

PART II

THE ANALYSIS

Chapter Eight

Critical Discourse Analysis of Excerpts from Selected Texts of President George W. Bush

Chapter Aim: The aim of this chapter is to employ CDA to excerpts of selected texts of George W. Bush. In the chapter, 11 texts are presented and analysed by using aspects of Teun A. Van Dijk's method of multidisciplinary CDA (Teun A. Van Dijk 2001a: 95-120). Deconstruction is incorporated into the CDA performed both in this chapter and the next chapter on the analysis of excerpts of Osama bin Laden.

Introduction

Deconstruction is a term denoting the application of postmodern/poststructural ideas to criticism of a text. A deconstruction acts to isolate the frames of reference and assumptions that underpin the text. It may seem a simple task to decipher the meaning of a text. This is far from the truth. Traditionally, the subject is an external observer who simply reflects the object. This means that the individual writes and then expresses her/his observation through language. Thus the observer is conceived as an independent entity who knows exactly what s/he is doing, an entity who is in control. This division between system and subject is the hallmark of structuralist thought. This stable determinate system has been greatly challenged by poststructural thought⁶⁵ which buys into an interaction between system and subject such that the subject is not capable of complete self-knowledge or complex knowledge of the system. Hence a text is open to be “deconstructed”. Close textual analysis aims to disclose the text's assumptions and reveal its multiple meanings.

The textual analyses in this chapter examine the speeches of George W. Bush in various settings such as in an inaugural address, to a joint session of congress, in the United Nations General Assembly and so on. The analysis of the selected speeches shows the ability of the Bush Administration to promote its own vision of the world, one particular ideological perspective, as the “truth”. The Bush Government, employing its own definition of “global

⁶⁵ Postmodernism and Poststructuralism are often considered to be synonymous. There does exist a difference between them, however. As has been discussed earlier in this thesis, Postmodernism is a reaction against the rationalism and the universalising centralism of modernism. Fayaz Chagani (2006:3) explains the difference simply when he says that Poststructuralism can be seen as a reaction against structuralism which claims there are universal structures of *language* and these structures determine absolutes in thought. While Poststructuralism therefore relates more to language, both movements are closely linked.

terrorism” built public consent for the GWOT and the war in Iraq through its neo-conservative outlook on foreign policy that represents the Bush administration’s position in international affairs. Two principal assumptions of the discourse on the Global War on Terror (GWOT) is that terrorists are beyond any sort of understanding and the way to deal with them is through “war” as opposed to “crime” where justice might be applied. This chapter shows how discursive means are used to produce “truth” – how the struggle over “truth” has its origin in micro-level discursive interaction as exemplified in Bush’s speeches – and to call attention to the way this process is factored in claims of truth at the macro-level in policies on terrorism and the GWOT.

There are two limitations to the style of CDA used here. The first is that each text is an excerpt of a larger text. Hence, the text under study is not a self-contained unit: it will have branches above and below within what can be described as the whole text. However, I have approached the problem by choosing excerpts that can be viewed as an isolated text as much as possible and I do not refer back to the surrounding text. While this is not an ideal situation, it does allow for a greater number of texts to be examined, texts that, in Bush’s case span the time from his first election to the end of 2006.

The second limitation relates to the size of the text. If I follow CDA theory strictly a large corpus of text can be problematic because of the many interactions occurring within that text and the need to examine larger interactions contained in the text. Consequently, when, at times I have retained a larger text, I have analysed only the principal interactions therein. Again, this is not an ideal situation but one that is practical in order to cover the necessary span of events surrounding a particular discourse. The CDA I outlined in Chapter Two allows for this kind of analysis selection.

After the CDA analyses on the 11 texts have been performed, the emergent lines of argument from all texts are presented in two tables. Table 8.2 lists the emergent lines of argument against the text number. I have used this table to prepare Table 8.3 which categorises the emergent lines of argument into three groupings: (1) September the 11th/ Defence Strategies (2) Freedom/Democracy/Globalisation and (3) Innocence/Terrorism. These three groupings are then discussed with the linkages made evident between them. The results of the analysis will show that September the 11th is the pivotal point, the justification for the dissemination of two new US foreign policies: preemption and the exporting of democracy. These policies

facilitate not only the maintenance of existing US global supremacy but are designed to push the barrier even further towards global dominance. Resistance, however, comes in the form of “terrorist” insurgency which is especially evident in Iraq. Bush’s discourse on freedom is central to the Bush universe but it is a freedom that has been the result of the construction of new knowledge and is shifted to the far right of the political spectrum, associated largely with economic freedoms. Postmodernist interpretations make it possible for “freedom” to be juxtaposed with militarism allowing militarism to take on the connotations of compassion while postcolonialist responses show the new master-slave relationship highlighted against the desecration of the cradle of civilisation.

Textual Analyses

Eleven (11) texts are presented in chronological order for analysis. They are listed below in Table 8.1⁶⁶.

Table 8.1 Texts used in CDA of George W. Bush

Text	Description of Text Excerpt	Date
1	Inaugural Address	20.01.2001
2	Address to a Joint Session of Congress on Terrorist Attacks	20.09.2001
3	Remarks by the President on Trade Promotion Authority	04.04.2002
4	Graduation Speech at the United States Military Academy	01.06.2002
5	Commencement Address at the University of South Carolina	09.05.2003
6	Address to the United Nations General Assembly	23.09.2003
7	Speech to the United Nations General Assembly	21.09.2004
8	Rebuttal to Sen. John Kerry in opening question of 2004 election debate	30.09.2004
9	Second Inaugural Address	20.01.2005
10	Introductory and concluding Paragraphs to the 2006 State of the Union Address	31.01.2006
11	Speech to Military Officers	05.09.2006

As can be seen, the texts are extracts from various sources complete with dates. The textual analyses begin as follows.

Text: 1

Type: Excerpt of Inaugural Address

Date: January 20 2001

Through much of the last century, America’s faith in freedom and democracy was a rock in a raging sea. Now it is a seed upon the wind, taking root in many nations.

⁶⁶ This table first appeared in Chapter Two as Table 2.1

Our democratic faith is more than the creed of our country, it is the inborn hope of our humanity, an ideal we carry but do not own, a trust we bear and pass along. And even after nearly 225 years, we have a long way yet to travel.

Bush (2001b: 1)

Setting

The inaugural address provides an opportunity for a newly elected or re-elected president to speak to the nation about the domestic affairs of the nation as well as its international role.

Often the inaugural speech invokes the loftiest ideals of the nation's purpose.

Macro propositions/Implications:

1. America's foundations are rooted in freedom and democracy.
2. Through much of the last century, it has been America's steadfast adherence to freedom and democracy that has brought about stability in the world.
3. American-led faith of democracy and freedom is now spreading to other nations.
4. American democratic faith in transcending the ideal of country is passed along as hope to all humanity.
5. Americans continually have to live up to this ideal.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- Humanity's hope lies in each nation adopting and extending the democratic tradition which America has given the world.

