

An Investigation of the Effect of the Generic Structures of US Presidential War Narrative on the Usage of Rhetoric

دراسة تأثير الهياكل العامة لرواية الحرب الرئاسية الأمريكية على استخدام البلاغة

Ali Salman Hummadi

(Department of English, College of Arts, University of Anbar, Iraq)

Email: alialanish1977@gmail.com

Seriaznita Binti Mat Said

(Language Academy, FSSH, University Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia)

Email: seriaznita.kl@utm.my

Received : 27-06-2022 Accepted : 17-08-2022 published: 30-09-2022

Abstract: The present study aims at examining how the generic structures of US presidential war narrative affect the type of Aristotle's triad of rhetoric used to realise the communicative functions of these generic structures. As such, eleven American presidential war addresses delivered by six American presidents extending during the period 1986-2018 were chosen as the sample of the study. The results show that the choice of any mode of rhetoric is based on its response to the communicative functions of the generic structures of the presidential war addresses. In previous studies, Aristotle's triad of rhetoric has frequently been examined by scholars in terms of the communicative purpose of the speaker only. This study, however, presents a revised approach to the usage of epideictic, deliberative and forensic types of rhetoric informed by their uses and functions in each generic structure employed to justify American military actions as the communicative purpose.

Keywords: Aristotle's Rhetoric, War Narrative, Generic Structures, Epideictic Rhetoric, Deliberative Rhetoric, Forensic Rhetoric.

الخلاصة

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى دراسة كيفية تأثير الهياكل العامة لرواية الحرب الرئاسية الأمريكية على نوع ثلاث أرسطو من البلاغة المستخدم لإدراك الوظائف التواصلية لهذه الهياكل العامة. على هذا النحو، تم اختيار أحد عشر خطاباً رئاسياً أمريكياً للحرب التي قدمها ستة رؤساء أمريكيون امتدت خلال الفترة 1986-2018 كعينة للدراسة. تظهر

النتائج أن اختيار أي نمط من أشكال الخطاب يعتمد على استجابته للوظائف التواصلية للبنى العامة لخطابات الحرب الرئاسية. في الدراسات السابقة ، كثيرًا ما تم فحص ثلوث أرسطو من البلاغة من قبل العلماء من حيث الغرض الاتصالي للمتحدث فقط. ومع ذلك ، تقدم هذه الدراسة نهجًا منقحًا لاستخدام أنواع البلاغة الوبائية والتداولية والطب الشرعي المستتيرة من خلال استخداماتها ووظائفها في كل بنية عامة تُستخدم لتبرير الأعمال العسكرية الأمريكية كهدف تواصلية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: خطاب أرسطو ، رواية الحرب ، التراكيب العامة ، البلاغة الوبائية ، البلاغة التأملية ، بلاغة الطب الشرعي.

1. Introduction

Sometimes, without a formal declaration of war by the American Congress, the nation's troops are sent to carry out major military actions. In this situation, the use of presidential war narrative becomes necessary and increasingly dominant in presidential discourse to help presidents justify these military actions, legitimise their initiatives, and undermine the possibility of robust opposition (Campbell & Jamieson, 2008; Hart, 1987). Presidential rhetoric is primarily aimed at using words by presidents in times of crisis to form attitudes or to encourage moves into action consistent with the presidents' policies (Knoblauch, 1985). Consequently, Campbell and Jamieson (2008) hold that political processes are 'infused with rhetoric', and through successful application of rhetoric, the president can negotiate and establish his political power. One of the rhetorical arguments used by presidents to craft this type of discourse is the skilful manipulation of Aristotle's modes of rhetoric: epideictic, deliberative and forensic to justify the American military actions as the communicative purpose of this genre in particular.

Besides, Campbell and Jamieson (2008: 224) claim that "the justification [for war] is embodied in a dramatic narrative from which, in turn, an argument is extracted" (Hodges, 2013). In relation, Hodges (2013) points out that each new call to war also creates the presidential war narrative and appropriates it in a way to meet the current needs, "borrowing from the generic framework and remaking it in light of the current situation" (2013: 47-48). As such, Hodges (2013) points out that the generic structure of the text is considered as the main linguistic tool used to make sense of human

happenings. He argues that the generic structure helps “to situate the particulars of narrated events within conventional models ... for interpreting those particulars”. To put it differently, presidents employ a generic precedent to craft a story “by mapping the particulars of the narrated events onto that framework” (Hodges, 2013: 50). Given this, the genre provides “conventional guidelines or schemas” (Bauman, quoted in Hodges, 2013: 50).

Accordingly, this study seeks to examine the influence of US presidential war narrative on rhetorical use with particular focus on Aristotelian triadic typology of rhetoric: forensic, demonstrative and deliberative. In other words, the study investigates how Aristotle’s triad of rhetoric is called for as a response to the needs of audiences and the dramatic events of the presidential war narrative embedded in the generic structures used to justify the American military actions as the communicative purpose of the genre. Presidential war narrative in specific is frequently examined and studied in terms of Aristotle’s modes of rhetoric. These studies have examined these types of rhetoric taking into account the communicative purpose of the rhetor only and their appearances in the text as a whole (Bostdorff, 2014, 2011; Condit, 1985; Hubanks, 2009; Jackson, 2004; Murphy, 2003; Ramos, 2010; Vatnoey, 2015; Watt et al., 2017). Yet, little work, so far, has been done to examine and study epideictic, deliberative and forensic types of rhetoric in terms of their employment and function to achieve the communicative function of each generic structure or element of the text. Accordingly, this study sets out to fill this gap by attempting to describe how Aristotle’s triad of rhetoric has been employed in response to the needs of audiences and the particulars of the war narrative reflected in the generic structures of the text. By audiences, I mean specifically the public at large, including American Congress and audiences and other non-American bodies. Based on the introduction and the problem statement the present study, the following questions are raised:

- 1) What generic structures are used to achieve the communicative purpose of US Presidential War Narrative?
- 2) What type(s) of Aristotle’s rhetoric used in each generic structure? How are they called for as a response to each generic structure? How are they employed to achieve the communicative function of each generic structure of US Presidential War

Narrative?

2. Theoretical Review

In the Rhetoric, Aristotle divides rhetoric into three main categories: (1) epideictic or ceremonial (2) deliberative or political and (3) forensic or judicial. These three divisions of rhetoric are based on three classes of listeners. Listeners as judges who determine what has been articulated as just or unjust when forensic rhetoric is employed. Listeners as members of an assembly who decide on what future events should be taken when deliberative rhetoric is employed. Listeners as observers who decide on the rhetor's skills of praise or blame when epideictic rhetoric is employed (Bostdorff, 2014; Garver, 2009; Rapp, 2009; Robert, 2004). In another sense, Eisenstadt (2014) argues that what audiences need is distinct and, therefore, speakers' strategies employed to satisfy that need are also distinct.

3.1 Epideictic Rhetoric

Condit (1985) suggests that epideictic speeches tend to serve and execute three functions for speakers and audiences—definition/understanding, shaping/sharing of community and display/entertainment. Condit offers these three functional pairs of epideictic rhetoric in terms of how exigencies, or generic structures in our study (Bhatia, 1993), are dealt with by speakers and their audiences. He explains that these three characteristics constitute the most complete or "paradigmatic" epideictic and may be labelled as "communal definition".

