UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE

FAKULTA SOCIÁLNÍCH VĚD

Institut politologických studií

Lucia Klincová

Legitimization methods employed by George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden- discourse analysis

Diplomová práce

Praha 2014

Autor práce: **Lucia Klincová**
Vedúci práce: **PhDr. Vít Střítecký, M. Phil., Ph.D.**
Rok obhajoby: **2014**

Anotácia
Táto diplomová práca sa zaoberá spôsobmi legitimizácie vojny proti teroru v prípade George-a W. Busha a teroristických útokov v prípade Osamu bin Ladena. Zaoberá sa obdobím od 9. septembra 2001, teda od uskutočnenia teroristických útokov v New Yorku a Washingtone D.C., až do 20. marca 2003, teda do začiatku invázie Spojených štátov amerických do Iraku. Použitím metódy diskurzívnej analýzy poukazuje na rôzne použité legitimizačné kategórie, ktoré boli v oboch prípadoch dominantné alebo naopak neboli využívané. Analýza je postavená na databáze oficiálnych vyjadrení a výrokov oboch vodcov a ich blízkych spolupracovníkov. Interpretáciou týchto prístupov a analýzou spoločenského, politického, kultúrneho či náboženského kontextu táto diplomová práca poukazuje na spoločné a odlišné znaky dvoch prípadov. Práca sa snaží dokázať, že aj napriek veľmi odlišným politickým pozíciám Osamu bin Ladena a George-a W. Busha bol spôsob ich použitých legitimizačných prístupov veľmi podobný.

Annotation
This diploma thesis focuses on the legitimization methods in case of George W. Bush´s war on terror and Osama bin Laden´s terrorist attacks. It takes into consideration the time period from the 9th of September 2001 (the date of the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington D.C.) until the 20th of March 2003 (the beginning of the USA´s invasion in Iraq). Using the discourse analysis methodology, the thesis presents the different legitimization approaches, which were used frequently, or not at all. The analysis itself is based on a database of the official statements of the two leaders or their close fellows. The interpretation of these approaches and the analysis of the societal, political, cultural or religious context, highlight the common and different features of these two cases. The aim of this thesis is to argue that despite very different political roles George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden played, their legitimization approaches were, in fact, very similar.

Prehlásenie

Prehlasujem, že som predkladanú prácu spracovala samostatne a použila len uvedené pramene a literatúru. Táto diplomová práca nebola využitá k získaniu iného titulu. Súhlasím s tým, aby práca bola sprístupnená pre študijné a výskumné účely.

V Prahe, 16. 5. 2014   Lucia Klincová

Poďakovanie

Na tomto mieste by som rada poďakovala PhDr. Vítovi Stříteckému, M.Phil., Ph.D. za podnetné rady, návrhy, komentáre a pripomienky a predovšetkým za trpezlivosť a ústretový postoj pri riešení jednotlivých bodov tejto práce.

VOĽBA TÉMY

Vojny a ozbrojené konflikty patria ku fenoménom z oblasti medzinárodných vzťahov, ktoré politickí aktéri len veľmi ťažko a komplikovane obhajujú a legitimizujú pred svojim obyvateľstvom a verejnosťou. Vysoké finančné náklady, obete v civilnom obyvateľstve, ale aj nedostatočná opora v medzinárodnom práve sú len niektoré z dôvodov, prečo sú vojny verejnosťou odmietané a musia byť preto silne argumentačne podporované.

Je prirodzené, že bežní ľudia vojnu odmietajú, pričom takmer bez výnimky nezáleží na ich občianstve či národnosti. V konečnom dôsledku ale dianie na medzinárodnej scéne determinujú vodcovia a lídri jednotlivých krajín, ktorí musia pred obyvateľstvom svoje rozhodnutia legitimizovať. V priebehu histórie mnoho politických lídrov uspelo v ospravedlňovaní svojich agresívnych vyčíňaní a tým následne získali priazeň obyvateľstva a verejnosti. Cieľom mojej diplomovej práce má byť práve snaha zamerať sa na proces legitimizácie určitého úmyslu, ktorému sú následne podriadené ďalšie kľúčové politické či ekonomické rozhodnutia.

Celkom konkrétne sa chcem vo svojej diplomovej práci zamerať na obdobie medzi 9. septembrom 2001 a a 20. marcom 2003. Celkom špecificky teda budem pri svojej analýze brať do úvahy dokumenty a oficiálne vyjadrenia od teroristických útokov na Svetové ekonomické centrum z 9.11.2001 až do začiatku invázie Spojených štátov amerických do Iraku z 20.3.2003.

Snahou mojej práce bude dokázať, že spôsob legitimizácie vojny proti terorizmu zo strany Spojených štátov amerických, konkrétne Georgea Busha a jeho administratívy, stojí na rovnakých základoch, ako legitimizácia teroristických útokov zo strany Al-Qaedy. Oficiálne vyjadrenia legitimizujúce ozbrojené aktivity a teroristické útoky je podľa môjho názoru nutné analyzovať, keďže sú ešte aj v dnešnej dobe celkom bežným javom. Do kontrastu naopak budem stavať fakt, že Spojené štáty americké, ktoré sú demokratickým štátom a presadzujú

mierové riešenie sporov, legitimizovali svoje útočné konanie v rámci vojny proti terorizmu. Na druhej strane stojí Al-Qaeda, ktorá je výrazne odlišným celkom, a preto by jej legitimizácia teroristických útokov mala logicky stáť na iných základoch. Napriek tomu sa vo svojej deiplomovej práci budem snažiť dokázať, že obe strany vo svojej legitimizácii vychádzajú z rovnakých základov.

VÝSKUMNÁ OTÁZKA:

Výskumná otázka, ktorú si vo svojej diplomovej práci plánujem položiť, vychádza z témy, ktorej sa chcem venovať. Mojím cieľom bude zistiť, či legitimizácia vedenia ozbrojeného konfliktu (vojny, invázie…) stojí na základoch v závislosti od špecifického aktéra, ktorý ho vykonáva. Rozhodujúcim faktorom, ktorý bude týchto aktérov odlišovať medzi sebou, bude ich ideológia.

Pri diskurzívnom analyzovaní oficiálnych vyjadrení a rečí vrcholných predstaviteľov vojny proti terorizmu zo strany Spojených štátov amerických, konkrétne Georgea Busha mladšieho a jeho administratívy a na druhej strane Al-Qaedy je totiž zjavná výrazná podobnosť. Vymedzovanie sa proti druhej strane, ktorá predstavuje "zlo", podpora v náboženstve a označovanie nepriateľa za nekultúrneho a barbarského, sú spôsoby legitimizácie, ktoré majú obe strany spoločné.

Mojou výskumnou otázkou teda je:

"Stojí legitimizácia vojny proti terorizmu USA a teroristických útokov Al-Qaedy na rovnakých základoch?"

V širšom kontexte sa budem snažiť odpovedať na otázku?

"Existuje závislosť medzi konkrétnou politickou, kultúrnou či spoločenskou dimenziou, prípadne ideológiou a spôsobom legitimizácie iniciácie ozbrojeného konfliktu?"

HYPOTÉZA:

Hypotéza, ktorú sa vo svojej diplomovej práci budem snažiť potvrdiť, prípade vyvrátiť, je postavená na zjavnej podobnosti medzi vyhláseniami legitimizujúcimi vojnu proti terorizmu zo strany Spojených štátov amerických (konkrétne Georgea Busha mladšieho a jeho administratívy) a na druhej strane vyhláseniami zo strany Al-Qaedy, ktoré legitimizujú ich teroristické útoky práve proti USA.

Celkom konkrétne moja hypotéza tvrdí, že spôsob legitimizácie ozbrojeného konfliktu, teroristického útoku či vojny nezávisí na tom, kto je jej autorom- v konkrétnom prípade, ktorým sa budem vo svojej

diplomovej práci zaoberať, budem potvrdzovať hypotézu, že legitimizácia vojny proti teroru zo strany USA stojí na rovnakých základoch ako legitimizácia teroristických útokov Al-Qaedy.

TEORETICKÉ UKOTVENIE

Teoretické ukotvenie svojej diplomovej práce nachádzam v prístupe, s ktorým prichádza Jay Lemke. Ten sa vo svojich výskumoch zaoberá práve otázkou vplyvu ideológie na formovanie rôznych druhov diskurzu, medzi inými aj toho politického.

Tvrdí, že sformovaný diskurz nie je nevyhnutne viazaný na ideológiu danej spoločnosti, či kultúry, ktorá ho vytvára.[1] Za ideologický považuje iba cieľ použitia diskurzu a nie základ, na ktorom je vytvorený a vyslovený.

Vychádzajúc z konštruktivizmu a opierajúc sa o prvok absencie vzťahu medzi ideológiou a spôsobom diskurzívnej legitimizácie Jaya Lemkeho budem teda pracovať na koncepte diskurzívnej legitimizácie.

METODOLÓGIA A OPERACIONALIZÁCIA

Vo svojej diplomovej práci budem používať metódu diskurzívnej analýzy. Konkrétne budem analyzovať korpus vyjadrení a oficiálnych stanovísk za obdobie od teroristických útokov na Svetové ekonomické centrum 11. septembra 2001 do uskutočnenia invázie USA do Iraku z 20. marca 2003. Venovať sa budem obom stranám konfliktu:

a) George Bush mladší a jeho administratíva
b) Osama bin Laden a ďalší hlavní predstavitelia Al-Qaedy

Postupovať budem vychádzajúc z prístupu, s ktorým prichádza Jay Lemke. V snahe dokázať, že diskurz Spojených štátov amerických v kontexte legitimizácie vojny proti terorizmu a diskurz Al-Qaedy spojený s legitimizáciou teroristických útokov stoja na rovnakých základoch, sa budem snažiť poukázať na fakt, že vzťah medzi ideológiou a spôsobom legitimizácie v podstate v tomto prípade neexistuje.

Konkrétne sa teda budem snažiť sledovať závislosť medzi existujúcou ideológiou v danej spoločnosti a spôsobom, ako svoju agresívnu politiku legitimizuje. Diskurzívnym kategóriám, ktoré sú v oboch prípadoch podvedome či explicitne vytvárané, budem určovať konkrétny prívlastok, ktorý ich

---

[1] Lemke, J. (1995) Textual Politics. London: Longman.

definuje. Vo väčšine prípadov totiž dochádza napríklad k vymedzovaniu "tej správnej spoločnosti" proti "barbarskej a zlej". Moja metóda sa teda bude snažiť tieto kategórie identifikovať, pomenovať ich a následne porovnávať ich použitie a výskyt u oboch strán mojej analýzy- teda na strane Georgea Busha a jeho administratívy a na strane Al-Qaedy.

Snahou tejto diplomovej práce bude metodologicky sledovať možný vzťah medzi konkrétnou ideológiou a spôsobom legitimizácie- používaním exaktných a relevantných dát alebo kategórií opierajúcich sa o rozpor medzi dobrom a zlom, jednotlivými náboženstvami, civilizovanosťou a barbarstvom apod.

V rámci operacionalizácie identifikujem niekoľko základných diskurzívnych kategórií, ktoré budem pri analyzovaní textov, vyhlásení a prejavov sledovať.

a) Legitimizácia vyšším dobrom
b) Legitimizácia faktom, že daná kultúra, spoločnosť, náboženstvo atď. je to jediné správne
c) Legitimizácia nutným postavením sa voči "zlu", ktoré reprezentuje práve druhá strana konfliktu
d) Legitimizácia odvolávaním sa na všeobecne platné a uznávané hodnoty, morálku atď.
e) Legitimizácia relevantným zdrojom moci (Boh, atp.), ktorý je reprezentovaný ako obhajca hodnôt a noriem legitimizujúcej strany

Na základe existencie týchto kategórií budem sledovať možné dichotómie v legitimizácii Georgea Busha a jeho administratívy a Al-Qaedy v období od 11. 9.2001 a 20.3 2003. Tieto dichotómie by mali byť odrazom odlišnej ideológie týchto dvoch skupín- teda Spojených štátov amerických ako demokratickej spoločnosti, u ktorej by mala prevládať určitá metafyzika politiky a na druhej strane Al-Qaeda, ktorá ako teroristická organizácia vychádza z inej ideológie, hodnôt a noriem.

KRITIKA ZDROJOV:

Veľké množstvo autorov venujúcich sa diskurzívnej analýze v prípade legitimizácie vojny proti teroru Spojených štátov amerických po 9. septembri 2001 potvrdzuje postavenie tejto témy v oblasti medzinárodných vzťahov.

Špecifickosť mojej diplomovej práce by ale spočívala v tom, že proti sebe staviam dve strany jedného konfliktu, ktoré na jednej strane obhajujú a legitimizujú vojnu proti terorizmu a na druhej strane teroristické útoky. Existujúca literatúra sa venuje totiž najmä diskurzívnej analýze prejavov samotného Georgea Busha, ktorý proti sebe stavajú civilizovanú americkú spoločnosť a barbarskú

spoločnosť, z ktorej vychádzajú teroristické skupiny. Týmto spôsobom postupuje napríklad Colett.[2]

Iná skupina zdrojov, ako napríklad Dunmire[3], postupujú formou intra a inter- textuálnej analýzy.

Postup, ktorý sa podobne ako moja diplomová práca, venuje porovnávaniu diskurzov z výrazne odlišných oblastí a poukazuje na ich výnimočnú podobnosť, je Keenan et al, vo svojom článku Call to Arms, kde diskurz Georgea Busha porovnáva s diskurzom Adolfa Hitlera, pápeža Urbana II., kráľovnej Alžbety I. a podobne.

Vzťahu medzi ideológiou a formovaním diskurzu sa venuje taktiež niekoľko autorov (napriklad Hodge and Kress 1988, Gee 1990; Lemke 1995), ktorí nepovažujú ideológiu za zásadný faktor formujúci diskurz ako taký. Proti nim stoja napríklad autori riadiaci sa pod feminizmus, ktorí v diskurze identifikujú výrazný vplyv ideológie vychádzajúci z "mužských" hodnôt.

Výnimočnosť mojej diplomovej práce zostáva ale silná práve preto, že sa budem venovať dvom diskurzom pochádzajúcich z úplne odlišných prostredí, ktoré sú ale bezpodmienečne previazané spoločným konfliktom. Budem sa snažiť odpovedať na otázku, či existuje vzťah medzi ideológiou tvorcu diskurzu a medzi konkrétnym spôsobom legitimizácie.

OSNOVA:

ÚVOD

1. Metodológia diplomovej práce
2. Historický popis obdobia medzi 11.9.2001 a 20.3.2003
    2.1. Teroristický útok na Svetové ekonomické centrum
    2.2. Reakcia USA na teroristický útok
    2.3. Zahájenie vojny proti teroru zo strany USA
3. Analýza diskurzov USA a Al-Qaedy
    3.1 Membership categorization analysis- vytváranie jednotlivých diskurzívnych kategórií
    3.2 Komparácia spôsobov legitimizácie používaných v prípade USA a v prípade Al-Qaedy
4. Vzťah medzi ideológiou a spôsobom legitimizácie konfliktu
 ZÁVER

---

[2] Collet, Tanja (2009) Civilization and Civilized in post 9/11 US Presidential Speeches, Discourse and Society,
[3] Dunmire, Patricia (2009) „9/11 Changed Everything": an intertextual analysis of the Bush Doctrine, Discourse and Society

ZOZNAM ZDROJOV:

Berard, Tim J. (2005) 'Evaluative categories of action and identity in non evaluative human studies research: examples from ethnomethodology',Qualitative Sociology Review 1 [http://www.qualitativesociologyreview.org /ENG/archive_eng.php]

Bonu, Bruno, Lorenza Mondada, Marc Relieu (1994) 'Catégorisation: l'approche de Sacks'. In: B. Fradin, L. Quéré, J. Widmer, eds. L'enquête sur les catégories. Paris: École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales [Raisons pratiques: Épistémologie, sociologie, théorie sociale/5]: 129-48

Bush, G.W. (2001) Today We Mourned, Tomorrow We Work. http://www.whitehouse.gov/ news/releases/2001/09/20010916–2.html

Bush, G.W. (2002) Remarks by the President at 2002 Graduation Exercise of the United States Military Academy. http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020601– 3.html

Bush, G.W. (2001) Statement by the President in his Address to the Nation. 11 September 2001. http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911–16.html

Bush, G.W. (2001) Transcript of President Bush's Address to a Joint Session of Congress. 20 September 2001. http://www.cnn.com/2001/US/09/20/gen.bush.transcript/

Bush, G.W. (2001) Radio Address of the President to the Nation. 6 October 2001. http:// www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011006.html

Bush, G.W. (2001) President Bush: 'No Nation Can Be Neutral in this Conflict.' Remarks by the President to the Warsaw Conference on Combating Terrorism. 6 November 2001. http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011106–2.html

Bush, G.W. (2001) President Discusses War on Terrorism in Address to the Nation. 8 November 2001. http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011108–13.html

Bush, G.W. (2001) President Bush Speaks to United Nations. 11 November 2001. http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011110–3.html

Bush, G.W. (2001) President: 'We're Fighting to Win – and Win We Will.' Remarks by the President on the USS Enterprise on Pearl Harbor Day. 7 December 2001. http://www. whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/12/20011207.html

Bush, G.W. (2002) Remarks by the President in Address to the Nation. 6 June 2002. http:// www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020606–8.html

Bush, G.W. (2002) President's Remarks at the United Nations General Assembly. 12 September 2002. http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020912–1.html

Bush, G.W. (2002) President Bush Calls on Congress to Act on Nation's Priorities. 23 September 2002. http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020923–2.html

Bush, G.W. (2003) President Addresses the Nation. 7 September 2003. http://www. whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/09/20030907–1.html

Bush, G.W. (2003) President Bush Addresses United Nations General Assembly. 23 September 2003. http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/09/20030923–4.html

Bush, G.W. (2003) President Bush Discusses Iraq Policy at Whitehall Palace in London.19 November 2003. http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/11/20031 119–1.html

Collet, Tanja (2009) 'Civilization and civilized in post-9/11 US presidential speeches', Discourse & Society 20: 455-475

Conein, Bernard (2001) 'Classification sociale et catégorisation'. In: Fornel, Michel de, Albert Ogien, Louis Quéré (dir.) L'ethnométhodologie: une sociologie radicale [Colloque de Cerisy]. Paris: Editions La Découverte [Collection "Recherches"]: 239-58

Conason, J. (2002, January 14) 'Is George W. Bush God's President?', The New York Observer 5. Congress of the United States of America (2001) USA Patriot Act. http://www. eff.org/Privacy/Surveillance/Terrorism_militias/20011025_hr3162_usa_patriot_bill .html

Congress of the United States of America (2003) Domestic Security Act: Section By Section 218 Discourse & Society 15(2–3) Downloaded from Analysis. http://www.publicintegrity.org/dtaweb/downloads/Story_01_020703_Doc_ 1.pdf

FBIS Reports "Detained Al-Qa'ida Leader Sayf al-Adl Chronicles Al-Zarqawi's Rise in Organization," FBIS Report - GMP2005060637100, May 21, 2005.

