. Published by Palgrave Macmillan New York

Blair, Statement to the parliament in response to the Terrorist Attacks on US: www.number10.gov.uk September 14, 2001

Blair, UK's Blair Pledges Solidarity, September 20, 2001 (white house website)

Blair, Tony, Blair, Full Text: Tony Blair's Speech, www.gurdian.co.uk, October 2, 2001

Blair, Statement to the Parliament: www.number10.gov.uk October 4, 2001

Blair, Prime Minister's Statements to the House of Common, www.number10.gov.uk, October 8, 2001,

Bovard, James, [2003]: Terrorism and Tyranny – Trampling Freedom, Justice, and Peace to Rid the World of Evil : Palgrave Macmillan

Bovard, James, [2004]: The Bush Betrayal: Palgrave Macmillan, New York

Bergen, Peter. L, [2001]: Holy War, Inc.: Inside the Secret World of Osama Bin Laden: The Free Press, New York

Bush (senior) Attack on Iraq Speech by President George Bush, Washington DC, January 16, 1991, http://www.famousquotes.me.uk/speeches/George_Bush/index.htm

Bush, G.W, Remarks of the President After Two Planes Crashed into World Trade

Center: September 11, 2009, available online on, www.whitehouse.gov, (accessed date January 10, 2009). All documents related to G.W Bush are available online on: http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news

Bush, Statement by the President in his Address to the Nation, September 11, 2001

Bush, Remarks of the President in Photo Opportunity with the National Security Team: September 12, 2001

Bush, National Day of Prayers and Remembrance for the Victims of the Terror Attacks on September 11, 2001

Bush, radio address to the Nation: September 15, 2001

Bush, Remarks by the president Upon arrival: September 16, 2001

Bush, "Islam is Peace" says the President: September 17, 2001

Bush, President Launches Online American Relief and Response Effort: September 18, 2001

Bush, President Building Worldwide Campaign Against Terrorism: September 19, 2001

Bush, Address to a Joint Session of the Congress and the American People: September 20, 2001

Bush, President on a radio Address to the Nation: September 20, 2001

Bush, President: FBI Needs Tools to Track Down terrorists: September 25, 2001

Bush, International Campaign against Terrorism Grow: September 25, 2001

Bush, President Meets with Muslim Leaders: September 26, 2001

Bush, At O'Hare President says "Get on Board": September 27, 2001

Remarks by President Bush and His majesty King Abdullah, September 28, 2001

Bush, King of Jordon: "We will stand behind you": September 28, 2001

Bush, President meets with the Congressional Leaders: October 2, 2001

Bush, President Directs Humanitarian Aid to Afghanistan: October 4, 2001

Bush, President Unveils Back to Work Plan: October 4, 2001 10/4/2001

Bush, Freedom at War with Fear: September 20, 2001

Bush, President Delivers State of the Union Address: January 28, 2003

Bush, Radio address of the President to the Nation: October 6, 2001

Bush, Presidential Address to the Nation: October 7, 2001.

Bush, Radio address to the Nation: October7, 2001

Bush, German leader Reiterates Solidarity with US: October 9, 2001

Bush, Radio Address of the President to the Nation: October 10, 2001

Bush, President Unveils "Most Wanted" Terrorist: October 10, 2001

Bush, President: "No Nation can be Neutral in this Conflict": November 6, 2001

Bush, President Speaks to the United Nations: November 10, 2001

Bush, President Pays Tribute at Pentagon Memorial: October 11, 2001

Bush, Prime Minster Berlusconi, President Bush and Italian Prime Minster Discuss War effort: October 15, 2001

Bush, Radio Address by the President to the Nation: November 24, 2001

Bush, President Delivers State of the Union Address: January 29, 2002

Bush, President's Remarks at The General Assembly: September 12, 2002

Bush, President's Radio Address, March 1, 2003

Bush, War on Terror: March 8, 2003

Bush, President says Saddam must Leave Iraq within 48 hours: March 17, 2003

Bush, President Discusses Military operation: March 23, 2003

Bush, President Discusses Middle East, Iraq and the Dollar in Cabinet Meeting: June 9, 2003

