

Dehumanizing to Demonizing: Critical Discourse Analysis of George Bush's Speeches for Exploring the Influence of Dehumanizing Metaphor in Political Discourse

Syed Shujaat Ali and Siraj Khan,

Kohat University of Science & Technology, Kohat

To legitimize US invasion of Iraq, Bush fabricated fake intelligence reports, and depended solely on propaganda; he manipulated language in a well-calculated manner; most particularly, the metaphors chosen and devised for his speeches were such that convinced the US citizens about the legitimacy of the invasion, elicited financial support of the European allies and moral support of the majority of the world community. This research work used discourse analysis to study the metaphors that were used by George Bush in the speeches he made on 8 different occasions, and the theoretical framework used in it is the combination of critical discourse analysis CDA with postcolonial theory concept of orientalism. It utilized both qualitative and quantitative data collection tools. It found that most of the task was accomplished through the linguistic manipulation in the shape of metaphor used to dehumanize the enemy, which first made the US citizens feel as victims to the jealousy of rogue Muslim states for intending to completely annihilate them; then, it made appeal to their sense of justice, sense of security, and right to self-defense. By grouping the world citizens into Us and Them groups, the innocent, peace-loving and the war-mongers, the angels and the devils, and then by placing themselves and the rest of the world among the first group and placing the powerful Muslims states among the second group, the US exploited the feelings and thoughts of all. Despite the UN and the rest of the world having come to know the sheer lies of the US now, the US still has managed to flog a dead horse and blind-fold majority of the world through this linguistic manipulation in the form of using dehumanizing metaphors .

Keywords: metaphor, war on terror, discourse, dehumanization,

In the 90's the concept of orientalism was reasserting itself to lead the discourse about the coming confrontation of Islam and the Western civilization. This construction of the enemy other by the Orientalist is therefore essential to the research to show their assumptions and justifications for

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Syed Shujaat Ali Chairman & Assistant Professor, Department of English, Kohat University of Science & Technology, Kohat, Pakistan. email: s_shojaat_ali@yahoo.com

Contribution of Authors

1. Developed the theoretical framework, carried out the discourse analysis, and drew the conclusions.
2. Helped in finding out the research gap and located the speeches.

the War on Terror discourse. The fact, that all the Muslim states of the world form one monolithic religious and socio-geographic block, causes alarm among other religions with respect to their survival. The moral panic of the western world against the Muslim world and their religion has been attributed by them to the conditions of volatility, projection, disproportionality, and hostility (2012: 2-3).

In the words of Morgan and Poynting (2012: 1) the "...racialized 'Muslim other' has become the preeminent 'folk devil' of our time". When Bush proclaimed The Muslims as the next enemy after the collapse of USSR, he said that Muslims, entirely sponsored by some rogue states, particularly the "axis of evil", being more determined ideological enemies of the US would not take reason in using weapons of mass destruction against them. To secure moral support for his preemptive strike from the world around, to convince the American citizens and to rally support of his European allies, Bush administration, resolved to depend on falsehood and propaganda campaign for making the invasion appear legitimate. Bush depended heavily and repeatedly on dehumanizing metaphors like "War against evil", "terrorism as cancer", "virus", "Taliban as insects", "Saddam Husain as rat" (Corn, 2003) and tried to link the enemy 'other' to germs, dirt, diseases and evil so as to make their eradication appear not only as justified but also the responsibility of every peace-loving citizen of the world, despite the fact that the same Osama, when engaged with USSR, and Saddam Hussain, when engaged with Iran, were once the Americans' blue eyed champions of democracy. With repeated use, the dehumanizing metaphors started appearing normal and representing reality, showing how language and power can reinforce each other.

The research paper hypothesizes that the dehumanizing metaphors used by the powerful states to scapegoat the weaker nations is unjust and it, instead of controlling terrorism, is rather promoting terrorism; its spill-over effect has made other nations like India, Israel and Russia follow suit and quell the legitimate demands of their citizens as terrorism, through the use of dehumanizing metaphors. If there is any evil at all in the world, it is not justified to eradicate it with another greater evil of dehumanization.

This study analyses eight speeches of Bush for his use of dehumanizing metaphors and tries to locate and then throw light over their linguistic intricacies for understanding their immense strength and impact in putting the whole world off the scent. Metaphor played a crucial role in the construction of the enemy 'other'. According to Thornborrow and Wareing (1998) a metaphor picks up a concept from a context where it normally belongs and transports it to a new context where it is normally absent. Cognitive linguistics brought about a revolution in understanding metaphor from a new perspective by defining it as 'comprehending one conceptual domain, from human discourse, through another conceptual domain' (Kovecses, 2010: 21). These metaphors helped Bush in launching the attack and sustaining in his preemptive stance, years after, when the Iraq war had extended against the wishes of the US. They still helped him pursue his policy of war when Colin Powell tendered very logical and factual arguments based on irrefutable evidence against the war and when UN reports nullified the allegations offered by the US initially for legitimizing the invasion of Iraq. The lexical choices and dehumanizing metaphors had been so powerful in appeal that they offered a safe camouflage to the sinister imperialistic designs of Bush administration and continued to do it for years despite mounting criticism.