The first function of Condit's epideictic rhetoric, defining/understanding, serves leaders in their job of defining and explaining a volatile situation to a community. When a distressing event or a time crisis occurs, epideictic speakers immediately set out to make the issue clear through the lens of an audience's shared values and beliefs (Condit, 1985). Eisenstadt (2014) endorses Condit when he argues that audiences are provided with a sense of comfort when they are guided to interpret a situation in terms of a backdrop saturated by important familiar terminology. What is happening through the

process of epideictic discourse is that speakers tame audiences through their presented explanations, with the speakers having the right to resort to disambiguation of past experience (Condit, 1985; Eisenstadt, 2014). Epideictic speakers then merge the past with the present through applying the meaning of past experience to a present one, “thereby wielding the power of emphasising those values to create paths to the future” (Eisenstadt, 2014: 46). This strategy of aligning a present event through the lens of the past, if successful, provide audiences “a hint at how they might judge what is to come” (Condit, 1985: 288). In his study, Bostdorff (2011) investigated the connection between the epideictic type of discourse and war through analysing George W. Bush’s August 20, 2005 address at the Naval Air Station near San Diego, ostensibly to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Allied victory over Japan. Bostdorff (2011) proved that Bush typically interwove epideictic appeals with collective memories of World War II to promote Iraq war and to shed light on the inextricable intertwining of epideictic rhetoric and war.

Condit’s second functional pair, “shaping/sharing a sense of community,” explains the formation of communities “through traditional, long-standing value systems” (Eisenstadt, 2014: 49). Condit maintains that epideictic rhetoric is particularly important to the sustainability of communities because its main focus is unity and sharing. Similarly, Bostdorff (2011) elucidates that during national crises such as war, making audiences as a unified community sharing a sense of moral identities is especially important to achieve intended ends. Jackson (2004) endorses Condit’s (1985) centrality and importance of the functional pair of sharing and creation of a community to human beings who, in crisis, need to be gathered in a symbolic community. This sense of shaping and sharing community is established and maintained by having audiences hear about the community’s legacy. When a confusing action takes place, such as war, epideictic rhetoric will operate to discover what the event means, and “what the community will come to be in the “face of the new event” (Condit, 1985: 289). Likewise, shaping/sharing a community, for instance, is often used in war times to define not only what the Americans are, but also--through dehumanising and decontextualising enemies --what they are not (Bostdorff, 2011).

In the third functional pair of entertainment and display, rhetors are required to present their eloquence as “a combination of truth, beauty and

power in human speech, and is a unique capacity of humanity” (Condit, 1985: 290). Additionally, Hart (Cited in Bostdorff, 2011) characterises the rapid increase of epideictic rhetoric among contemporary presidents to the increasing need for presidents to demonstrate leadership. For example, during times of tragedy or wars, the desire to demonstrate leadership may be particularly acute (Bostdorff, 2011). In this respect, as inspired by Condit (1985), Jackson (2004) states that although crisis rhetoric, by character, is not used at all for entertaining, rhetors’ mastery and use of eloquence also gives them credibility as powerful leaders. Jackson (2004) considers the audience as the judge of the mastery and beauty of eloquence presented by the speaker. In war crisis, presidents are able to define why an event took place and who we are in the face of what has happened. Presidents could reveal leadership over issues of public morality which is one of the tenets of the entertainment function of epideictic rhetoric. Presidents exhibit leadership through directly benefitting the community in teaching it that “if virtue is a faculty of beneficence, the highest kinds of it must be those which are the most useful to others” (Hauser, 1999: 14).

2.2 Deliberative Rhetoric

According to Aristotle, political speaking aims to motivate audiences either to do or not to do something. One of these two policies or options is always put into practice by private counsellors, as well as by men who deliver their oration to public assemblies (Kennedy, 2007; Robert, 2004). In the same line, Aristotle (Quoted in Hubanks, 2009: 204) writes that “[the deliberative rhetor][...will be concerned] not with all, but [only] those [things] which can both possibly come to pass and [possibly] not... As to what necessarily exists or will exist or is impossible to be or to have come about, on these matters there is no deliberation”. As such, Aristotle equates the role of deliberative audiences in the sense that it must hear an argument and make a decision (Hubanks, 2009).

Within a modern view, Dow (1989) asserts that deliberative rhetoric is fundamentally concerned with revealing or explaining the expediency or the harmfulness of a proposed policy or course of action. Likewise. Deliberative speeches are dedicated to focusing on the future, “presenting arguments for

or against some action based on their potential to do good or cause harm” (Eisenstadt, 2014: 42). Listeners of deliberative discourse either support or refute the speaker’s proposed outcome. Succinctly, speakers deliver deliberative rhetoric to account for a decision-making body, highlighting the expedient and harmful aspects of some future action or inaction, aiming at attracting the listeners’ support or approval (Eisenstadt, 2014). Dow claims that, in crisis times, deliberative oratory aims to recruit public support for the actions already taken, regardless of the audience agreement to the action in specific (Dow, 1989). Deliberative rhetoric has long been used to constitute public responses to national threats and dangers. In the same line, presidential addresses influence how the public sees a complex national threat by demonstrating the expediency of one action over another more harmful action (Glover, 2007). Glover adds that Aristotle’s framework of deliberative rhetoric can be used by scholars to find out how a president highlights particular threats and then he calls for a presidential and public response to rebuff these threats (2007). Ramos' (2010) study of George W. Bush's address to Congress and the nation on September 20, 2001, is an example of Bush's references to deliberative rhetoric techniques.

2.3 Forensic Rhetoric

According to Aristotle, forensic rhetoric is mainly used to either attack or defend someone (Robert, 2004). Jackson (2004) states that it is the speaker’s responsibility to argue that the action taken is either justified or not. Ramos goes further to claim that “whether in a court of law or the political arena, the orator makes arguments in a forum to determine whether past events constitute just or unjust causes” (2010: 19). Jackson (2004) elaborates that convincing Congress and the public of the justification of the undertaken action is the ultimate and major objective of the forensic type of discourse. Eisenstadt (2014) agrees with Aristotle as to consider forensic speeches focusing on the past since both attacks and their respective defences are events that happened in the past. According to these attacks and defences, listeners judge in the light of the justice or injustice of defendants based on the accusations and evidence presented by attackers. Ramos (2010) recalls Jackson’s (2004) analysis of George W. Bush's speech to Congress and the nation on September 20, 2001, as an example of the president’s use forensic

rhetorical techniques. In her study, Jackson describes how Bush talked about bringing the radical Islamic perpetrators to justice.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The current study focused on presidential war discourse in terms of ‘what is said’ and ‘how is said’ represented by the typifications of the generic structures used to justify American military actions and Aristotle’s modes of rhetoric employed to achieve the communicative function of these generic structures. Consequently, this study was positioned to be a document or content analysis study (Ary et al., 2018; Leedy & Ormrod, 2016). Thus, qualitative content analysis as a research design was a logical selection to systematically examine of the content of US presidential war narrative in terms of its generic structures used to justify American wars and types of rhetoric used to realise the communicative functions of these generic structures.

3.2 Data Collection

The data collected for the qualitative content analysis in the present study comprised eleven American presidential war addresses purposefully sampled to achieve the study objectives. The data were selected from different decades through US history to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings’ interpretations. These comprised addresses of wars and military introductions against Islamic and Arab countries and extended during the period 1986-2018. In the eleven war addresses under study, it was the presidents’ announcements of military actions or the introduction armed forces that led to the situations being perceived as war addresses. Thus, once presidents announced that the United States had launched airstrikes or military introduction in response to the enemy’s act of aggression, the importance of the situation was instantly magnified as a war situation. The complete transcripts of the addresses under scrutiny can be found in the online database provided by the American Presidency Project at the University of California at Santa Barbara (Woolley and Peters 2010). Table

1 below shows the presidential war addresses delivered by American presidents during their office terms.