Bush, President Bush Addresses United Nations General Assembly: September 23, 2003

Bush, State of the Union Address: January 4, 2004

Bush, State of the Union Address: February 25, 2005

Chomsky, Noam, [1968]: *Linguistic Contributions to the Study of Mind*. Language and Mind, Publ. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Chomsky, Noam. *The War in Afghanistan*: Z Magazine, February 1, 2002, available online on www.Chomsky.info

Coady C. A. J, [1985]: *The Morality of Terrorism.* Philosophy, Vol. 60, No 231, Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of Royal Institute of Philosophy, Stable URL: Http://www.jstore.org/stable/3750562,

Copi, Irving M. and Carl Cohen, [2001]: Introduction to Logic. Pearson Education (Singapore) Pte. Ltd., India.

Clausewitz, Carl Von, [1832] On War : Translated by Howard, Michael and Peter Paret, Oxford University Press, (2007)

Fairclough, Norman, [2001]: Language and Power. Second Edition (2001) Pearson Education Limited, England

Feteris, Eveline T, [2008]: *The Pragma-Dialectical Analysis and Evaluation of Teleological Argumentation in a Legal Context*. Argumentation. Kluwer Academic

Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands

Fillmore Charles J., [2006]: *Frame Semantics.* In Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Reading: Edited by Dirk Geeraerts, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, originally published in 1982 in *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, Linguistic Society of Korea. Seoul: Hanshin publishing. Reprinted with permission)

Floistad Guttorm (edited by), [1986]: Contemporary Philosophy Volume 1. Philosophy of Language & Philosophy of Logic, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers Dordercht/ Bostan/ Lancaster

Frege, Gottlob, [1948]: *Sense and Reference.* The Philosophical Review. Publisher Duke University Press on Behalf of Philosophical Review. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2181485. p.216

Goodwin, Jean, [1998]: *Forms of Authority and the Real Ad Verecundiam.* Argumentation

Hanfling, Oswald, [1989]: Wittgenstein's Latter Philosophy. Published by the Macmillan Press Ltd.

Hass Michael, [2009]: George W. Bush, War Criminal? The Bush Administration's Liability for 269 War Crimes. Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

Haq-Mazhar-Ul, [2003]: The 1973 Constitution of Pakistan. Published by Mr. Tariq Khursheed for Bookland, Urdu Bazar Lahore

Harak G. Simon, [2007]: Philosophical Perspectives On the 'War on Terrorism'. Edited by Gail M. Presbey, Rodopi Amsterdam- New York

Held Virginia, [2004]: *Terrorism and War*. The Journal of Ethics, Terrorism Published by Springer, URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/25115781

Herf, Jeffrey, [2006]: The Jewish Enemy, Nazi Propaganda During World war II and the Holocaust. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press

Hertzberg, Hendrik, [2004]: Politics, Observations and Arguments. The Penguin Press New York

Hitler, Declaration of war on US by Hitler, December 11, 1941, http://www.famousquotes.me.uk/speeches/Adolf_Hitler/index.htm Hurley, Patrick J, [2003]: A Concise Introduction to Logic. Wadsworth/Thomson Learning Belmont USA, Eighth Edition

Hospers, John, [1973]: Philosophical Analysis. Second Edition, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd

Hurka, Thomas, [2008]: *Proportionality and Necessity*. In War- Essays in Political

Philosophy. Edited by Larry May, Cambridge University Press

Hussain, Saddam Christmas Message Excerpt, available online on http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/2604699.stm

Hussain, Saddam 24, March 2003: available online on www.gaurdian.co.uk

Ikuenobe, Polycarp, [2002]: *In Search of Criteria for 'Fallacies' and 'Begging the Question*. Argumentation

Ivie Robert and Oscar Giner, [2007]: *Hunting the Devil: Democracy's Rhetorical Impulse to War*. Presidential Studies Quarterly