Literature Review

Negative stereotypical assumptions of Islam existed for centuries, yet Islamophobia, as a word has surfaced just a couple of decades ago on the academic and vernacular scene. It is a phenomenon both political, cultural and religious, representing a notion for describing the Muslims

and their religion negatively, way beyond just dislike and disagreement. What “harbors and nurtures terrorism” is nothing but the stereotypical assumptions of the western literati’s stereotypical assumptions regarding Islam (Mansoor, 2012: 2). According to her, such biased behaviours against the Muslims have made them feel insecure throughout the world and more specifically in the United States. According to Pratt and Woodlock (2016) the powerful political parties in action shape how Islam should be seen and perceived; consequently, Islam is seen by the US and European states as the ‘religious other’ i.e. an ideologically opposite religion. Shakur claims that the west has very earnestly and perpetually exploited media and fictional literature for the depiction of the Muslim world; however, previously it used to be a depiction of exotic and romantic nature, while recently it has changed over to their depiction as terrorist stereotypes (2014: pp. 72-73).

Edward Said considers that the establishing of the US hegemony in the political and economic spheres is largely due to its ideological and cultural subjugation of the under-developing and weaker nations of the world. Following the footsteps of the British and French Imperialists, the US also has taken over the role of acting as the “guardian of the western civilization” (Said, 1993: 285). Developments in the recent past like the Iranian Revolution and Al-Qaeda’s alleged involvement in twin towers attack has alarmed the west against the Muslims. Negative profiling of the Muslims and wrong depiction of Islam is due to the “‘white subject’ of the ‘west’ that reaches its peak in the binary of other/Other. The said dichotomy, instead of being just a geographical discrimination, is more of a conceptual and ideological difference, termed sometimes as a clash of civilizations. To Edward Said Oriental and Occidental are manmade divisions showing how the Western Powers, by distorting knowledge about the Orient, have dominated, restructured and exerted their control over the Orient; Orient as an idea has codified history, specialists, imagery, vocabulary and repetition through which it has constructed a reality for the West by the West. For Said, there is no empire without its culture; it is culture which paves the way for imperial hegemony in the world.

In the vilification campaign against the Muslims and Islam, dehumanizing metaphors have served the purpose of US and the Jewish lobby well. Metaphor, a well-known figure of speech, found both in literature and daily routine discourse, is very familiar to human thinking and experience. Metaphor picks up characteristics from one entity and applies it onto another entity. Origins of the word, ‘metaphor’, were traced by Thornborrow and Wareing (1998:96) to Greek language, where it stood for transporting something. Kovecses sees metaphor as a support in the projection of reality and understands it as a vehicle of thought in the following words, “when he views metaphor as concepts organized structurally and cognitive operations grouped together for the sake of deciphering the world (2013). Metaphor had been offering spaces for literary investigation since past, but due to the advent of modern cognitive linguistics, it has started attracting linguists with respect to linguistic analysis. Through the introduction of Conceptual Metaphor Theory by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), *metaphor has started to be seen in a totally different perspective of being considered as a cognitive entity in addition to linguistic entity*. CMT turns down the concept of metaphor being used primarily as a decorative device and drives across the concept that metaphor enjoys indispensable position and centrality in human thought and language (Deignan, 2005). Due to this development, metaphors have now started to be treated in literature and daily discourse both linguistically and conceptually. CMT has made us sensitive to the ever-changing links between different human faculties. According to Gibbs (2009), it is CMT that has caused a considerable heightened comprehension of those links of dynamic nature that exist between physical experiences, linguistic behavior and structure, and prevalent patterns of thought.

Tendahl and Gibbs (2008) view metaphor not simply as a figure of speech, but rather a type of particular mental mapping and a sort of neural co-activation impacting considerably how a person

reflects, reasons, and envisions in day to day life ... According to them, the basic function of verbal metaphors is not only to serve as devices meant for decoration and communication so as to articulate topics that are basically complex to be described literally, but rather they show the underpinning conceptual mappings which are used for the metaphorical conceptualization of abstract and obscure domains of knowledge such as ideas, time, emotions, spatial orientation and concepts of comprehension, in the forms of knowledge that is more concrete, specific and particular, like embodied experiences.

Steen (1999) has concisely summed up the three discourse functions of metaphor, when he attributes the expressing of meaning to its linguistic function, the shaping of ideas to its conceptual function and the transmission of the message to its communicative function. Lakoff (1980) believes that besides the literary metaphors, there are some basic types of metaphors which we follow and use unknowingly; According to the claim made by George and Mark Johnson (1980), metaphors, over and above affecting the manner of our communicating ideas, in reality also lead to the structuring of our perceptions and comprehension, right from the very initial stage. When the lens provided by philosophy and linguistics interact, then we witness a wonderful guide being offered, regarding some of the highly common metaphors and regarding the knowledge they provide us with respect to human mind.