Table 1: American presidential war addresses as the sample of the study

President	Title of Address	Year	No. of Words
Ronald Reagan	Speech to the Nation on Air Strikes Against Libya	1986	1000
George W. H. Bush	Address on Iraq's invasion of Kuwait	1990	1416
Bill Clinton	Address to the nation on the invasion of Iraq	1991	1454
George W. Bush	President Clinton explains Iraq strike	1998	2053
George W. Bush	Bush Announces Strikes Against Taliban	2001	969
Barak Obama	Address to the Nation on Iraq	2003	1768
	Address on the Start of the Iraq War	2003	581
	Address on Military Operations in Iraq	2007	2928
Barak Obama	Speech on Syria	2013	2216
Donald Trump	Trump's Address on Afghanistan, Plans For US Engagement	2017	2937
	Full transcript of Trump's address on Syria airstrikes	2018	866

To ensure the reliability of the process of coding, the researcher asked two raters to code the full set of texts to confirm that there is a clear understanding of the definitions of the generic structures and their modes of rhetoric and how they are realised in texts (Ary et al. 2018; Creswell 2009; Flick 2018).

3.3 Data Analysis

This study adopted a qualitative content analysis to identify the generic structures of US presidential war narrative and their influence on rhetorical use with particular focus on Aristotle's modes of rhetoric: epideictic, deliberative and forensic. Data analysis started with reading and studying the corpus (body) of texts repeatedly to prepare it for analysis. Data analysis also requested the researcher to develop an understanding of the context of the texts in question and an analysis of the previous political knowledge and perception the researcher brings to the new setting as well. Based on the

semantic units of the text (Bhatia, 1993; Swales, 1990), the researcher determined the generic structure as the basic unit of analysis with an in-depth analysis and interpretation of how each generic structure influences the type of rhetoric used to realise its communicative function. After that, data were read line by line to extract the initial generic structures by highlighting as far as possible the boundaries that appear to establish these structures. Using the computerised program Nvivo 12, the researcher continued reading and systematically coding the corpus of each text until labels of the generic structures finally emerge as reflective of semantic units of the texts (Bhatia, 1993; Swales, 1990). After that, an analysis of Aristotle's triad of rhetoric has been carried out in terms of the emergent generic structures of US presidential war narrative.

As for the nexus between genre analysis and rhetoric, they display a set of commonalities in that both take into account the purpose, audience, stance, and design of the given rhetorical situation. The rhetorical analysis investigates not only what everything means in the content, but also why the author writes it the way it is, who the author is (discourse community), how content is organised (structure), and what communicative purpose intended beyond this content, style and structure (Browning, 2018). All these are strengths shared by genre analysis. Although generic structure analysis and Aristotle's modes of rhetoric display differences in analytical focus, their theoretical orientations complement each other in various ways. All of the generic structure analysis and rhetorical analysis are aimed to focus on "the relationship between human action, situational context, and underlying values" (Ilie, 2018: 92). Bringing these disciplines into one eclectic analytical framework has the potential of providing a multi-aspects rich explanation and interpretation for the complex phenomenon in question. Ilie (2018) evaluates the multi-disciplines theoretical framework as having the potential to account "for the complex and many-sided aspects of context-specific language use" (Ilie, 2018: 92). Ilie narrows down his argument to the potential of applying such an analytical framework to political discourse genre which significantly requires processes of deliberation and rhetorical argumentation, that is rooted in the notion of discussing issues from different angles (Ilie, 2018: 92).

4. Analysis and Discussion

The major focus of the present study was to describe the different functions performed by instances of Aristotle's types of rhetoric in response to the different generic structures of the texts that are created by the circumstantial events, the needs of the audience and the communicative purpose of the genre. As a result, this study, set out, to identify the generic structures constituting the texture of each address as a first step of the analysis to, then, identify which type Aristotle's mode of rhetoric has been used and how it operates to realise the rhetorical function of each generic structure. As a result of a close-reading and careful study of the selected American presidential war addresses, the study arrived at a set of particulars of narrated events situated in generic structures or stages utilised by presidents to justify American military actions. Despite the variation in the generic structures extracted, they have taken the predictable sequential order shown in table 2 below:

Table 2: The generic elements of the presidential war narrative

<p>Generic Element 1. The Enemy's Act of Aggression breaking the world normalcy and creating a violent situation.</p> <p>Generic Element 2. Self-defensive Nature/Mission of Military Action.</p> <p>Generic Element 3. Communicating the Enemy's Atrociousness and Savagery</p> <p>Generic Element 4: War as a Last Resort after Aborting Diplomatic Solutions by Enemy</p> <p>Generic Element 5: Objectives and Real Intentions of Military Action</p> <p>Generic Element 6: Consequences of Failing to Respond Militarily (Inaction)</p>

The following sub-sections explained and discussed in detail the analysis of how different modes of Aristotle's rhetoric responded to the different generic structures. Each instance of Aristotle's type of rhetoric situated in its generic structure or exigence was elaborated with some concrete examples extracted from the sample of the study.

1. Epideictic type of rhetoric realizing generic structure 1

The function of the first generic structure was to divide the world into one that is canonical before the date of the enemy's aggression and one that is violent after the aggression. Consequently, presidents, within this specific generic structure, needed to recount the new world after aggression that

would justify their legitimacy to what military action or introduction taken. The creation of the newly imagined world occurred so early immediately after the presidents announced the military action or introduction at the start of each address. After this announcement, presidents soon provided a series of propositions leading to the understanding of a conclusion that the president and his administration were justified in undertaking the military attack – a conclusion also verified by Dow (1985) in his analysis of Reagans' (1983) speech on the events in Lebanon and Grenada. To define and realise this rhetorical act of epideictic argument, presidents linked old acts of aggression with the new one to create the unprecedented present (Murphy, 2003). Those propositions created by presidents in this generic element affirmed in content that a violation of the normalcy of the world had taken place and that the world was born with a new form. Presidents also enacted the belief that the newborn world had appeared from “the cocoon of the old, exploiting the fact that epideictic is a rhetoric of transformation” (Murphy, 2003: 614).

In his televised presidential speech, of April 14, 1986, Reagan recognised the needs of the audience to understand the event of waging war against Libya and its reasons. Consequently, he set out to evocatively recount past events of April, 5 solemnly describing the number of people killed and wounded due to the terrorist bomb in a nightclub in West Berlin. By Reagan's reference to time (now) when remarking that “Evidence Is Now Conclusive”, he placed himself and his audiences in the present (the temporal marker of epideictic speech), and thus, as disclosed by Hubanks (2009), in a position to reflect on the past while projecting the course to the future simultaneously.

- (1) On April 5 in West Berlin a terrorist bomb exploded in a nightclub frequented by American servicemen. Sgt. Kenneth Ford and a young Turkish woman were killed and 230 others were wounded, among them some 50 American military personnel. Evidence Is Now Conclusive (Reagan, April 14, 1986).

Embedded in the final part of the excerpt (1) above was quintessential epideictic rhetoric when Reagan utilised eulogistic themes of suffering loss and missing the dead to define and make communal the nation's distress.

This result has also been supported by Hubanks (2009: 215) who stated that George W. Bush, in his speech of September 14th, 2001, utilised “eulogistic themes (suffering loss, feeling sorrow, missing the dead) to define and express the nation’s collective anguish”. As in the case of eulogy whereby the community has suffered a loss, and its major need was to define the situation and assign meaning to that event, war situations established similar needs especially those in which Americans were shot dead. As praise and blame are main strategies used in eulogies, praise and blame, as tenets of epideictic rhetoric, have been successfully used by presidents. They were aimed to define the situation further and removing confusion especially when Reagan blamed the enemy of committing a horrific action through bombing a nightclub frequented by American servicemen. Thus, through narrating past events to comment on current things and through blaming the enemy’s act of killing and eulogising the innocent people, presidents shaped the audiences’ understanding of an explicable event taking explanation of the event and comforting of the audiences as the main goal of the orator (Hubanks, 2009).