Local Meanings

1. The juxtaposition of the word "freedom" to "democracy" implies the two are linked.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. America introduced freedom and democracy to the world.
2. Democracy should eventually replace all other forms of government around the world.

Hyperboles

'Our democratic faith . . . is the inborn hope of our humanity . . . ' is a hyperbole expressing a universal vision born of US self-glorification.

Omissions

What are omitted are English and European contributions to the development of democracy and even contributions going back to Roman and Greek periods as well as the value of governmental systems other than democracy.

Summary and Discussion

The communicative setting, that of Bush's inaugural address, is not only an appropriate event in which to glorify the nation but a strategic one. The hyperbole coupled with what has been left out in the excerpt works to establish the implicit meanings that America has given freedom and democracy to the world and the spread of democracy, American style, around the world is a logical consequence of this for the salvation of humanity. In this short excerpt, Bush reaffirms America as the prime mover in world affairs. He will use the linkage, made in the speech between freedom and democracy, many times in further speeches. Such linkages will be referred to again in this thesis.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- America is destined to advance freedom and democracy around the world.
- Embracing American-style democracy is the hope of all humanity.

Text: 2

Type: Excerpt of an Address to a Joint Session of Congress on Terrorist Attacks

Date: September 20 2001

But the only way to defeat terrorism as a threat to our way of life is to stop it, eliminate it, and destroy it where it grows. Many will be involved in this effort, from FBI agents to intelligence operatives to the reservists we have called to active duty. All deserve our thanks, and all have our prayers. And tonight, a few miles from the damaged Pentagon, I have a message for our military: Be ready. I've called the Armed Forces to alert, and there is a reason. The hour is coming when America will act, and you will make us proud. This is not, however, just America's fight. And what is at stake is not just America's freedom. This is the world's fight. This is civilization's fight. This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism, tolerance and freedom.

Bush (2001c: 6)

Setting

This address was made to a joint session of congress nine days after the September 11 terrorist attacks on New York, Washington and Pennsylvania. In it, Bush called upon the nations of the world to support a war against terrorism, the so-called "Global War against Terror".

Macro propositions/Implications:

1. In order to defeat terrorism, it is necessary to destroy it at its source.

2. To destroy terrorism at its source will involve a military-style operation as defined by the people who will be involved – FBI agents, intelligence operatives, reservists.
3. All people in the effort to defeat terrorism are deserving of America’s thanks and prayers.
4. While it is America’s intention to act against the terrorists, it is not just America’s fight.
5. Those who believe in progress and pluralism, tolerance and freedom should be involved in the fight against terrorism.
6. It is not only America’s or the world’s fight but, in fact, civilisation’s fight.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- To defeat terrorism at its source will involve not only Americans in a military-style operation but all those who comprise civilisation.

Local Meanings

1. The words “damaged pentagon” is at the same time a reminder of the reason why the fight against terrorism has been instituted and offers a justification for it: America has been violated at its core. The words are designed to incite the American people, particularly the military, to retribution.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. To defeat terrorism where it grows means taking the fight outside America.
2. All peoples who consider themselves civilised have a moral obligation to join in America’s fight against terrorism at its source.

Hyperboles

“This is civilization’s fight” is a hyperbole which following “And what is at stake is not just America’s freedom” carries the connotation that what is ultimately at stake is the freedom of civilization. This then ties in with **Implicit Meaning Number 2** above.

Omissions

What is omitted is any reference to the possible reasons for the terrorist attacks.

Summary and Discussion

What is significant in this extract is that the omission, mentioned above, indicates that to consider the reasons for the attacks is not something that should be contemplated. Sentence by sentence, Bush builds up the rhetoric for the fight to include the Armed Forces of

America, the world and finally civilisation. Through his argument, Bush creates what appears to look like a plausible case: It is the obvious duty of every nation in the world to join America in the fight against terrorism. The argument suggests that those who do not include themselves in this “fight” are “outside” civilisation: They do not believe in “progress”, “pluralism”, “tolerance” and especially “freedom”. This, of course, includes the terrorists themselves. The word, “freedom”, a hallmark of Bush’s speeches, could be contrasted with an antonym “tyranny”, the character of the governments of countries which will not be included in the fight against terrorism.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- Addressing terrorism means fighting a military-style offensive at its source.
- It is every nation’s duty to join America in the fight against terrorism.
- What is at stake in the fight against terrorism is the freedom of civilisation.

Text: 3

Type: Excerpt of Remarks by the President on Trade Promotion Authority

Date: April 4 2002

And then, of course, trade creates the habits of freedom. If you welcome trade into your country, it creates the notion of freedom. It gives people, consumers, the opportunity to demand product, which is part of a free society. It creates an entrepreneurial class, which is a part of a free society.

And the habits of freedom begin to create the expectations of democracy and demands for better democratic institutions. Societies that open to commerce across their borders are more open to democracy within their borders. And for those of us who care about values and believe in values -- not just American values, but universal values that promote human dignity -- trade is a good way to do that.

Bush (2002a: 4)

Setting

The President talks to the Senate on Trade Promotion Authority.

Macro propositions/Implications:

1. Trade creates the habits of freedom.
2. Trade creates the notion of freedom.
3. Trade gives consumers the opportunity to demand goods.
4. Trade creates an entrepreneurial class.
5. The habits of freedom create the expectations of democracy.
6. Trade is a good way to promote human dignity through belief in universal values.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication:

Trade plays a role in promoting democracy and human rights all over the world.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. Economic and political freedoms reinforce each other.
2. Economic development provides fertile ground for the development of democracy.

Omissions

What is omitted from the passage is the mention not simply of “trade” but of “free trade”. Use of the term “free trade” would have heavily nuanced the meaning. As free trade is a concept in economics and government encompassing international trade of goods without trade barriers and the free movement of capital between countries, today’s global free trade or “globalisation” is a heavily contentious subject. While a form of globalisation where all nations and people prosper is probably what most people would like to see, the current form of globalisation is far from this reality and harbours many blatant inequities. President Bush frequently refers to “free trade” in the rest of the document. In this key passage where he is connecting trade to freedom, he makes no mention of the downsides of free trade. This omission thus creates misleading implications.

Summary and Discussion

In this excerpt Bush connects economic reform to political reform. Trade along with its economic benefits can be a method for spreading broader freedoms and democracy around the world. While the argument is presented without alluding explicitly to globalisation, the scenario described refers to globalisation, by omission, without all but mentioning it. A deceptive connotation carries the message that there are no harmful consequences to this link between economic reform and political reform.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- Trade ultimately creates the prerequisites for freedom.
- The habits of freedom create the expectations of democracy.
- Economic and political freedoms necessarily reinforce each other.