Kovecses (2010), in his book, informs his readers about the recent progress made in the research on metaphor and how this progress in the form of fresh developments has influenced our apprehension of mind, culture and language. Cognitive linguistic theory of metaphor is outlined by him by throwing light over the basic ideas and concepts on metaphor. In addition to it, he also throws light over primary metaphor, image schemas, system of metaphor, invariance principle, many space-blending theory, and mental imagery experiments. A variety of political speeches, ranging from classical rhetoric to current approaches like critical metaphor theory and historical approach, were analyzed by him. He informed on the manner in which traditional approaches could be blended with the critical approaches of the present day. He analyzed political speeches from a range of theoretical approaches ranging from classical rhetoric to contemporary approaches such as the discourse-historical approach and critical metaphor analysis. We are told how traditional approaches of classical rhetoric could be integrated with present day 'critical' approaches, like critical metaphor analysis. As a result, we come to comprehend many a discourse theory that explain the nexus between linguistic features possessed by speeches and the contexts of cultural and social nature where they are uttered.

Text, according to Said (1978), is located in the world which has a web of affiliations with the vast aspects of political, cultural and social world. The literary Text, for example, is not to be interpreted by the professional knowledge of the canonical lines of English literature alone as such a view will cut the text of the political action in the text and will leave no space for the judgment of the text worldliness of the author who writes it and the critics who read it. The text of 'Heart of Darkness' by Joseph Conrad, a novella most analyzed in post colonialism, criticizes the economic exploitation of Africa just because of their different skin colours or somewhat flatter noses. It is interpreted as racist work by post-colonial writers, such as Achebe in his essay entitled 'An Image of Africa'. He shows it represents Africa as one belonging to 'the other world', tangentially opposed to the image of Europe and its civilization, as an area where the elegance and conceited intellect of white man is jeered to failure through the African savagery and bestiality.

Corn (2003) analysed the speeches of GW Bush and Tony Blair through Critical Discourse Analysis CDA, to conclude that both the leaders have used rhetorical devices, such as euphemism and dysphemism, for the ideological manipulation of the world; however, he has shown that the speeches were full of deceit and shallow rhetoric to befool the audience.

Theoretical Framework

The research is intended to look at the application of metaphors used in War on Terror discourse with a view to interrogate their potential for dehumanization of the enemy other. To conduct the interrogation, the theoretical framework employed by the research work is the combination of critical discourse analysis (CDA) with postcolonial theory concept of Orientalism. First, the orientalist construction of the other is explained through the lens of Orientalism, followed by the critical analysis of the metaphors used in discourse on War on Terror and the negative material effects of these metaphors had, will be analyzed through CDA. In the end the research will prove the failure of the use of these biased metaphors with a view to modify the present dominant discourse about the War on Terror for a genuine humanistic discourse in future engagements.

Edward Said's renowned book *Orientalism* which served as reference point for the field of post colonialism examined and criticized Western discourses of orientalism. Edward Said (2003) views orientalism as a Western specific style meant primarily for subjugating the Orient, restructuring it and claiming authority and control over it, and this image is the most recurring one of Europe about the other. Over time, these descriptions which the West constructed were systematized, grouped into a controlled body of knowledge. These words and images are so frequently repeated that it comes to appear like true knowledge and reality of the East as an archetype. Said believes that though today there is no more direct western colonization, however its forms of representation are still very much active. The discourse of orientalism explains the relationship between the 'Orient' and the 'West' where the later considers itself as superior in opposition to the inferior East. This 'essence' of relationship allows the binary division where the 'West' draws the lines to divide the world into two unequal halves with permanent characteristics and attributes. This asymmetrical dichotomy has material effects in form of political and cultural confrontations.

The paper will show that in the War on Terror discourse, the metaphors used colluded to demonize the terrorist other' as evil and diseases to be removed and not humans to be talked with or to listen to their sides of the stories. The researcher will try to prove that the metaphors used simplified the complex issue of terrorism, dramatized the threat of Muslim barbarism and legitimized the violence committed against the prisoners and civilians to further the West own self interests.

CDA looks at discourse for unequal power relations and the role of language in it and whether these relations can be transformed because CDA considers that upon the modification of discourse, the ensuing social effects will also get modified. Amelioration is thus probable by gaining a critical awareness as according to Norman Fairclough, "Consciousness is the first step towards emancipation" (2001, p.1).

Method

The researcher made use of data collection tools belonging to both qualitative and quantitative paradigms; however, the research is strongly implanted in qualitative epistemological position that takes into account the significance of placing it inside a specific linguistic, cultural and social context. Besides, it copes with the social construction of the contexts along with the identities that the participants construct inside the language community seriously. The selected sample is

Metaphor and its role in Dehumanization. The quantitative analysis carries the study of frequency of those linguistic features which reflect the cultural and linguistic disparity. Every linguistic feature is studied under certain perspectives in the light of Van Dijk Theory of "US and Them", George Lakoff's Theory of Conceptual Metaphors and Jonathan Charteris-Black's Critical Metaphor Analysis, the researcher will tend to find the metaphors used in dehumanization like, "Axis of evil", "War is Hell", and "Terrorism is an Earthquake."

The data was collected from the most front line political figure, the 43rd President (from 2001 to 2009) of the US, George W. Bush. The researcher has critically analyzed his skillfully selected language used metaphorically and will follow the critical metaphor analysis theory. How language has been used to dehumanize the other.