The same applies to all the presidential addresses under examination. In a speech given on August 8, 1990, after ordering 82nd Airborne Division as well as key units of the United States’ air force to take up defensive positions in Saudi Arabia, George W. H. Bush felt the need to define the meaning of this military introduction, and audiences felt the need to understand this horrific event as well (Dow, 1989). As a result, Bush began his speech by defining the situation to notify the audience of the events that forcefully motivated the United States’ recourse to war. At the start of the first generic structure, Bush described the events that have taken place over the preceding week during which Iraqi armed forces, without provocation or warning, invaded a member of the Arab League and a member of the United Nations, Kuwait.

- (2) Less than a week ago, in the early morning hours of August 2d, Iraqi Armed Forces, without provocation or warning, invaded a peaceful Kuwait. Facing negligible resistance from its much smaller neighbor, Iraq's tanks stormed in blitzkrieg fashion through Kuwait in a few short hours. With more than 100,000 troops, along with tanks, artillery, and surface-to-surface missiles, Iraq now occupies Kuwait. This aggression came just hours after Saddam Hussein specifically assured numerous

countries in the area that there would be no invasion (Bush, January 16, 1991).

In the excerpt above, epideictic rhetoric, through the utilisation of past events, has succeeded in aligning the current event of war declaration against Iraq. Early in the speech, Bush recalled a tragic incident when Iraqi Armed forces invaded its neighbour Kuwait. This strategy of recounting tragic incidents undertaken by the enemy immediately after declaring war was also evidenced in Dow (1989), Glover (2007), Hubanks (2009) and Jackson (2004). By linking current events with past ones of the perceived irrational behaviour of the enemy, Bush was able to place the military action against Iraq within the epideictic pattern and made it understandable for the audiences. Citizens were in need to understand what has happened and who they are in light of a communal rupture (Dow, 1989; Hubanks, 2009; Murphy, 2003). The epideictic speech addressed such concerns. The rhetorical function of these strategies was to establish a communal meaning for the event to have the audiences understand and get familiar with it and to guide the response of the nation's members.

To realise the communicative function of this generic structure, epideictic type of rhetoric has dominantly prevailed it to reimagine the meaning of injustice of the enemy's attack and the justice of the United States' response in the light of the values system of humanity and the world peace and order. In brief, all the strategies of epideictic rhetoric used in our study to define and realise the communicative goal of generic structure 1 such as creating a new world after aggression, linking old events with the new one, defining things to understand them well, sharing the communal beliefs, and utilising eulogistic themes are also revealed in previous studies (Bostdorff, 2011; Dow, 1985; Glover, 2007; Hubanks, 2009; Jackson, 2004; Murphy, 2003). In these previous studies, their focus was not on the enemy's act of aggression as a stage or a generic element in the speech, but on the epideictic type of argument as a strategy of demonstrating and realising the rhetor's aims.

2. Deliberative type of rhetoric realizing generic structure 2

After using the epideictic type of rhetoric to define and realise the function

of the first generic element, the second generic element has been prevailed by a deliberative type of oration. Indeed, the presidents' frequent use of the fear and threat rhetoric can be regarded to constitute an implicit reference to the deliberative argument made to the American people. Many examples of the hegemony of the discourse of the emerging threats and dangers existed in the presidential war narrative as a way to validate and legitimise the American attacks against enemies as self-defence missions. Because these types of discourse appealed to a national sense of grief and desire for punishing the enemy, they implicitly denoted a specific policy that there should be a pre-emptive step to stop the enemy's threat and that punishment must be sought (Dunmire, 2007). By providing these propositions, presidents previewed policies for the union's betterment and suggested expediency arguments to gain the public support for the taken military actions. To justify the function of the self-defence strategy, presidents manipulated a politics of fear to establish for "a right-wing agenda that included the Patriot Act, massive changes in our legal system, a dramatic expansion of the US military, and U.S.-led military intervention" in any area (Hubanks, 2009: 205). To put into practice the politics of fear, most presidents, in their war narrative, constructed the discourse of an "evil Other, a loosely defined yet easily identifiable enemy against whom Americans could unite and in the interest of defeating would accept open war" (Hubanks, 2009: 205). Instead of discussing that the policy presented is the most expedient plan to take, however, Clinton, in his televised address on Iraq strike on December 16, 1998, argued that the policy presented was the most expedient plan to have taken. This conclusion was also demonstrated and reported by Dow, who stated that "because it was clear that his actions could only be revealed after they had occurred, public demonstration of such deliberation necessarily came after-the-fact. Nonetheless, a national address discussing such actions must highlight the deliberative characteristics of the process, to reassure a democratic society that has negative memories of secret wars" (Dow, 1989: 302).

The change of the United States' policy from declared to undeclared responses also emphasised the vitality of deliberative strategies to these situations. The development of nuclear arms, poison gas or biological weapons has made the state of declaring warfare virtually unthinkable. Thus,

presidents have expanded their authority to wage undeclared wars in the name of defeating universal terrorism. Without a congressional declaration of war, however, the United States would have a mandatory response from the public towards the present crisis (Dow, 1989). Thus, one purpose of deliberative war rhetoric was to gain the informal approval of the congress and public for presidential action that has already been taken. In the following excerpt, Clinton justified the military action conducted by America against Iraq as expedient in terms of preventing Saddam Hussein from using chemical weapons in threatening his neighbours or the world. Clinton went further to exaggerate the suitability of his military strikes through showing Saddam's plan of using chemical weapons again (normal behaviour of Saddam) if his aggressive policy is left without repulse, a finding that was also reported in Dow's (1989) study.

- (3) Saddam Hussein must not be allowed to threaten his neighbors or the world with nuclear arms, poison gas or biological weapons.
- (4) The international community had little doubt then, and I have no doubt today, that left unchecked, Saddam Hussein will use these terrible weapons again.

This situation presents a clear and present danger to the stability of the Persian Gulf and the safety of people everywhere (Clinton, December 16, 1998).

To gain the congress and public support for taken military actions and to mitigate the opposition voices, Clinton and other presidents used this exigence to structure the second generic structure of their presidential war narrative in a clear deliberative argument to assure that their course was expedient, wise and reasonable. The strategies that have been clearly employed by American presidents to define the discourse of self-defence and to justify their undeclared wars was to rely on evidence and past experience that was directly related to the situation being discussed rather than the values underlying the situation in question. This result was also shared by Dow (1989: 304) who argued that Reagan, in his use of arguments, "offered specific evidence establishing that the action was rational and expedient". The following excerpts taken from George W. H. Bush's address on Iraq's invasion of Kuwait on August 8, 1990 and Reagan's 1986 address explained

the reliance of presidents on past experience and evidence to justify the self-defence mission.

- (5) But we must recognise that Iraq may not stop using force to advance its ambitions. Iraq has massed an enormous war machine on the Saudi border capable of initiating hostilities with little or no additional preparation. Given the Iraqi government's history of aggression against its own citizens as well as its neighbors, to assume Iraq will not attack again would be unwise and unrealistic (Bush, August 8, 1990).
- (6) The evidence is now conclusive that the terrorist bombing of La Belle discotheque was planned and executed under the direct orders of the Libyan regime (Reagan, April 15, 1986).

By denoting that Iraq has massed its armed forces near the Saudi borders with its history of offence against its citizens as well as its neighbours, Bush relied on evidence to justify the policy taken and to gain more support from public opinion.