Jacobs, Scott, [2000]: *Rhetoric and Dialectic from the Standpoint of Normative Pragmatics. A*rgumentation

Jacquette, Dale (Volume editor) [2007]: Philosophy of Logic. Elsevier B. V

Johnson, R. H. and J. A. Blair, [1987]: *The Current State of Informal Logic*. Informal Logic

Johnson, Ralph H, [1999]: T*he Relation between Formal and Informal Logic.* Argumentation

Khan Sarfraz and Shuja Ahmad [2009]: *Good Versus Evil: Argument to Begin Global War on Terrorism*: In Central Asia

Khan, Ismail, [2007]: *Omer Threatens to Intensify War, Talks with Karzai govt ruled out*. www.dawn.com

Khattak, Raj Wali Shah; Fida Mohammad and Richard Lee [2009]: *The Pashtun Code of Honour.* In Central Asia

Kimball, Robert H, [2001]: *Moral and Logical Perspectives on Appealing to Pity.* Argumentation

Lafollette Hugh, [2005]: *Living on a Slippery slope:* The Journal of Ethics

Lakoff George, [1996]: Moral Politics- What Conservatives Know That Liberals Don't. University of Chicago Press

Lakoff George, [1999]: *Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System to Justify War in the Gulf.* Viet Nam generation Journal & Newsletter, V3, N3 (November 1991) available online on http://www2.iath.virgina.edu/sixties/HTML_docs/journal.html

Lakoff , George and Evan Frisch, [2006]: *Five Years After 9/11: Drop the War Metaphor,* www.rockridgeinstitute.org/research/rockridge/ Lakoff George, www.rockridgeinstiture.org: last modified Thursday, February 14, 2006

Lakoff, George, [2001]: *Metaphors of Terror.*
www.press.uchicago.edu/News/911lakoff.html

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson,[1980]: Metaphors we Live By. The University of Chicago Press

Lakoff, George. *"War on Terror," Rest in Peace*: Available online on http://www.rockridgeinstitute.org/index.html

Lakoff George and Mark Johnson, [1999]: Philosophy in the Flesh- The Embodied Mind and its Challenges to western Thought. Published by Basic Books, A Member of the Perseus Books Group

Lakoff, George, [2004]: Don't think of a Elephant!. Chelsea Green Publishing, White River Junction, Vermont.

Lakoff, George, *Simple Framing*: available online on www.rockridgeinstitute.org/index.html

Lee, Stephen P., [2008]: *Weapons of Mass destruction- Are the Morally Special*: War- Essays in Political Philosophy. Edited by Larry May, Cambridge University Press

Lewis, Jeff, [2005]: Language Wars- The Role of Media and Culture in Global Terror and Political Violence. Pluto Press London

Lieberman Peter, *An Eye for an Eye: Public Support for War Against Evildoers*: International Organization 60, Summer

Malik, Aqeb, [2009]: *The Suicide Dream.* www.dawn.com

Mir, Hamid, [2001]: *Osama Claims He Has Nukes: If US Uses N- Bombs It Will Get Same Response*. November 10, 2001: www.dawn.com

Moseley, Alexander, [2002]: A Philosophy of War. Algora Publishing New York

Osama Bin Laden, Osama Bin Laden Speeches, October 7, 2001: www.september11news.com/OsamaSpeeches.htm

Mullah Omer, *Interview with Mullah Omer*: www.bbc.co.uk, November 15, 2001

Mullah Omar, Mullah Omer- in his own words, September 26, 2001: http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2001/sep/26/afghanistan.features11

Musharraf, Pervez, [2006]: In the Line of Fire. Simon & Schuster UK Ltd

Nixon, Richard, Vietnamization- War in Vietnam Speech, by Richard Nixon, Address to the Nation: November 3, 1969, http://www.famousquotes.me.uk/speeches/Richard_Nixon/2.htm,

Norris Pippa, Montague Kern, and Marion Just [2003]: *Framing Terrorism.* Published in, Framing Terrorism- The News Media, the Government and the Public. Edited by Pippa, Montague Kern, and Marion Just. Published by Routledge New York