Fitzgerald, Richard, William Housley (2002) 'Identity, categorisation and sequential organisation: the sequential and categorial flow of identity in a radio phone-in', Discourse and Society 13: 579-602.

Global terrorism research project. Haverford college. Dostupné z WWW: http://rrubio.live.haverford.edu/aqsi/content/welcome.

Hester, Stephen, Peter Eglin (1997) 'The reflexive constitution of category, predicate and context in two settings'. In: Hester, S., P. Eglin, eds.,Culture in action: studies in membership categorization analysis. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America: 25-48.

Housley, William, Richard Fitzgerald (2007) 'Categorisation, Interaction, Policy and Debate'. Critical Discourse Studies, Vol. 2/1: 187-206.

"Interview Held with Usama Bin Ladin on 21 Oct. 2001," Jihad Online News, Jan. 21, 2003.

James Turner Johnson (2002) "Jihad and Just War," First Things, June/July 2002, pp. 12-14.

Jihad watch archives. Dostupné z WWW: http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives.html

Kim, Kwang-ki; Tim Berard. 2009) 'Typification in society and social science: The continuing relevance of Schutz's social phenomenology', Human Studies 32/33: 263-89

Lemke, J.L. 1983. "Thematic Analysis: Systems, Structures, and Strategies" Recherches Semiotiques/Semiotic Inquiry 3: 159-187.

Lemke, J.L. 1985. "Ideology, Intertextuality, and the Notion of Register" Systemic Perspectives on Discourse. Ed. J.D. Benson & W.S. Greaves. Vol. I. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing. Pp.275-294.

Lemke, J.L. 1987. "Social Semiotics and Science Education." American Journal of Semiotics 5: 217-232.

Lemke, J.L. 1988. "Discourses in Conflict: Heteroglossia and Text Semantics." Systemic Functional Approaches to Discourse. Ed. J.D. Benson & W.S. Greaves. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing. Pp. 29-50.
Lemke, J.L. In press,a. "Text Structure and Text Semantics." Discourse and Text: Explorations in Systemic Semantics. Ed. R. Veltman & E. Steiner. London: Frances Pinter.

Lemke, J.L. In press,b. "Intertextuality and Text Semantics." Discourse in Society: Functional Perspectives. Ed. M. Gregory & P. Fries. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Lemke, J.L. In press, c. "Technical Discourse and Technocratic Ideology." Proceedings of the International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Sydney 1987. Ed. M.A.K. Halliday, John Gibbons, & Howard Nicholas. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lemke, J.L. In press, d. Talking Science: Language, Learning, and Values. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Lemke, J.L. In press, e. "Ideology, Intertextuality, and the Communication of Science." Relations and Functions Within and Around Language. Ed. M. Gregory. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Miller, M.C. (2002) The Bush Dyslexicon: Observations on a National Disorder. New York: Norton.

Mondada, Lorenza (1997) 'La construction discursive de catégories'. In: D. Dubois (éd.)Catégorisation et cognition: de la perception au discours. Paris: Kimé: 291-313

Mondada, Lorenza (1999) 'L'accomplissement de l' "étrangéité" dans et par l'interaction: procédures de catégorisation des locuteurs [The accomplishment of 'foreign-ness' in and through interaction: prodedures for the categorization of speakers in interaction]', Langages34, N. 134: 20-34

Mondada, Lorenza, Danièle Dubois, (1995) 'Construction des objets de discours et catégorisation: Une approche des processus de référenciation',.Tranel23: 273-302

Russow, J. (2003) US Engaged in an Illegal War. http://globalresearch.ca/articles/ RUS303A.html

Ryan, Anne, David Silverman (2000) 'Marking boundaries: culture as category work', Qualitative Inquiry 6: 107-28

Sacks, Harvey (1979) 'Hotrodder: a revolutionary category'. In: G. Psathas, ed., Everyday language: studies in ethnomethodology. New York: Irvington: 7-14

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2007) 'A tutorial on membership categorization',Journal of Pragmatics 39: 462-82

Shaykh Usama Bin Ladin, May God Protect Him, and Al Qaeda Organization," Al Qal'ah (Internet), Oct. 14, 2002.

Silverman, David (2006) Interpreting qualitative data: methods for analysing talk, text and interaction. Third edition. London: Sage

Stokoe, Elizabeth; ed. (2012) Special issue on 'Categories and Social Interaction: Current Issues in Membership Categorization', Discourse Studies 14/3

Transcript: Al Qaeda Spokesman, ABC News, 8.10.2002. Dostupné z WWW: http://abcnews.go.com/International/story?id=80500&page=1#.UaiB1UA9Pzx

Usama Bin Ladin's Message to Iraq, Al Jazirah Television, Feb. 11, 2003.

Usama Bin Ladin's Message to Iraq, Al-Jazirah Television, Feb. 11, 2003. Op. cit.

Van De Mieroop, Dorien (2008) 'Co-constructing identities in speeches: How the construction of an 'other' identity is defining for the 'self' identity and vice versa', Pragmatics 18:3.491-509

Whitehead Kevin A. (2012) 'Moving forward by doing analysis',Discourse Studies 14: 337-343

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION:

Political leaders have always had a difficult time legitimizing wars and armed conflicts in general to their constituents which they represent. The reasons why the majority of the world's populace has always rejected the concept of war were its high financial cost, civilian casualties, as well as the lack of support by the international law. Thus the concept of war and its justification needs public support, civil authorities support, and support from political leaders influencing international law and relations.

It seems natural the average population, not directly involved in politics, will not support the involvement of their nation-state in armed conflict, unless justified by their political representatives. This can be seen in the American society and the recent armed conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan; both widely supported by the American people at first.[4]

Throughout history, political leaders successfully justified armed conflicts and consequently gained the approval of their voters. Therefore, the main focus of this thesis will be the examination of methods employed by key political leaders in order to legitimize their aggressive policies in the post 9/11 world. This thesis will focus on the legitimization methods influencing subsequent key political and economic decision making prior to implementing and executing the war on terror.

The thesis will analyze the decision-making political process of George W. Bush and his administration in the aftermath of 9/11 terrorist attacks on the American soil. It will focus on the methods used by the Bush's administration in order to legitimize the "war on terror".

---

[4] the American society was definitely willing to support its government´s military efforts. For example, in March 2003, polls showed 47-60% of the US public supported an invasion of the United States of America in Iraq. The complete official poll results are available at WWW: http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2003-03-16-poll-iraq_x.htm. It is necessary to point out that the approach of the American society has definitely changed since.

On the other hand, this thesis will analyze Osama bin Laden's statements and decision-making process, which included statements made by his second in charge leader.

The goal of this thesis is to compare the justification methods regarding the "war on terror" used by Bush's administration and Al-Qaeda. It will be looking for either similarities or differences based on two very different ideological foundations and cultures. It will consider the time period between the 11the of September 2001 and the 20th of March 2003.

It will take into consideration and analyze the documents and official statements produced by the two relevant international players involved in the conflict, starting on the 11th of September2 001 (attacks on the World Trade Center (WTC)) and ending on the 20th of March 2003 (the initial invasion of Iraq).

It is important to understand whether or not the war on terrorism initiated by the United States stands on the same footing as the legitimization of terrorist attacks on the U.S. planned and executed by Al-Qaeda. It is necessary to analyze all official statements attempting to grant legitimacy to both: the armed conflict by the U.S. and terrorist attacks by Al-Qaeda.

The core of this analysis will be based on the contrast between the American democratic system (which is supposed to legitimize the use of force by the democratic values, such as the stability of the international system, etc.) and the terrorist organization Al-Qaeda (which does not abide by laws within the international system and is rather driven by a religious ideology).

It can be assumed that a democratic regime would not employ an armed conflict based on the fact its political leaders are democratically elected and can be voted out of their office.

In order to differentiate between the legitimatization methods used by the American democratic regime and Al-Qaeda's terrorist organization this thesis will assume there is a difference between legitimizing an aggressive war on terror by a democratic country and the terrorist attacks themselves. This thesis will also assume different methods were employed by the decision and policy makers to gain public support.

Therefore this research will attempt to answer these questions:

"Are there similarities between the legitimization methods of George W. Bush´s war on terror and Osama bin Laden´s terrorist attacks on WTC[5]? Do similarities exist despite the fact both leaders believe in a very different world order and laws that govern that order?"

Without the doubt, 9/11 WTC terrorist attacks were the most crucial event greatly impacting international relations today. The foreign policy put in place as a response to Al-Qaeda's attacks consisted of military initiatives and political rhetoric specifically designed to influence the American electorate.

"*Terms like 'terrorist' were shorn of their historic associations to become a mythical embodiment of all that is threatening in the world. Nearly a decade later a new President promised to move away from unilateral policy and simplistic rhetoric towards "mutual respect and mutual understanding," in a post-"War on Terror" world.* "[SHAMASH 2011:3]

However, this thesis will not focus on Barack Obama's foreign policy as its goal is to analyze and examine the aggressive rhetoric of former U.S. President George W. Bush in "*framing the issue of terrorism as one of the most existential threats humanity is facing and in making of terrorism a hegemonic ideological framework, and not only for what concerns the United States*" [BARTOLUCCI 2011:562].

---

[5] The World Trade Center

A significant amount of authors[6] have conducted research on the process of legitimizing the war on terror put in place by George W. Bush. This confirms how important the discourse analysis on this topic is in the International Relations today. However, this research differs from the research conducted before, as this thesis analyzes the legitimization methods employed by both parties involved in the conflict. The goal of this thesis is to prove whether or not there is a correlation between the methods of legitimization used by the U.S. and Al-Qaeda simultaneously.

For example, Dunmire used the method of intra and inter-textual analysis, which compares discourses from different areas and highlights their exceptional similarity. [DUNMIRE 2009] This approach is also used by Graham, Keenan and Dowd in their paper "Call to Arms", in which they compare George W. Bush´s discourse to the one of Adolf Hitler, Pope Urban II, Queen Elizabeth I, etc. [GRAHAM, KEENAN, DOWD 2004]

There are other authors who also focus on the correlation between the political decision making processes amongst very different state actors simultaneously and its discourse. Yet in their research, they do not consider religious ideology as the only major factor impacting the decision-making processes. For example, the feminist scholars tend to blame the "male" approach and values as the reason for a violent formation of the discourse.

The existing literature which focuses on the discourse of George W. Bush's speeches and statements, points out his belief in irreconcilable differences between the modern American society and the extremely evil and barbaric enemy-Al-Qaeda.

In order to answer the research question, this thesis will analyze two specific sets of discourses. It will categorize statements, speeches, and discourses and then compare them to decide which category carries the most weight.

---

[6] I provide the specific names and topics later in this thesis.

Based on this comparison, the thesis will be able to discern which ideology or values have the most impact on the discourse used in regards to the legitimization methods of the "war on terror" by both actors. This research will support or refute the hypothesis that a democratic system, such as the United States of America, would use more peaceful, pragmatic, expertise and data-oriented discourse method to sway the public in believing why a military intervention is necessary in response to the 9/11 attacks.

In order to choose relevant and scientifically valuable research, this thesis will analyze all crucial statements used by George W. Bush's administration, as well as statements released by Osama bin Laden and his closest fellows. This thesis will analyze all statements in depth, considering political, economic, cultural, societal, and religious context as well.

This thesis will be structured into several parts. First, it will provide the methodology of the analysis, taking into consideration the specific cases it will study. Second, it will explain the historical background of the mutual relations between the United States of America and Al- Qaeda, starting on the 11th of September 2001. Later, this thesis will provide the analysis itself- interpreting the way both men used the legitimization methods, based on the social, religious and political context. In conclusion, the aim of this thesis will be to produce a comparison of the legitimization approaches and to highlight and explain their similarities and differences.

1. METHODOLOGY

In order to confirm or deny the hypothesis, this thesis will employ methods of discursive analysis. Specifically, it will consider significant amount of official positions and statements for the limited period starting on the 11th of September 2001, ending on the 20th of March 2003. It will focus on:

a)   George W. Bush and his administration

b)   Osama bin Laden and other important Al-Qaeda representatives

The research itself will be based on Jay Lemke´s approach. During his research, Lemke addressed the impact of ideology on the formation of different discourses, political being one of them.

Jay Lemke examines "*the role of language in social controversies and in processes of social and cultural change. He discusses the relationship between discourse and the notions of power and ideology, and analyzes how language is used to make expert opinion seem indisputable or controversial political views seem natural*". [Lemke 1995:4]

He explains that discourse exists within a specific context. "*Language is always used as part of a complex cultural activity. Verbal data make sense only in relation to this activity context and to other social events and texts with which we normally connect them, (i.e. their intertexts). Meaning is not made with language alone.*"[LEMKE 2011:262]

 However, he also argues that the phenomenon of ideology/political regime does not have to be part of this context which influences the formation of the discourse. He explains that "*a discourse formation is not necessarily inherently ideological, but is so only by virtue of its uses; it is the social function of the discourse which is ideological, and not the discourse itself*". [LEMKE 1998:1181]

This thesis also suggests that the discourse is not necessarily tied to an ideology of a given society or culture. He considers the objective of the discourse to be the only ideological concept, unlike the basis on which it is created. According to the constructivist approach and correlation between ideology and the methods of discursive legitimization inspired by Jay Lemke, this thesis will also apply the concept of discursive legitimization in its research.

This thesis will attempt to confirm or deny whether the discourse of the U.S. in the context of legitimizing the war against terrorism and Al-Qaeda´s legitimization of the terrorist attacks on WTC are based on the same logic or whether they employ different methods altogether. In summary, it will focus on the differences and similarities between the two legitimizations, while taking into consideration cultural, ideological, and religious context. This thesis will attempt to confirm or deny any existing relationship between societal/regime ideologies and societal/regime's legitimizing methods or strategies of its aggressive policies. The main goal is to identify specific attributes which define the discursive categories. Then, this thesis will compare those discursive categories both parties used the most during legitimization processes and decide which of these categories is the most used by each actor involved in the conflict and why. For example, this thesis suspects the democratic representatives of a nation-state would base their legitimization on pragmatic arguments supported by relevant data and realistic assessment of all advantages and disadvantages of an aggressive intervention if such course is taken.

First, this thesis will identify basic discursive categories which define legitimizing methods used in below analyzed texts, statements, and speeches. The categories are:

a) Legitimization by a dichotomy between "us" and "them"
b) Legitimization by the superiority of a culture, society, or religion
c) Legitimization by a necessary evil confrontation
d) Legitimization by universally and generally accepted and recognized values, morals, etc.
e) Legitimization by a relevant source of power, such as God, which represents a defender of values and norms of the legitimizing party

f) Legitimization as part of the necessary process of securitization (to better protect a given nation-state from future acts of terrorism)

g) Legitimization of war on terror as a necessary confrontation of the international law crimes

By using the categories described above, this thesis will monitor the existence of dichotomy or similarity between legitimization of war methods employed by George W. Bush's administration and Osama bin Laden's legitimatization of WTC attacks. The existing dichotomy or similarity should, in fact, reflect the difference between two cultures or ideologies, specifically the American metaphysics policy, and Al-Qaeda's religious ideology, values, and norms. To ensure scientific accuracy, this thesis will check for other existing factors causing a dichotomy or similarity.

This thesis remains unique because it analyzes two discourses which originate in two very different environments, yet are linked by a common conflict.

2. GEORGE W. BUSH VERSUS OSAMA BIN LADEN

"*George W. Bush and Osama Bin Laden are arguably two of the most defining persons of the beginning of the 21st century. One is accused of coordinating an attack that left scores of people dead and shook a complacent world. The other invaded two countries in wars the justification of which is still hotly debated.*"[AERTS 2011:4]

"*In January 2009, George W. Bush left office unpopular. Having initiated two major conflicts and pursued a largely unilateral approach to fighting terrorism, Americans felt internationally isolated. Meanwhile, intellectual and policy circles were increasingly questioning the wisdom behind current discourses on terrorism and political Islam*" [SHAMASH 2011:7]. According to the official polls, Bush's popularity was much higher after the terrorist attacks on the 11th of September 2001. Bush had an 86% approval rating among the American voters.[7]

It is crucial to understand both personalities; the one of George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden. Both represented two very different actors during legitimization of their acts of aggression.

However, the fact is, a person itself does not have a sole impact on the society to which it belongs. In fact, "*organizations, media and bureaucracies play an important role in the perpetuation and institutionalization of a discourse*" [PERL 2004:181]. This thesis argues this argument holds true in case of institutions set up under George W. Bush´s presidency, as it holds true in case of any leader who is elected to power.

Bush's foreign policy and his focus on the war against terror are obviously reflected within institutions he built during his presidency.

For example, the Department of Homeland Security was set up following the 9/11 terrorist attacks, "*not only commands a huge budget and employs nearly a quarter of a*

---

[7] The official presidential approval polls are available at WWW:
http://www.gallup.com/poll/116500/presidential-approval-ratings-george-bush.aspx.

million people, but also the biggest… most diverse merger of functions and responsibilities,'
in US governmental history" [PERL 2004:176].

It is necessary to understand George W. Bush's and Osama bin Laden's political and structural positions in order to continue my analysis. Even though it takes into consideration the official discourse of other people who were close to George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden at the time, it suggests that both actually shared their positions and attitudes with their closest advisors. A minor dichotomy within the official statements connected to the process of legitimization is definitely possible. But this thesis supposes that George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden were the only actual decision-makers at the time and thus it does not consider it relevant in this thesis.

It is important to also consider the power vested in very specific functions both these men represented; (i.e. President of the United States vs. Al-Qaeda leader). This is crucial to understand during this analysis of the legitimization processes of both men. Even though Al-Qaeda has no voters, in case of a democratic nation-state; voters indeed do shape the ruling party's political decisions.

This thesis argues it is more difficult to legitimize a very controversial political decision made by a President of the U.S. than it is for the head of a terrorist organization. Yet many authors of the existing literature[8] argue that this is not the case and the process of legitimization is actually very similar in both cases.

While analyzing their political positions, it is important to understand the co-existence of both men in their time and society. "*Both Bush and Bin Laden have always portrayed themselves as each other's antithesis, but rather peculiarly they have both depended on the other to define themselves. Their antagonistic dance was used to strengthen either position*". [AERTS 2011:6]

---

[8] Some of the references of the authors sharing this opinion are:
AGATHANGELOU, Anna M; LING, L.H.M. Power, Borders, Security, Wealth: Lessons of Violence and Desire from September 11. International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 48, No. 3 (Sep., 2004), pp. 517-538.;
BHATIA, Aditi. Religious metaphor in the discourse of illusion: George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden. World Englishes, Vol. 26, No. 4, pp. 507–524, 2007.

