



Indexed in:



**Lembaga Masyarakat
Ahli, Pendidik, dan
Peneliti Indonesia**

Jalan Santun Gg Sumbar No 52,
Kelurahan Sudirejo I,
Kecamatan Medan Kota,
Sumatera Utara,
Indonesia

Simbisa Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities

A Critical Analysis of the War on Dissent and the Anti-Terrorism Debate

Loli Gunali Ginting*

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Manajemen Sukma, Medan, Indonesia
loli.gunali@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The "war on terror" has become a prevailing paradigm influencing public opinion and international policy since September 11, 2001. According to this article, anti-terrorism rhetoric frequently serves as a potent instrument to stifle dissent, undermine democratic norms, and delegitimize social movements, despite its apparent goal of reducing violent extremism. This study uses the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) methodology to investigate how language in media coverage, legislation, and political speeches creates a politically powerful and ambiguous definition of a "terrorist" (Fairclough, 2023). Systematic rhetorical techniques, such as creating a single "terrorist" enemy, employing fear-based narratives, and purposefully confusing terrorism with respectable political activism, are revealed by an analysis of data from multiple Western and Indonesian sources (Jackson, 2005). The main contention is that this discourse purposefully conflates dissent with national security threats, which weakens civil liberties and increases state power. In order to protect democratic values from the overreach of securitization, this study's conclusion highlights the necessity of critically analyzing the terminology used in counterterrorism policies.

Keywords: Securitization, Civil Liberties, Dissent, Anti-Terrorism, and War on Terror.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background: The "War on Terror" era.

The world's political landscape was drastically changed by the events of September 11, 2001, in the United States. In addition to inciting violent international military reactions, this event established the "war on terror" as a potent and ubiquitous discursive paradigm (Chomsky, 2001). Countries all over the world quickly embraced this discourse, which was used as an excuse for a variety of measures, including the adoption of domestic legislation that severely restricted civil liberties and military interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Anti-terrorism discourse has grown in importance as a topic for political, legal, and media analysis during the last 20 years. It influences how we perceive dangers, define security, and eventually strike a balance between security and liberty (Hodges, 2011). It makes sense that in order to safeguard its citizens from the threat of extreme violence, a state would need to take extraordinary measures. But this sense of urgency also carries a great deal of complexity and abuse potential.

1.2. Formulation of the Problem

The tendency of anti-terrorism discourse to go beyond its declared goal is the main issue this study attempts to address. Definitions of "terrorism" and "terrorists" are frequently imprecise, ambiguous, and morally charged (Jackson, 2005). Because of this ambiguity, the state is able to define threats broadly, including not only violent actors but also people or organizations that question the status quo, object to government policies, or voice divergent viewpoints. As a result, the "war on terror" runs the risk of turning into a "war on dissent."

When human rights advocacy groups, environmental activists, or anti-war demonstrators are called "extremists," "radicals," or even "domestic terrorists," this blurring of boundaries is made clear. This is not merely a linguistic chance; it is a discursive tactic with real political and social repercussions (Van Dijk, 2015). It is used to discredit criticism, delegitimize opposition, and defend the use of national security forces against its own people.

Thus, this article's research question is: How is anti-terrorism discourse strategically created and used to discredit, silence, and stifle political dissent? This inquiry is further divided into:

1. What are the main rhetorical and linguistic components of anti-terrorism discourse?
2. In what ways does this discursive technique confuse terrorism with lawful political activism?
3. What effects does this "war on dissent" have on democratic norms and civil liberties?

1.3. The goal and importance of the research

This study's objective is to:

1. Determine and evaluate the main points and rhetorical devices used in anti-terrorism discourse.
2. Show how the line between terrorism and lawful dissent is consistently blurred by this discourse.
3. Analyze how this debate has affected public opinion, media coverage, and legislation.
4. Examine critically how this phenomenon affects democratic health and civil liberties.

This research is important because it helps us understand how language functions as a mechanism of power (Foucault, 1991). A

critical examination of the rhetoric underlying security policies is essential in a political environment where security is frequently given top priority. We can be more alert to the subtle deterioration of the liberties that are the cornerstone of democracy if we comprehend how language can be used as a weapon to stifle dissent and public opinion. This study intends to educate the public, media professionals, academics, and policymakers in order to support the creation of successful counterterrorism tactics that uphold the core values of a democracy.

2. METHODS OF RESEARCH

2.1. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is the research methodology.

The Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) methodology serves as the foundation for this study's qualitative methodology. The focus on highlighting the connections between language, power, and ideology is what makes CDA so effective (Van Dijk, 2008). In contrast to purely linguistic analysis, CDA views language as a social practice that both actively shapes and is shaped by social reality, rather than as a neutral medium. With this method, the researcher can examine not just what is said but also how it is said and how it affects the social structure.