The data has been obtained from President G. W. Bush's thirteen scripted speeches delivered during the first decade of 21st century. These speeches were delivered at various venues inside the US. Out of the above-mentioned speeches, only six were retrieved from the internet.

Metaphors Used in the War on Terror Discourse

Conflict Metaphors

Metaphors hailing from conflict as their source domain are the conceptualizations used most widely of Bush War on Terror rhetoric in the analyzed discourse. This is understandable, as the War on Terror phrase encompasses not only political, but also military activities designed to prevent or thwart terrorism. From the reasons for the usage of conflict metaphors, the most significant one is that they usually provoke strong emotions and therefore serve a significant role in the process of persuading the public. Emotion counts as one of the essential features to be considered in addition to the use of metaphor in a strategic way (Ferrari, 2007).

The conceptual metaphor, "War on Terror is a Conflict", is the basis for many metaphorical expressions concerning the War on Terror efforts, as these shares a common sequence of activities with the actual violent conflict. According to Charteris-Black (2004), this sequence is following: In the beginning a threat is felt that leads to identifying an enemy; after this, a call to the allies is given for taking action in the shape of a military involvement and an onslaught over the enemy, which is required for subduing the enemy dead or alive, leading to a win, subjugation and then to imposition of some type of penalty.

"In the normal course of events, Presidents come to this chamber to report on the state of the Union. Tonight, no such report is needed. It has already been delivered by the American people. We have seen it in the courage of passengers, who rushed terrorists to save others on the ground -- passengers like an exceptional man named Todd Beamer. And would you please help me to welcome his wife, Lisa Beamer, here tonight. We have seen the state of our Union in the endurance of rescuers, working past exhaustion. We have seen the unfurling of flags, the lighting of candles, and the giving of blood, the saying of prayers -- in English, Hebrew, and Arabic. We have seen the decency of a loving and giving people who have made the grief of strangers their own." (Bush)

"Tonight we are a country awakened to danger and called to defend freedom. Our grief has turned to anger, and anger to resolution. Whether we bring our enemies to justice, or bring justice to our enemies, justice will be done." (Bush)

As Bill Clinton's letter to President-elect Bush in 2001, explained it very accurately here.

"Today you embark on the greatest venture, with the greatest honor, that can come to an American citizen. Like me, you are especially fortunate to lead our country in a time of profound and largely positive change, when old questions, not just about the role of government, but about the very nature of our nation, must be answered anew. You lead a proud, decent, good people. And from this day you are President of all of us. I salute you and wish you success and much happiness. The burdens you now shoulder are great but often exaggerated. The sheer joy of doing what you believe is right is inexpressible."

Many examples from the analyzed discourse provide evidence for the conceptual metaphor, "War on Terror is a Conflict". The concept of "conflict in the metaphors" of George W. Bush and Tony Blair are used both as a disagreement and as an armed conflict. In the following examples, President Bush associates War on Terror as an effort to highlight the conflict between the terrorists and the US and its allies with the use of armed forces.

"Al Qaeda is to terror what the mafia is to crime. But its goal is not making money; its goal is remaking the world -- and imposing its radical beliefs on people everywhere." (Bush)

Another conceptualization within the frame of the conflict metaphor that Bush uses in his War on Terror discourse is the conceptual metaphor like "Ticking Bombs". The source domain of weapon suggests that the enemy can be defeated with the means of the target domain, in this case the positive values, such as peace, hope, or Western values in general:

Bush uses the negatively evaluated portrayal of weapons in his counterterrorism discourse as well. In this conceptualization, the aspect of weapons to cause the negative action rather than to achieve something good is highlighted. This characteristic leads to the conceptual "*faceless cowards*", which is in direct opposition to the previously described conceptual metaphor. In the following examples, Bush emphasizes that it is the negative values, the twisted ideologies of the terrorist groups, which set the world in conflict.

There are some examples of such metaphorical expressions, where the underlying conceptual metaphor can be formulated as "war on terror a struggle for survival" (of the American soldiers as well as the American citizens):

"Nearly 7,000 Americans have made the ultimate sacrifice. And there is no heavier decision than asking our men and women in uniform to risk their lives on our behalf." (Bush)

Morality Metaphors

"I've said in the past that nations are either with us or against us in the war on terror. To be counted on the side of peace, nations must act. Every leader actually committed to peace will end incitement to violence in official media, and publicly denounce homicide bombings. Every nation actually committed to peace will stop the flow of money, equipment and recruits to terrorist groups seeking the destruction of Israel - including Hamas, Islamic Jihad, and Hezbollah. Every nation actually committed to peace must block the shipment of Iranian supplies to these groups, and oppose regimes that promote terror, like Iraq. And Syria must choose the right side in the war on terror by closing terrorist camps and expelling terrorist organizations." (Bush)

“The first is in Iraq itself and you will know, having talked to local people and having been on the streets in Basra, you will know the sheer misery of the tyranny they lived under.” (Blair 07)

A very peculiar and appropriate type of conceptual metaphor that can be found throughout the discourse of President Bush: ‘Morality Metaphor’. This metaphor is based on the premise that a military conflict usually needs to be morally justified, or morally acceptable. As Lakoff (1991) demonstrates in his essay ‘Metaphor and War,’ The system of metaphor utilized for justifying the Gulf war, one feature of conceptualizing morality is seeing it as as an issue of accounting and of maintaining the books of morality balanced. Sabbah (2011) is elaborating this concept: —A wrongdoer, ‘criminal’, or ‘sinner’ must settle the books of morality by giving the taken away thing back, by compensating or by getting punished. Lakoff (1991) calls the most common discourse form for settling moral accounts as “the fairy tale of a just war” and the characters’ cast has the moral and courageous HERO who is defending the “victim¹⁴” attacked or hurt by the evil “villain” (p. 3-4).