It is crucial to realize both personalities were quite interconnected by the time and events they existed in and reacted to subsequently. "*Robert Fisk even went as far as saying in an interview with Democracy Now!, the day before the 2004 presidential election in which the incumbent Bush faced John Kerry, that Osama Bin Laden wanted Bush to be re-elected so he would further mire the country into the Middle-East swamp, and cause more American casualties, which Bush will surely do*". [AERTS, 2011:27]

George W. Bush was ultimately the president of the U.S. and as a result had to make decisions based on his beliefs, his party's beliefs, and his constituents' expectations. According to the Constitution of the United States of America, "*The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States*"[9]. [10]

Clearly, the President of the United States holds the highest position over all of his armed forces, but is subject to seeking military advice from generals and other political and military leaders before waging wars. Even though the U.S. Constitution provides the President with the ultimate power over all armed forces, his power remains constrained by the system of checks and balances.

The President has much power (to declare war if approved by the Congress), but still before making any war waging decisions, he must answer to his voters. In case of the war on terror, G.W. Bush had to justify his decision to wage war on Iraq and later Afghanistan to the Congress and Americans as a whole prior to being able to execute his decision.

G.W. Bush was democratically elected and thus had to justify his decision to wage war against Al-Qaeda to American voters and the democratically elected Congress.[11]

---

[9] The Constitution of the United States of America. Available at WWW: http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution_transcript.html.

[10] The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any Subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offences against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

[11] The members of both chambers of the United States´Congress are elected.

This thesis will naturally assume the war legitimization process had to be extremely complicated. It had to include logical arguments, pros and cons of the invasion, and an expert analysis of the consequences post invasion.

Osama bin Laden's position was very different. Al-Qaeda has no constituents. It largely consists of foreign fighters bonded together by a common religious ideology and Al-Qaeda's strive to create a Great Islamic Caliphate. Thus bin Laden's position in this conflict was different and not connected to any election processes. Because Al- Qaeda is not a democratic unit and not a nation-state, no system of checks and balances exists within this organization.

This terrorist network has a very different hierarchy than known nation-states. "*Al-Qaeda's management philosophy has been described as centralization of decision and decentralization of execution.*"[AL-HAMMADI 2005:65] Clearly, Al-Qaeda does not employ democratic process of decision- making with the need to legitimize its actions to the civilian populace.

3. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE DISCOURSE

(TIMELINE OF THE DISCOURSE CONNECTED TO THE WAR ON TERROR AND THE TERRORIST ATTACKS)

It is necessary to consider the dynamics of the war on terror in its entirety. This thesis is going to pin point the most important moments since the 9/11 terrorist attacks on WTC until the U.S. invasion of Iraq on the 20th of March 2003. It will focus on the mutual relationship between the two actors involved in the conflict, their communication, and the most relevant events connected to the conflict.

It will logically connect all developments of the discourse. The discourse in question evolved with time and gained significance with certain events occurring. This thesis is going to focus on such key moments that significantly impacted this conflict and the discourse that followed it.

The terrorist attack on the WTC marked the beginning of the discourse used as the basis of this thesis. It considers it to be the main cause of the conflict that followed the attacks. The event itself was the reason for the American official political discourse. George W. Bush used the attacks in his speeches to sway the public and political leaders to shape the war waged on Iraq and subsequently Afghanistan and it helped his administration to define the war on terror and the ways the U.S. reacts to different forms of terrorism today.

The entire period following the 9/11 attacks on WTC, after which the U.S. formed its attitudes towards terrorism and Al- Qaeda claimed responsibility for the attack, is defined by great amount of discourses by both actors involved in the conflict.

On the 12th of September 2001, G.W. Bush declared war against terrorism. Shortly before 11 a.m. that day, President Bush announced: "*The deliberate and deadly attacks which were carried out yesterday against our country were more than acts of terror. They were acts of war. This battle will take time and resolve, but make no mistake about it, we will win.*"[BUSH 2001a]

G.W. Bush revealed his negative and aggressive belief on how to approach a non-state actor who executed attacks on an American soil clearly. The U.S. President declared war against a non-state actor and against terrorism as a whole.

Al-Qaeda´s role in the conflict was clear even though its number one leader, Osama bin Laden, denied ever ordering the attacks. The terrorist organization was known for its anti-Western beliefs in every aspect, more so its anti-American position because it represents the "free and democratic world".

The organization effectively operates by delegating authority and allowing sub-leaders to carry out attacks against western targets as they see fit. To emphasize this point, shortly before the 9/11 attacks, al-Zawahiri (second in charge to Osama bin Laden) published his book called Knights under the Prophet's Banner. It was Al-Qaeda's way to spread propaganda and gain support to restore the Great Islamic Caliphate requiring "*...greatest damage and maximum causalities needed to be brought to the US and its allies.*"[HENZEL 2005].

Shortly after, intense discourse assumed as the international coalition against terrorism was created. G.W. Bush employed speeches and official statement to legitimize his drive to invade Iraq and Afghanistan and to stress the importance of an effective international cooperation against world-wide terrorism.

Even later that day, "*Bin Laden releases a statement praising the terrorists, saying the attacks were a punishment from Allah on America*" [DOW 2001]. He did not, however, admit the involvement of Al-Qaeda in these events. "*Following the latest explosions in the United States, some Americans are pointing the finger at me, but I deny that because I have not done it. The United States has always accused me of these incidents which have been caused by its enemies. Reiterating once again, I say that I have not done it, and the perpetrators have carried this out because of their own interest.*"[BIN LADEN 2001a]

George W. Bush's reaction was fast and efficient, "*the first war of the 21st century*"[BUSH 2001b] has begun and speaks of a "*quiet anger in America*"[BUSH 2001b]. This statement later caused much speculation in regards to U.S. policy employed to gain approval of its allies in order to retaliate against a terrorist organization. At the time, G.W. Bush had an official approval rating of 86% amongst American voters[12]. "

Later that month during a short TV address, G.W. Bush said: "*We are at war. You will be asked for resolve. You will be asked for your strength because the course to victory may be long. Those who make war against the United States have chosen their own destruction.*"[BUSH 2001c]

Even later that month during an interview, Osama bin Laden discussed the 9/11 attacks with Karachi Ummat[13] and its causes. During his intense speech, bin Laden pointed out that "*it is the United States, which is perpetrating every maltreatment on women, children, and common people of other faiths, particularly the followers of Islam*" [BIN LADEN 2001b].

It is necessary to re-state that Osama bin Laden refused to admit he was the one who gave the order to conduct terrorist attacks on WTC on 9/11[14]. Regardless, he still remained highly critical of the US policy.

"*Only one conclusion could be derived from the indifference of the United States and the West to these acts of terror and the patronage of the tyrants by these powers that America is an anti-Islamic power and it is patronizing the anti-Islamic forces. America does not want to see anyone equal to it. It expects slavery from others. Therefore, other countries are either its slaves or subordinates. However, our case is different.*"[BIN LADEN 2001c]

As the conflict developed with time, between the American government and Al-Qaeda intensified. President Bush said, he "*wants Osama bin Laden dead or alive as the Pakistani*

---

[12] The official presidential approval polls are available at WWW: http://www.gallup.com/poll/116500/presidential-approval-ratings-george-bush.aspx.

[13] The full interview is available at WWW: http://www.globalresearch.ca/interview-with-osama-bin-laden-denies-his-involvement-in-9-11/24697.

[14] For the first time, Osama bin Laden admitted Al-Qaeda´s responsability for 9/11 attacks in October 2004. He ccused U.S. President George W. Bush of negligence on the day 19 suicide hijackers took over four American passenger jets. He also threatened new attacks if the policies of the U.S. government do not change.

delegation looks like failing in its quest to force the Taliban to surrender the terrorist mastermind" [BUSH 2001d].

He also spoke of a *"crusade against terrorism, language which does little to engage support from Muslim countries"* [BUSH 2001d]. He explained: "*I would strongly urge the Taliban to turn over the Al-Qaeda organizers who hide in their country. Anybody who harbors terrorists needs to fear the United States and the rest of the freedom-loving world*" [BUSH 2001e].

Less than two weeks after the terrorist attacks on WTC during joint session of Congress, President Bush issued stark warning to all world governments employing a very rousing speech. He said to an audience, including Tony Blair,: "*Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists.*"[BUSH 2001f]

He further confirmed the US economy would cope with terrorist attacks and a subsequent war. He explained: "*We're still the greatest nation on the face of the Earth, and no terrorist will ever be able to decide our fate.*"[BUSH 2001f]

In October, during George W. Bush's addresses of the U.N. General Assembly, he stated: "*We must unite in opposing all terrorists. No national aspiration, no remembered wrong can ever justify the deliberate murder of the innocent. Any government that rejects this principle, trying to pick and choose its terrorist friends, will know the consequences.*"[BUSH 2001g].

"*On Sunday, October 7, 2001, less than a month after the attacks of September 11, US President George W. Bush announced the American military response in a televised address. Within hours, there came a riposte from Osama bin Laden who had prepared a videotape in anticipation of such military action and conveyed it to the widely viewed Arabic language network Al-Jazeera, with instructions that it should be released shortly after Bush's broadcast*"[LINCOLN 2002].

In November 2001, two months after WTC attacks by the terrorists, the intensity of the discourse on both sides of the conflict has seemingly decreased.

However, there were several instances since the terrorist attacks until up to the U.S. invasion of Iraq; where the discourse on both ends of the conflict was intense and crucial. This thesis argues that a powerful statement can greatly impact political relations between actors involved.

In 2002, the relationship between the U.S. government and Al-Qaeda could be described as a continuously negative one. In January of that year during the President's State of the Union speech, Bush named Iraq, Iran and North Korea, as the "axis of evil." He promised that the U.S. "*will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons.*"[SANGER 2002]

On the 14th of May2002, The UN Security Council readmitted the 11-year-old sanctions against Iraq, which established complicated list of procedures and requirement in order to provide the country with humanitarian aid. The U.S., via the sanctions committee, prevented $5 billion of humanitarian aid entering Iraq.

On the 12th of September in New York City, President Bush made his address at the opening of the UN General Assembly, challenging the body to "*confront the grave and gathering danger of Iraq, or become irrelevant.*"[BUSH 2002a]

Few days later, on the 17th of September 2002, President Bush released the National Security Strategy, which leaned towards conservative military approach toward Al-Qaeda and Iraq. The strategy stated "*the United States would exploit its military and economic power to encourage free and open societies. His release also prioritized that the U.S. Army's military influence is not to be challenged, as it was during the Cold War.*"[BUSH 2002b] On the 8th of November, the United States Security Council approved the arms inspections of Iraq. [15]

---

[15] Resolution 1441 was unanimously approved by the UN Security Council. The resolution creates stiff new arms inspections for Iraq, which also means "serious consequences" if Iraq decides not to cooperate.

In 2003, George Bush started threatening Iraq without UN's approval. On January 28th, Bush stated that "*Saddam Hussein is not disarming*" [BUSH 2003a] during his State if the Union speech.

Bush indicated that he was ready to invade Iraq with or without UN's approval; an indication of the discourse George W. Bush and his administration decided to take prior to U.S. intervention of Iraq on the 20th of March 2003.

Based on this analysis and the historical background, it is evident that the period between 11th of September 2001 and 20th of March 2003 was very dynamic and definitely reflective of political and cultural differences between the U.S. and Al-Qaeda. An imbalance did exist between official statements released by both actors involved in the conflict.

The number of statements released by George W. Bush was much higher at the time, due to his political position. Obviously, he was expected to express the government's concerns regarding terrorist attacks on U.S. soil and subsequently the U.S. national security than Osama bin Laden ever would as his concerns lied elsewhere. This imbalance negatively impacts my analysis, thus this thesis wants to focus on the most important discourses and cope with any quantitative disparities by a deep analysis instead.

4. THE DISCURSIVE ANALYSIS OF THE LEGITIMIZATION TECHNIQUES

This discourse analysis is based on a database of speeches by George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden (or their closest advisors/ followers). These quotations are part of the legitimization discourse regarding the 9/11 terrorist attacks in New York City, Washington D.C., and Pennsylvania and the subsequent invasion of Iraq by the U.S. on the 20th of March 2003.

In this thesis, each quotation is associated with a discursive category in order to analyze the legitimization techniques the speakers in question used. Each quotation/speech has its own category, although each could definitely be placed in more than one category. This thesis rather focused on the most obvious goal of each specific expression, sentence, or paragraph. All categorized quotations will be available as an appendix. Later, this thesis will also analyze the reason why either speaker chose specific speech techniques.

This thesis analyzes the most important statements made by speakers involved in and critical to the conflict. Although G.W. Bush had more public appearances than bin Laden altogether based on his status, the analysis is approached as fairly as possible. The in depth analysis will follow the chart below during my focus on legitimization categories for both figures.

Legitimization technique	George W. Bush	Osama bin Laden
Legitimization by dichotomy between "us" and "them"	20 (20%)	13 (18,05%)
Legitimization by the superiority of a culture, a society or a religion	3 (3%)	9 (12,6%)
Legitimization by a necessary evil confrontation	11 (11%)	1 (1,39%)
Legitimization by the universal and generally accepted and recognized values, morals, etc	34 (34%)	25 (34,7%)
Legitimization by the relevant source of power (God, etc.), which is represented as a defender of the values and norms of the legitimizing party	4 (4%)	20 (27,7%)
Legitimization as part of the process of securitization	26 (26%)	4 (5,55%)
Legitimization by the relevant data, international law or expertise done by the professionals in the field	2 (2%)	0 (0%) %)
Total	100	72

Please note that numbers and percentages used above are descriptive in nature and carry no explanatory function. They do, however, show the most and the least dominating legitimization methods used by George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden respectively. Their interpretation is an extremely important part of this analysis.

4.1 CASE OF GOERGE W BUSH

Because of the political power status the United States holds amongst the international players, "*President George W. Bush had to justify the interventions made in Afghanistan and Iraq to both domestic and international audiences*" [KERTON-JOHNSON 2008:100].

This thesis agrees with the assumption that the American values and norms were always reflected in G.W. Bush's speeches and are generally accepted by the international community as universal, moral, and a major part of the international law. And such words describing American values; such as freedom, liberty, democracy, and truth, form the inherent part of Bush´s political discourse at the time.

Despite the fact that the 9/11 terrorist attacks took place on American soil, the conflict has become an international one rather quickly due to the fact terrorism is transnational in its core. American values are believed to be universal and therefore the terrorist attack on American soil understood as an attack on the entire democratic (western) world "*Likewise, any messages intended by the USA and its allies to be conveyed by the war on terrorism have a variety of audiences from nations that may actively support, provide passive support, or even oppose such action.*"[GRAY, WILSON 2006:24]

This thesis suggests that President George W. Bush was in a position, where the public support from the USA´s citizens was crucial for all of his future decisions connected to his war on terror strategy.

Moreover, it is necessary to take into consideration President Bush´s political ambition to be elected for the next term. Therefore, this thesis argues that the interpretation of the legitimization discourse cannot be done without understanding the specific context and the values, which define its society and culture.

4.1.1 LEGITIMIZATION BY THE DICHOTOMY BETWEEN "US" AND "THEM"

This legitimization technique used by both sides of the conflict is a strict division of "us" and "them. Both actors involved use this division to demonstrate social, religious, moral, and cultural disparities, as well as attempt to dehumanize the opponent. "Us" defines the statement maker as the one with good values being under an attack by its opponent defined as evil "them" interchangeably.

The opposing side is, according to Murray Edelman, based on "*identifiable persons or stereotypes of persons to whom evil traits, intentions or actions can be attributed. It is not the [actual] harm that matters but the attribution*". [EDELMAN 1988:87).

Tuman also argues that "*all political movements and conflicts inevitably require lines to be drawn, sides to be defined, and allegiances (or their absence) declared*". [TUMAN 2003:40].

For example, George W. Bush always described his opponent in his discourse, the terrorists/Al-Qaeda, as barbaric or barbarians. Some of his official statements describing the social difference between democracies and Al-Qaeda stand on the concept of barbarism. By using the term "barbarism or barbaric", G.W. Bush degraded and dehumanized the culture 9/11 terrorists belonged to, thus legitimizing the future war on terror. "*None of us could have envisioned the barbaric acts of these terrorists*". [BUSH 2001h]

This thesis suggests Bush attempted to make his audience believe how irrational, evil, and unreasonable the terrorist attacks (and terrorists) were; thus making military intervention necessary and unavoidable. This thesis argues that the term "barbaric" was very carefully chosen in order to dehumanize the terrorists who deserved severe punishment without negotiations.

"*We're going to find those who – those evil-doers, those barbaric people who attacked our country and we're going to hold them accountable.*" [BUSH 2001i] President Bush repeated those specific "us" vs. "them" descriptions frequently. It was a coherent strategy allowing a public build-up of very negative views of the opponent, therefore easily legitimizing the war on terror.

Bush made sure however, that his audience believed the "us" vs. "them" division was not about culture or religion[16]. That in fact it was about terrorist barbaric behavior disrespecting generally accepted rules, morals, and values throughout the international community.

"*There is a great divide in our time – not between religions or cultures, but between civilization and barbarism. People of all cultures wish to live in safety and dignity .Our enemies reject these values – and by doing so, they set themselves not against the West, but against the entire world*". [BUSH 2001j] The 9/11 terrorists were described as "evil-doers" and "barbaric", therefore "*barbarism is given the same intrinsic quality that is ascribed to evil*". [BHATIA 2007:512]

Some authors use "our" or "we" rather than "us" vs. "them" to create sense of collective approach, patriotism, and unity. President Bush used both during his war on terror discourse to allow the use of "our" and "we" make "us" even more significant and distinct from "them"; a very important factor in the process of legitimization in this case.

The division between "us" and "them" directly corresponds to the concept of securitization, as barbaric nations are not on the same footing as civilized nations of the modern world who "*wish to live in safety in dignity*". [BUSH 2001j]. It suggests that barbaric nations do not "wish to live in safety and dignity". That safety is not a value they respect and thus national security of any modern nation-state must be addressed and be cautious about.

---

[16] I will explain later that even though President Bush argued that this division was not based on the different culture, or religion; he actually used the method of legitimization by the superiority of the American society.