In particular, the three-dimensional model created by Norman Fairclough (2023) serves as the foundation for the CDA framework used in this investigation. It comprises:

1. Text analysis is the study of the data's linguistic characteristics, including sentence structure, grammar, metaphors, and word choice (lexis).

2. Discursive Practice Analysis: Examining how texts are created, shared, and consumed. Asking who creates the discourse, for whom, and in what institutional contexts is part of this.
3. Sociocultural Practice Analysis: Explaining how the discourse reproduces or challenges prevailing power relations and ideologies by placing it within a larger social, political, and historical context.

2.2. Sources and Gathering of Data

To ensure thorough analysis and triangulation, data for this study were gathered from a number of important sources. The following categories apply to the data sources:

1. Political Speeches: Key speeches by influential figures who helped to shape the "war on terror" narrative are transcribed. These consist of:
 - a. Speeches by President George W. Bush after 9/11, such as the "Axis of Evil" speech (2002)
 - b. Speeches by British Prime Minister Tony Blair on counterterrorism measures.
 - c. speeches by Indonesian government officials about how to deal with terrorism that are pertinent.
2. Legislative Documents: The legal language employed in anti-terrorism laws from a number of nations was examined. Important definitions and clauses that are subject to wide interpretation were the main focus. Among the documents examined are:
 - a. USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 ("Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism").
 - b. UK Terrorism Acts.

- c. Law No. 5 of 2018 on the Elimination of Terrorism in Indonesia.
- 3. Mass Media Reports: A selection of articles from reputable print and web outlets both domestically and internationally. The selection concentrated on covering social movements or protests (such as anti-government rallies, environmental activism, or anti-war protests) in addition to terrorist attacks. The New York Times, The Guardian, Kompas, and The Jakarta Post are among the media outlets from 2001 to 2022.

2.3. Procedure for Data Analysis

The three dimensions proposed by Fairclough (2023) are followed in the data analysis process:

1. Text Analysis Stage: Every text was carefully studied at this point. Particular focus was placed on:
 - a. Lexicalization: The selection of terms used to characterize dissenters (such as "anarchists," "radicals," and "troublemakers") and terrorists (such as "barbaric," "evil," and "enemy").
 - b. Metaphor: Examining conceptual metaphors, particularly "TERRORISM IS AR" (Jackson, 2005).
 - c. Sentence Structure: The use of modalities to convey a sense of urgency and inevitability, such as "we must..." or "there is no other choice...", or the use of the passive voice to obfuscate agency.
2. Stage of Discursive Practice Analysis: This phase linked the text to its production and consumption context. The objective was to determine whose voices are marginalized (activists, stigmatized communities) and who speaks (politicians, security experts). The study also looked at how news organizations present stories and which sources—typically official government sources—are prioritized (Herman & O'Sullivan, 1989).
3. Stage of Sociocultural Practice Analysis: This phase connected the results of the previous two phases to the larger sociopolitical environment. By delegitimizing alternatives, anti-terrorism rhetoric serves to legitimize state policies (such as heightened military spending and surveillance), support nationalist beliefs, and ultimately solidify the dominance of hegemonic groups (Foucault, 1991).

3. FINDINGS FROM THE RESEARCH

Consistent patterns and methodical rhetorical techniques in the development of anti-terrorism discourse are revealed by the critical analysis of the data. Three interrelated major themes are used to present the findings.

3.1. Creating the Enemy: A Dehumanized and Monolithic "Other"

One of the most fundamental conclusions is that the "terrorist" is always constructed as an absolute "Other" in anti-terrorism discourse. This process of "othering," as Said (1978) characterized in a different context, is glaringly obvious. This tactic is used in a number of ways:

1. Vagueness (Ambiguity): The term "terrorist" is frequently purposefully left open-ended in speeches and even in laws. They are

characterized as "enemies of civilization," "forces of evil," or "haters of freedom." This flexibility enables the label to be applied to a variety of groups.

2. Homogenization: A monolithic enemy is continuously presented in the discourse. Under the general heading of "global terrorism," the diversity and complexity of various groups—each with its own set of beliefs, objectives, and local contexts—are erased (Zulaika & Douglass, 2016).
3. Dehumanization: The wording is always intended to make the offenders seem less human. By depriving them of their humanity, this discourse precludes any understanding of the underlying causes or political context of their actions and rationalizes the use of any means to eradicate them. They are called "monsters," "savages," "animals," or "viruses."

3.2. The Existential Threat and Fear Rhetoric

Emotional mobilization, especially fear, is a key component of anti-terrorism discourse. Terrorism is presented as an existential threat to the survival of the country, its values, and its way of life, rather than just a criminal or political issue.