Similarly, Trump, in his address, did the most favourable deliberative account when he recollected memories of World war I and appropriated them to muster support for the conducted airstrikes against targets associated with the chemical weapons capabilities of the Syrian government. He invoked lessons of the past to reinforce a shared identity and to instil both obligation and confidence of the advocated policy. The trend of recourse to past historical memories was also evidenced by Noon (2004). Noon argued that "historical analogies offer cognitive frameworks through which we might evaluate new information and experience, but they also trigger emotional, even subconscious associations that are equally capable of inspiring, attracting, and recruiting support for a particular political decision" (2004: 340). Noon also added that the three types of rhetoric vitally invoke historical analogies, but, given the second generic structure, they were adapted to meet the needs of the deliberative type of argument. By adopting this rhetorical act, audiences became in the status of mandatory acceptance of Trump's policy to avoid being anguished, held or killed by the development or use of chemical weapons.

- (7) In the last century, we looked straight into the darkest places of the human soul. We saw the anguish that can be unleashed and the evil that

can take hold. By the end of World War I, more than one million people had been killed or injured by chemical weapons. We never want to see that ghastly spectre return (Trump, April 13, 2018).

In explaining this fear-based rhetoric whereby the doers of elusive evil had the desire and the tool to inflict harm upon the United States and the world at any moment, the argumentative deliberative nature of the presidents' war discourse has been exposed. Compared with previous studies, this finding was consistent with that of Hubanks (2009) who argued that presidential war narrative has consistently been the venue through which American presidents echoed fear arguments to have the nation and audiences look anxiously to the government to put a policy for protection and defence. Other studies that have demonstrated this result were Glover (2007) and Dow (1989). On the contrary, Murphy (2003) concluded the complete absence of the deliberative argument from George W. Bush's post 9/11 speeches as he thought that Bush's speeches did not offer policy and expediency arguments for the nation's common good. Hubanks (2009: 205) critiqued Murphy's work stating that "to focus on only the epideictic aspects of Bush's rhetoric—and surely they exist – is to overlook other equally important aspects: those instances where implicit arguments are sharply articulated through the use of manipulative, fear-based rhetoric". Thus, legitimised by presidential addresses and established to resonate in the public mind, the fear appeals used by presidents have warned American people of the threats and dangers they may face.

3. Forensic means to a deliberative end in generic structure 3

Dow (1989) argued that it is not possible to characterise any crisis rhetoric such as war rhetoric as being a homogeneous type of discourse. The different situations involved in presidential war narrative require different discursive responses. Such a type of discourse needs to be investigated in terms of the multiple exigencies it responds to and the different functions it accomplishes. Communicating the enemy's atrocities and cruelty was the third generic structure used to contribute to the communicative purpose of justifying the military action conducted by the United States. As it was one of the generic structures that were repeatedly used by presidents in war

times, presidents made use of the most favourable of forensic rhetoric to define this structure and make it achieve its rhetorical role in view of the communicative purpose of the genre under scrutiny. This type of rhetoric is concerned with the past and “that past could be crimes committed, charges unjustly brought, or behaviour that needs public reckoning” (Golden, Berquist, and Coleman, Cited in Ramos, 2010: 20). In an implicit argument to gain the public support, presidents also recounted the enemy’s acts of atrociousness. Recounting these atrocities aimed at urging audiences to make a judgment on the justice of the defending nation based on the atrocities of the attackers and persuading Americans and the public that those who committed evil crimes were required to be persecuted and brought to justice. Both the explicit employment of a forensic type of rhetoric used to accuse the enemy of its voluntary criminal act and the implicit arguments of deliberative discourse used to gather the support of the public to justify the American response are made clear in the following excerpt.

(8) He (Saddam) has used them. Not once, but repeatedly. Unleashing chemical weapons against Iranian troops during a decade-long war. Not only against soldiers, but civilians, firing Scud missiles at the citizens of Israel, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain and Iran. And not only against a foreign enemy, but even against his people, gassing Kurdish civilians in Northern Iraq (Clinton, December 16, 1998).

Clinton accused Saddam of committing evil crimes in using chemical weapons against Iranian soldiers and civilians, firing other deadly missiles at the citizens of Israel, Saudi Arabia and Bahrain, and even using biological weapons against his people. Clinton, not only foregrounded these acts as crimes conducted against humanity but also attracted the audience’s attention to an important fact that these crimes were part of the enemy’s nature and understanding. By crafting this generic structure in such a way, presidents, in general, were condemning individuals and their criminal acts and, simultaneously, mandating audiences to justify bringing justice to criminals, or at least, gaining their support. Jackson (2004) also pointed out that George W. Bush used forensic argument in his speech to Congress and the nation on September 20, 2001, when he referred to bring the radical Islamic terrorists into justice. Thus, by making the case against the radical Islamic terrorists, Bush was also able to influence the American people and

convinced them that those terrorists were required to be brought into justice which was considered a just cause for an undertaken or future course of Action. By this analysis, Jackson (2004) neglected the deliberative effect intended from utilising forensic tools of argument. Since this generic structure was established as a just cause to justify the undertaken military action as being the deliberative effect intended, this study considered the forensic argument as a form required to achieve an effect (Hubanks, 2009).

Each one of the generic structures of a text constituted a part of the text and fulfilled a specific communicative function serving the general communicative purpose of the whole genre (Bhatia, 1993; Swales, 1990). As a result, presidents can be said to make a strong relationship between forensic argument and deliberative argument. In other words, the role of forensic argument in criminalising the enemy and in recruiting the public support to the undertaken military action was emphasised in this generic structure. Thus, utilising forensic argument to define and realise a given generic structure does not necessarily preclude a text from demonstrating a deliberative effect. This phenomenon of the potential of genres to co-exist congruently within a discourse (generic simultaneity) was a result also demonstrated by Dow (1989), Eisenstadt (2014) , Hubanks (2009) and Vatnoey (2015).

4. Forensic means to a deliberative end realizing generic structure 4

Hubanks (2009) argues that one of the remarkable things in crisis rhetoric is the co-existence of epideictic, deliberative and forensic within a given discourse. Although the forensic type of discourse is oriented to attack or defend the past actions of some party using accusation and defence, it also has the potential, by extension and implication, to show the expediency of a policy for the sake of gathering support for undertaken policies and decisions. This notion was endorsed by Hubanks (2009) as well in investigating George H. W. Bush's post- 9/11 speech where he emphasised that the recurrent use of appeals of fear and terror can be viewed as a discourse of both blame speech and implicit argument towards the deliberative end.

As far as the generic structure of a last resort to military action after enemy's abortion of diplomatic solutions is concerned, its title suggested that the United States has already conducted the military intervention as a result of exhausting all the diplomatic efforts to avoid war and restore peace and freedom of the world. The presidential narrative employed by presidential purposes aimed, in this specific generic structure, at criminalising the enemy through the appropriate use of the topic of the injustice of the enemy's past behaviours and at gaining, in argument by implication, the public support of the nation to justify the military action undertaken. In an excerpt from his address on 1998, December 16, Clinton has enumerated the diplomatic activities of the United States, the United Nation, and several other countries to restore peace and order to the Middle East. Clinton affirmed that so many Arab countries have also attempted to have Saddam come into compliance leaving no other option just to prepare for war and later wage it. Accusing the enemy of deliberately aborting all the diplomatic alternatives and choices was the focus of the forensic discourse used to realise this generic structure, as this is clear in the excerpt below.

- (9) The United States has patiently worked to preserve UNSCOM as Iraq has sought to avoid its obligation to cooperate with the inspectors. On occasion, we've had to threaten military force, and Saddam has backed down (Clinton, December 16, 1998).
- (10) Faced with Saddam's latest act of defiance in late October, we built intensive diplomatic pressure on Iraq backed by overwhelming military force in the region. The UN Security Council voted 15 to zero to condemn Saddam's actions and to demand that he immediately come into compliance (Clinton, December 16, 1998).