Bush's idea of the difference between barbaric nations and the more civilized world suggests the modern society does not think or understand barbaric nations (terrorists). Thus are unable to understand "the barbaric acts of terrorists". Although the 9/11 attacks were conducted on the American soil, Bush's "barbaric" vs. "modern world" notion assumes the attacks were in fact committed against the entire free world *"by constantly referencing civilization and civilized society"* [BHATIA 2007:513]. *"The civilized world is rallying to America's side"*. [BUSH 2001f]

Carefully selected words by President Bush to create collective understanding of the civilized world and terrorism, the international community gained a deeper understanding of the division between "us" and "them".

He wanted his audience to see the attacks on global level- and as a division between "good" and "evil", thus easily legitimizing the war on terror. *"No nation can be neutral in this conflict, because no civilized nation can be secure in a world threatened by terror"*. [BUSH 2001k]

Bush did not see the attacks on WTC as a conflict between the U.S. and Al-Qaeda; rather he saw it as a global war led by the modern democratic world against terrorists. It made his legitimization strategy effective as it was easier to gain international community's consent to wage war.

The United States of America were presented in President Bush´s war on terror discourse as the leading country of the entire civilized world. It was described as the actor around which the civilized world is "rallying".

"This statement can be interpreted as implicit positive self-presentation, thereby emphasizing the goodness of America, while also creating further the illusive us vs. them divide between the civilized (or all those on the side of America) and the uncivilized". [BHATIA 2007:513]

Nevertheless, the actors of the discourse sometimes share the "*double contrastive identities*" [LEUDAR, NEKVAPIL 2004: 251]. Specifically in this case, Osama bin Laden is being portrayed as barbaric by America (in George W. Bush´s official statements), but in turn he accused Americans of being "*the worst civilization witnessed by the history of mankind*" [BIN LADEN 2002a]; *"the superlative 'worst' depicting a powerful negative-other presentation of the opposite side".* [BHATIA 2007:513]

The division between the civilized society and the uncivilized one (also defined as barbaric) used by George W. Bush falls under one of the categories this thesis described at the beginning of this paper. Specifically, it falls under the legitimization by the superiority of a culture, a society or a religion.

Let us assume, based on this legitimization discourse categories, George W. Bush wanted to emphasize the division between civilized West and the uncivilized terrorists using "us" vs. "them" strategy. It is extremely hard to do as there is no historical precedence to make political divisions based on geography (West vs. East) in our modern and globalized society.

Yet Bush stated on many occasions that *"our war is not against a religion. Our war is against evil."* [BUSH 2002c]; "*We do not fight Islam, we fight against evil*" [BUSH 2002c]. In fact, this "*constant referencing the Islamic faith and Christianity gives a contrary impression"*. "[BHATIA 2007:513]

Despite the fact Bush attempted to make the world understand the war on terror has nothing to do with Islam (or any other religion), rather it has everything to do with evil. But his discourse proves otherwise.

"Bush still invokes religion constantly, quoting the Koran to give the impression that, despite not being a follower of the Islamic faith, he is aware of the teachings of the Koran." [BHATIA 2007:514]

Even though the intercept above is not an evidence of President Bush correlating terrorism to Islam, speaking of Islam in the same text as terrorist attacks themselves has negative and permanent psychological effect on the audience. "*Although no religious connotations are implied, the very use of religious terminology in relation to conflict, war and violence can open a Pandora's Box of genuine religious violence.*" [LARSSON 2004:106]

George W. Bush attempted to separate Islam from terrorism in his discourse, but his frequent references to terrorists and how they "*practice a fringe form of Islamic extremism*" [BHATIA 2007:514] places Islamic religion in a predicament.

Bush quoted Koran many times trying to show how terrorist groups (Al-Qaeda) should be labeled extremist and ridicule Allah. "*Let me quote from the Koran itself: In the long run, evil in the extreme will be the end of those who do evil. For that they rejected the signs of Allah and held them up to ridicule*". [BUSH 2001l]

As this thesis stated before, George W. Bush did not directly imply a direct link between terrorism and Muslims via Islamic extremism, yet by using words such as terrorism, Islam, and Muslim interchangeably left a permanent and negative impact on the audience´s understanding of this (non) existing correlation.

The "us" against "them" division portrays Bush's opponents as people who do not respect universal values or the rules of their own religion. "*Those who commit evil in the name of Allah blaspheme the name of Allah. The terrorists are traitors to their own faith, trying, in effect, to hijack Islam itself".* [BUSH 2001k]

This text intercept reinforced the "us" against "them" division by pointing out the fact that the members of the terrorist group do not respect the rules of their own religion.

This thesis argues that this fact also helped legitimizing the war on terror, because the terrorists were presented as someone who has no respect for the greater power, such as religion, international law or universal morals.

George W. Bush described terrorist groups as evil, barbaric and uncivilized. However, "*terrorists are neither crazy nor amoral. They come from many walks of life. They come from all religious traditions and from none. One thing they do have in common. They are weaker than those they oppose.*" [WHITE 2008: 38–39] Hence the fact George W. Bush connected the 9/11 terrorists to barbarism and Islam was his way to legitimize his political decisions for the public and the international community.

George W. Bush´s definition of terrorism and terrorists as evil ones can be "*interpreted as part of the discourse of illusion, where not only do the more powerful groups in society categorize groups and individuals into types of people according to their perceptions, but those whom the 'us' group categorize as 'others' and evil, in turn perhaps deem 'us' as evil*". [BHATIA 2007:514]

To sum up the "us" against "them" legitimization technique, it is crucial to understand the audience of the 9/11 WTC terrorist attacks and its consequences did not have a detailed knowledge about Islamic society, culture and religion at the time to form its own opinions. George W. Bush defined those terms for the audience itself, which allowed him to legitimize the war on terror.

Since general public accepted the description of terrorists as an uneducated barbaric and uncivilized social group very different from developed and modern societies, it was much easier for the audience to accept President Bush´s political decisions following the 9/11 attacks.

This thesis will analyze Osama bin Laden´s discourse shortly, describing his approach to "us" vs. "them" dichotomy to legitimize Al-Qaeda´s 9/11 terrorist attacks. Both actors used the same method, which is extremely effective as both figures gained large amount of support from their audiences.

4.1.2. LEGITIMIZATION BY THE SUPERIORITY OF A CULTURE, A SOCIETY, OR A RELIGION

As George W. Bush justified the war on terror by dividing the civilized/developed West from the uncivilized/underdeveloped Middle East; he legitimized his political decisions by creating a perception of superiority of the U.S. over other nations[17]. This thesis argues that this method was frequently used by other nation states often, as it is in human nature to believe one´s culture is superior to others.

George W. Bush frequently argued the 9/11 terrorist attacks never meant to target America alone, but rather the entire western culture: "*We face enemies that hate not our policies, but our existence; the tolerance of openness and creative culture that defines us*". [BUSH 2001g] "The tolerance of openness" can be understood as a direct reference to the concept of democracy, frequently used by Bush to depict the American and western culture.

George W. Bush's idea of democracy was crucial during his discourse, as the American foreign policy has always been to export democratic regime into undemocratic parts of the world, "*also to places which are not prepared for it, either culturally, or politically, and which see the U.S. action as interference into their internal affairs*".[BUSH 2001g]

George W. Bush´s official statements openly suggested that because the American/western culture is superior to other nations, it is and will be targeted by terrorist organizations. "*America was targeted for attack because we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world. And no one will keep that light from shining*". [BUSH 2001c]

The method of legitimization by cultural superiority, religion, or society is never a method expected to be used by democratically elected leader.

---

[17] This analysis also takes into consideration basically any other concept connected to the western society, its values, behavioral models, morals, etc

Taking into consideration national patriotism, pride, and emotions of American population which experienced huge loss, Bush's legitimization method was one of the most effectives.

Al-Qaeda´s leaders used the very same approach to legitimize 9/11 terrorist attacks, arguing Islamic culture is superior to the west and must be accepted by the rest of the world.

4.1.3 LEGITIMIZATION BY A NECESSARY EVIL CONFRONTATION

Another method used by G.W. Bush effectively was the legitimization by a necessary evil confrontation, which defined the war on terror as a necessary answer to deal with "evil" terrorism. The evil in this case was too dangerous to deal with in other ways, thus an offensive reaction becomes the only option. This method directly connects the "us" vs. "them" method as the opponent ("them") always defines "evil" the good "us" faces.

Bush simplified his speech vocabulary by proposing a strict (black-and white) division of the conflict. The word "evil" was one of his extreme oversimplifications. *"That evil has returned, and that cause is renewed."* [BUSH 2001c] The "good, democratic, civilized, western" world stood against the "evil, barbaric, uncivilized middle eastern" world and it was an extremely simple way of explaining the American foreign policy to an international audience. This thesis argues George W. Bush wanted to maximize the support of mass international audience by intensifying the negative image of the targeted group.

"Personalizing the problem as Osama bin Laden and demonizing him as evil thus deflects attention from the global network of Jihadism and the many dimensions of struggle. It exaggerates the importance of military action as a violent and retaliatory tool of the destruction of evil and decenters the importance of dialogue, understanding, coalition-building, and using the instruments of global finance, law, and politics to isolate and overcome the forces of global terrorism".[KELLNER 2003:2]

By intensifying the danger, he made an offensive reaction to 9/11 attacks a necessity. *"We will defend ourselves and our future against terror and lawless violence."* [BUSH 2001e] *"Aggressions and ambitions of the wicked must be opposed early, decisively and collectively, before they threaten us all."* [BUSH 2001c] Bush saw terrorism as a global danger threatening "us all"- therefore calling for a collective reaction decisively engaging the phenomenon of terrorism, which was, in this case, defined as evil.

"Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forwards, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime." [BUSH 2001c] It is evident George W. Bush made the necessary evil confrontation a global issue. He said many times that any nation-state supporting terrorist evil will become America's enemy, thus dividing the two sides of the conflict forevermore.

4.1.4 LEGITIMIZATION BY THE UNIVERSAL AND GENERALLY ACCEPTED AND RECOGNIZED VALUES, MORALS, ETC.

President Bush based his statements on the idea that America's post 9/11 foreign policy reflected the universal, generally accepted values and morals. The assumption that the entire free western world recognizes the same values as the United States of America legitimizes the American post 9/11 foreign policy.

George W. Bush frequently referenced other nations to suggest the 9/11 attacks were against the entire free world: *"The suffering of September the 11th was inflicted on people of many faiths and many nations. All of the victims, including Muslims, were killed with equal indifference and equal satisfaction by the terrorist leaders. The terrorists are violating the tenets of every religion, including the one they invoke".* [BUSH 2001k] By naming non U.S. nation states or nations seemingly affected by 9/11 attacks as well, Bush explained the lethal offensive against terrorism as a response to 9/11 attacks was supported by modern world's universal and generally accepted values.

Bush's administration employed this method of legitimization to suggest the 9/11 attacks were against the western world and a global issue as a response to America's attempts to export democracy elsewhere: *"But the stakes for America are never small. If our country does not lead the cause of freedom, it will not be led. If we do not turn the hearts of children toward knowledge and character, we will lose their gifts and undermine their idealism. If we permit our economy to drift and decline, the vulnerable will suffer most."*[BUSH 2001b] Bush believes a military intervention was necessary to protect the American people and to continue exporting democracy elsewhere.

George W. Bush made an effort to explain the 9/11 attacks were a global problem affecting the entire free world: *"Those names include a citizen of Gambia, whose wife spent their fourth wedding anniversary, September the 12th, searching in vain for her husband. Those names include a man who supported his wife in Mexico, sending home money every week. Those names include a young Pakistani who prayed toward Mecca five times a day, and died that day trying to save others."* [BUSH 2001e]

This specific method used by Bush made his audience believe the 'free" world is the only one which recognized the values of life, freedom, peace, and non-violence. George W. Bush used this method to make the war on terrorism a global issue to easily legitimize the post 9/11 U.S. policy.

That is one of the reasons why President Bush called for International cooperation regarding his military intervention in the Middle East. Specifically naming affected nationalities, ethnicities, and religions by 9/11 attacks suggested terrorism being a global issue. By creating a global threat out of terrorism, an aggressive reaction was easy to legitimize. *"Our war on terror begins with Al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated"* [BUSH 2002a].

Bush stated many times how necessary it was to fight terrorism which posed a great security threat to world democracies: *"We will direct every resource at our command— every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war—to the destruction and to the defeat of the global terror network"* [BUSH 2002a]

George W. Bush centered his discourse around generally accepted morals and values by his audience, as seen in his speeches on how to protect freedom and individual liberties. *"They hate our freedoms –our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other. They want to drive Israel out of the Middle East. They want to drive Christians and Jews out of vast regions of Asia and Africa."* [BUSH 2001k]

As explained previously, this approach to legitimize war against terrorism by making 9/11 attacks a global issue enabled Bush to win attention of a large audience and ultimately international support to go to war.

George W. Bush's idea of protecting individual freedoms by waging war on terrorism followed his entire discourse to 9/11 attacks: *"Freedom and fear are at war. The advance of human freedom, the greatest achievement of our time and the great hope of every time, now depends on us.*

Our nation, this generation, will lift the dark threat of violence from our people and our future. We will rally the world to this cause by our efforts, by our courage. We will not tire, we will not falter and we will not fail."[BUSH 2002b] George W. Bush had to separate the concept of freedom from fear if he wanted his audience continuously approve his courses of action against terrorism.

Freedom and fear were present on both sides of the conflict in different ways and as a response to different actions taken by each actor. The U.S. waged war on terrorism as a reaction to fear caused by 9/11 terrorists. Bush immediately connected the war on terrorism to lost freedoms of all peoples of the free world and therefore successfully legitimized America's post 9/11 foreign policy.

President Bush´s discourse blatantly described the U.S as blameless and provoked to armed conflict by 9/11 terrorists: *"We are a country awakened to danger and called to defend freedom. Our grief has turned to anger, and anger to resolution."*[BUSH 2001b] George W. Bush stated America is a peaceful nation, unwilling to wage wars unless provoked to do so by terrorist attacks.

The war on terror was therefore legitimized by the sudden global need to fight terrorism for peace *"Yet, as we have learned, so suddenly and so tragically, there can be no peace in a world of sudden terror. In the face of today's new threat, the only way to pursue peace is to pursue those who threaten it."* [BUSH 2001e]

4.1.5 LEGITIMIZAZION BY THE RELEVANT SOURCE OF POWER (GOD, ETC.) WHICH IS REPRESENTED AS A DEFENDER OF THE VALUES AND NORMS OF THE LEGITIMIZING PARTY

Approaching audiences by employing various legitimizing ways of such a controversial policy as the war on terrorism will always be extremely challenging. This holds true specifically when the speaker does not have the proper legal support of the universally recognized norms of the international law[18]. Thus other sources of power must be used in order to gain the necessary public support. In Bush's discourse, the phenomenon of God was such source of power used. Even Osama bin Laden used this strategy frequently and effectively as well and it will be discussed later.

George W. Bush used the concept of God during his war on terrorism discourse to make his audience believe he is defending God's laws by fighting "evil" and hence the public must support the war.

Bush also argued that the free western society respects all religions and religious norms, unlike the terrorists; therefore that it justifies the war in order to protect God's laws and punish tyrannical ungodly terrorists who inflict pain on innocent people. *"Our enemies fear a society which is pluralistic and open to worship an almighty God. Our enemies are right to fear open societies because those societies leave no room for bigotry and tyranny. The promise of our time has no room for the vision of the Taliban or Al Qaeda"* [BUSH 2002a]

By connecting religion and its values to the war on terrorism as its defender, Bush seemingly made armed conflict acceptable, supportable, and tolerable for a religious audience.[19]

---

[18] The legality of the invasion and occupation of Iraq has been widely debated since the United States, United Kingdom, and a coalition of other countries launched the 2003 invasion of Iraq. The then United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan said in September 2004 that: "From our point of view and the UN Charter point of view, it [the war] was illegal."[MACASKILL; BORGER 2004].

[19] This phrase does not indicate any particular faith or religion, but rather the specificity of American society and their religious value orientation.

Bush in fact suggested that the goals of the war on terror were very Godly. *"Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them."*[BUSH 2001f]

Some scholars, such as Menegatos, see such discursive technique as "*indicative of the messianic-millenarian theodicy that is prevalent in George W. Bush's speeches*" [AERTS 2011:5]. The concept of theodicy means that "*America's civil religion that gives the nation a sacred history and a sacred mission for the future". It is a "religious orientation, heavily influenced by [Christianity, one that played a crucial role in the development of American institutions and still adds a religious dimension for the whole fabric of American life, including the political sphere*". [AERTS 2011: 5].

Most of George W. Bush's official statements were concluded with expressions such as *"May God continue to bless America."*[BUSH 2001a] or *"In all that lies before us, may God grant us wisdom, and may He watch over the United States."*[BUSH 2001f] Even though such statements are used frequently and without hesitation throughout American society, Bush's political position gave those statements much more weight and importance. Thus it enabled Bush to allow his audience to believe the U.S. plays some sort of a sacred role when it comes to international relations and conflicts: "*Bush, as a proponent of this messianic-millenarian theodicy, has the ability to couple religious refrains with a kind of patriotic fundamentalism*".[AERTS 2011: 12]

4.1.6 LEGITIMIZATZION BY A PROCESS OF SECURITIZATION

Another method used by George W. Bush to legitimize his foreign policy regarding the war on terror is securitization[20]. It seems logical that in order to explain and justify an aggressive foreign policy to the people, people must feel threatened by the enemy who such aggressive policies are meant to keep at bay. The concept of terrorism had to be defined as a serious threat to all people of the United States of America, their values, culture, and morals.

George W. Bush employed the concept of legitimization by the process of securitization in most of his official political statements post 9/11. During his first post 9/11 address[21], President Bush actually did not open his speech by addressing values of the American people under attack, a method normally common for the President. In this case, Bush addressed the terrorist attacks themselves first.

The threat to the United States of America is described in the fourth paragraph of his speech and those responsible weren't mentioned specifically. Those responsible were described vaguely[22], which suggests the lack of knowledge about the attackers at the time. His speech gave the impression that the United States of America is alone to face the evil attackers responsible for 9/11 WTC attacks.

In this specific speech, Bush created a void between the United States and its allies, peaceful nations, and those who support terrorism: *"America and our friends and allies join with all those who want peace and security in the world, and we stand together to win the war against terrorism."*[BUSH 2001a]

Therefore terrorists who refuse to recognize western values as a peaceful way of life represent a serious threat to the free world and thus became an immediate subject of securitization by George W. Bush.