Paul, Ron, [2003]: *Phony Justifications for War.*
http://www.lewrockwell.com/paul/paul113.html
Paul, Ron, [2005]: *Ending Suicide Terrorism.*
http://www.antiwar.com/paul/?articleid=6712
Paul, Ron, [2005]: *Big lies and little Lies.*
http://www.lewrockwell.com/paul/paul285.html
Pirie, Madsen, [2006]: How to Win Every Argument- The Use and Abuse of Logic: Continuum International Publishing Group
Powell, Colin: November 20, 2001,
http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2001/nov/20/afghanistan.israel
Powell, Colin, Colin Powell's Address to the Security Council: February 5, 2003, available on line on http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/02/20030205-1.html#23
Quine, W.V, [1951]: *Main Trends in Recent Philosophy: Two Dogmas of Empiricism.* The Philosophical Review, Published by Duke University Press on behalf of philosophical review. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2181906
Rampton, Sheldon and John Stauber, [2003]: Weapons of Mass deception, The Uses of Propaganda in Bush's War on Iraq. Jeremy P. Tracher/ Penguin, A Member of Penguin Group (USA) Inc. New York
Record Jeffrey, [2003]: *Bounding The Global War on Terrorism.* Strategic Studies Institute United States Army War College
Rice, Condoleezza [2003]: *Why We Know Iraq is Lying*: The New York. http://www.nytimes.com/2003/01/23/opinion/why-we-know-iraq-is-lying.html?pagewanted=1
Robret Talisse and Scott F. Alkin, [2006]: *Two forms of Straw Man:* Argumentation
Ruggiero Vincenzo, [2007]: *War, Crime and Cosmopolitanism.* Published online: 1 June 2007, Springer Science+ Business Media B.V
Runkle, Gerald, [1985]: Theory and Practice- An Introduction to Philosophy. CBS College Publishing New York
Roosevelt Franklin, "We Chose Human Freedom" May 27, 1941: President Franklin Delano Roosevelt Radio Address Announcing the Proclamation of an Unlimited National Emergency available on http://www.usmm.org/fdr/emergency.html
Roosevelt, Franklin, "The Forward March of Hitler and of Hitlerism can be Stopped -- and It will be Stopped." October 27, 1941 http://www.usmm.org/fdr/kearny.html

Roosevelt, Franklin, D- Day prayer, June 6, 1944,
http://www.historyplace.com/speeches/fdr-prayer.htm
Rumsfeld Donald H, www.defense.gov
Rumsfeld Donald H. Pentagon Town Hall Meeting with Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld: March 7, 2002
http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=196
Russell, Bertrand, [1956]: Logic and Knowledge. Unwin Hyman Limited
Sarhindi , Waris, [1993]: Ilmi Urdu Lughat. Ilmi Kutab Khana Lohore
Saeed, Molvi Mohammad, [2002]: Zarb -e- Momin
Safdari, Cyrus, [2006]: *Rhetoric of War: First Iraq, then Iran?*. Global Dialogue, http://www.worlddialogue.org/dialogue.htm
Schiappa, Edward, [1998]: *Constructing Reality Through Definitions: The Politics of Meanings.* A lecture presented for the center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing and composition, Literacy, and Rhetorical Studies Minor, The Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing, Speakers Series
Searle, John, R, [1981]: Expression And Meaning. Cambridge University Press
Searle, John, R and Daniel Vanderveken, [1985]: Logic Thought and Action, Chapter 5, Speech act and Illocutionary Logic. Cambridge University Press. Printed by Springer, The Netherlands
Silberstein, Sandra, [2002]: War of Words- language, Politics and 9/11. Routledge London and New York
Skoll Geoffrey R, [2007]: *Meaning of Terrorism.* International Journal of Semiotics of Law
Sproule , J. Michael, [1980]: Argument- Language and its influence. McGraw- Hill Book Company
Stevenson, C, L, [1938]: *Persuasive Definitions*. Mind, New Series, Published by: oxford University Press on Behalf of the Mind Association, Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2250337
Taylor Dianna, [2007]: *Responsibility And/In Crises*: Philosophical Perspectives on the 'War on Terrorism'. Edited by Presbey Gail M: Rodopi Amsterdam New York NY
Theidon, Kimberly, [2001]: *"Terror's Talk: Fieldwork and war"*. Dialectical Anthropology, Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Netherlands
Tzu Sun, The Art of War: Translated by Lionel Giles, Globusz Publishing New York-