Thus, the presidents' credibility has been evaluated by the nation through the interaction of the forensic and deliberative types of rhetoric to justify the present. Forensic rhetoric has been translated in the text as the presidents' tendency to accuse the past that is represented by the behaviour of the enemy in aborting diplomatic solutions. In contrast, deliberative rhetoric as speculating about the future was represented by the goodness of the actions taken.

The overlap of the forensic type of rhetoric and its deliberative end has been used in terms of the honourable action that the United States has

adopted as the defender of the real values of the world and for demonstrating that accepting the undertaken course of action will bring good and keep these values safe (Bostdorff, 2011). Thus, enemies were explicitly accused and framed as doing past criminal actions through forensic rhetoric. In contrast, the expediency of America's choices of using military force to defeat enemies was implicitly argued through a deliberative type of rhetoric. Presidents, as argued in Dunmire's (2011) study, highlighted the forensic themes used by recounting the past actions and efforts exerted by US and other nations to avoid war and restore peace and by the enemy's attempts to abort these efforts. Like Jackson (2004), Dunmire also foregrounded the use of the forensic argument to criminalise the past actions of the enemy neglecting its intended deliberative role of stirring the audiences' emotions and gaining their support for the military decision taken. On the contrary to our study, other previous related studies of presidential crisis rhetoric (Bostdorff, 2011; Dow, 1985; Jackson, 2004; Hubanks, 2009) have concluded that all discourses employed a combination of two types of rhetoric (epideictic and deliberative) and excluded the third type (forensic). Murphy's (2003) study of Bush-9/11 rhetoric was purely epideictic as, in his view, it aimed at the themes of American unity and was not projected to convince the nation of the suitability of the decision taken.

5. Deliberative type of rhetoric realizing generic structure 5

The principle of 'right intention' is central in guiding just war theory. This principle asserts that a war is just only if the state resorts to it for the right objectives and real intentions (Purves & Jenkins, 2016). To make the argument of the right objectives and intentions of the military intervention appealing to audiences and to urge them to accept and support the decision taken in this specific exigence, presidents resorted to deliberative types of rhetoric. In this specific generic structure, deliberative type of rhetoric has taken the form of the presidents' articulation of the intended goals of the future expediencies of the present and future action, seeking support or approval by a majority of the nation. By enumerating the principles and objectives that guide the presidents' undertaken policy, presidents aimed at offering the expediency of the proposed course of action on the basis that it will do good. Thus, through evoking a broad sense of public expediency in

one course of action, presidents were able then to capitalise opinion and attract particular public support. In a speech delivered by George W. H. Bush on 8 August 1990, the president attempted to show the expediency of the undertaken decision of the American armed forces introduction through listing its four objectives, as it is clear in the excerpt below.

- (11) Four simple principles guide our policy. First, we seek the immediate, unconditional, and complete withdrawal of all Iraqi forces from Kuwait. Second, Kuwait's legitimate government must be restored to replace the puppet regime. And third, my administration, as has been the case with every President from President Roosevelt to President Reagan, is committed to the security and stability of the Persian Gulf. And fourth, I am determined to protect the lives of American citizens abroad (Bush, August 8, 1990).

The president overwhelmingly observed the deliberative account and established the expediency of the proposed course of action. This expediency denoted Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait, restoring the Iraqi puppet regime with the legitimate government of Kuwait, and providing evidence recollected from history that Bush's administration adheres to the stability of the Persian Gulf region. Consequently, this type of argument was a fundamental component of deliberative argument whereby audiences were forced to express their positions as advocates and opponents of a proposed policy (Hubanks, 2009). In contrast to Dow's (1989) view of deliberative argument in war narrative as functioning to gain the audiences' public support for taken actions, a function of Aristotle's deliberative rhetoric is to speak of actions occurring in future as a result of present proposed policy, as shown in the following excerpt.

- (12) Our objectives are clear: Saddam Hussein's forces will leave Kuwait. The legitimate government of Kuwait will be restored to its rightful place, and Kuwait will once again be free. Iraq will eventually comply with all relevant United Nations resolutions, and then, when peace is restored, it is our hope that Iraq will live as a peaceful and cooperative member of the family of nations, thus enhancing the security and stability of the Gulf (Bush, January 16, 1991).

Deliberative rhetoric was also used to speak of actions occurring in future as a result of a policy or decision already taken as shown in the following

excerpt taken from Obama's speech in his attempt to obtain the approval of the United States' congress to strike target in Syria.

- (13) The purpose of this strike would be to deter Assad from using chemical weapons, to degrade his regime's ability to use them, and to make clear to the world that we will not tolerate their use (Obama, September 10, 2013).

In this excerpt and other similar ones delivered by presidents under the generic structure of the real intention of the military action taken, presidents differentiated between dictators or enemies and the innocent people ruled under them. Thus, befriending the people of countries on which the United States was waging war pushed audiences to accept the expediency of the military action taken. This was consistent with what has been found in Dow (1989) when he argued that the first ten sentences of Reagan's address on Libya in 1986 established the deliberative case for the action through providing specific evidence that the military action taken was rational and desirable. The rationality and expediency of the action taken came up when Reagan announced in his speech that it was Qadhafi and his regime that was attacked and not Libyan people. Qadhafi was warned that his aggressive and terrorist attacks will bring retaliation and that Qadhafi's latest act was one in a series of similar acts in his previous history.

In another excerpt taken from Obama's speech to obtain the sanction of the American congress to strike targets of chemical weapons in Syria, Obama highlighted the deliberative power of the rhetoric. Obama drew on collective memories of American wars as a means of intensifying the moral righteousness of the deliberative policy presented to congress (Bostdorff & Goldzwig, 2005). Thus, in stating that,

- (14) I will not put American boots on the ground in Syria. I will not pursue an open-ended action like Iraq or Afghanistan. I will not pursue a prolonged air campaign like Libya or Kosovo. This would be a targeted strike to achieve a clear objective: deterring the use of chemical weapons, and degrading Assad's capabilities (Obama, September 10, 2013).

Obama was establishing the expediency of the policy proposed to

Congress combined with surveying hard past memories of secret wars undertaken by the United States without a formal declaration by Congress. This is completely similar to Bostdorff & Goldzwig's (2005) argument that

All human beings draw upon their understanding of the past in order to make decisions about the future, and political leaders are no different. Not only do political leaders use their conceptions of history to guide their policy making, but they also employ the past in their messages in order to convince citizens to support particular policies and/or to create a value climate in which citizens are likely to do so.

Deliberative rhetoric in general presented potential advantages to presidents either to gain support for taken actions or to show the desirable benefits of the proposed course of action through showing audiences evidence that the results will be positive or negative. But the combination of deliberative rhetoric with recollecting bad negative memories of American secret wars was an appealing potent brew. By this rhetorical act, Obama was successful in reassuring a democratic society labelled by rationality and wisdom in making decisions, as this is clear in Obama's excerpt below.

(15) So even though I possess the authority to order military strikes, I believed it was right, in the absence of a direct or imminent threat to our security, to take this debate to Congress. I believe our democracy is stronger when the President acts with the support of Congress. And I believe that America acts more effectively abroad when we stand together (Obama, September 10, 2013).