---

[20] *"Securitization is an extreme version of politicization that enables the use of extraordinary means in the name of security. For the securitizing act to be successful; it must be accepted by the audience. Securitization studies aims to understand "who securitizes (Securitizing actor), on what issues (threats), for whom (referent object), why, with what results, and not least, under what conditions."* [BUZAN 1998:32]
[21] [BUSH 2001a]
[22] George W.Bush uses the words „no one". „*And no one will keep that light from shining.*" [BUSH 2001]

This thesis argues that the method of securitization is evident specifically at times when George W. Bush made comments in his speeches that other terrorist attacks are likely and imminent. "*Our first priority is to get help to those who have been injured and to take every precaution to protect our citizens at home and around the world from further attacks*". [BUSH 2001a]

Bush saw the 9/11 WTC attacks as a horrific beginning to more attacks on American soil or elsewhere. Bush considered the danger of terrorism ever-present with a high likelihood of re-occurring. George W. Bush stated precautions must be taken in order to protect American citizens from further terrorist attacks on American soil or anywhere in the free world for that matter.

In the same Presidential post 9/11 address, Bush used specific words and metaphors openly admitting the necessity to employ American military forces to contain those responsible for 9/11 attacks. He stated that the United States might have "*to take every precaution*" [BUSH 2001a].

Based on those statements, the war on terror was immediately justified in the need to protect world peace and security on a global level. Bush clearly divided terrorism and global security in his discourse, allowing the Americans to feel insecure and afraid of future terrorist attacks. Bush used a very interesting paradox here.

He stated that once a country under attack desires to restore peace, it must go to war first. "*It also indicates that Bush and the United States is prepared to go to war, but not only for the United States to be secure, but for the whole world in general. Thus the United States takes over the burden to ensure peace and security in the whole world; however, at the same time it would be grateful for any help coming from its friends and allies.*" [HARE 2001:162]

This thesis sees the method of securitization to be one of the most effective ones in this case. Bush's audience was sensitive to the post 9/11 threat and he successfully bridged the danger of terrorism to an American population scared for their lives, families, values, and norms. It is logical that as a political leader, Bush used this method to legitimize his decisions.

What this thesis finds lacking is the fact that President Bush never used any professional expertise regarding his securitization statements prior to releasing them to the public. Thus Bush's methods of legitimization can be related and compared to the ones employed by Osama bin Laden.

Bin Laden often described the danger American and western society in general posed to the world. Bin Laden based his statements on cultural and religious values and never used strategic security expertise. Had he used strategic expertise, his methods would suggest a real danger and suggested necessary steps preventing it.

George W. Bush restated his methods of securitization during his United Nations address; when he pointed out the fact Al-Qaeda owns weapons of mass destruction and thus poses a major threat to the United States of America and the entire western society.

"*These same terrorists are searching for weapons of mass destruction, the tools to turn their hatred into holocaust. They can be expected to use chemical, biological and nuclear weapons the moment they are capable of doing so*". [BUSH 2001d] By repeating and portraying terrorist threat as real and ever-present, it enabled legitimization of the war on terror as the only way to protect American citizens. It appears much easier to gain public approval to wage war is war seems to be the only way to restore peace and strengthen national security.

"*As we meet, the terrorists are planning more murder -- perhaps in my country or perhaps in yours*".[BUSH 2001e] This sentence itself attempted to gain international support for the war by questioning the future of national security of all western nation states. To a degree, as a leader of a free and democratic nation under attack, Bush seemed genuinely concerned about the security of the West and wanted international support to his plight.

Therefore he continued informing the public and the international community of measures taken to negate the existing terrorist threat to the United States and the rest of the free world. "*We've intensified security at the borders and ports of entry, posted more than 50,000 newly-trained federal screeners in airports, begun inoculating troops and first responders against smallpox, and are deploying the nation's first early warning network of*

sensors to detect biological attack. And this year, for the first time, we are beginning to field a defense to protect this nation against ballistic missiles." [BUSH 2002a]

The audience was made aware that despite all measures taken to prevent new terrorist attacks on American soil, the threat still existed. That ensures public support of a strict foreign policy from this point forward.

The process of securitization appears to be the one method which impacted the audience the most. Public cares about its security and safety as it is one of the most basic needs of all human beings. Therefore, President Bush´s securitization discourse based on ever-present terrorist threat to the public was extremely important to his legitimization concept.

"*There's never a day when I do not learn of another threat, or receive reports of operations in progress, or give an order in this global war against a scattered network of killers*". [BUSH 2002a] Public knowledge of always present danger posed by the terrorism enabled politicians to wage war on two nations and employ strict national and foreign policies to justify the war on terror in the name of public safety and national security.

4.1.7 LEGITIMIZAZION BY THE NECESSARY CONFRONTATON OF THE INTERNATIONAL LAW CRIMES

This thesis would have expected democratically elected leaders of free nation-states[23] to employ different legitimization methods regarding acts of aggression or waging wars. The legitimization by the necessary confrontation method within the international law would be the proper approach in this case.

But analyzing George W. Bush's quotations regarding the war on terrorism discourse, it is evident he never used this method at all. President Bush referenced the international law in a very different context. *"These obligations are urgent and they are binding on every nation with a place in this chamber. Many governments are taking these obligations seriously, and my country appreciates it. Yet, even beyond Resolution 1373, more is required, and more is expected of our coalition against terror*." [BUSH 2001g]

---

[23] Even though the United States´ presidential elections are not purely direct. The president is elected by the electoral college, however, the public opinion is strongly reflected in the result of the elections.

4.2 THE CASE OF OSAMA BIN LADEN

At the time of 9/11, Osama bin Laden was, quite logically, in a very different position compared to George W. Bush. He was not democratically elected and was not a head of a legitimate nation state. He was in fact a head of a terrorist organization called Al-Qaeda. Bin Laden could have said or done anything along the basis of his faith and thus any discourse he undertook never needed an approval of anyone.

His followers had to follow orders and Osama bin Laden's legitimization discourse was always expected to be extreme. However, this analysis does confirm bin Laden's legitimization methods were similar to George W. Bush's methods.

"*Osama Bin Laden's portrait tends to be very dichotomous: to many in the West he epitomized terrorism and -by association- the horrors of fundamentalist Islam. He perfectly fits the orientalist image of the irrational bearded fanatic with turban and scimitar who operates from a remote cave or desert, an arguably overly simplified image that unfortunately still persists in many media*". [LINCOLN 2006]. Bin Laden was not only a terrorist group leader, but also their prophet-ideological leader.

It is truly necessary to take into consideration that Osama bin Laden wanted his voice to be heard. Al Jazeera´s English broadcasting was "*his preferred contact point for new messages and in the subsequent years several other videotapes, as well as audiocassettes and scanned letters, made their way to the news channel*". [AERTS 2011:6] [24]

Bin Laden's discourse had a very important function as he wanted to legitimize the terrorist attacks to his own supporters as well as to the rest of the world yet to accept Islam and Al-Qaeda´s extreme ideology.

---

[24] The authenticity of some of Osama bin Laden´s statements is still being disputed. The texts which were chosen for the analysis , however, have all been accepted "*as genuine by a majority of the experts and officials who have examined them*" [HOWARTH 2011:6].

This thesis will analyze Osama bin Laden's most important messages and speeches. All texts used in this thesis can be found in the appendix. The number of bin Laden's statements is lower than those released by Bush, likely due to their very different political positions and media support.

4.2.1 LEGITIMIZATION BY A DICHOTOMY BETWEEN "US" AND "THEM"

Many authors [25] argue that Osama bin Laden used this legitimization method frequently, but this research concludes otherwise. Bin Laden's dichotomy was often based on superiority of his own culture and religion, and such statements are founds in following categories. There are several examples representing bin Laden's dichotomy. He also described this division as an opposition between the Islamic nations and the Western world, defined by its indifference.

"*Only one conclusion could be derived from the indifference of the United States and the West to these acts of terror and the patronage of the tyrants by these powers that America is an anti-Islamic power and it is patronizing the anti-Islamic forces*". [BIN LADEN 2001a]

Al-Qaeda's organizational structure and beliefs are likely reasons for bin Laden's dichotomy and its frequency based on Islamic superiority to all other cultures or nations. Islamic religion, norms, values, and culture in its extreme form enabled Osama bin Laden´s dominant legitimization method regarding WTC attacks based on superiority of culture, religion, and society. [26]

---

[25] For example, Eric Aerts argues, that "*this strategy of establishing two rival camps is one of the more straightforward ways of bin Laden´s dichotomization*".[AERTS 2011:7]

[26] The aim of my analysis was to place every statement into one single category. However, many of the statements could be defined by multiple different legitimization methods.

Just as President George W. Bush, Osama bin Laden made a very clear distinction between the two sides of the conflict. *"I say these events have split the whole world into two camps: the camp of belief and the disbelief. So every Muslim shall take - shall support his religion."*[BIN LADEN 2001b] This approach is very similar to the one based on the dichotomy between "us" and "them".

However, this thesis argues that Osama bin Laden centered this method on the superiority of its own culture, or on the inferiority of the opponent one. It is evident Osama bin Laden called upon Islam and all faithful Muslims to act like the superior culture that they based on religion. He asked that all faithful Muslims use Islam to spread Islamic culture and Al-Qaeda's mission to create greater Islamic Caliphate.

Osama bin Laden took a slightly different approach than George W. Bush referring to the superiority of Islamic culture during his discourse. He portrayed the United States of America and the western society inferior due to specific habits such as drinking alcohol, using drugs, and treating women without respect among others: *"Your nation encourages drinking alcohol in all its shapes and forms i.e. production, trading and usage. On the one hand, you have made selling and using some drugs illegal, yet you so often turn a blind eye to this vice."*[BIN LADEN 2001d]

His goal, while using this approach, was to show how extremely immoral the western society is and terrorist attacks would enable spread of Islam and its values to the world and therefore save it from immorality.

"Your nation allows immoral acts and you assume that these are part of personal freedom, all whilst you continue to move towards this hell without any concern. Even your policies and rules show no concern for these things. Who can forget your previous President's immoral acts committed in the Oval office?" [BIN LADEN 2001d]

Bin Laden particularly targeted Bill Clinton's political scandal with Monica Lewinski to show lack of morals in the U.S. and called all loyal supporters to show support for greater unification of Muslims throughout the world.

Moreover, Osama bin Laden linked the concept of western inferior position to its own responsibility for global issues western culture supposedly caused. One of the issues was sexually transmitted diseases. *"And because of all this, you have been described as the nation of all kinds of different diseases - diseases that had never existed in the past. So you have to be proud of yourself, because your evil acts have spread AIDS all around the world, especially to the poorest countries in the world, killing many millions."*[BIN LADEN 2001d]

This specific approach seemed to have been effective in gaining public support for Al-Qaeda´s discourse. By arguing the inferiority of the west and America itself, bin Laden showed the west poses the ultimate threat to the world by spreading infectious sexual diseases due to immorality and godlessness. Therefore, this thesis argues this approach could be also linked to the one based on the process of securitization.

"Despite the great devastation inflicted on the Iraqi people by the crusader-Zionist alliance, and despite the huge number of those killed, which has exceeded 1 million ... despite all this, the Americans are once again trying to repeat the horrific massacres, as though they are not content with the protracted blockade imposed after the ferocious war or the fragmentation and devastation" [BIN LADEN 2001c]

Bin Laden called his followers to wage war on "Satan's" troops and "the devil's supporters"-the immoral west. This thesis argues that he basically referred to President Bush creating an aura of malignancy around the whole American discourse.

"We—with God's help—call on every Muslim who believes in God and wishes to be rewarded to comply with God's order to kill the Americans and plunder their money wherever and whenever they find it. We also call on Muslim ulema, leaders, youths, and soldiers to launch the raid on Satan's U.S. troops and the devil's supporters allying with them, and to displace those who are behind them so that they may learn a lesson" [BIN LADEN 2001b]

Throughout bin-Laden's discourse, the man claimed the post 9/11 conflict was between two religions (Christianity vs. Islam) and not a political one. An interesting and extremely important fact as both actors fought for the support of many Arab nations not affected by Taliban.

Even though Osama bin Laden used a slightly different approach than President Bush in this case, he also attempted to legitimize terrorist attacks by the necessary evil confrontation method.

He used examples of dying innocent women and children throughout the Middle East who had no protection. Al-Qaeda took on a role of their protector in bin Laden´s discourse. *"One million Iraqi children have thus far died in Iraq although they did not do*

anything wrong. Despite this, we heard no denunciation by anyone in the world or a fatwa by the rulers' ulema[27]"[BIN LADEN 2001a]

---

[27] Body of Muslim scholars

Osama bin Laden and George W. Bush both had very different beliefs of generally accepted and recognized values and morals, stemming from two different cultures both men grew up in. This specific legitimization method however was often used by both actors equally. Both actors called on their personal values and morals via the logic of their specific religion. Bin Laden stated the WTC terrorist attacks, any all other future attacks, are Al-Qaeda's resolve to spread Islam around the world. ``*We don't have time to keep up with the demands of those who are asking about Islamic books to learn about Islam. This event made people think (about true Islam) which benefited Islam greatly."*[BIN LADEN 2001b]

Bin Laden in fact used the WTC terrorist attacks to spread the message of Islam, its values and morals, as well as Al-Qaeda's desire to create a Great Islamic Caliphate once more. He used the attacks as a tool to increase world-wide interest in Islam. He turned them into a worldwide campaign for Islamic extremism. *"Hundreds of people used to doubt you and few only would follow you until this huge event happened. Now hundreds of people are coming out to join you".*[SHAYKH 2001]

As explained earlier, Osama bin Laden's values and morals used in his process of legitimization were directly linked to his religion. *"I tell you that these events have split the entire world into two camps: one of faith, with no hypocrites, and one of unbelief –may God protect us from it."*[BIN LADEN 2001d]

Bin Laden suggested that the reason for the WTC terrorist attacks was to defend the Islamic God and punish the immoral western world; the central issue on which Al-Qaeda basis all of its work. Bin Laden made promises that he will fight on behalf of all faithful ones that loath hypocrisy. Bin Laden's audience was primarily extremist religious Muslims, which made his justification methods regarding WTC attacks very effective.

Osama bin Laden effectively used lives and faith of all 9/11 hijackers who executed the 9/11 attacks on WTC to his advantage. Osama bin Laden portrayed them all in a very positive light, talked about their morals and values, made them examples to all people of faith. He often described hijackers' actions as highly moral and exemplary acts to follow. "*The very least you can say about these people is that they are immoral, dissolute, apostates, who help the butcher slaughter his victim and help the oppressor against the innocent child. May God Almighty protect me against them, and may He give them what they deserve.*" [BIN LADEN 2001d]

As George W. Bush made the concept of freedom a focal point of his war on terror discourse, bin Laden made it an inseparable component of his discourse as well. "*Since World War One, which ended over 83 years ago, the entire Islamic world has fallen under the crusader banners, under the British, French and Italian governments. They divided up the whole world between them, and Palestine fell into the hands of the British. From that day to this, more than 83 years later, our brothers and sons have been tortured in Palestine. Hundreds of thousands of them have been killed, hundreds of thousands detained.*"[BIN LADEN 2001f]

Referencing the World War I, which allowed for western influence over the Islamic world, he legitimized the WTC terrorist attacks as the only way for the Islamic world to retaliate against western oppression. Thus the concept of freedom became the focal point to the post 9/11 political discourse on both ends of the spectrum even though the freedom itself is understood differently by either participant.

Osama bin Laden's legitimization discourse often called for yet another generally accepted and recognized value, the idea of justice. He argued all Muslims have always been treated unjustly and unfairly by the west. "*When the victim starts to avenge the innocent children in Palestine, Iraq, southern Sudan, Somalia, Kashmir, and the Philippines, the hypocrites and ruler's jurists stand up and defend this blatant unbelief -I seek God's help against them all.*" [BIN LADEN 2002a]

Bin Laden's war on the western world ultimately fights for justice and to ultimately secure fair treatment of all Muslims throughout the world.

4.2.5 LEGITIMIZATION BY THE RELEVANT SOURCE OF POWER (GOD, ETC.), WHICH IS REPRESENTED AS A DEFENDER OF THE VALUES AND NORMAS OF THE LEGITIMIZING PARTY

Osama bin Laden actually went much further with his legitimization by the relevant source of power than Bush, especially when referencing God. "*And with regard to you, Muslims, this is the day of question. This is a new (inaudible) against you, all against the Muslims and Medina. So be like the followers of the prophet, peace be upon him, and all countrymen …, lovers of God and the prophet within, and a new battle, great battle, similar to the great battles of Islam, like the conqueror of Jerusalem. So, hurry up to the dignity of life and the eternity of death*" [BIN LADEN 2002a]

He directly argued that the WTC terrorist attacks were God's doing, not men's. *"This is America; God has sent one of the attacks by God and has attacked one of its best buildings. And this is America filled with fear from the north to south and east to west, thank God."*[BIN LADEN 2001d] Such statement had an extremely significant legitimizing power, especially since bin Laden´s audience was extremely religious[28]. Bin Laden held a significant status within Al Qaeda's network, thus made him a powerful speaker, leader, and influencer.

Bin Laden used this legitimization method frequently. *"And when God has guided a bunch of Muslims to be at the forefront and destroyed America, a big destruction, I wish God would lift their position."*[BIN LADEN 2001c] He called on the logic of merit, solely determined by God. *"They supported the murder against the victim, so God has given them back what they deserve."*[BIN LADEN 2001c]

All Osama bin Laden's speeches are designed to sway his audience to believe Al Qaeda's acts of terrorism legitimized by God himself and are ultimately God's acts. *"When Almighty God rendered successful a convoy of Muslims, the vanguards of Islam, He allowed them to destroy the United States."*[BIN LADEN 2001e]

---

[28] This thesis argues that Osama bin Laden´s audience was religious- linked to Al-Qaeda and to Islam itself.

Osama bin Laden always addressed evil done unto all Muslims by western actors despite the fact this evil was never intended by God for the "faithful" ones; and such imbalance of power must be corrected. *"Our nation has tasted this humiliation and contempt for more than 80 years. Its sons are being killed, its blood is being shed, its holy places are being attacked, and it is not being ruled according to what God has decreed."*[BIN LADEN 2001e] This thesis argues that this legitimization approach was a very effective and useful technique, especially taking into consideration Osama bin Laden´s audience, which was religious and therefore recognizing the value of God. However, several differences can be seen, when comparing Osama bin Laden´s approach with the one of George W. Bush.

4.2.6 LEGITIMIZATION AS PART OF THE PROCESS OF SECURITIZATION

Osama bin Laden used the method of legitimization based on the concept of securitization as well as George W. Bush did, but his approach is slightly different. *"And to America, I say to it and to its people this: I swear by God the Great, America will never dream nor those who live in America will never taste security and safety unless we feel security and safety in our land and in Palestine".* [BIN LADEN 2001e]

Bin Laden was convinced the United States of America was a direct threat to Islam throughout the world and thus acts of terrorism will be necessary to address this security issue.