Berlin, www.globusz.com

Teays, Wanda, [1996]: Second Thoughts- Critical thinking from a Multicultural Perspective. Mayfield Publishing Company- Mountain View California

Thornberry Patrick, [2005]: *Invisible Cities.* 11 September 2001- War, Terror and Judgment. Edited by Gokay Bulent and R.B.J. Walker, Frank Cass, London, Portland, OR, This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library

Tiles, J.E [1988]: *Logic and its Place in Philosophy,* An Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Edited by Parkinson G.H.R, Routledge- Great Britain

Ulrike Hahn and Mike Oaksford, [2006]: *A Bayesian Approach to Informal Argument Fallacies*. Syntheses

Volokh Eugene, [2003]: *The Mechanisms of the Slippery Slope*. Harvard Law review http://www.jstor.org/stable/1342743

Walton, Douglas, [2005]: *Deceptive Arguments Containing Persuasive language and Persuasive Definitions.* Argumentation

Walton Douglas and Fabrizio Macagno, [2009]: *Reasoning from Classifications and Definitions*: Argumentation

Walton, Douglas, [1999]: *The Appeal to ignorance, or Argumentum Ad Ignorantiam.* Argumentation.

Walton, Douglas, [2006]: *Poisoning the Well*: Argumentation

Walton, Douglas, [1999]: *Rethinking Fallacy of Hasty Generalization*: Argumentation

Walton, Douglas, [2008]: Informal Logic, A Pragmatic Approach. Cambridge University Press

Walton, Douglas, [1999]: *The Fallacy of Many Questions: On the Notions of Complexity, Loadedness and Unfair Entrapment in Interrogative Theory.* Argumentation

War, [2000]: Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy

Wittgenstein, Ludwig, Tractatus Logico- Philosophicus, Translated by Pears, D. F and B. F. McGuiness, Routledge Classics 2001, New York. This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e- library 2002.

Winkler Carol k. [2008]: *Encroachments on State sovereignty: The Argumentation Strategies of the George W. Bush Administration.* Argumentation

Wittgenstein, Ludwig, [1963]: Philosophical Investigations. Translated by G.E.M Anscombe: Basil Blackwell, Oxford

Wolfe, Wojtek Mackiewucz, [2008]: Winning the War of Words- Selling the War on

Terror from Afghanistan to Iraq: Praeger Security International Westport, Connecticut London

Woods, John, [1998]: *Argumentum ad Baculum*. Argumentation

Zarefsky, David, [2006]: *Strategic maneuvering through persuasive definitions: implications for Dialectic and Rhetoric*. Argumentation

Zarefsky, David, [2008]: *Strategic Maneuvering in Political Argumentation*: Argumentation

Ziaudin Sardar, [2001]: *My Fatwa on Fanatics*.

http://observer.guardian.co.uk/islam/story/0,,576698,00.html

NEWS PAPERS

Zarb – e- Momin: December 6-12, 2002

Zarb-e Momin: July 26- August 1, 2002

Zarb-e Momin: July 26- August 1, 2002

Zarb-e Momin: September 27- October 3, 2002

Zarb-e Momin: September 27- October 3, 2002

Zarb-e Momin: July 11-17, 2003

Zarb-e Momin: February 28- March 6, 2003

Zarb-e Momin: November 5-11, 2004

Into the Mind of a Suicide Bomber: The Daily Dawn, July 21, 2007

CDs

Nooristan War

Kunar War

Da Gaziano Karwan

Afghanistan Jihad

Lal Masjid operation

Iraq War