When comparing our result of using collective memories to those of older studies, it must be pointed out that the sources of memoria or shared recollection of the past was a strategy widely used by epideictic rhetors. Presidents used this specific strategy to "enhance their image, as in the case of Clinton and the anniversary of the March on Washington" or "to alter the audience's understanding of the past, as Reagan did when he appropriated Martin Luther King, Jr.'s memory and cast him as an opponent of affirmative action" (Bostdorff, 2011: 300). Bostdorff (2011) then asserted that underlying these kinds of purposes was "the epideictic invocation of collective memory for political ends" which was consistent with the finding of our study in using collective memories for deliberative effect. Bostdorff

also supports the view of our study when he argues that

In the years that followed as Bush led the nation in the war on terror and then the war in Iraq he continued to demonstrate ... collective memories of World War II as a way to reap the potential strategic advantages of all epideictic rhetoric: to enhance his presidential image; to deflect public criticism; to support his deliberative arguments for the war in Iraq.

6. Deliberative type of rhetoric realizing generic element 6

The communicative function of this generic structure was established to show that the very existence of the world or the United States was under threat of enemies if a decision of military action has been opposed. As a result, deliberative rhetoric has been dominantly used to garner the public support to ensure a future of peace and order which is contrasted with a future of threat and danger if the United States fails to act. In view of this threat, international law allows states at a threat to take all the necessary precautions and measures for the sake of their survival “including preemptive war, the suspension of constitutional rights, preventive detention, or any other extraordinary measure” (Jackson, 2005: 99). According to the appeals of fear and threat invoked by the speaker, deliberative type of rhetoric will automatically capitalise audiences urging them unconsciously to accept the expediency of the action undertaken. Furthermore, as the deliberative type of rhetoric is concerned with the future, this generic structure has been defined through establishing the future expediency of the taken military action and the future harmfulness of not moving to act militarily. This generic structure has been deliberately framed to have audiences imagine the fearful and disastrous hypothetical consequences that will be done hereafter if the present military action has not occurred. In a speech delivered on December 16, 1998, Clinton was comparing two types of future that audiences would face.

(18) Heavy as they are, the costs of action must be weighed against the price of inaction. If Saddam defies the world and we fail to respond, we will face a far greater threat in the future. Saddam will strike again at his

neighbors. He will make war on his own people (Clinton, December 16, 1998).

- (19) Because we're acting today, it is less likely that we will face these dangers in the future (Clinton, December 16, 1998).

Thus, the expediency of the taken course of action was foregrounded through the use of deliberative rhetoric and its tenet of the thematic arguments of good and harm in an attempt to garner the audiences' support and to mitigate the war opposition voices. Consequently, by simply enumerating this barrage of threats that the United States and world may face in case of inaction, presidents implicitly reinforced deliberative arguments for action. In this way, praising the step of the action undertaken can be seen to function as the right policy taken, while the succeeding blame statements directed to the enemy and its constructed threats and dangers function as expediency arguments supportive of that undertaken policy. Foregrounding the deliberative character of the speech through reinforcing the disastrous consequences of inaction was a conclusion also supported by Dow (1989: 305) when he referred to Reagan's speech on Libya in 1986 as "refuting the counter-argument that Qadhafi should be ignored rather than dignified through retaliation". Dow went further to emphasise the deliberative argument of the consequences of inaction when Reagan decided the time of military response and highlighted the fearful consequences of opposing this response, as this is clearly stated in the quoted excerpts of Reagan's speech:

"[Qadhafi] suffered no economic or political or military sanction; and the atrocities mounted in number, as did the innocent dead, and wounded" and "to ignore by inaction the slaughter of American civilians and American soldiers.. is simply not in the American tradition" (Quoted in Dow, 2004: 305).

Similarly, Hubanks (2009) also established the deliberative rhetoric in Bush' post-9/11 war discourse when referring to Bush's attempts to show the nation the fitting aspects of the military response and the harmful consequences of any decision of inaction. Hubanks asserted that presidents employed the deliberative type of argument to realise the specific exigence of the fearful consequences of military inaction. This specific exigence or

generic structure had been reflected in the very utilisation of ‘fear-laden rhetoric’ wherein enemies of humanity of peace possessed the means and the ability to inflict harm upon us at any time now and in the future in case of failing to act or respond (2009: 205).

5. Conclusions

War narrative or rhetoric has been examined in an attempt to intrinsically search for stable discursive patterns of Aristotle’s types of rhetoric used to serve for the communicative functions of the generic structures of US presidential war narrative. Concerning the second objective, the study attempts to describe the different functions performed by instances of Aristotle’s types of rhetoric that are responses to the generic structures represented by the particulars of the narrated events, what audiences need in this situation and the communicative purpose of the genre. The analysis indicates that the use of Aristotle’s modes of rhetoric should be based on an understanding of the generic structures that give rise to the establishment of these modes of rhetoric – a finding which is also noted by Dow (1989). If different generic structures produce different uses of Aristotle’s types of rhetoric, we should ask ourselves how these differences affect rhetorical actions. The important answer that the present study gives is that war narrative or rhetoric in particular centres on how it responds to exigencies (generic structures) that calls them forth, “an exigence created by the events, the needs of the audience, and the purposes of the rhetor” (Dow, 1989: 296).

Analysis of the second objective shows that generic structures responding to critical events such generic element 1 are described by epideictic types of arguments that “function to allow the audience to reach a communal understanding of the events which have occurred” (Dow, 1989: 296). In contrast, generic structures that belong to justificatory rhetoric focusing “on explanation and rationalisation of military retaliation” (Cherwitz and Zagacki, 1986: 309) such as generic structures 2, 5 and 6 are discursively reflected by deliberative types of argument. Furthermore, as the study shows, other generic structures of war narrative contain elements of both kinds of argument. However, one of the two types is primary and an end in itself and the other is just a means to the accomplishment of that end such as the generic structures 6 – a finding also reported by Hubanks (2009). Table 3

below shows the use of Aristotle's types of rhetoric in each generic structure.

Table 3: Types of Aristotle's rhetoric realising the generic structures

Generic element No.	Title	Type of Rhetoric used
1	The Enemy's Act of Aggression breaking the world normalcy and creating a violent situation.	Epidictic
2	Self-defensive Nature/Mission of Military Action	Deliberative
3	Communicating the Enemy's Atrociousness and Savagery	Forensic Means to Deliberative End
4	War as a Last Resort after Aborting Diplomatic Solutions	Forensic means to Deliberative End
5	Objectives and Real Intentions of Military Action	Deliberative
6	Consequences of Failing to Act Militarily (Inaction)	Deliberative

Windt argues that justificatory rhetoric elements moves from deliberative arguments to epideictic ones “when the president moves from an account of the facts of the situation to presenting the crisis as a test of national character” (Cited in Dow, 1989: 296). On the contrary, our study presents that war narrative or rhetoric, as a justificatory discourse, moves from the epideictic type of rhetoric through presenting a communal understanding of the events which have occurred and the war as a test of national character into the deliberative type of rhetoric through presenting facts of the situation. From the analysis of the data under study, it is observed that deliberative rhetoric is more primary and dominant than other types of rhetoric in terms of using it mostly as the main end for rhetorical uses and its relatedness to the communicative purpose the discourse fulfilled in this situation. Of interesting finding to the study is the consummatory rhetorical structures showing “the people of the US as well as the world community that enemy attacks were hostile and unprovoked” (Cherwitz and Zagacki, 1986: 309). These consummatory rhetorical structures are also evidenced in the addresses when presidents, in generic structures 3 and 5 employ forensic types of rhetoric in an attempt to present a case for the guilt of the enemy and to legitimise and justify the undertaken military decision. The analysis of the second objective highlights the importance of the exigence or rhetorical

situation (generic structure), beside the communicative purposes of the speakers, in determining the type of rhetoric created. This finding is consistent with Dow's discussion which clearly states that "purpose is important, but it is only one of several factors that contribute to an exigence" (1989: 297). These exigencies which are represented by the needs of the audience are another important factor in defining the different functions of rhetoric. In other words, in the analysis of the war addresses of the study, the dominance of forensic, epideictic or deliberative arguments was a result of the effect of the exigence needed by the audience (Dow, 1989).