Text: 4

Type: Excerpt of Graduation Speech at the United States Military Academy, West Point

Date: June 1 2002

The gravest danger to freedom lies at the perilous crossroads of radicalism and technology. When the spread of chemical and biological and nuclear weapons, along with ballistic missile technology -- when that occurs, even weak states and small groups could attain a catastrophic power to strike great nations. Our enemies have declared this very intention, and have been caught seeking these terrible weapons. They want the capability to blackmail us, or to harm us, or to harm our friends -- and we will oppose them with all our power. (Applause.)

For much of the last century, America's defense relied on the Cold War doctrines of deterrence and containment. In some cases, those strategies still apply. But new threats also require new thinking. Deterrence -- the promise of massive retaliation against nations -- means nothing against shadowy terrorist networks with no nation or citizens to defend. Containment is not possible when unbalanced dictators with weapons of mass destruction can deliver those weapons on missiles or secretly provide them to terrorist allies.

We cannot defend America and our friends by hoping for the best. We cannot put our faith in the word of tyrants, who solemnly sign non-proliferation treaties, and then systemically break them. If we wait for threats to fully materialize, we will have waited too long. (Applause.)

Homeland defense and missile defense are part of stronger security, and they're essential priorities for America. Yet the war on terror will not be won on the defensive. We must take the battle to the enemy, disrupt his plans, and confront the worst threats before they emerge. (Applause.) In the world we have entered, the only path to safety is the path of action. And this nation will act. (Applause.)

Bush (2002b: 2)

Setting

West Point is significant in that it is the United States Military Academy where numerous important American military leaders graduated. It is also a former army fort and the oldest continuously occupied military post in the US. Therefore it carries great standing from its historical past and great promise as to present and future graduates who will contribute in defining and maintaining the military policy of the nation.

Macro propositions/Implications:

1. There is a grave danger, even to great nations, when radicalism and technology coincide.
2. Our enemies have been caught seeking modern technological weaponry, including nuclear weapons.
3. These same enemies seek to harm America and her friends.
4. America will oppose them.
5. America's defence once relied on deterrence but new threats require new thinking.

6. Containment is compromised when unstable dictators can access weapons of mass destruction and use them or provide them to terrorist allies.
7. America cannot put her faith in such unstable dictators.
8. America cannot wait for threats to fully materialize.
9. America must take the battle to the enemy.
10. In this new world, the path of action is the only path to safety.
11. America will act.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication:

- As deterrence is no longer adequate to ensure America's defence in the new world where radicalism and technology overlap, America's safety lies only in the path of action, in neutralising threats abroad before they materialise at home.

Local Meanings

1. The local meanings of the text create a polarisation between "great nations" (like America) and its enemies – "shadowy terrorist networks", "unbalanced dictators with weapons of mass destruction" and "the word of tyrants". The lexical choice emphasises the division involved, e.g. "great" is starkly contrasted with "shadowy" and "unbalanced". Such words contribute to the polarisation in such a way as to form a biased model of the situation where the actors can be set apart as the good (America and her friends) and the bad (such as Selected Arab states and groups which have been labeled with terrorist connections). This presentation camouflages any real understanding that may be gained from the dynamics of the political events which have taken place.
2. The use of the word "freedom" in the opening sentence of the extract is an interesting one. Perhaps the greatest casualty in the merger between radicalism and technology would be peace. If that is the case, the means to address such a possibility would be conflict resolution and transformation processes. One does not really fight for peace. On the other hand, one does fight for freedom. There are many connotations to this word. To fight for freedom implies that we are in some way enslaved by the tyranny of terrorists, unbalanced dictators, leaders pursuing nuclear agendas. Looking at the state of affairs in the light of a fight for freedom, which Bush does in this excerpt,

means rejecting any consideration of negotiation. The choice of “freedom” over “peace” is a very calculated one.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. “New threats require new thinking” contains an ominous implicit meaning: There needs to be a change in the strategies underlying America’s defence. There is going to be a move from deterrence. This is affirmed in the later statement: “If we wait for threats to fully materialize, we will have waited too long”. Implicit here is a message of urgency, of taking action before it’s too late. Hence the move to be expected is one from deterrence to one of action.
2. “We must take the battle to the enemy” strongly implies that America will be prepared to initiate military action abroad, if and when it is deemed necessary. This gives the political powers in America great latitude to choose a course of action, a strong departure from the conservatism of deterrence.

Hyperboles

The text contains two prominent hyperboles: “If we wait for threats to fully materialize, we will have waited too long” and “In the world we have entered, the only path to safety is the path of action”. In other words: We need to strike first. See what happened with September 11 2001. The justification given for this new direction in defence strategy is the “gravest danger” which lies “at the perilous crossroads of radicalism and technology” – terrorists obtaining and using technological weaponry.

The hyperboles work to create the fear (and anxiety) of inaction within a target audience whose *raison d’etre* is to defend the nation and also to stimulate and encourage those in the audience who, being future military leaders, may support a stronger military role in political affairs.

Omissions

It is to be noted that “the enemy” is not well defined. There is reference to the war on terror not being won “on the defensive” and from that it can be gathered that “weak states and small groups” who seek to attain a “catastrophic power” may fall into this category. Also tyrants “who solemnly sign non-proliferation treaties, and systematically break them” are indicated

as the enemy. Yet who the enemy is remains elusive. Such elusiveness facilitates an enemy that can be continually redefined in order to serve political interests.

What is also omitted is any recognition that there could be reasons for the terrorist attacks: Why are they attacking us or why are they likely to attack us.

Summary and Discussion

The Overall Macro proposition spells out what these four short paragraphs essentially declare. It is a new military doctrine, a doctrine outlining when it is justifiable to take military action. In short, it is a doctrine of pre-eminence⁶⁷. It has been noted that “the enemy” is not well defined and this imprecision can serve the political and military interests of the powerful in terms of providing an expanding base of just who the enemy can be: now shadowy terrorist networks and tyrants with suspected weapons of mass destruction, later possibly countries which may “secretly” pursue a nuclear agenda. Iran and North Korea come to mind. As the Local Meanings indicate, the lexical choice contributes to a polarisation which defines a biased state of circumstances: America is inherently good; the enemy is inherently evil. Such a dichotomy prevents the enemy from having any cause at all. Hence there are no reasons to consider an understanding of the actions of the enemy. In any case, the fight for freedom as opposed to an approach toward peace removes negotiation and other conflict resolution processes from receiving any consideration at all.

While this speech is a discourse at the microlevel of social interaction, namely the simple ceremony of a graduating class, at the same time it buys into the reproduction of politics and power at the macrolevel. Bush is addressing the very people who may be the nation’s future military leaders selling a very controversial and powerful policy. Here “local” contexts are closely related to “global” contexts making the verbal interaction potentially very significant.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- Freedom is compromised when radicalism and technology meet.
- Terrorists must be prevented at all costs from using modern technological weaponry.

⁶⁷ This doctrine has become known as the “Bush Doctrine” (Singer 2003:1).

- Deterrence is no longer an adequate defence strategy to protect the American nation.
- The very existence and nature of modern technological weaponry demands an American defence strategy based on preemption.
- Addressing terrorism means fighting a military-style offensive at its source.