Hyperbolic language is commonly used in media headlines and political speeches to portray the magnitude of the threat. Attacks are portrayed as "an attack on humanity itself," and the possibility of more attacks is presented in terms of apocalypse or disaster.

- The "war on terror" is the primary metaphor (Hodges, 2011). This metaphor is extremely significant because it frames the enemy as something to be destroyed, not negotiated with, permits the suspension of regular legal

procedures, justifies the mobilization of enormous resources, and avoids important debate. There is no place for compromise or negotiation in the logic of war.

3.3. The Confusion of Terrorism and Dissent

This is the main conclusion drawn from the study. The analysis demonstrates the systematic efforts of anti-terrorism discourse to delegitimize terrorism by obfuscating the distinction between it and lawful dissent.

1. The USA PATRIOT Act (2001) and similar laws in other countries can criminalize activities like providing humanitarian aid, legal training, or even advocacy for groups labeled as "terrorist." Legislative Overreach (Scope Creep): Anti-terrorism laws frequently contain overly broad definitions of "acts of terrorism" or "material support." The definition of "critical infrastructure" that must be protected from "terrorist attacks" can be expanded to include various industries or facilities, including environmental activism that involves blockades.
2. Stigmatization and Lexical Association: The use of labels purposefully overlaps. The terms "subversive," "extremist," and "radical" are used interchangeably to refer to both activists and terrorists. The media frequently portrays large-scale demonstrations as "anarchic" or "violent," emphasizing isolated instances of property damage to undermine the validity of a movement as a whole (Hall, 1997).
3. The "Enemy Within" narrative asserts that the threat originates both internally and externally. It portrays activists, critics, and dissenters as a

"enemy within" who, knowingly or unknowingly, supports and aids the external terrorist enemy. Criticizing foreign policy, for instance, can be characterized as "unpatriotic" or "justifying terrorism" (Chomsky, 2001).

3.4. Securitization of Political and Social Concerns

A process known as "securitization," in which a growing number of social and political issues that were previously regarded as normal are pushed into the security domain, is the result of this discourse.

1. Immigration and Surveillance: Rather than being framed as an economic or human rights issue, immigration policy is increasingly being framed as a national security issue. Communities of immigrants, especially Muslim communities, are subject to widespread suspicion and close scrutiny.
2. Activism as a Security Threat: Law enforcement agencies are increasingly classifying social movements that oppose powerful corporate or state interests—like environmentalism or indigenous rights activism—as "domestic terrorism." Protest is no longer viewed as a democratic expression but rather as a security issue that needs to be managed and controlled.

4. DISCUSSION

According to the study's findings, anti-terrorism rhetoric has developed into a potent tool with repercussions that go well beyond just stopping terrorism. Using ideas from political and critical theory, this section will provide a more thorough interpretation of these findings.

4.1. The Political Technology of "The War on Dissent"

A "political technology" is the use of anti-terrorism rhetoric to stifle dissent (Foucault, 1991). The state obtains legitimacy to carry out actions that would otherwise be regarded as undemocratic by fostering a persistent and unclear atmosphere of fear. This is an example of what Giorgio Agamben (Kanwar, 2006) refers to as a "permanent state of exception," in which security justifies a suspension of the law, which then becomes the new standard.

The state can avoid serious political discussion by confusing dissent with terrorism. The state can delegitimize its critics by portraying them as threats rather than addressing criticism of its foreign, economic, or environmental policies. According to Van Dijk (2015), this is an extremely successful tactic for stifling criticism and upholding the status quo. This phenomenon creates a "chilling effect," whereby individuals and groups are less inclined to criticize or take part in activism out of concern that they will be stigmatized, watched, or even charged with a crime.

4.2. The erosion of civil liberties and the shrinking of democratic space

The gradual degradation of civil liberties is the most obvious effect of this discursive war. In the name of security, the freedoms of speech, assembly, and privacy are routinely undermined. Concrete examples of this process include watch lists, warrantless wiretapping, and mass surveillance programs. The "security above all" argument is a potent defense for reversing fundamental liberal democratic principles (Kanwar, 2006).

In a broader sense, this results in the deterioration of democratic space and the

public sphere. The freedom to be critical and to hold those in positions of authority accountable is necessary for a healthy public debate. The fundamental components of democracy itself are undermined when criticism is equated with treason and activism with terrorism. A society used to a narrative of fear finds it more difficult to organize against unfair policies and is more willing to give up liberty for security.

4.3. The Media's Function in Hegemonic Discourse Reproduction

The mass media plays a crucial role in the dissemination and replication of anti-terrorism discourse, so it does not function in a vacuum. The results of this study demonstrate that government officials' voices are frequently amplified by the media. There are a number of reasons for this. First, the "war on terror" narrative is a highly marketable news frame due to its emphasis on drama, conflict, and emotion (Herman & O'Sullivan, 1989). Second, the state's viewpoint dominates news coverage as a result of journalists' "indexing"—the practice of relying on official sources (government, police, military) for information.