Some scholars such as Jackson (2004) and Murphy (2003) characterised crisis rhetoric such as war rhetoric as being a homogeneous type of discourse completely governed by either epideictic, deliberative or forensic. Still, other scholars such as Dow (1989), Eisenstadt (2014), Flanagan (2018), Hubanks (2009) and Vatnoey (2015) demonstrated the co-existence of Aristotle's modes of rhetoric congruently within the presidential war discourse based on the function of each generic structure of the war narrative that affects the type of rhetoric called for. Thus, the consistency between the communicative function of each generic structure and its effect on the type of rhetoric employed to serve this communicative function needs to be further studied and verified in familiar and unfamiliar other genres. The religious sermon, for example, is described as simultaneously manifesting epideictic, deliberative and forensic types of rhetoric. In Smith's terms, "a sermon can be epideictic, praising or blaming good and evil; forensic, judging men guilty of sin; and/or deliberative, advising what course leads to salvation" (Quoted in Hubanks, 2009: 211). Thus, the analytical framework adopted in the current study can be applied to religious sermons to find out if the employment of any type of Aristotle's triad of rhetoric based on the effect of the communicative function of the generic structure is typical in other types of genres.

The study arrives at the conclusion that different generic structures within the same address created by exigencies of the events, the needs of the audience and the communicative purpose of the narrative lead to the creation of different types of Aristotle's rhetoric. In other words, the use of any type of Aristotle's triad of rhetoric is based on the function of the generic

structure that calls for the type of rhetoric needed to realise this function. In contrast to previous studies that examined Aristotle's mode of rhetoric in terms of the communicative purpose of the speaker, this study presents a new approach to the usage of these types of rhetoric informed by their responses to functions of each generic structure employed to justify American military actions. To uncover how the three types of rhetoric (epideictic, deliberative and forensic) are called forth requires an understanding of how the content of the text unfolds into generic structures or exigencies comprising the surrounding events and the needs of audiences.

References

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Irvine, C. K. S., & Walker, D. 2018. Introduction to Research in Education. Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Bhatia, V. K. 1993. Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings. London: Longman.
- Bostdorff, D. M. 2011. Epideictic Rhetoric in the Service of War: George W. Bush on Iraq and the 60th Anniversary of the Victory over Japan. *Communication Monographs*, 78.3: 296-323.
- Bostdorff, D. M., & Ferris, S. H. 2014. John F. Kennedy at American University: The Rhetoric of the Possible, Epideictic Progression, and the Commencement of Peace. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 100.4:407-441.
- Bostdorff, D. M., & Goldzwig, S. R. 2005. History, Collective Memory, and the Appropriation of Martin Luther King, Jr.: Reagan's Rhetorical Legacy. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 35.4:661-690.
- Browning, E. 2018. Rhetorical Analysis. In A. Moser (Ed.), *Let's Get Writing!* Virginia: Virginia Western Community College, pp. 21-34. Retrieved from <https://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/textbooks/let-s-get-writing>.
- Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. 2008. *Presidents Creating the Presidency: Deeds Done in Words*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cherwitz, R. A., & Zagacki, K. S. 1986. Consummatory Versus Justificatory Crisis Rhetoric. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 50.4:307-324.
- Condit, C. M. 1985. The Functions of Epideictic: The Boston Massacre

- Orations as Exemplar. *Communication Quarterly*, 33.4:284-298.
- Creswell, J. W. 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Los Angeles: University of Nebraska–Lincoln.
- Dow, B. J. 1989. The Function of Epideictic and Deliberative Strategies in Presidential Crisis Rhetoric. *Western Journal of Communication*, 53.3:294-310.
- Dunmire, P. L. 2007. Emerging Threats and Coming Dangers. In (eds.) *Discourse, War and Terrorism: Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture*, eds. by A. Hodge & C. Nilep, 19-43. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Dunmire, P. L. 2011. *Projecting the Future through Political Discourse: The Case of the Bush Doctrine (Vol. 41)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Eisenstadt, M. 2014. Presidential Epideictic Rhetoric During Times of Crisis: Barack Obama's "9/11" Moment. MA Thesis, University of Nevada, Las Vegas.
- Flanagan, J. 2018. 'John Howard's "Use" of the Anzac Legend: Applying an Epideictic Lens'. *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 64.1: 98-111.
- Flick, U. 2018. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications Limited.
- Garver, E. 2009. Aristotle on the Kinds of Rhetoric. *Rhetorica: A journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 27.1:1-18.
- Glover, C. 2007. *Sustaining Iraq: George W. Bush's Perspective of War*. ProQuest. MA Thesis, Central Michigan University.
- Hart, R. P. 1987. *The Sound of Leadership: Presidential Communication in the Modern Age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hauser, G. A. 1999. Aristotle on Epideictic: The Formation of Public Morality. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 29.1:5-23.
- Hodges, A. 2013. The Generic US Presidential War Narrative. *Discourses of War and Peace*, 47-68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hubanks, J. 2009. Praise, Blame and Advocacy: An Examination of President George W. Bush's Post-9/11 Discourse and the Rhetorical Genres that Define it. *Intersections*, 10.2: 199-225.
- Ilie, C. 2018. Pragmatics vs Rhetoric. In C. Ilie & N. R. Norrick (eds.), *Pragmatics and its Interfaces*, 85-119. John Benjamins Publishing

Company.

- Jackson, F. A. 2004. A Study of Pre and Post-Cold War Presidential International Crisis Rhetoric. MA thesis, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- Jackson, R. 2005. Writing the War on Terrorism: Language, Politics and Counter-Terrorism. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Kennedy, G. A. Trans. 2007. Aristotle: On Rhetoric. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Knoblauch, C. H. 1985. Modern Rhetorical Theory and Its Future Directions. Perspectives on Research and Scholarship in Composition, eds, by Ben W. M. and Timothy R. D., 26-44. New York: Modern Language Association.
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. 2016. Practical research: Planning and design. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Murphy, J. M. 2003. "Our Mission and Our Moment": George W. Bush and September 11th. Rhetoric & Public Affairs, 6.4:607-632.
- Noon, D. H. 2004. Operation Enduring Analogy: World War II, the War on Terror, and the Uses of Historical Memory. Rhetoric & Public Affairs, 7.3: 339-364.
- Purves, D., & Jenkins, R. 2016. Right Intention and the Ends of War. Journal of Military Ethics, 15.1:18-35.
- Ramos, T. E. 2010. Crisis Speeches Delivered During World War II: A Historical and Rhetorical Perspective. University of the Incarnate Word.
- Rapp, C. 2009. The Nature and Goal of Aristotle's Rhetoric. The Blackwell Companion to Aristotle, ed, by G. Anagnostopoulos, 579-595. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Roberts, W. R. Trans. 2004. Aristotle Rhetoric. Chelmsford: Dover Publications.
- Santa Barbara, CA. www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=65366.
- Santa Barbara, CA. www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=65366.
- Swales, J. 1990. Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vatnoey, E. 2015. Leaders' Response to Terrorism: The Role of Epideictic Rhetoric in Deliberative Democracies. Journal of Public Deliberation, 11.2:5.

- Watt, A., Carvill, C., House, R., Livingston, J., & Williams, J. M. 2017. Trump Typhoon: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Donald's Twitter Feed. 2017 IEEE International Professional Communication Conference (ProComm) 1-7. IEEE.
- Woolley, John T. and Gerhard Peters. 2010. The American Presidency Project [online].