Text: 5

Type: Excerpt of Commencement Address at the University of South Carolina

Date: May 9 2003

The combined GDP of all Arab countries is smaller than that of Spain. Their peoples have less access to the Internet than the people of Sub-Saharan Africa. The Arab world has a great cultural tradition, but is largely missing out on the economic progress of our time. Across the globe, free markets and trade have helped defeat poverty, and taught men and women the habits of liberty. So I propose the establishment of a U.S. -Middle East free trade area within a decade, to bring the Middle East into an expanding circle of opportunity, to provide hope for the people who live in that region.

We will work with our partners to ensure that small and mid-sized businesses have access to capital, and support efforts in the region to develop central laws on property rights and good business practices. By replacing corruption and self-dealing, with free markets and fair laws, the people of the Middle East will grow in prosperity and freedom.

Bush (2003b: 3)

Setting

President Bush addresses graduating members of the class of 2003 at the University of South Carolina.

Macro propositions/Implications

1. The Arab world is largely missing out on the economic progress of our time.
2. Across the globe free markets and trade have helped defeat poverty.
3. Across the globe free markets and trade have taught men and women the habits of liberty.
4. By replacing corruption and self-dealing with free markets and fair laws, the people of the Middle East will grow in prosperity and freedom.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- Free markets and trade will promote prosperity and freedom among the people of the Middle East and the USA will help this become reality.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. An economy based on the principles of free trade is superior to any other economic system.
2. Globalisation, which arises from the principles of free trade, is a positive good in the world.
3. There is a link between free trade and freedom.
4. There is a link between free trade and peace.

Hyperboles

There are two prominent hyperboles in the text, both associated with the concept of “freedom”: Across the world free markets and trade have taught people the “habits of liberty” and the introduction of free markets into the Middle East will bring freedom to its inhabitants. Both these statements in connecting economic structures with the idea of freedom make extravagant claims which are unsubstantiated. The link, moreover, between a practical reality like economics on the one hand and a highly abstract notion like freedom on the other is not explained.

Summary and Discussion

In this text, Bush speaks of the Middle East missing out on the economic progress of our time. That economic progress is defined as “free markets and trade” which is what underpins globalisation. Globalisation is thus presented as an unquestionable advancement or evolution for humankind that not only defeats poverty, but also brings freedom. Should not the people of the Middle East have a choice, however, to reject this so-called progress? The downsides of globalisation are nowhere mentioned. In addition, the link between globalisation and freedom, while asserted is not elucidated.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- Free markets defeat poverty.

- Free markets bring freedom.
- Free markets bring peace.
- Free trade, freedom and peace are inextricably linked.

Text: 6

Type: Excerpt of an Address to the United Nations General Assembly

Date: September 23 2003

By the victims they choose, and by the means they use, the terrorists have clarified the struggle we are in. Those who target relief workers for death have set themselves against all humanity. Those who incite murder and celebrate suicide reveal their contempt for life, itself. They have no place in any religious faith; they have no claim on the world's sympathy; and they should have no friend in this chamber.

Events during the past two years have set before us the clearest of divides: between those who seek order, and those who spread chaos; between those who work for peaceful change, and those who adopt the methods of gangsters; between those who honor the rights of man, and those who deliberately take the lives of men and women and children without mercy or shame.

Between these alternatives there is no neutral ground. All governments that support terror are complicit in a war against civilization. No government should ignore the threat of terror, because to look the other way gives terrorists the chance to regroup and recruit and prepare. And all nations that fight terror, as if the lives of their own people depend on it, will earn the favorable judgment of history.

Bush (2003c: 1)

Setting

It is approximately two years after the September 11 attacks and President Bush addresses the United Nations General Assembly. During the previous month on 19 August, terrorists had struck the UN headquarters with the result that 22 people were killed including Sergio Vieira de Mello, a very well-known, much loved and untiring human rights UN chief. It is a propitious time and place for Bush to focus on a plea for assistance in Iraq and in this excerpt, push his formula for a continued War on Terror under the auspices that terrorists, themselves, are fighting a war against civilization.

Macro propositions/Implications

1. It is the terrorists who have defined the struggle we find ourselves in.
2. Through their choice of victims and means, the terrorists do not qualify for our understanding but set themselves against all humanity.
3. There is clearly a divide between those who do good and those who do evil.

4. There is no neutral ground between these two alternatives.
5. Every government that supports terrorists is complicit in a war against civilisation.
6. Every nation that fights terrorism will win history's approval.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- The terrorists in setting themselves against all humanity do not earn our understanding for there is no neutral ground between good and evil.

Local Meanings

1. The local and the global can be seen connected in the sentence: "Those who target relief workers for death have set themselves against all humanity". The death of the 22 people in the terrorist attack on the UN headquarters in Baghdad, acutely fresh in the minds of the members of the UN General Assembly, is used to restate the hyperbole of the terrorists' war against humanity by strategically bringing the matter home at the local level.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. Macro proposition 1 imparts the implicit meaning that the struggle we are in is the sole responsibility of the terrorists.
2. The "clearest of divides" indicates a good/evil dichotomy where we, "who seek order" are good and the terrorists, who "spread chaos" are evil.
3. The terrorists, who are inherently evil are therefore not motivated by any other agenda.
4. Macro proposition 4 indicates that governments must make a choice as to what side they are on – they cannot remain neutral in the War on Terror. The onus is on each government to actively make a decision in this respect.

Hyperboles

Both "the clearest of divides" and "a war against civilization" serves to drive an ideology of "us" versus "them". This form of discourse is extraordinarily powerful and also manipulative in that it sets up a structure of society in which we are heroic which is exactly what we want to hear. This communicative event reinforces an image of ourselves that is both positive and

righteous. It does not stimulate any critical thinking on our part which surely is the hallmark of intelligent human beings. The bombing of the UN headquarters in Baghdad has to be acknowledged as a great tragedy but hyperbole of this kind serves only to mask the complexities involved in the issues surrounding this event.

Omissions

The “clearest of divides” presents us with a profile of the terrorists: “those who spread chaos”, “those who adopt the method of gangsters” and “those who deliberately take the lives of men and women and children without mercy or shame”. It is known that USA military activities in Iraq and Afghanistan have often killed women and children and other civilians and not shown much remorse and regret. The terrorist profile is one-dimensional. It does not illuminate the motivations of the terrorists and portrays a human being whose basic drive is the pursuit of evil. What is omitted is some insight as to why a human being does take the lives of men and women and children. Are we to understand then that a human being chooses to kill because s/he is, in essence, evil and this is the modus operandi of his or her life? Can such a human being exist? It is unlikely. It is more likely there are grounds for the taking of human life in this manner even though such action assaults our mind and being.