By using the state's terminology ("radical," "extremist") and portraying protests as threats to public order, the media actively contributes to the delegitimization of dissent (Hall, 1997). They frequently neglect to set the scene or address the underlying causes of social complaints, which serves to marginalize marginalized voices and uphold hegemonic power structures.

4.4. Historical Reverberations: From the "Terrorist Threat" to the "Red Scare"

It is not new to use a discourse of external threat to stifle internal opposition and rally support at home. Strong historical parallels

exist with the Cold War period, especially with the American "Red Scare." The term "communism," which was portrayed at the time as a single, malevolent force, was used to defend the restriction of civil liberties, the blacklisting of intellectuals and artists, and the monitoring of civil rights advocates.

These days, "terrorist" has taken the place of "communist" as the meaningless term for the ultimate enemy (Zulaika & Douglass, 2016). Anybody who actively opposes the status quo can be labeled a "terrorist" using this ambiguous signifier, which can be used as a moral defense of oppressive behavior. This historical parallel demonstrates how these discursive technologies continue to be remarkably effective and persistent in consolidating power even as they change their names.

5. CONCLUSION

Through a critical analysis of political speech, legislation, and media coverage, a coherent set of linguistic and rhetorical strategies has been identified that creates an ambiguous enemy, amplifies fear-based narratives, and, most importantly, conflates legitimate political activism with terrorism. This study shows how anti-terrorism discourse, which was born out of a legitimate need to address security threats, has been systematically developed and deployed as a tool for waging a "war on dissent."

This is not just a semantic issue; it is a practice of power with far-reaching effects, as it expedites the degradation of civil liberties, legitimizes the growth of state power, and stifles substantive democratic discourse. This discourse successfully turns political issues into security issues, silences dissenting opinions, and marginalizes alternative voices.

This has serious ramifications for democratic societies. To combat the overuse of security discourse, academia, the media, and civil society must make a deliberate and coordinated effort. Several suggestions can be made in light of this analysis:

1. For Policymakers: Legislators urgently need to define terrorism in a way that is more accurate, limited, and compliant with the law, and that is obviously different from acceptable political activity. This would stop such laws from being abused to target legitimate activities like protests or advocacy (Abdullah, 2021).
2. For Media Practitioners: It is the duty of journalists and media outlets to provide more contextualized and critical coverage of social movements and terrorism. This entails challenging official narratives, steering clear of sensationalist and fear-based reporting, looking for sources outside of official circles, and making a conscious effort to distinguish between dissent and violence.
3. It is imperative that academics and civil society keep an eye on the status of civil liberties and resist the securitization of public life. Future studies could examine how this discourse functions in various non-Western contexts or how the dynamics of anti-terrorism discourse and resistance to it are evolving due to new social media platforms.

In the end, a democratic society faces the challenge of preserving security without compromising the very liberties that make democracy what it is. The first step in opposing this sacrifice is to comprehend

and analyze the language that is used to convince us of its necessity.

Bibliography

- Abdullah, M. Z. (2021). Analisis Yuridis Terhadap Undang-Undang Nomor 15 Tahun 2003 jo Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 2018 Tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Terorisme Dalam Hubungan Dengan Hak Azasi Manusia. *Legalitas: Jurnal Hukum*, 13(1), 26–35.
- Act, P. (2001). *USA PATRIOT ACT of 2001*. Public Law. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/US-A-PATRIOT-Act>
- Bush, G. W. (2002). *President Delivers State of the Union Address*. Office of the Press Secretary. <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/01/print/20020129-11.html>
- Chomsky, N. (2001). *9-11 Noam Chomsky*. New York: Open Media/Seven Stories Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2023). Critical discourse analysis. In *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 11–22). Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1991). The Foucault effect: studies in governmentality. *Harvester Wheatsheaf*.
- Hall, S. (1997). The spectacle of the other. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, 7, 223–290.
- Herman, E. S., & O'Sullivan, G. (1989). The "terrorism" industry: the experts and institutions that shape our view of terror. (*No Title*).
- Hodges, A. (2011). *The "War on terror" narrative: discourse and*

intertextuality in the construction and contestation of sociopolitical reality.
OUP USA.

Jackson, R. (2005). *Writing the war on terrorism: Language, politics and counter-terrorism.* Manchester University Press.

Kanwar, V. (2006). Giorgio Agamben, State of Exception (Stato di eccezione). Translated by Kevin Attell. *Icon-International Journal of Constitutional Law - ICON INT J CONST LAW*, 4, 567–575. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/mol023>

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism* pantheon books. New York.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 466–485.

Zulaika, J., & Douglass, W. (2016). *Terror and taboo: The follies, fables, and faces of terrorism.* Routledge.