“I have a hope for the people of Muslim countries. Your commitments to morality, and learning, and tolerance led to great historical achievements. And those values are alive in the Islamic world today. You have a rich culture, and you share the aspirations of men and women in every culture. Prosperity and freedom and dignity are not just American hopes, or Western hopes. They are universal, human hopes. And even in the violence and turmoil of the Middle East, America believes those hopes have the power to transform lives and nations.” (Bush)

Sabbah (2011) provides a very clear and precise characteristic of the “hero” within the conceptual metaphor “the fairy tale of a just war: hero” is courageous, moral and rational character who upholds freedom and justice close to his heart, is unwilling to negotiate with enemies, and believes it is his responsibility to carry out what is in the best interests of his nation and/ or of the victim too. In the following example, Obama portrays the American nation as the “hero” fitting Sabbah’s description.

“From Europe to Asia, from the far reaches of Africa to war-torn capitals of the Middle East, we stand for freedom, for justice, for dignity.”

The “victim” and the “hero” can be the same person.

In the next few examples, Bush highlights the moral superiority of the American nation, such as inherent goodness, strength, or courage.

“We have seen it in the courage of passengers, who rushed terrorists to save others on the ground -- passengers like an exceptional man named Todd Beamer. And would you please help me to welcome his wife, Lisa Beamer, here tonight.” (Bush)

“On a day when others sought to destroy, we have chosen to build, with a National Day of Service and Remembrance that summons the inherent goodness of the American people.” (Obama)

Sabbah (2011) describes the “victim” as the guiltless character who is residing in the shadow of evil and his ruthless treatment. As it was already mentioned before, the “victim” and the “hero” can be the same person within the concept of “the fairy tale of a just war”. In Bush’s War on Terror discourse, there are two “victims”: the first one is the US, the second ones are other countries

threatened by terrorism, whether the countries in the Middle East or the Western allies of the US. First and foremost, the US is the "victim" in this conceptualization of war on terror. This has been the case since the 9/11 attacks, when the US suffered such major terrorist attack on its own soil, within its own borders.

"Nine-eleven was an enormous trauma to our country. They stand against us, because we stand in their way." (Bush 23)

Journey Metaphors

According to Lackoff, metaphors with journey as their source domain are the ones based on the conceptual metaphor "purposeful social activity is travelling along a path to a destination" (as cited in Charteris-Black, 2004). In other words, in a voyage, any deeds are goal-oriented and these goals may be conceptualized as traveler's destinations (Xue, Mao, & Li, 2013).

Following are several examples of the pursuit metaphorical expressions within the conceptual metaphor "positive values are goals" selected from the various speeches in the discourse:

"After September 11 2001, I told the American people that the road ahead would be difficult and that we would prevail. Well, it has been difficult. And we are prevailing. Our enemies are brutal, but they are no match for the United States of America and they are no match for the men and women of the United States military." (Bush 37)

In Bush's speeches, the purposeful social activity that is proposed in the above mentioned conceptual metaphor is the fight against terrorism. This provides an evidence for the conceptual metaphor "war on terror is a journey", on which is based many of the metaphorical expressions taken from the corpus under analysis. The specific manner in which this conceptual metaphor has been realized, projects the War on Terror strategy as a mission, since a mission is an important assignment that needs to be achieved for political, religious or commercial purposes and typically involves travel, as Obama looks into it in such way:

"But know this: Our coalition is strong, our cause is just, and our mission will succeed." (Obama)

Following this conceptual metaphor, the counterterrorism efforts are conceptualized as a journey with the destination of overcoming the phenomenon of terrorism in the two examples below:

"Today, the core of al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan is on the path to defeat." (Obama)

Another aspect of the journey that was pointed out by Xue, Mao, and Li (2013) is the importance of a map or a guide: if there is no map on the journey, the traveler can get lost easily; therefore a guide who knows a direction to the destination is needed for every journey (p. 680). This aspect is covered by the conceptual metaphor, "the west as a guide. "The west" in this conceptual metaphor stands for the Western (or European) culture. In the discourse of Bush, the Western values and norms are perceived as moral and inherently good, as well as universally applicable for human beings. However, President Bush by no means identifies the cultures of other civilizations as bad or morally insufficient. Quite contrary: he supports the idea that everyone was created equal, with the equal human rights¹⁶. The Western values therefore do not stand in the opposition to the values of other civilizations, but only to the violent and twisted ideologies of the extremist terrorist groups. "The west as a guide" conceptual metaphor in the speeches of Bush entails the US as the moral guide:

“Six months ago I came here to address the graduating class of 2005. I spoke to them about the importance of their service in the first war of the 21st century: the global war on terror.” (Bush)

“Some are eager to stoke the flames of division, and to stand in the way of progress. But if we choose to be bound by the past, we will never move forward. Together, we must work towards a world where we are strengthened by our differences, and not defined by them.” (Bush)

Building Metaphors

“Leaders who want to be included in the peace process must show by their deeds an undivided support for peace. And as we move toward a peaceful solution, Arab states will be expected to build closer ties of diplomacy and commerce with Israel, leading to full normalisation of relations between Israel and the entire Arab world.” (Bush)

The source domain of building is a common one, as the intentions for building and the connotations connected with it are very common in people’s life. As Charteris-Black (2004) explains, building is conceptually related to travelling, as both are activities pertaining to taking progress in the direction of set goals,, the main difference being that the increase in case of building is along the vertical path, while in case of travelling it is along the horizontal path (p. 95). Since achieving goals is perceived as good in western society, both building and travelling metaphors imply a positive evaluation towards the intended goals. The most common conceptual metaphor within the source domain of building – “worthwhile activity is building” – is then created thanks to these positive connotations. In another way, we can say that the conceptual metaphor can catch the conception of a building as the symbol of a productive social struggle (Charteris-Black, 2004). In the metaphors used by Bush, the building is the world without terrorism and the builders are the American people, the US government and military and its allies. According to him the terrorist are the destructive enemies of the world.

“Some of the violence you see in Iraq is being carried out by ruthless killers who are converging on Iraq to fight the advance of peace and freedom. Our military reports that we have killed or captured hundreds of foreign fighters in Iraq who have come from Saudi Arabia, Syria, Iran, Egypt, Sudan, Yemen, Libya and other nations. They are making common cause with criminal elements, Iraqi insurgents and remnants of Saddam Hussein's regime who want to restore the old order. They fight because they know that the survival of their hateful ideology is at stake. They know that as freedom takes root in Iraq, it will inspire millions across the Middle East to claim their liberty as well. And when the Middle East grows in democracy, prosperity and hope, the terrorists will lose their sponsors, lose their recruits and lose their hopes for turning that region into a base for attacks on America and our allies around the world.” (Bush).

According to Charteris-Black (2004), the buildings of metaphors are specific instances of examples of reification. Since the activity of building often is in collocation with the goals of abstract nature like peace and global understanding. This is also true for many of the war on terror metaphors conceptualized through the source domain of building in Bush’s speeches.

The first two metaphors of the previous paragraph are such examples of reification: in the first one, Bush strives for building imaginary bridges that will connect the people of different faiths, in the second one he calls for building a (again imaginary) structure of cooperation between the US and its allies. There are several other examples of reification through this conceptual metaphor. In the first example, the future is seen as a building supported by the pillars, in this case peace. Without the pillars the building would collapse. The world without terrorism, i.e. world living in peace is then the key prerequisite for the existence of the future. The second example is a simple example of reification, where the future is conceptualized as something that could be built.

“This is civilization's fight. This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism, tolerance and freedom.” (Bush)

Even though activities like building as well as destroying can be represented as activities that are creative (Charteris-Black, 2004), Bush opts for portraying building as a positive activity and destroying as its exact opposite, a negative one. In the following example, he identifies the terrorism with the ideas of the negative destruction. The terrorist only destroy the positive (such as values, communities, but also physical buildings) built by someone else, they are able to neither create anything valuable nor make a worthwhile contribution to the society:

To enhance the level of negative evaluation even more, Bush places them in the direct opposition to the inherently positive counterterrorism efforts connected to building.

“For the most powerful weapon in our arsenal is the hope of human beings – the belief that the future belongs to those who would build and not destroy; the confidence that conflicts can end and a new day can begin.” (Bush)

Light and Darkness Metaphors

“The enemy of light”, the source domain of light in this conceptual metaphor is used to express negative meanings. The predisposition of the light metaphors to be evaluated negatively is connected to its polarity with darkness. This is also the case for the metaphors used by Bush: the war on terror efforts are conceptualized as light, while the terrorism and its ideology is conceptualized as darkness. These conceptual metaphors draw their connotations from the physical experience. People cannot see well in the dark which makes them easier targets as well as more vulnerable to harmful forces. On the other hand, it is easier to avoid such dangers in light, as people can see what is happening and be more successful in defending themselves. There are two conceptual metaphors underlying the metaphorical expressions used by Bush: “War on terror is light” and “terrorism is darkness”. We see broader conceptual keys underlying them, “good is light” and “bad is darkness”, two of the concepts that govern our everyday thoughts. Through the conceptual metaphor “war on terror is light” Bush portrays the US as the “SAVIOR” who saves the world from the terrorism with the help of light. He also depicts terrorism and its ideology as something so dark that it cannot exist in the light.