Summary and Discussion

Two years after the September 11 bombings and shortly after terrorist attacks have left the UN headquarters in Baghdad with 22 people dead, Bush, in this excerpt, expediently advances his good/evil dichotomy by claiming that the terrorists are beyond the consideration of our understanding – they are inherently evil and as such, are not motivated by any cause other than the pursuit of evil. The ideology of “us” versus “them” manipulatively affirms our virtue in this very complex issue and acts as a constraint on a critical evaluation of the grounds the terrorists use to justify their killing. For Bush, no neutral ground between good and evil means that it is the terrorists who have completely defined the struggle we are in; they are wholly responsible. We, the Western world, are entirely innocent. Every government of every nation, according to Bush, must make a choice as to what side they are on. To Bush, it’s that simple.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- It is the terrorists who are the sole cause of the conflict that we find ourselves in.
- America is inherently good and heroic while the terrorists are evil and cowardly.
- It would be of no value to attempt to understand the terrorists' motives for they are only inspired by evil.
- What is at stake in the fight against terrorism is the freedom of civilization.

Text: 7

Type: Excerpt of Speech to the United Nations General Assembly

Date: September 21 2004

The United Nations and my country share the deepest commitments. Both the American Declaration of Independence and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaim the equal value and dignity of every human life. That dignity is honored by the rule of law ... limits on the power of the state ... respect for women ... protection of private property ... free speech ... equal justice ... and religious tolerance. That dignity is dishonored by oppression, corruption, tyranny, bigotry, terrorism, and all violence against the innocent. And both of our founding documents affirm that this bright line between justice and injustice - between right and wrong - is the same in every age, and every culture, and every nation.

Wise governments also stand for these principles for very practical and realistic reasons. We know that dictators are quick to choose aggression, while free nations strive to resolve differences in peace. We know that oppressive governments support terror, while free governments fight the terrorists in their midst. We know that free peoples embrace progress and life, instead of becoming the recruits for murderous ideologies.

Bush (2004b: 1)

Setting

President Bush addresses the United Nations General Assembly. Unlike the previous year, Bush did not devote the majority of his time to Iraq and terrorism although these issues were certainly covered and a plea was again made to the global body to help build a democratic Iraq.

Macro propositions/Implications

1. Both the founding documents of the United States and the United Nations share the deepest commitments.
2. These commitments embrace the equal value and dignity of every human life.

3. While this dignity is honoured by the rule of law, limits on the power of the state, respect for women, protection of private property, free speech, equal justice and religious tolerance, it is dishonoured by oppression, corruption, tyranny, bigotry, terrorism and all violence against the innocent.
4. There is a clear divide between justice and injustice and between right and wrong that is affirmed in both of these founding documents.
5. This clear divide exists in every age, in every culture and in every religion.
6. This clear divide is also affirmed by wise governments for very practical and realistic reasons.
7. This clear divide is revealed when dictators are quick to choose aggression and free nations strive to resolve differences in peace.
8. This clear divide is revealed when oppressive governments support terror and free governments fight the terrorists in their midst.
9. This clear divide is revealed when free peoples embrace progress and life instead of succumbing to ideologies which can lead to murder.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- The founding documents of both the United States and the United Nations affirm a clear divide between justice and injustice, right and wrong, freedom and oppression, which is clearly expressed when free peoples choose life over the pursuit of terrorism.

Local Meanings

1. Bush chooses the term “bright line” to distinguish between justice and injustice, between right and wrong. In his speech to the UN the previous year (see Text 4), Bush has chosen the term “the clearest of divides” to set up a similar dichotomy of good/evil. I have retained this former application of “clear divide” to illustrate the continuity in Bush’s thought.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. Through sharing similar goals and commitments expressed in the American Declaration of Independence and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the aspirations of the United States can be likened to those of the United Nations.
2. The clear divide between justice and injustice, right and wrong and ultimately good and bad has a universal application which speaks an absolute truth.
3. The clear divide also has a practical application seen when oppressive governments support terror and free governments oppose terror.
4. Freedom is essential in the fight against terror.

Hyperboles

Likening the US to the UN greatly promotes the credibility and respectability of all US motives. By invoking the common “deepest commitments” between these two entities gives more credence to Bush’s construct of the great divide and ultimately to Bush’s way of dealing with the problem of terrorism via the War on Terror. Bush is using a sanction from the UN that the UN has not given. By setting up the UN not only as an ally but as a defender of the US in the moral sense legitimates US actions and policy with respect to terrorism in the strongest terms. In short, this is not only a hyperbole; it comes close to outright deception.

Omissions

What is omitted is an acknowledgment of the very complexity of the issues Bush invokes in order to illustrate the simplicity of a clear divide or “bright line” between “right and wrong”. For example the statement, “We know that oppressive governments support terror, while free governments fight the terrorists in their midst”, brings into question concepts of “terror” and “freedom” which are both fraught with contention. Such attitudes as Bush has advanced are organised by a neo-conservative ideology. This ideology is not explicit but pre-supposed by the text. The use of “We know” to open the sentence, however, incorporates the audience, which are the members of the General Assembly of the United Nations into this discursive dimension. Through this device, Bush gives the impression that the both the United States and the United Nations, together, share his neo-conservative outlook on the subject of terrorism unquestioningly which is also a deception.

Summary and Discussion

In this excerpt, Bush invokes the simplicity of the great divide between right and wrong, what Bush construes as a fundamental and absolute truth, to explain the existence of terrorism in the world today. What is different in this speech to Bush's other speeches is that Bush borrows the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to do it. By drawing on the similar commitments of the founding documents of both the UN and the US, Bush aims to grant credibility to his neo-conservative ideology. His subtle suggestion of a deep and abiding relationship that America shares with the UN is a deceit and the implication that the UN endorses his policies is invalid.

As usual, Bush paints a very simplistic picture of an issue that is replete in complexity. The discourse that is being pushed – America, a beacon of goodness and freedom is valiantly fighting the evil terrorists – dominates his neo-conservative agenda. This discourse belies what is happening at the societal level. On the international front, there is no acknowledgement that the terrorists might have a cause, that US foreign policy may have had a marginalising effect on Arab and Mid-Eastern countries producing fall-out effects while on the home front, the enactment of the USA Patriot Act formed in response to the terrorist acts of September 11 2001, dramatically expands the authority of US law enforcement to an unprecedented level, a level which is being questioned by American citizens. Both of these actions curtail the freedom, which Bush tells us is essential in the fight against terror, of countries that are the recipients of American largesse and also of Americans themselves.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- Through sharing similar commitments expressed in the American Declaration of Independence and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the objectives of the United States can be likened to those of the United Nations.
- Like the United Nations, the United States distinguishes a clear divide between right and wrong.
- The clear divide between right and wrong is seen when oppressive governments support terror and free governments oppose terror.
- Freedom is inimical to the growth of terrorism.

Text: 8

Type: Rebuttal of President Bush to Sen. John Kerry in opening question of the 2004 election debate⁶⁸.

Date: September 30 2004

Question: Do you believe you could do a better job than President Bush in preventing another 9/11-type terrorist attack on the United States?

Kerry's Response:

Yes, I do.