Osama bin Laden´s approach in this case calls his audience to fear the west at all costs. This thesis argues he did it to bridge the idea of the inferior American society and the ultimate threat it poses to the superior Muslim culture. *"And because of all this, you have been described as the nation of all kinds of different diseases - diseases that had never existed in the past. So you have to be proud of yourself, because your evil acts have spread AIDS all around the world, especially to the poorest countries in the world, killing many millions."* [BIN LADEN 2001d] This specific quotation effectively impacts bin Laden's audience, as the threat he spoke of was easy to imagine and understand.

However, this thesis argues that the legitimization as part of the process of securitization was not used as frequently by Osama bin Laden as it was in case of George W. Bush for the reason of a very different nature of their audiences.

Osama bin Laden´s audience, mostly Islam adherents; have a different approach towards their life on Earth.[29] This thesis argues that their understanding of death itself is different from the Western society. This argument can be supported by the example of Al-Qaeda´s suicide bombers who see the death in a completely different perspective.

---

[29] *"Islamic doctrine holds that human existence continues after the death of the human body in the form of spiritual and physical resurrection. There is a direct relation between conduct on earth and the life beyond."* Available from WWW: http://www.islamreligion.com/articles/38/.

4.2.7 LEGITIMIZATION BY A NECESSARY CONFRONTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LAW CRIMES

Regarding Osama bin Laden's discourse, it is hard to dissect this specific legitimization method. This thesis argues this is due to the fact it is tightly connected to the nature of Al-Qaeda as an international actor. Al-Qaeda's supporters are not voters and not bound by legitimate political and international laws. Al Qaeda's supporters do not need supporting data or international law analysis or expertise regarding Al-Qaeda's legitimating methods of WTC attacks. Rather, such legitimization methods of Al-Qaeda were strictly based on religious ideology, values, and morals instead.

5. INTERPRETATION OF THE ANALYSIS RESULTS

In conclusion, this thesis argues that despite the common assumptions that different regimes require different legitimization techniques, they indeed share many similarities. Based on the previous analysis, it is evident that George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden used similar legitimization methods in order to gain public support for their political decisions making process regarding the WTC attacks and a subsequent war on terrorism.

George W. Bush's administration legitimized its decision to wage war on terrorism by justifying United States of America's need to protect universal values and morals regarding personal freedoms and laws. This technique is typical for the United States of America as it holds an important role in today's global world and as an international actor. America is believed to be the international actor responsible for democratization of undemocratic parts of the world.

If it is argued that democratic principles are better than any other system and they are global and universal in nature, democratization of the world would naturally be supported by the global populace.

On the other hand, the legitimization of terrorist actions by universally and generally accepted values was one of the methods very frequently and effectively employed by Al-Qaeda. Terrorist attacks got great public attention in general, as terrorist acts are meant to create insecurities and shock the world in order to spread political chaos throughout the world and to create political void into which extreme Islam can step in.

Such method was meant to spread Islamic propaganda into the western world regarding Al Qaeda's legitimization of terrorist acts. Spreading the western concept of freedom and democracy throughout the Middle East was the case regarding George W. Bush's legitimating efforts to wage war on terrorism.

Another technique, legitimization by securitization, used frequently by George W. Bush regarding the war on terror was not used equally by the two actors involved in the conflict. The concept of securitization was used much more by the U.S. than Al-Qaeda. This thesis supposes this specific difference exists due to several specific cultural differences between the two actors that could not be any more different.

The western culture places great value on human life, its purpose, and its protection. Al-Qaeda, as a religious extremist organization, has a lower value for earthly life, rather places all value on the afterlife. That is one of the reasons why its followers are willing to sacrifice their lives as needed and as asked. That is why securitization method to legitimize war on terrorism makes more sense in regards to U.S. and influencing its citizens.

The concept of generally accepted and recognized values and morals used by both actors is directly connected to the method of legitimization by the dichotomy between "us" and them". In order to gain public support regarding the war on terror, it was necessary to dehumanize the enemy.

This applied to both actors involved in the 9/11 conflict and beyond. The same applied to legitimization method by cultural, social, and religious superiority used frequently by both men. As stated before, it appears much easier to gain public support if the opponent seems evil, barbaric, uneducated, and uncivilized.

Each actor showed differences when applying the legitimization technique by the relevant source of power (God), seen as the defender of the superior values and norms in the conflict. This approach is more evident and visible for Al-Qaeda rather than the United States of America.

The reason being is the nature of Al- Qaeda itself as an organization solely based on Islamic extremism. Its religious audience was much more likely to support the legitimized actions based on the arguments connected to God and his decisions.

It remains interesting that either actor based their legitimization methods on relevant data or international law.

It can be assumed such an approach would be effective in terms of achieving the public support the most. This thesis assumed this technique would be used at least by George W. Bush during his war on terror discourse, since he was the only democratically elected leader in this case. The legitimization by necessary confrontation of crimes against the international law would be, what this thesis would consider, the most effective technique used by an elected leader of a democratic regime especially.

The interpretation this thesis provided together with the analysis of the societal, political, cultural or religious context, pointed to the fact, that despite a very different political roles George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden played, their legitimization approaches were, in fact, very similar. The audiences in both cases were willing to support the military activities of their leaders when these were legitimized by the concept of God; superiority of their own society or culture; universal values; or their own security.

On the contrary, the method of legitimization by the necessary confrontation of the international law crimes was not used by any of these two men almost at all. Therefore, this thesis argues that despite some great differences between the two societies, the legitimization approaches their leaders used were, in fact, very similar.

CONCLUSION

The goal of this thesis was to analyze different legitimization techniques used by two very different international actors regarding the 9/11 WTC terrorist attacks and subsequent armed conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan. By analyzing the most important official statements and speeches by George W. Bush and his administration, as well as Osama bin Laden and his second in charge, this thesis concludes the following.

Although it is impossible to analyze all statements used to legitimize George W. Bush´s war on terror and Al-Qaeda´s terrorist attacks, this thesis took into consideration the ones which received the most media attention and reached the largest audience. As explained earlier, the number of quotations employed by the two actors was unequal. The fact itself had an impact on this thesis, the quantity of speeches did not truly influence this analysis, rather than their content did. The actual interpretation of those statements impacting different legitimization techniques are the core of this research.

Despite the initial assumptions, there are many similarities between both actors and their way of choosing legitimization approaches in order to gain public approval of their actions. This thesis concludes that the context of speeches employed by either actor (social norms, political regime, and religion) had the most impact on legitimization techniques selected by the two representatives. Based on this analysis, it is evident that the legitimization discourses employed by both actors share high volume of similarities regardless of their cultural and religious background.

To be specific, this discourse analysis shows several techniques commonly used by George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden were employed at the same time. The legitimization by a dichotomy between "us" and "them" and the legitimization by the universal and generally accepted and recognized values and morals, are the key approaches defining legitimization strategies by both political players.

It is still necessary to consider the fact that despite similarities, there are many differences in context of speeches employed by both actors. Once all specific methods are interpreted, different points of view can be seen and understood. It must be noted

that during interpretation of these methods, different cultural values, morals and audience must be taken into consideration and must be evaluated as well.

For instance, the legitimization by the universal and generally accepted and recognized values and morals heavily replies on the speaker´s environment. Values and morals described as universal and generally accepted in this case solely depend on the speaker's and his audience´s environment, culture, and thus their common standpoint. Thus it is always necessary to take into consideration speaker's culture, values, norms, and time frame when analyzing specific legitimization methods.

To sum it all up, this analysis and interpretation of legitimization methods employed by George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden show many similarities. Even though their political and cultural background, as well as decision making process was different, their end point remained identical; to gain public support for a controversial measure employed by either actor.

The main aim of this thesis was to provide an analysis answering the question of similarities between the legitimization methods of George W. Bush´s war on terror and Osama bin Laden´s terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in 2001. This thesis intended to find out whether these similarities exist despite the fact both leaders believe in a very different world order and laws that govern that order.

First, this thesis provided the methodology of the analysis, taking into consideration the specific cases it studied. Second, it described the historical background of the mutual relations between the United States of America and Al- Qaeda. Later, this thesis provided the discourse analysis itself. It interpreted the approaches both men used while legitimizing their political decisions, based on the social, religious and political context. In conclusion, this thesis produced a comparison of the legitimization approaches and to highlighted their similarities and differences.

SUMMARY

This diploma thesis attempted to provide a deep analysis of the legitimization methods in case of George W. Bush´s war on terror and Osama bin Laden´s terrorist attacks. It took into consideration the time period from the 9th of September 2001 (the date of the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington D.C.) until the 20th of March 2003 (the beginning of the USA´s invasion in Iraq). This thesis used the method of discourse analysis. It presented the different legitimization approaches, which were used frequently, or not at all. The analysis itself was based on a database of the most important official statements of the two leaders or their close fellows. The interpretation of these approaches and the analysis of the societal, political, cultural or religious context, pointed to the fact, that despite very different political roles George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden played, their legitimization approaches were, in fact, very similar. The audiences in both cases were willing to support the military activities of their leaders when these were legitimized by the concept of God, superiority of their own society or culture, universal values or their own security. On the contrary, the method of legitimization by the necessary confrontation of the international law crimes was not used by any of these two men almost at all. Therefore, this thesis argues that despite some great differences between the two societies, the legitimization approaches their leaders used were, in fact, very similar.

REFERENCES

AERTS, Erik. 2011. *The Rhetorical Struggle of George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden.* Words of War. Academia.edu. p. 3-83. 2011. Available at WWW: http://www.academia.edu/1893223/Words_of_War_-_The_Rhetorical_Struggle_of_George_W._Bush_and_Osama_bin_Laden.

AGATHANGELOU, Anna M.; LING, L.H.M. 2004. *Power, Borders, Security, Wealth: Lessons of Violence and Desire from September 11*. International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 48, No. . p. 517-538. 2004.

AL-HAMMADI Khalid. 2005. *The Inside Story of al-Qa'ida*. London: Al-Quds al-Arabi. English translation from FBIS. part 4. March 22, 2005.

BARTOLUCCI, Valentina. 2011 *Terrorism rhetoric under the Bush Administration Discourses and effects*. Pisa: University of Pisa and Bradford: University of Bradford. Journal of Language and Politics 11:4. 2011. iii, 158 p. 562–582 2011. Available at WWW: https://benjamins.com/#catalog/journals/jlp.11.4.05bar/details

BHATIA, Aditi. 2007. *Religious metaphor in the discourse of illusion: George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden*. World Englishes, Vol. 26, No. 4, p. 507–524, 2007.

BIN LADEN, Osama. 2001a. *Interview with Osama bin Laden. Denies his Involvement in 9/1.* Global Research. Ummat (in Urdu), Karachi, p. 1 and 7. September 28. 2001. Available at WWW: http://www.globalresearch.ca/interview-with-osama-bin-laden-denies-his-involvement-in-9-11/24697?print=1.

BIN LADEN, Osama. 2001b. *America filled with fear.* Doha:Qatar. Al Jazeera broadcast. October 7. 2001. Available at WWW: http://europe.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/asiapcf/central/10/07/ret.binladen.transcript/.

BIN LADEN, Osama. 2001c*. Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders. World Islamic Front Statement.* The U.S. Edicts and Statements. December 6. 2001.

BIN LADEN, Osama. 2001d. *Osama bin Laden´s letter.* Observer.co.uk. October 23. 2001. Available at WWW: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/nov/24/theobserver.

BIN LADEN, Osama. 2001e. *Bin Laden´s warning.* Al- Jazeera broadcast. October 7. 2001. Available at WWW: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/1585636.stm.

BIN LADEN, Osama. 2001f. *Bush´s speech to the Muslims.* In: An End to al-Qaeda: Destroying Bin Laden's Jihad and Restoring America's Honor. December 12. 2001.

BIN LADEN, Osama. 2002a. *Letter to the American people.* Observer.co.uk. November 24. 2002. Available at WWW: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/nov/24/theobserver.

BUSH, George. 2001a. *Address to the Nation.* Washington D.C.: Oval Office. September 11. 2001. Available at WWW:
http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/gwbush911addresstothenation.htm.

BUSH, George. 2001b*. Speech at the National Cathedral.* New York City: Ground Zero Bullhorn. September 14. 2001. Available at WWW:
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/523290/posts.

BUSH, George. 2001c. *We are at war speech.* Washington D.C. September 17. 2001. Available at WWW: http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/nation/2001/09/15/bush-war.htm.

BUSH, George. 2001d. *Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People.* Washington D.C.: United States Capitol. September 19. 2001. Available at WWW:
http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/print/20010920-8.html.

BUSH, George. 2001e. *The President's News Conference With President Megawati Sukarnoputri of Indonesia in Bali, Indonesia.* Washington D.C.: The Oval Office. September 20. 2001. Available at WWW:
http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/speeches/12381375/presidents-news-conference-president-megawati-sukarnoputri-indonesia-bali-indonesia.

BUSH, George. 2001f. *Bush's address to a joint session of Congress and the nation.* Washington D.C.: The United States´ Congress. September 20. 2001. Available at WWW:
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushaddress_092001.html.

BUSH, George. 2001g. *BUSH´s address to the United Nations.* New York City: The United Nations. October 10. 2001*.* Available at WWW: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushtext_111001.html.

BUSH, George. 2001h. Emergency supplemental appropriations act for recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States. Washington D.C.: United States´s Congress. September 21. 2001. Available at WWW: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CDOC-107hdoc123/html/CDOC-107hdoc123.htm.

BUSH, George. 2001i. *Bush on Bringing bin Laden to Justice.* Washington D.C.: The White House. September 17. 2001. Available at WWW: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bush091701.html.

BUSH, George. 2001j. *President Bush on Pearl Harbor.* U.S.S. Enterprise. December 7. 2001. Available at WWW: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushtext_120701.html.

BUSH, George. 2001k. *Remarks by the President To the Warsaw Conference on Combatting Terrorism.* Warsaw: Poland. November 6. 2001. Available at WWW: http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011106-2.html.

BUSH, George. 2001l. *Remarks by the President at Islamic Center of Washington, D.C.* Washington D.C.: The Islamic Center of Washinton D.C. Office of Press Secretary. September 17. 2001. Available at WWW: http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010917-11.html.

BUSH, George. 2002a. *George W. Bush's address to the UN General Assembly.* New York City: The United Nations. Septeber 12. 2002. Available at WWW: http://everything2.com/title/George+W.+Bush%2527s+address+to+the+UN+General+Assembly%253A+September+12%252C+2002.

BUSH, George. 2002b. *The National Security Strategy.* Washington D.C.: The White House. September 2002. Available at WWW: http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/nsc/nss/2002/.

BUSH, George. 2003. *State of the Union Address.* Washington D.C.: The United States´ Congress. January 28. 2003. Available at WWW: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/transcripts/bushtext_012803.html.

DOW, Ian. 2001. *Terrorist attacks America: I thank Almighty Allah and bow before him; Warning of thousands prepared to die in holy war*. Scottish Daily Record & Sunday. September 13 2001.

DUNMIRE, Patricia, L. 2009. *9/11 changed everything: an intertextuality analysis of the Bush Doctrine.* Discourse & Society March 20. p 195-222. 2009. Available at WWW: http://das.sagepub.com/content/20/2/195.refs.

EDELMAN, Murray. 1988. *Constructing the Political Spectacle.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1st edition. 142 p. ISBN-13: 978-0226183992. 1988.

GRAHAM, Philip W.; KEENAN, Thomas; DOWD, Anne-Maree. 2004. *A call to arms at the End of History: A discourse-historical analysis of George W. Bush's declaration of war on terror* . Discourse & Society 15(2-3) 2004. p. 199-221. Available at WWW: http://eprints.qut.edu.au/7267/1/7267.pdf.

GRAY, Jacqueline, M.; WILSON, Margaret. A. 2008. *Understanding the 'War on Terrorism': Responses to 11 September 2001.* Oslo: International Peace Research Institute. Journal of

Peace Research. 43/23. p. 23-36. 2008. Available at WWW: *http://www.sagepub.com/martin3study/articles/Gray.pdf*.

HENZEL, Christopher. 2005. *The Origins of al Qaeda's Ideology: Implications for U.S. Strategy*. Parameters: The U.S. Army Professional Writing Collection. p. 69-80. 2005. Available at WWW: http://www.army.mil/professionalWriting/volumes/volume3/october_2005/10_05_3.html.

KELLNER, Douglas. 2003. *Bush and bin Laden's Binary Manicheanism: The Fusing of Horizons.* Abstract from From September 11 to Terror War: The Dangers of the Bush Legacy. The American Prospect. 2003. Available at WWW: http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/bushandbinladensbinarymanicheanism.pdf.

KERTON-JOHNSON, Nicholas. 2008. *Justifying the use of force in a post 9/11 world: striving for hierarchy in international society. International Affairs 84:5 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-). p. 991-1007.* 2008. Available at WWW: http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/25144933?uid=3737856&uid=2&uid=4&sid=2110374 5990361.

LARSSON, John. P. 2004. *Understanding Religious Violence: Thinking Outside the Box on Terrorism.* Farnham: Ashgate. 173 p. ISBN 978-075463-9084. 2004.

LEMKE, Jay. 1995. *Intertextuality and text semantics*. In M. Gregory and P. Fries, Eds. Discourse in Society: Functional Perspectives Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing. p.85-114. 1995.

LEMKE, Jay. 1998. *Analysing Verbal Data: Principles, Methods, and Problems*. in K. Tobin & B. Fraser, (Eds). International Handbook of Science Education. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers. p. 1175-1189. 1998.

LEMKE, Jay. 2011. *Semantic Variation: Meaning in society and in sociolinguistics by Ruqaiya Hasan Review*. Linguistics and the Human Sciences 4 (3). p. 261 – 267. 2011.

LEUDAR, Jan. Nekvapil, Jiří. 2004. *On membership categorisation: 'Us', 'them' and 'doing violence' in political discourse*. Discourse and Society, 15, p. 243-266. 2004.

LINCOLN, Bruce. 2002. *The Rhetoric of Bush and Bin Laden. Holy Terrors: Thinking about Religion after September 11. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 2002.*

MACASKILL, Ewen; BORGER, Julian. 2004. *Iraq war was illegal and breached UN charter, says Annan.* Washington D.C.: The Guardian. September 16. 2004. Available at WWW: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/sep/16/iraq.iraq.

PERL, Raphael. 2004. *The Department of Homeland Security: Background and Challenges*. Washington D.C.: National Research Council of the National Academies, Terrorism: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Improving Responses, U.S.-Russian Workshop Proceedings. p.176. 2004. Available at WWW: http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=10968&page=176.

SANGER, David E. 2002. *The State of the Union: the overview; Bush, focusing on terrorism, says secure U.S. is top priority.* The New York Times. January 30. 2002. Available at WWW: http://www.nytimes.com/2002/01/30/us/state-union-overview-bush-focusing-terrorism-says-secure-us-top-priority.html.