The direct antithesis for the light in this conceptualization of War on Terror is darkness. Since darkness has association with evil, lack of understanding and ignorance, (Charteris-Black, 2004), it is the perfect concept to associate with the undesirable phenomena of terrorism. Within the conceptual metaphor “terrorism is darkness”, terrorism is pictured as a shadow that obstructs the light, a shadow that preys on people’s minds or a darkness that means pure evil.

“And the potential spread of weapons of mass destruction continues to cast a shadow over the pursuit of peace. Many more (Americans) have left a part of themselves on the battlefield, or brought the shadows of battle back home. The

brutality of terrorists in Syria and Iraq forces us to look into the heart of darkness.”
(Bush)

As Charteris-Black (2004) points out, the light and darkness provide prototypical poles for creating a contrast between the moral notions of goodness and evil (p. 102). Bush is aware of this potential of the light metaphors and uses them to create the connotation of the US (and subsequently everyone opposing terrorism) as inherently good and of the terrorists as depraved villains, which could again lead to the simplistic Manichean view of the world.

Findings and Discussion

It transpires among the findings that Metaphor does not merely just embellish thought by providing fanciful expression, but rather it serves as a potent tool in the hands of encoders of speech to present ideas more believably and persuasively through a form and shape intended for creating the desired impact. Dehumanizing metaphors are so powerfully impressionistic that they are frequently accepted without any critical thought as they reach us often through mediums such as media outlets, movies, talk shows, computer games, political cartoons, internet blogs and other sources of information and entertainment, which the majority of people consider neutral, and less motivated/less ideological. With repetitive use in dominant discourse and no critical consideration on the part of the receivers, these metaphors with passage of time they start appearing natural and common sense, as if they were based on reality and truth.

Our day to day conceptual system is structured by a system of metaphor, which includes concepts highly complex and abstract in nature, and which underpins most of our day to day language. The entry of this bulky metaphor system on the scene has caused an imbalance in the earlier existing distinction between the literal and the figurative, because the word 'literal' when employed for defining the conventional distinction, goes laden with all those assumptions of false nature. Influencing opinions through the utilization of metaphors constitutes the major role of research. Cognitive metaphor, also called conceptual metaphor, belongs to cognitive linguistics and is employed for comprehending an idea in terms of another idea or another conceptual domain. For instance quantity can be understood in directionality terms when we say the prices are skyrocketing.

Arousing the emotions and dehumanizing others by using metaphors to influence opinions is the central aim of the research.

Representation found inside discourse cannot be called neutral, for being a practice that is constructed. When ideas and events get filtered through a web of different ideologies, then the transmitted ideas and events can no more be trusted as neutral. Critical discourse analysis, for basically dealing with the manner in which dominance, discrimination and power abuse are realized obstructed and reproduced by talk as well as text, belongs to discourse analytical research. Edward Said (1978) underlines the manner in which the East gets represented by the West. According to him, the Orient too gets reshaped when it passes through the representation process. In his view, many a Western writer, like what Kingslake did in his travel narrative *Eothen* (2020) suffer from portraying distorted pictures of the East in their works in order to cater to their colonizing targets. This study throws a searchlight over this work and treats its 27 pages as data of research. It is done simply to expose how the writer had tainted the image of the East produced by him with his bias. The researchers made use of the ideological square given by Van Dijk (1984), through which forms of positive self and forms of negative other are revealed. The researchers first located such images that were tainted with bias and then identified those rhetorical techniques that had been employed for

materializing them. Upon scrutiny, a great deal of creations based on binary oppositions came to surfaced, which exposed how the East had been distortedly and biasedly described and portrayed.

Van Dijk saw prejudice not only as a feature of an individual's thinking against a particular social group but rather a type of social representation common to the members of a group which they have internalized socialization, and which they have changed and promulgated during mutual interaction and social communication. Such types of shared ethnic attitudes serve different functions for that group, including the safeguard of the interests of that group. These social functions are revealed by the type of cognitive structures in existence and the types of strategies adopted for their use (*Ibid*).

Conclusion

This study found that the influence of language cannot be underestimated; it can both make us and break us, and when used meticulously and calculatedly, it can go a long way in shaping the public perception and opinion in the desired direction, even contrary to the ground realities. The Bush administration used language as a tool to accomplish its dream of becoming the sole global imperialist. Through the effective employment of dehumanizing metaphors, Bush was able to succeed in his agenda of maligning the Muslim world in the perception of US citizens, European allies and non-Muslim states of the world. The non-guilty Muslim world was hidden under the façade of dehumanizing metaphors and was portrayed as a severe threat to the existence of civilization and peace in the world. Metaphor because of its visual presentation of concepts made itself more prone to be manipulated by the dominant powers and enabled them to lie more efficiently. In the War on Terror, the enemy other was dehumanized with repeated negative metaphors such as 'monster', 'insect', 'virus', 'evil' and 'cancer'; thereby, making their killing and extermination appear not only justified but also a moral responsibility of everyone.

If metaphors shape the way we think and act, we shall be cautious with the metaphors we opt to adopt. It is suggested that the modern citizen of the world should be sensitive to the present discourse on War on Terror and should not take it on face value, to avoid being led into the trap. On the other hand, the media and governments would do well to modify it, so as to save the world from further clashes. We cannot stop the succession of fighting by responding to physical violence along with violence of speech or image. We need to examine the metaphors we use and discard those metaphors that push us towards inhuman treatment of the humans.