But before I answer further, let me thank you for moderating. I want to thank the University of Miami for hosting us. And I know the president will join me in welcoming all of Florida to this debate. You've been through the roughest weeks anybody could imagine. Our hearts go out to you. And we admire your pluck and perseverance.

I can make America safer than President Bush has made us.

And I believe President Bush and I both love our country equally. But we just have a different set of convictions about how you make America safe.

I believe America is safest and strongest when we are leading the world and we are leading strong alliances.

I'll never give a veto to any country over our security. But I also know how to lead those alliances.

This president has left them in shatters across the globe, and we're now 90 percent of the casualties in Iraq and 90 percent of the costs.

I think that's wrong, and I think we can do better.

I have a better plan for homeland security. I have a better plan to be able to fight the war on terror by strengthening our military, strengthening our intelligence, by going after the financing more authoritatively, by doing what we need to do to rebuild the alliances, by reaching out to the Muslim world, which the president has almost not done, and beginning to isolate the radical Islamic Muslims, not have them isolate the United States of America.

I know I can do a better job in Iraq. I have a plan to have a summit with all of the allies, something this president has not yet achieved, not yet been able to do to bring people to the table.

We can do a better job of training the Iraqi forces to defend themselves, and I know that we can do a better job of preparing for elections.

All of these, and especially homeland security, which we'll talk about a little bit later.

Kerry (2004: 1-2)

Bush's Rebuttal:

I, too, thank the University of Miami, and say our prayers are with the good people of this state, who've suffered a lot.

September the 11th changed how America must look at the world. And since that day, our nation has been on a multi-pronged strategy to keep our country safer.

We pursued al Qaeda wherever al Qaeda tries to hide. Seventy-five percent of known al Qaeda leaders have been brought to justice. The rest of them know we're after them.

We've upheld the doctrine that said if you harbor a terrorist, you're equally as guilty as the terrorist.

And the Taliban are no longer in power. Ten million people have registered to vote in Afghanistan in the upcoming presidential election.

In Iraq, we saw a threat, and we realized that after September the 11th, we must take threats seriously, before they fully materialize. Saddam Hussein now sits in a prison cell. America and the world are safer for it.

We continue to pursue our policy of disrupting those who proliferate weapons of mass destruction.

Libya has disarmed. The A.Q. Khan network has been brought to justice.

And, as well, we're pursuing a strategy of freedom around the world, because I understand free nations will

⁶⁸ The CDA Analysis will be done on Bush's Rebuttal. Kerry's Response is included for reference only.

reject terror. Free nations will answer the hopes and aspirations of their people. Free nations will help us achieve the peace we all want.

Bush (2004c: 2)

Setting

It is the first Presidential Debate, held at the University of Miami, Florida. The topic of the debate is foreign affairs. The two candidates are George W. Bush, President of the United States and Senator John F. Kerry, Democratic Presidential Nominee.

Macro propositions/Implications

1. September the 11th changed how America must look at the world.
2. September the 11th has created the need for a multi-pronged strategy to be implemented for the purposes of national safety.
3. Al Qaeda has been pursued uncompromisingly because it is believed Al Qaeda are the perpetrators.
4. A doctrine has been upheld that says if you harbour a terrorist, you're equally as guilty as the terrorist in consequence of which Afghanistan has been freed from the Taliban's power.
5. The legacy of September the 11th means that threats are taken seriously before they materialise.
6. The legacy of September the 11th allowed a threat to be seen in Iraq which has also been neutralised.
7. A strategy of freedom is being pursued around the world.
8. A strategy of freedom is important because free nations will reject terror.
9. A strategy of freedom is important because free nations will achieve peace.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- September the 11th has created the need for a change in how America must look at the world, where threats are neutralised before they fully materialise, and where freedom is pursued around the world because free nations will reject terror and embrace peace.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. The change in 'how America must look at the world' defines a change in foreign policy. More precisely, macro proposition 5 which holds that threats are taken seriously before they materialise, is a subtle means of describing a policy of preemption.
2. The connection is missing in the text between the statement of this policy of preemption and the statement of the strategy of freedom. What is implicit is that with this policy of preemption, America will seek to foster freedom around the world, i.e. employ a policy of democratisation.
3. Macro proposition 7 tells us that a 'strategy of freedom' or more explicitly a strategy of democratisation is being pursued around the world. Macro propositions 8 and 9 are clearly linked with the implication that freedom prevents terrorism.

Hyperboles

The implication that freedom prevents terrorism referred to above is itself the function of hyperbole. Is it true that in free and democratic countries terrorism is not a problem? It is a contentious point. Terrorism is, in fact, a feature of many democratic societies because the "freedom" available provides an opportunity for extremists to organise. The US itself has seen the organisation of various domestic terrorisms such as the Black Panthers, the Weather Underground and the Jewish Defence League as well as individual terrorists such as Timothy McVeigh. Training of the September 11 pilots was possible in the USA.

Omissions

What is omitted is a clear path that links September the 11th to Iraq. The thread that is presented is tenuous, i.e. that Saddam Hussein posed a threat and that threat had to be taken seriously. We know now beyond any doubt that there was no real threat. It was a lie and we were all duped.

Summary and Discussion

September the 11th is presented in this text as the organising principle for two major policy changes: a change to a policy of preemption (where before there was a policy of containment) and a movement toward the exporting of democracy. The exporting of democracy is

promoted in the name of freedom as a prevention against terrorism and the securing of peace. Both issues are contentious. Both issues define a new American foreign policy. These two issues or this new foreign policy is presented as a direct consequence of the events of September the 11th. That is, the events of September the 11th are promoted as the primal cause of this new direction in foreign affairs.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- September the 11th has changed how America must look at the world.
- Threats must be neutralised before they fully materialise.
- Freedom will prevent terrorism as seen when free nations reject terror and embrace peace.
- It is expedient to pursue a strategy of freedom around the world.

Text: 9

Type: Second Inaugural Address

Date: January 20 2005

We have seen our vulnerability - and we have seen its deepest source. For as long as whole regions of the world simmer in resentment and tyranny - prone to ideologies that feed hatred and excuse murder - violence will gather, and multiply in destructive power, and cross the most defended borders, and raise a mortal threat. There is only one force of history that can break the reign of hatred and resentment, and expose the pretensions of tyrants, and reward the hopes of the decent and tolerant, and that is the force of human freedom.

We are led, by events and common sense, to one conclusion: The survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in other lands. The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world.

America's vital interests and our deepest beliefs are now one. From the day of our Founding, we have proclaimed that every man and woman on this earth has rights, and dignity, and matchless value, because they bear the image of the Maker of Heaven and earth. Across the generations we have proclaimed the imperative of self-government, because no one is fit to be a master, and no one deserves to be a slave. Advancing these ideals is the mission that created our Nation. It is the honorable achievement of our fathers. Now it is the urgent requirement of our nation's security, and the calling of our time.

So it is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.