SHAMASH, Lani. 2011. *The "war on terror" discourse and militant political Islam: how did the manifestation and institutionalisation of a domestic discourse affect american policy and attitudes towards Hamas?* London: Department of Politics and International Studies, School of Oriental and African Studies. 2011. 78p. Avaiable at WWW:

http://www.academia.edu/1509772/The_War_on_Terror_Discourse_and_Militant_Political_Islam_How_Did_the_Manifestation_and_Institutionalisation_of_a_Domestic_Discourse_Affect_American_Policy_and_Attitudes_Towards_Hamas.

SULAYMAN, Shaykh. 2001. *Transcript of Bin Laden Videotape.* Washigton D.C.: Pentagon. December 13. 2001. Available at WWW: http://www.npr.org/news/specials/response/investigation/011213.binladen.transcript.html.

TUMAN, Joseph. S. 2003. *Communicating Terror: The Rhetorical Dimensions of Terrorism.* Los Angeles*:* SAGE. 221p. ISBN 14-129-73244. 2003.

WHITE, James E. 2008. *Contemporary Moral Problems: War, Terrorism, and Torture*. Cengage Learning; 4 edition. 128 p. ISBN 978-1111523510. 2008.

Online documents:

The Constitution of the United States of America. Available at WWW: http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution_transcript.html.

(downloaded on the 26th of February 2014)

Official public support polls of George W. Bush: http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2003-03-16-poll-iraq_x.htm.

(downloaded on the 16th of March 2014)

LIST OF APPENDICES:

Appendix n°1: George W. Bush´s legitimization discourse´s quotations (chart)

Appendix n°2: Osama bin Laden´s legitimization discourse´s quotations (chart)

In order to make the chart clearer, this thesis will assign each legitimization category a letter:

> **A:** Legitimization by a dichotomy between "us" and "them"
>
> **B:** Legitimization by the superiority of a culture, a society or a religion
>
> **C:** Legitimization by a necessary evil confrontation
>
> **D:** Legitimization by the universal and generally accepted and recognized values, morals, etc
>
> **E:** Legitimization by the relevant source of power (God, etc.), which is represented as a defender of the values and norms of the legitimizing party
>
> **F:** Legitimization as part of the process of securitization
>
> **G:** Legitimization by the necessary confrontation of the international law crimes

Appendix n°1: George W. Bush´s legitimization discourse´s quotations (chart):

N°	Quotation	Author	Category
1.	"*None of us could have envisioned the barbaric acts of these terrorists*" [BUSH 2001h]	GWB[30]	A
2.	"*We're going to find those who – those evil-doers, those barbaric people who attacked our country and we're going to hold them accountable.*" [BUSH 2001i]	GWB	A
3.	. "*There is a great divide in our time – not*"	GWB	A

---

[30] GWB stands for George W.Bush

	between religions or cultures, but between civilization and barbarism. People of all cultures wish to live in safety and dignity .Our enemies reject these values – and by doing so, they set themselves not against the West, but against the entire world". [BUSH 2001j]		
4.	*"The civilized world is rallying to America's side"* [BUSH 2001f]	GWB	A
5.	*"No nation can be neutral in this conflict, because no civilized nation can be secure in a world threatened by terror"* [BUSH 2001k]	GWB	A
6.	*"Our war is not against a religion. Our war is against evil"* [BUSH 2001c]	GWB	A
7.	*"We do not fight Islam, we fight against evil"* [BUSH 2002c]	GWB	C
8.	*"Let me quote from the Koran itself: In the long run, evil in the extreme will be the end of those who do evil. For that they rejected the signs of Allah and held them up to ridicule"* [BUSH 2001l]	GWB	A
9.	*"The terrorists practice a fringe form of Islamic extremism that has been rejected by Muslim scholars and the vast majority of Muslim clerics. The terrorists' directive commands them to kill Christians and Jews, to kill all Americans."* [BUSH 2002a]	GWB	A
10.	*"Those who commit evil in the name of Allah blaspheme the name of Allah. The terrorists are traitors to their own faith, trying, in effect, to hijack Islam itself".* [BUSH 2001k]	GWB	A
11.	*"America and our friends and allies join with*	GWB	A

	all those who want peace and security in the world, and we stand together to win the war against terrorism." [BUSH 2001a]		
12.	*"Our first priority is to get help to those who have been injured and to take every precaution to protect our citizens at home and around the world from further attacks".* [BUSH 2001a]	GWB	F
13.	*"These same terrorists are searching for weapons of mass destruction, the tools to turn their hatred into holocaust. They can be expected to use chemical, biological and nuclear weapons the moment they are capable of doing so".* [BUSH 2001d]	GWB	F
14.	*"As we meet, the terrorists are planning more murder -- perhaps in my country or perhaps in yours".* [BUSH 2001e]	GWB	F
15.	*"We've intensified security at the borders and ports of entry, posted more than 50,000 newly-trained federal screeners in airports, begun inoculating troops and first responders against smallpox, and are deploying the nation's first early warning network of sensors to detect biological attack. And this year, for the first time, we are beginning to field a defense to protect this nation against ballistic missiles."* [BUSH 2002a]	GWB	F
16.	*"There's never a day when I do not learn of another threat, or receive reports of operations in progress, or give an order in this global war against a scattered network of killers".* [BUSH 2002a]	GWB	F

17.	*"That evil has returned, and that cause is renewed."* [BUSH 2001c]	GWB	C
18.	*"We will defend ourselves and our future against terror and lawless violence."* [BUSH 2001e]	GWB	F
19.	*"Aggressions and ambitions of the wicked must be opposed early, decisively and collectively, before they threaten us all."* [BUSH 2001c]	GWB	F
20.	*"Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forwards, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime."* [BUSH 2001c]	GWB	A
21.	*"We face enemies that hate not our policies, but our existence; the tolerance of openness and creative culture that defines us"* [BUSH 2001g]	GWB	B
22.	*"(…) also to places which are not prepared for it, either culturally, or politically, and which see the U.S. action as interference into their internal affairs"* [BUSH 2001g]	GWB	B
23.	*"America was targeted for attack because we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world. And no one will keep that light from shining".* [BUSH 2001c]	GWB	B
24.	*"The suffering of September the 11th was inflicted on people of many faiths and many nations. All of the victims, including Muslims, were killed with equal indifference*	GWB	D

	and equal satisfaction by the terrorist leaders. The terrorists are violating the tenets of every religion, including the one they invoke". [BUSH 2001k]		
25.	*"But the stakes for America are never small. If our country does not lead the cause of freedom, it will not be led. If we do not turn the hearts of children toward knowledge and character, we will lose their gifts and undermine their idealism. If we permit our economy to drift and decline, the vulnerable will suffer most."* [BUSH 2001b]	GWB	D
26.	*"Those names include a citizen of Gambia, whose wife spent their fourth wedding anniversary, September the 12th, searching in vain for her husband. Those names include a man who supported his wife in Mexico, sending home money every week. Those names include a young Pakistani who prayed toward Mecca five times a day, and died that day trying to save others."* [BUSH 2001e]	GWB	A
27.	*"Our war on terror begins with Al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated"* [BUSH 2002a]	GWB	A
28.	*"We will direct every resource at our command—every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war—to the destruction and to the defeat of the global terror network"* [BUSH 2002a]	GWB	F

29.	"They hate our freedoms –our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other. They want to drive Israel out of the Middle East. They want to drive Christians and Jews out of vast regions of Asia and Africa." [BUSH 2001k]	GWB	D
30.	"Freedom and fear are at war. The advance of human freedom, the greatest achievement of our time and the great hope of every time, now depends on us. Our nation, this generation, will lift the dark threat of violence from our people and our future. We will rally the world to this cause by our efforts, by our courage. We will not tire, we will not falter and we will not fail." [BUSH 2002b]	GWB	D
31.	"We are a country awakened to danger and called to defend freedom. Our grief has turned to anger, and anger to resolution." [BUSH 2001b]	GWB	D
32.	"Yet, as we have learned, so suddenly and so tragically, there can be no peace in a world of sudden terror. In the face of today's new threat, the only way to pursue peace is to pursue those who threaten it." [BUSH 2001e]	GWB	D
33.	"These obligations are urgent and they are binding on every nation with a place in this chamber. Many governments are taking these obligations seriously, and my country appreciates it. Yet, even beyond Resolution 1373, more is required, and more is expected	GWB	G

	of our coalition against terror." [BUSH 2001g]		
34.	*. "Our enemies fear a society which is pluralistic and open to worship an almighty God. Our enemies are right to fear open societies because those societies leave no room for bigotry and tyranny. The promise of our time has no room for the vision of the Taliban or Al Qaeda"* [BUSH 2002a]	GWB	E
35.	*"Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them."* [BUSH 2002a]	GWB	E
36.	*"May God continue to bless America."* [BUSH 2001a]	GWB	E
37.	*"In all that lies before us, may God grant us wisdom, and may He watch over the United States."* [BUSH 2001f]	GWB	E
38.	*"The pictures of airplanes flying into buildings, fires burning, huge structures collapsing, have filled us with disbelief, terrible sadness, and a quiet, unyielding anger. These acts of mass murder were intended to frighten our nation into chaos and retreat. But they have failed; our country is strong."* [BUSH 2001k]	GWB	F
39.	*"Great person has been moved to defend a great nation. Terrorist attacks can shake the foundations of our biggest buildings, but they cannot touch the foundation of America. These acts shattered steel, but they cannot dent the steel of American resolve."* [BUSH 2001g]	GWB	D

40.	*"Today, our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature. And we responded with the best of America -- with the daring of our rescue workers, with the caring for strangers and neighbors who came to give blood and help in any way they could."* [BUSH 2001a]	GWB	C
41.	*"Our first priority is to get help to those who have been injured, and to take every precaution to protect our citizens at home and around the world from further attacks."* [BUSH 2001a]	GWB	F
42.	*"The search is underway for those who are behind these evil acts. I've directed the full resources of our intelligence and law enforcement communities to find those responsible and to bring them to justice. We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them."* [BUSH 2001a]	GWB	A
43.	*"America and our friends and allies join with all those who want peace and* *security in the world, and we stand together to win the war against terrorism.* *Tonight, I ask for your prayers for all those who grieve, for the children whose* *worlds have been shattered, for all whose sense of safety and security has been* *threatened."* [BUSH 2001a]	GWB	D
44.	*"This is a day when all Americans from every walk of life unite in our resolve for* *justice and peace. America has stood down enemies before, and we will do so* *this time. None of us will ever forget this day.*	GWB	D

	Yet, we go forward to defend freedom and all that is good and just in our world." [BUSH 2001a]		
45.	*"Few countries meet their exacting standards of brutality and oppression. Every other country is a potential target. And all the world faces the most horrifying prospect of all."* [BUSH 2001c]	GWB	F
46.	*"This threat cannot be ignored. This threat cannot be appeased. Civilization, itself, the civilization we share, is threatened. History will record our response, and judge or justify every nation in this hall."* [BUSH 2001e]	GWB	F
47.	*"The civilized world is now responding. We act to defend ourselves and deliver our children from a future of fear. We choose the dignity of life over a culture of death. We choose lawful change and civil disagreement over coercion, subversion, and chaos. These commitments -- hope and order, law and life --unite people across cultures and continents. Upon these commitments depend all peace and progress. For these commitments, we are determined to fight."* [BUSH 2001f]	GWB	A
48.	*"I also thank the Arab Islamic countries that have condemned terrorist murder. Many of you have seen the destruction of terror in your own lands. The terrorists are increasingly isolated by their own hatred and extremism. They cannot hide behind Islam. The authors of mass murder and their allies have no place in any culture, and no home in any faith."* [BUSH 2001f]	GWB	D

49.	"For every regime that sponsors terror, there is a price to be paid. And it will be paid. The allies of terror are equally guilty of murder and equally accountable to justice." [BUSH 2002a]	GWB	A
50.	"The United States, supported by many nations, is bringing justice to the terrorists. We're making progress against military targets, and that is our objective. Unlike the enemy, we seek to minimize, not maximize, the loss of innocent life." [BUSH 2001d]	GWB	D
51.	"We have a responsibility to share intelligence and coordinate the efforts of law enforcement. "[BUSH 2002b]	GWB	D
52.	"No national aspiration, no remembered wrong can ever justify the deliberate murder of the innocent. Any government that rejects this principle, trying to pick and choose its terrorist friends, will know the consequences." [BUSH 2002a]	GWB	D
53.	"The war against terror must not serve as an excuse to persecute ethnic and religious minorities in any country. Innocent people must be allowed to live their own lives, by their own customs, under their own religion. And every nation must have avenues for the peaceful expression of opinion and dissent. When these avenues are closed, the temptation to speak through violence grows." [BUSH 2001d]	GWB	D
54.	"We must press on with our agenda for peace and prosperity in every land. My Country is pledged to encouraging	GWB	D

	development and expanding trade." [BUSH 2002a]		
55.	*"There is a current in history and it runs toward freedom. Our enemies resent it and dismiss it, but the dreams of mankind are defined by liberty -- the natural right to create and build and worship and live in dignity."* [BUSH 2001b]	GWB	D
56.	*"It is our task - the task of this generation - to provide the response to aggression and terror. We have no other choice, because there is no other peace."* [BUSH 2001b]	GWB	C
57.	*"We will work for a prosperity that is broadly shared, and we will answer every danger and every enemy that threatens the American people."* [BUSH 2001b]	GWB	D
58.	*"This nation can lead the world in sparing innocent people from a plague of nature. And this nation is leading the world in confronting and defeating the man-made evil of international terrorism".* [BUSH 2001e]	GWB	D
59.	*"As we fight this war, we will remember where it began -- here, in our own country. This government is taking unprecedented measures to protect our people and defend our homeland".* [BUSH 2001e]	GWB	F
60.	*"These regimes could use such weapons for blackmail, terror, and mass murder. They could also give or sell those weapons to terrorist allies, who would use them without the least hesitation".* [BUSH 2001f]	GWB	F

61.	*"Once again, we are called to defend the safety of our people, and the hopes of all mankind. And we accept this responsibility."* [BUSH 2001a]	GWB	F
62.	*"Whatever action is required, whenever action is necessary, I will defend the freedom and security of the American people."* [BUSH 2001a]	GWB	F
63.	*"From three Iraqi defectors we know that Iraq, in the late 1990s, had several mobile biological weapons labs. These are designed to produce germ warfare agents, and can be moved from place to a place to evade inspectors. Saddam Hussein has not disclosed these facilities. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed them."* [BUSH 2001c]	GWB	F
64.	*"Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production. Saddam Hussein has not credibly explained these activities. He clearly has much to hide."* [BUSH 2001c]	GWB	F
65.	*"We seek peace. We strive for peace. And sometimes peace must be defended. A future lived at the mercy of terrible threats is no peace at all. If war is forced upon us, we will fight in a just cause and by just means - sparing, in every way we can, the innocent."* [BUSH 2002a]	GWB	D
66.	*"Thousands of lives were suddenly ended by evil, despicable acts of terror."* [BUSH 2002b]	GWB	C

67.	*"Americans are a free people, who know that freedom is the right of every person and the future of every nation. The liberty we prize is not America's gift to the world; it is God's gift to humanity."* [BUSH 2002b]	GWB	D
68.	*"We have a chance to write the story of our times, a story of courage defeating cruelty and light overcoming darkness. "*[BUSH 2001e]	GWB	C
69.	*"It is our task -- the task of this generation -- to provide the response to aggression and terror. We have no other choice, because there is no other peace."* [BUSH 2001d]	GWB	D
70.	*"We stand for the permanent hopes of humanity, and those hopes will not be denied. We're confident, too, that history has an author who fills time and eternity with his purpose."* [BUSH 2001d]	GWB	D
71.	*"We know that evil is real, but good will prevail against it. This is the teaching of many faiths, and in that assurance we gain strength for a long journey."* [BUSH 2001d]	GWB	C
72.	*"When men and women are released from oppression and isolation, they find fulfillment and hope, and they leave poverty by the millions."* [BUSH 2001c]	GWB	D
73.	*"The only alternative to victory is a nightmare world where every city is a potential killing field."* [BUSH 2002a]	GWB	C
74.	*"And, finally, this struggle is a defining moment for the United Nations, itself. And the world needs its principled leadership. It*	GWB	D

	undermines the credibility of this great institution, for example, when the Commission on Human Rights offers seats to the world's most persistent violators of human rights. The United Nations depends, above all, on its moral authority - and that authority must be preserved." [BUSH 2001d]		
75.	*"The American government also stands by its commitment to a just peace in the Middle East. We are working toward a day when two states, Israel and Palestine, live peacefully together within secure and recognize borders as called for by the Security Council resolutions."* [BUSH 2001f]	GWB	D
76.	*"My country is pledged to encouraging development and expanding trade. My country is pledged to investing in education and combatting AIDS and other infectious diseases around the world. Following September 11th, these pledges are even more important. In our struggle against hateful groups that exploit poverty and despair, we must offer an alternative of opportunity and hope."* [BUSH 2001e]	GWB	D
77.	*"Innocent people must be allowed to live their own lives, by their own customs, under their own religion. And every nation must have avenues for the peaceful expression of opinion and dissent. When these avenues are closed, the temptation to speak through violence grows."* [BUSH 2001b]	GWB	D
78.	*"Let us never tolerate outrageous conspiracy theories concerning the attacks of September*	GWB	C

	the 11th; malicious lies that attempt to shift the blame away from the terrorists, themselves, away from the guilty. To inflame ethnic hatred is to advance the cause of terror." [BUSH 2002a]		
79.	*"We have a responsibility to deny weapons to terrorists and to actively prevent private citizens from providing them."* []	GWB	F
80.	*"Every United Nations member has a responsibility to crack down on terrorist financing. We must pass all necessary laws in our own countries to allow the confiscation of terrorist assets. We must apply those laws to every financial institution in every nation."* [BUSH 2001d]	GWB	G
81.	*"We continue to provide humanitarian aid, even while the Taliban tried to steal the food we send."* [BUSH 2001e]	GWB	D
82.	*"The United States, supported by many nations, is bringing justice to the terrorists in Afghanistan."* [BUSH 2001g]	GWB	F
83.	*"The allies of terror are equally guilty of murder and equally accountable to justice."* [BUSH 2001l]	GWB	A
84.	*"We're taking new measures to investigate terror and to protect against threats."* [BUSH 2001l]	GWB	F
85.	*"The authors of mass murder and their allies have no place in any culture, and no home in any faith."* [BUSH 2001k]	GWB	A
86.	*"The civilized world is now responding."* [BUSH 2003a]	GWB	A