References

- Bauer, T. (UK 2014). In Ideological Battlegrounds – Construction of Us and Them Before and After 9/11, eds. J. Witkowska and U. Zagratzki: *The Islamization of Islam,* Cambridge Scholars Publishers, 16-33.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). Why “an angel rides in the whirlwind and directs the storm”: a corpus-based comparative study of metaphor in British and American political discourse. In *Advances in Corpus Linguistics* (pp. 133-150). Brill Rodopi.
- Conrad, J. (1889). *Heart of Darkness*. New York: Penguin, 1994
- Corn, D. (2003). *The Lies of George W. Bush; Mastering the Politics of Deception*
- Deignan, A. (2005). *Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Pearson Education. p.1
- Ferrari, F. (2007). Metaphor at work in the analysis of political discourse: investigating a preventive war' persuasion strategy. *Discourse & Society*, 18(5), 603-625.

- Gentner, D., & Kurtz, K. (2006), 'Relations, objects, and the composition of analogies. *Cognitive Science* 30, 609-642
- Gibbs, W. R. Jr. (2009). 'Why Do Some People Dislike Conceptual Metaphor Theory? *Cognitive Semiotics?* 5/1-2 p.14-36
- Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Johnson, Mark. 1981. *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Johnson, M. (1987). *The Body in the Mind: the Bodily Basis of Meaning, Reason and Imagination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kinglake, A. W. (2020). *Eothen*. BoD—Books on Demand.
- Kovecses, Z. (1990). *Emotion Concepts*. Springer-Verlag. A thorough and voluminously documented demonstration that emotion is conceptualized metaphorically.
- Kovecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kovecses, Z. (2013). 'The Metaphor-Metonymy Relationship: Correlation Metaphors are Based on Metonymy. *Metaphor and Symbol* 28:2. 75-88
- Lakoff, G. (1991). *Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used To Justify War in the Gulf*. Distributed via electronic bulletin boards, January, 1991. Reprinted in Brien Hallet (ed.), *Engulfed in War: Just War and the Persian Gulf*, Honolulu: Matsunaga Institute for Peace, 1991. Also in: *Journal of Urban and Cultural Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1991. Also in: *Vietnam Generation Newsletter*, vol. 3, no. 2, November 1991. Also in: *The East Bay Express*, February, 1991. An analysis of the metaphorical system used in the public discourse and expert policy deliberations on the Gulf War, together with what the metaphors hid, and a critique of the war based on this analysis.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. The first book outlining the contemporary theory of metaphor.
- Mansoor, A. (2012). "Post 9/11 Identity Crisis in H. M. Naqvi's Home Boy," *Pakistaniaat: A Journal of Pakistan Studies* 4, no. 2 (2012): 1-36, accessed March 4, 2017, <https://pakistaniaat.org/index.php/pak/article>.
- Meyer, M. (Ed). (1993). *The Bedford Introduction to Literature*. (3rded.). Boston: St. Martin's Press.
- Morgan, G., & Poynting. (2012). *Introduction to Global Islamophobia: Muslims and Moral Panic in the West*, eds. Morgan and S. Poynting (England 2012): Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1-14.
- Pratt, D., & Woodlock, R. (2016). introduction to *Fear of Muslims? International Perspective on Islamophobia*, eds. D. Pratt and R. Woodlock: Springer International Publishing, 1-18.
- Sabbah, F. (2011). Conceptual metaphors of war in news reports covering the 2003 invasion of Iraq by The New York Times and The Daily Star. In *Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching, Lancaster*. Retrieved April (Vol. 5, p. 2015).
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism: Western concepts of the Orient*. New York: Pantheon.
- Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*, (New York): Vintage Books.
- Shakur, T. (2014). "Representation of South Asian Diasporic Muslims in the 21st Century Fictional Films: A commentary on 'Yasmin' and 'Brick Lane'," *SACS, Special Edition* (2014): 72-79, accessed March 4, 2017, www.globalbuiltenvironmentreview.co.uk/2014.pdf.
- Steen, G. (1999) 'Analysing Metaphor in Literature: With Examples from William Wordsworth's "I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud"'. *Poetics Today* 20/3 449-522
- Tendahl, M., & Gibbs, R. W. Jr. (2008). 'Complementary perspectives on metaphor: Cognitive linguistics and relevance theory'. *Journal of Pragmatics*.40, 1823–1864.
- Thornborrow, J., & Wareing, S.(1998). *Patterns in language: An introduction to language and literary style*. London: Routledge.

- Van-Dijk, T. A. (1984). *Prejudice in discourse: An analysis of ethnic prejudice in cognition and conversation*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Witkowska, J., & Zagratzki, U. (Eds.). (2014). *Ideological Battlegrounds—Constructions of Us and Them Before and After 9/11 Volume 1: Perspectives in Literatures and Cultures*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Xue, J., Mao, Z., & Li, N. (2013). Conceptual Metaphor in American Presidential Inaugural Addresses. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 3(4).