Bush (2005a: 1)

Setting

George W. Bush is sworn in to second term.

Selected Macro propositions/Implications

1. The source of our vulnerability lies in the violence of those ideologies, which feed hatred and excuse murder, crossing the most defended borders.
2. There is only one force of history that can successfully deal with the violence of tyrants and that is the force of human freedom.
3. The survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in other lands.
4. The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world.
5. It is in our nation's security that we are called to advance American ideals.
6. It is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements abroad with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- Because the best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world, it is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democracy in all cultures with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.

Implicit or Indirect meanings

1. The President's speech is a bold articulation of the massive mission of his term of office. His ideas are stated in a very direct way. Hence, there is little left implicit here. What could be seen as implicit is perhaps that *we* are not safe unless *you* are free. Of course, this brings into question exactly what Bush means by being "free". There are various connotations to the word "freedom" – democratic freedom, economic freedom and freedom to pursue what one desires, for example. Although Bush does allude to self-government and equality and contrasts freedom with tyranny in addition to referring to the growth of democratic movements, he still fails to spell out what he means exactly by "freedom". Considering the last line in the passage, it seems as if Bush is equating freedom to democracy.

Hyperboles

The sheer breadth of Bush's ideas make these ideas seem like hyperbole: to support democracy in every nation, in every culture and end tyranny all over the world! However, Bush's willingness to articulate them so clearly and boldly grants them the credentials of legitimacy as principles of his foreign policy. With these principles, America's foreign policy has become greatly extended. One must question how realistic these principles are. They are embedded in a speech which is certainly highly provocative.

Omissions

Referring back to Implicit meanings, I bring forward again the term "freedom". President Bush exalts the cause of freedom yet does not clearly provide enough analysis of this problematic word. He seems to mean democratic freedoms. In this case, this necessarily invokes capitalism and the mechanism of The Market and further the virtues and vices of globalisation. The waters become somewhat muddied. Does George W. Bush know what is best for every nation and every culture in the world? Is he familiar with the inequities that globalisation, a consequence of free trade, causes? Bush fails to address the deeper issues that "freedom" raises.

Summary and Discussion

Bush's provocative speech was a forceful articulation of an extension of foreign policy principles: "So it is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in the world." To spread freedom worldwide is, of course, a massive undertaking. It is questionable whether the extent of such a mission precludes any nation, even the United States, from executing it. The extract raises serious questions however. For example, is Bush suggesting the adoption of a more belligerent stance toward undemocratic countries such as Saudi Arabia and Pakistan which are valuable allies but **do not** embrace Western democratic ethics? Or is he just articulating broad principles? There are no answers coming from the text.

That the best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in the entire world translates to, as suggested above, we are not safe unless you are free. This might be a

credible claim if there were more substance to the rhetoric as well as an acknowledgement that Western style democracy has its demons too, particularly where globalisation is concerned. Bush is viewing “freedom” in a utopian sense and is not recognising the economic realities behind democratic dynamics. Capitalism and consumerism might not be palatable to some Islamic societies who are not accustomed to the necessity of getting the competitive edge in order to survive and progress or do well in life.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world.
- It is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democracy in every nation and culture with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.
- Freedom and democracy are interconnected.

Text: 10

Type: Introductory and Concluding Paragraphs to the 2006 State of the Union Address

Date: January 31 2006

In this decisive year, you and I will make choices that determine both the future and the character of our country. We will choose to act confidently in pursuing the enemies of freedom -- or retreat from our duties in the hope of an easier life. We will choose to build our prosperity by leading the world economy -- or shut ourselves off from trade and opportunity. In a complex and challenging time, the road of isolationism and protectionism may seem broad and inviting -- yet it ends in danger and decline. The only way to protect our people, the only way to secure the peace, the only way to control our destiny is by our leadership -- so the United States of America will continue to lead. (Applause.)

* * * *

Before history is written down in books, it is written in courage. Like Americans before us, we will show that courage and we will finish well. We will lead freedom's advance. We will compete and excel in the global economy. We will renew the defining moral commitments of this land. And so we move forward -- optimistic about our country, faithful to its cause, and confident of the victories to come.

Bush (2006a: 1,10)

Setting

The State of the Union Address was made before a Joint Session of Congress.

Selected Macro propositions/Implications

1. Our prosperity depends upon our leading the world economy.
2. We cannot be prosperous by shutting ourselves off from trade and opportunity.
3. We cannot be prosperous by choosing isolationism and protectionism.
4. The only way to secure peace is by our leadership.
5. We will lead freedom's advance.
6. We will compete and excel in the global economy.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- By competing and excelling in the global economy, we will lead the advance of freedom and secure peace.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. Economic hegemony is directly linked to freedom and peace. This is emphasised in the juxtaposition of selected macro propositions 5 and 6 in the concluding paragraph.

Hyperboles

These two paragraphs are noticeably marked by hyperbole: leading the world economy; securing peace through our leadership; leading freedom's advance; excelling in the global economy. The use of the term "world economy" instead of "US economy" and the term "excel in the global economy" indicates that Bush supports the philosophy underpinning globalisation where the USA comes out on top, ahead of all other countries.

Summary and Discussion

What is apparent in these two excerpts is the connection between economic performance in the global arena and freedom. Bush is very articulate about rejecting protectionism and shutting off the US economy from trade and opportunity. Here, Bush is speaking the language of globalisation. In the concluding paragraph, he connects freedom to globalisation through statements that are juxtaposed, as mentioned in Indirect Meanings above.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- The US will lead the world economy.
- The US will lead freedom's advance.

Text: 11

Type: Excerpt of speech President Bush makes to the Military Officers Association of America

Date: September 5 2006

The terrorists who attacked us on September the 11th, 2001, are men without conscience -- but they're not madmen. They kill in the name of a clear and focused ideology, a set of beliefs that are evil, but not insane. These al Qaeda terrorists and those who share their ideology are violent Sunni extremists. They're driven by a radical and perverted vision of Islam that rejects tolerance, crushes all dissent, and justifies the murder of innocent men, women and children in the pursuit of political power. They hope to establish a violent political utopia across the Middle East, which they call a "Caliphate" -- where all would be ruled according to their hateful ideology. Osama bin Laden has called the 9/11 attacks -- in his words -- "a great step towards the unity of Muslims and establishing the Righteous... [Caliphate]."

This caliphate would be a totalitarian Islamic empire encompassing all current and former Muslim lands, stretching from Europe to North Africa, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia. We know this because al Qaeda has told us. About two months ago, the terrorist Zawahiri -- he's al Qaeda's second in command -- declared that al Qaeda intends to impose its rule in "every land that was a home for Islam, from [Spain] to Iraq. He went on to say, "The whole world is an open field for us."