87.	"These commitments -- hope and order, law and life --unite people across cultures and continents." [BUSH 2001d]	GWB	D
88.	"Civilization, itself, the civilization we share, is threatened." [BUSH 2001d]	GWB	F
89.	"Few countries meet their exacting standards of brutality and oppression. Every other country is a potential target." [2001d]	GWB	F
90.	"They seek to overthrow governments and destabilize entire regions." [BUSH 2003a]	GWB	F
91.	"However long it takes, their hour of justice will come." [BUSH 2003a]	GWB	D
92.	"They dare to ask God's blessing as they set out to kill innocent men, women and children. But the God of Isaac and Ishmael would never answer such a prayer. And a murderer is not a martyr; he is just a murderer." [BUSH 2002b]	GWB	A
93.	"We meet in a hall devoted to peace, in a city scarred by violence, in a nation awakened to danger, in a world uniting for a long struggle." [BUSH 2001d]	GWB	F
94.	"America has stood down enemies before, and we will do so this time. None of us will ever forget this day. Yet, we go forward to defend freedom and all that is good and just in our world." [BUSH 2001d]	GWB	D
95.	"The search is underway for those who are behind these evil acts." [BUSH 2001h]	GWB	C
96.	"Our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature." [BUSH 2001h]	GWB	C
97.	"These acts shattered steel, but they cannot	GWB	D

	dent the steel of American resolve." [BUSH 2002b]		
98.	*"These acts of mass murder were intended to frighten our nation into chaos and retreat."* [BUSH 2002b]	GWB	F
99.	*"Our very freedom came under attack in a series of deliberate and deadly terrorist acts."* [BUSH 2002b]	GWB	D
100.	*"The terrorists call their cause holy, yet, they fund it with drug dealing; they encourage murder and suicide in the name of a great faith that forbids both."* [BUSH 2002b]	GWB	D

Appendix n°2: Osama bin Laden´s legitimization discourse´s quotations (chart):

1.	*"We beseech Almighty God to accept them as martyrs and place them among the prophets, the sincere lovers of truth, the martyrs, and the benevolent people who are the best companions, grant their families patience and solace, bless their children and property, and reward them on behalf of Islam."* [BIN LADEN 2001b]	OBL[31]	D
2.	*"Those who left children behind them, their children are mine. I will be their caretaker, God willing."* [BIN LADEN 2001b]	OBL	E
3.	*"We hope that these brothers would be the first martyrs in Islam's battle in this age against the new Jewish crusade that is being led by the biggest crusader, Bush, under the banner of the cross. This battle is one of Islam's immortal battles."* [BIN LADEN 2001a]	OBL	D
4.	*We have managed to attack the head of infidelity, who deliberately and openly declares his hostility to Islam day and night, in his own country.* [ABU-GHAYT 2002]	Sulayman Abu-Ghayth[32]	D
5.	*"May God's peace and blessings be upon him, who said: He who does not join fighters in battle, fails to support them financially or take care of a fighter's family will be punished by God before the Day of*	OBL	A

---

[31] OBL stands for Osama bin Laden
[32] Sulayman Abu-Ghayth served as a spokesman for Al-Qa'ida organization at the time of the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

	Judgment." [BIN LADEN 2001d]		
6.	*"I bring you the good news, brothers, that we are firm on the path of jihad for the cause of God, following the example God's messenger, God's peace and blessings be upon him."* [BIN LADEN 2001b]	OBL	E
7.	*Almighty God ordered us to perform jihad, and therefore we performed jihad. God ordered us to support the oppressed, and therefore we supported the oppressed. God Almighty ordered us to terrorize the infidels, and therefore we terrorized the infidels. God Almighty ordered us to fight the leaders of infidelity, and therefore we fought the leaders of infidelity. We believe that we have aided the religion of God Almighty.* [ABU-GHAYTH 2002]	Sulayman Abu-Ghayth	E
8.	*"Islam strictly forbids causing harm to innocent women, children, and other people. Such a practice is forbidden ever in the course of a battle. It is the United States, which is perpetrating every maltreatment on women, children, and common people of other faiths, particularly the followers of Islam."* [BIN LADEN 2002a]	OBL	D
9.	*"Only one conclusion could be derived from the indifference of the United States and the West to these acts of terror and the patronage of the tyrants by these powers that America is an anti-Islamic power and it is patronizing the anti-Islamic forces. Its friendship with the Muslim countries is just a show, rather deceit. By enticing or*	OBL	A

	intimidating these countries, the United States is forcing them to play a role of its choice." [BIN LADEN 2002a]		
10.	*"Put a glance all around and you will see that the slaves of the United States are either rulers or enemies [of Muslims]."* [BIN LADEN 2001e]	OBL	A
11.	*"America does not want to see anyone equal to it. It expects slavery from others. Therefore, other countries are either its slaves or subordinates."* [BIN LADEN 2001c]	OBL	A
12.	*"Most of the world nations upholding their freedom are the religious ones, which are the enemies of United States, or the latter itself considers them as its enemies."* [BIN LADEN 2001c]	OBL	A
13.	*"I have already said that we are against the American system, not against its people."* [BIN LADEN 2002a]	OBL	D
14.	*"Drug smugglers from all over the world are in contact with the US secret agencies. These agencies do not want to eradicate narcotics cultivation and trafficking because their importance will be diminished. The people in the US Drug Enforcement Department are encouraging drug trade so that they could show performance and get millions of dollars' worth of budget."* [BIN LADEN 2001f]	OBL	F
15.	*"In the same way, whether it is President Bush or any other US President, they cannot bring Israel to justice for its human rights*		D

	abuses or to hold it accountable for such crimes." [BIN LADEN 2001e]		
16.	*"I must say that my duty is just to awaken the Muslims; to tell them as to what is good for them and what is not. What does Islam says and what the enemies of Islam want? Al-Qaeda was set up to wage a jihad against infidelity, particularly to encounter the onslaught of the infidel countries against the Islamic states."* [BIN LADEN 2001c]	OBL	D
17.	*"We are in favor of armed jihad only against those infidel countries, which are killing innocent Muslim men, women, and children just because they are Muslims. Supporting the US act is the need of some Muslim countries and the compulsion of others."* [BIN LADEN 2002b]	OBL	A
18.	*"I have already said that we are not hostile to the United States. We are against the system, which makes other nations slaves of the United States, or forces them to mortgage their political and economic freedom."* [BIN LADEN 2001e]	OBL	D
19.	*"It is simply that the American people are themselves the slaves of the Jews and are forced to live according to the principles and laws laid by them."* [BIN LADEN 2001e]	OBL	D
20.	*"Terror is the most dreaded weapon in modern age and the Western media is mercilessly using it against its own people."* [BIN LADEN 2001e]	OBL	D
21.	*"God opens up ways for those who work for*	OBL	E

	Him." [BIN LADEN 2002a]		
22.	*"Its sons are being killed, its blood is being shed, its holy places are being attacked, and it is not being ruled according to what God has decreed."* [BIN LADEN 2002a]	OBL	E
23.	*"When Almighty God has rendered successful a convoy of Muslims, the vanguards of Islam, He allowed them to destroy the United States. I ask God Almighty to elevate their status and grant them Paradise. He is the one who is capable to do so."* [BIN LADEN 2001f]	OBL	E
24.	*"In the aftermath of this event and now that senior US officials have spoken, beginning with Bush, the head of the world's infidels, and whoever supports him, every Muslim should rush to defend his religion."* [BIN LADEN 2001d]	OBL	D
25.	*"These diseases are a punishment from God and are in response to the call of persecuted women in Lebanon and Palestine."* [BIN LADEN 2001d]	OBL	E
26.	*"Everyone is today required to take up the jihad and serious action. All the popular leaderships from all sectors should act to stop this thunderous hemorrhage and expose these blatant treasons."* [BIN LADEN 2001c]	OBL	D
27.	*"Then came the New York invasion that ignited the house of the idiots of the age, smashed their citadels, nullified their witchcraft, exposed all the flags that marched behind them, and announced the*	OBL	E

	beginning of their end, God willing." []		
28.	*"These momentous events are the blessed jihad that has continued its march toward the desired objective and the promised day."* [BILN LADEN 2002a]	OBL	D
29.	*"My beloved ones, we have done what Almighty God ordered us to do. We did not invent anything. Nor did we invent any words. However, we implemented what Almighty God ordered us to do."* [BIN LADEN 2001e]	OBL	E
30.	*"I say these events have split the whole world into two camps: the camp of belief and the disbelief. So every Muslim shall take -shall support his religion."* [BIN LADEN 2002b]	OBL	A
31.	*"When these defended their oppressed sons, brothers, and sisters in Palestine and in many Islamic countries, the world at large shouted. The infidels shouted, followed by the hypocrites."* [BIN LADEN 2001e]	OBL	A
32.	*"Despite the great devastation inflicted on the Iraqi people by the crusader-Zionist alliance, and despite the huge number of those killed, which has exceeded 1 million ... despite all this, the Americans are once again trying to repeat the horrific massacres, as though they are not content with the protracted blockade imposed after the ferocious war or the fragmentation and devastation"*[BIN LADEN 2001e]	OBL	F
33.	*"We-with God's help- call on every Muslim who believes in God and wishes to be*	OBL	E

	rewarded to comply with God's order to kill the Americans and plunder their money wherever and whenever they find it. We also call on Muslim ulema, leaders, youths, and soldiers to launch the raid on Satan's U.S. troops and the devil's supporters allying with them, and to displace those who are behind them so that they may learn a lesson"[BIN LADEN 2001f]		
34.	*"It is a question of faith, not a war against terrorism, as Bush and Blair try to depict it."* [BIN LADEN 2002a]	OBL	D
35.	*"After the US politicians spoke and after the US newspapers and television channels became full of clear crusading hatred in this campaign that aims at mobilizing the West against Islam and Muslims, Bush left no room for doubts or the opinions of journalists, but he openly and clearly said that this war is a crusader war. He said this before the whole world to emphasize this fact."* [BIN LADEN 2001b]	OBL	A
36.	*"One million Iraqi children have thus far died in Iraq although they did not do anything wrong. Despite this, we heard no denunciation by anyone in the world or a fatwa by the rulers' ulema."* [BIN LADEN 2001a]	OBL	D
37.	*"We don't have time to keep up with the demands of those who are asking about Islamic books to learn about Islam. This event made people think (about true Islam) which benefited Islam greatly."* [BIN LADEN	OBL	D

	2001a]		
38.	*"Hundreds of people used to doubt you and few only would follow you until this huge event happened. Now hundreds of people are coming out to join you."* [BIN LADEN 2001a]	OBL	D
39.	*"I tell you that these events have split the entire world into two camps: one of faith, with no hypocrites, and one of unbelief –may God protect us from it."* [BIN LADEN 2001d]	OBL	A
40.	*"The very least you can say about these people is that they are immoral, dissolute, apostates, who help the butcher slaughter his victim and help the oppressor against the innocent child. May God Almighty protect me against them, and may He give them what they deserve."* [BIN LADEN 2001d]	OBL	D
41.	*"Since World War One, which ended over 83 years ago, the entire Islamic world has fallen under the crusader banners, under the British, French and Italian governments. They divided up the whole world between them, and Palestine fell into the hands of the British. From that day to this, more than 83 years later, our brothers and sons have been tortured in Palestine. Hundreds of thousands of them have been killed, hundreds of thousands detained."* [BIN LADEN 2001d]	OBL	A
42.	*"When the victim starts to avenge the innocent children in Palestine, Iraq, southern Sudan, Somalia, Kashmir, and the Philippines, the hypocrites and ruler's jurists stand up and defend this blatant unbelief -I seek God's help against them all."* [BIN	OBL	E

	LADEN 2002b]		
43.	*"And with regard to you, Muslims, this is the day of question. This is a new (inaudible) against you, all against the Muslims and Medina. So be like the followers of the prophet, peace be upon him, and all countrymen …, lovers of God and the prophet within, and a new battle, great battle, similar to the great battles of Islam, like the conqueror of Jerusalem. So, hurry up to the dignity of life and the eternity of death"* [BIN LADEN 2002b]	OBL	D
44.	*"This is America; God has sent one of the attacks by God and has attacked one of its best buildings. And this is America filled with fear from the north to south and east to west, thank God."* [BIN LADEN 2001d]	OBL	E
45.	*"And when God has guided a bunch of Muslims to be at the forefront and destroyed America, a big destruction, I wish God would lift their position."* [BIN LADEN 2001c]	OBL	E
46.	*"They supported the murder against the victim, so God has given them back what they deserve."* [BIN LADEN 2001c]	OBL	E
47.	*"When Almighty God rendered successful a convoy of Muslims, the vanguards of Islam, He allowed them to destroy the United States."* [BIN LADEN 2001e]	OBL	E
48.	*"Our nation has been tasting this humiliation and contempt for more than 80 years. Its sons are being killed, its blood is being shed, its holy places are being attacked, and it is*	OBL	E

	not being ruled according to what God has decreed." [BIN LADEN 2001e]		
49.	*"And to America, I say to it and to its people this: I swear by God the Great, America will never dream nor those who live in America will never taste security and safety unless we feel security and safety in our land and in Palestine"* [BIN LADEN 2001e]	OBL	F
50.	*"Some US analysts and studies said that 70 percent of the American people are still suffering from depression and psychological disorders to this very day after the incident of the two towers and the strike on the Pentagon, thanks to God Almighty."* [BIN LADEN 2001e]	OBL	E
51.	*"The happy man is the one who has been martyred in God's path. We pray to God Almighty to grant us success in supporting the religion of God, and to grant us martyrdom while facing the enemy and not while turning our backs to the enemy."* [BIN LADEN 2001f]	OBL	E
52.	*"Those 19 brothers, who left [their homes], made efforts, and offered their lives for Allah's cause--Allah has favored them with this conquest, which we are enjoying now."* [AL-ZAWAHIRI 2002]	Ayman al-Zawahiri[33]	E
53.	*"The United States will not even dream of enjoying security if we do not experience security as a living reality in Palestine, the land of the two holy mosques, and all Muslim*	OBL	F

---

[33] Ayman al-Zawahiri is the current leader of Al-Qaeda.

	countries, God willing." [BIN LADEN 2001b]		
54.	*"The difference between us and our adversaries in terms of military strength, manpower, and equipment is very huge. But, for the grace of God, the difference is also very huge in terms of psychological resources, faith, certainty, and reliance on the Almighty God. This difference between us and them is very, very huge and great. As a matter of fact, we [words indistinct] by our reliance on the Almighty God."* [BIN LADEN 2001d]	OBL	A
55.	*"The United States is nothing but propaganda and a huge mass of false statements and exaggeration. The purpose of this propaganda was to make the United States big in the eyes of the world. What it wanted has happened. However, the truth is what you saw. We killed them outside their land, praise be to Allah. Today, we kill them in the midst of their own home."* [BIN LADEN 2002a]	OBL	D
56.	*"This war is not confined to them -- it served as an opportunity for other nations to revise their stance."* [BIN LADEN 2001d]	OBL	A
57.	*"There is no need to explain and prove the degree of American support for Israel. The creation of Israel is a crime and it has to be erased. Each and everyone who has polluted him or herself with this crime has to pay for it, and pay for it heavily."* [BIN LADEN 2001e]	OBL	D
58.	*"The blood pouring out of Palestine must be*	OBL	C

	treated - with revenge of equal quantity. And you have to know that the Palestinians are not crying alone. You must be aware that the women are not becoming widows alone. You must be aware that their sons are not becoming orphans alone." [BIN LADEN 2001e]		
59.	*"Your forces occupy our lands spreading your ideology and thereby polluting the hearts of our people. You have laid siege on our holy places, mocking the sanctity of our mosques. You have done all of this to protect the Jews and safeguard your pillage of our treasures."* [BIN LADEN 2001e]	OBL	D
60.	*"By electing these leaders, the American people have given their consent to the incarceration of the Palestinian people, the demolition of Palestinian homes and the slaughter of the children of Iraq. The American people have the ability and choice to refuse the policies of their Government and even to change their Government, yet time and time again, polls show that the American people support the* policies *of the elected Government."* [BIN LADEN 2001e]	OBL	D
61.	*"The American army is part of the American people. It is these very same people who are shamelessly helping the Jews fight against us. This is why the American people are not innocent. The American people are active members in all these crimes."* [BUN LADEN 2001c]	OBL	D

62.	_"In our religion, Allah, The Lord of the Worlds, gave us the permission and the option to take revenge and return to you what you gave us."_ [BIN LADEN 2002a]	OBL	E
63.	_"We ask you next to stop your unfair acts, lies, immorality and debauchery. We regret to tell you that you are the worst civilization in the history of mankind."_ [BIN LADEN 2002a]	OBL	D
64.	_"You are the nation who, rather than ruling by the Law of Allah, choose to implement your own inferior rules and regulations, thus following your own vain whims and desires."_ [BIN LADEN 2001c]	OBL	B
65.	_"We call you to Islam; the last religion that has replaced all the previous religions; the religion of good manners, sincerity, mercy, fear of Allah, kindness to others, justice between people."_ [BIN LADEN 2001c]	OBL	B
66.	_"You run a society contrary to the nature of mankind by separating religion from your policies. So much so that people believe that even if they commit adultery, theft, and other wicked acts, as long as they go and confess, everything will be okay."_ [BIN LADEN 2001d]	OBL	B
67.	_"You are the nation who allows riba (interest on money), even though all the religions, including Christianity, have forbidden partaking in riba (interest on money). Yet you build your economy and investments on riba (interest on money)."_ [BIN LADEN 2001d]	OBL	B

68.	*"Your nation encourages drinking alcohol in all its shapes and forms i.e. production, trading and usage. On the one hand, you have made selling and using some drugs illegal, yet you so often turn a blind eye to this vice."* [BIN LADEN 2001d]	OBL	B
69.	*Your nation allows immoral acts and you assume that these are part of personal freedom, all whilst you continue to move towards this hell without any concern. Even your policies and rules show no concern for these things. Who can forget your previous President's immoral acts committed in the Oval office?* [BIN LADEN 2001d]	OBL	B
70.	*"Your nation endorses gambling in its all forms. Your companies practice this as well, resulting in the investments becoming active and the criminals becoming rich.* *Your nation exploits women like consumer products or advertising tools, calling upon customers to purchase them. "*[BIN LADEN 2001d]	OBL	B
71.	*"You promote immoral acts in all their forms directly and indirectly. With the help of this, you open the door for your tourists, encouraging them to join you in these immoral acts spreading filth upon whoever comes into contact with you."* [BIN LADEN 2001d]	OBL	B
72.	*"And because of all this, you have been described as the nation of all kinds of different diseases -- diseases that had never existed in the past. So you have to be proud*	OBL	B

of yourself, because your evil acts have spread AIDS all around the world, especially to the poorest countries in the world, killing many millions.” [BIN LADEN 2001d]		