Bush (2006b: 2)

* * * *

The following two paragraphs are for reference, not for analysis

Now, I know some of our country hear the terrorists' words, and hope that they will not, or cannot, do what they say. History teaches that underestimating the words of evil and ambitious men is a terrible mistake. In the early 1900s, an exiled lawyer in Europe published a pamphlet called "What Is To Be Done?" -- in which he laid out his plan to launch a communist revolution in Russia. The world did not heed Lenin's words, and paid a terrible price. The Soviet Empire he established killed tens of millions, and brought the world to the brink of thermonuclear war. In the 1920s, a failed Austrian painter published a book in which he explained his intention to build an Aryan super-state in Germany and take revenge on Europe and eradicate the Jews. The world ignored Hitler's words, and paid a terrible price. His Nazi regime killed millions in the gas chambers, and set the world aflame in war, before it was finally defeated at a terrible cost in lives.

Bin Laden and his terrorist allies have made their intentions as clear as Lenin and Hitler before them. The question is: Will we listen? Will we pay attention to what these evil men say? America and our coalition partners have made our choice. We're taking the words of the enemy seriously. We're on the offensive, and we will not rest, we will not retreat, and we will not withdraw from the fight, until this threat to civilization has been removed. (Applause.)

Bush (2006b: 4)

Setting

President Bush is addressing the Military Officers Association on the fifth anniversary of September the 11th. There is, consequently, marked hyperbole and graphic description throughout the entire text in keeping with the gravity of the event and the need not only to acknowledge the military personnel who have had to fight in the War on Terror but to justify

the War itself. The excerpt describes the terrorists and their motives. A further two paragraphs are not for analysis purposes but will be referred to in the analysis of the excerpt.

Selected Macro propositions/Implications

1. The terrorists (who attacked us on September the 11th, 2001) are men without conscience but they are not madmen.
2. The terrorists' ideology is evil but not insane.
3. The terrorists are driven by a radical and perverted vision of Islam.
4. The terrorists' vision of Islam rejects tolerance, crushes all dissent and justifies murder in the pursuit of political power.
5. The terrorists aim to establish a Caliphate, a totalitarian Islamic empire encompassing all current and former Muslim lands, across the Middle East and other places where Islam takes a hold.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- The terrorists, evil men without conscience but not madmen, are drawn by a radical and perverted vision of Islam which seeks to establish a Caliphate, a totalitarian Islamic empire encompassing all current and former Muslim lands, across the Middle East and further afield.

Omissions

My analysis of this text centres on the omission of Bush to acknowledge that the idea of a Caliphate is esteemed by many Muslims. Bush calls Bin Laden's concept of the Caliphate "a violent political utopia", "a totalitarian Islamic empire encompassing all current and former Muslim lands". Showing his ignorance of Muslim history, Bush fails to show appreciation of the unique political system that the Caliphate represented in medieval Islamic times. The 10th century Caliphate of Cordoba was the largest and culturally the most sophisticated polity in all of Europe. This form of political system bore no resemblance to any of the Muslim governments today. Allegiance was not to a nation state but to the *umma*, or community of believers, that forms the heart of Islam. While the last Caliphate was overturned in 1924 by a military officer, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, placing Islamic religious law second to the rule of law by the state, the idea of the Caliphate, logically, still holds respect among many Muslims. The notion of the Caliphate in the Islamic world quite possibly functions as a symbol, with the possibility of becoming a coalescing institution, around which some Islamic believers find solidarity but there is no evidence to suggest that it equates to a type of globalisation or totalitarian state as Bush suggests.

As evidenced in the Macro propositions, Bush fails to acknowledge any understanding about the enemy's cause. Simply speaking, the terrorists are evil without cause. Can the West be so innocent that it can afford not to listen to the enemy, listening in the sense of seeking to understand? The last two paragraphs show that Bush has put Lenin and Hitler into the same category, a very surprising comparison, and called them both evil. Failure to show respect to a personage of Lenin's historical status is an omission that is hard to understand. This kind of omission, repeated in the case of Bin Laden, does not facilitate knowledge of the adversary. Bush's certainty of the evil of Bin Laden moves into the realm of dogma. Dogmatic certainty in this case can be an overextension which narrows down the paths of finding a solution.

Summary and Discussion

Bush has listened to the terrorists (Al Qaeda) enough to understand that their intention is to establish a Caliphate across the Middle East, reclaiming lands that were formerly Islamic. However, he does not see in Bin Laden an adversary who is a human being motivated by a cause. To Bush, Bin Laden is a man "without conscience" but not mad, something less than human. This view prevents Bush from seeing any validity in Bin Laden's "version" of the world and completely thwarts any solution being made to the terrorist problem other than war.

Bin Laden's vision of the "Caliphate" appears to be a threat to Bush's vision of the world. Lenin and Trotsky after him had a vision of Global Communism. Hitler's vision was for Germany to dominate Europe and eliminate the threat posed by the economic success of Jews. It is not apparent at this stage whether bin Laden's vision of the "Caliphate" is a global vision like Lenin's or a more limited vision like Hitler's? It is obvious that Bush's vision is global – free trade with the USA supreme.

For many Islamic people, the concept of the Caliphate must dwell within the collective memory of Islamic society. History is not something to be so easily shrugged off. The idea of the Caliphate could even be a conscious or even an unconscious rallying call for solidarity. In this text, Bush shows no awareness of this possibility.

Emergent Lines of Arguments

- The terrorists, evil men without conscience, but not madmen, are drawn by a radical and perverted vision of Islam which seeks to establish a Caliphate, a totalitarian Islamic empire encompassing all current and former Muslim lands, across the Middle East and further afield.

* * * *

In order to discuss meaningfully the lines of argument emerging from the CDA performed on the texts as a whole, it is necessary to organise them coherently. As a result, I present the following table, Table 8.2, which shows all lines of argument emerging from each CDA analysis against the text number. Table 8.3 will show these lines of argument grouped into categories.

Table 8.2 Lines of Argument Emerging from CDA performed on Bush Texts

Text	Emergent Lines of Argument
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • America is destined to advance freedom and democracy around the world. • Embracing American-style democracy is the hope of all humanity.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressing terrorism means fighting a military-style offensive at its source. • It is every nation's duty to join America in the fight against terrorism. • What is at stake in the fight against terrorism is the freedom of civilization.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trade ultimately creates the prerequisites for freedom. • The habits of freedom create the expectations of democracy. • Economic and political freedoms reinforce each other.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freedom is compromised when radicalism and technology meet. • Terrorists must be prevented at all costs from using modern technological weaponry. • Deterrence is no longer an adequate defence strategy to protect the American nation. • The very existence and nature of modern technological weaponry demands an American defence strategy based on preemption. • Addressing terrorism means fighting a military-style offensive at its source.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free markets defeat poverty. • Free markets bring freedom. • Free markets bring peace. • Free trade, freedom and peace are inextricably linked.
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the terrorists who are the sole cause of the conflict that we find ourselves in. • America is inherently good and heroic while the terrorists are evil and cowardly. • It would be of no value to attempt to understand the terrorists' motives for they are only inspired by evil. • What is at stake in the fight against terrorism is the freedom of civilization.
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through sharing similar commitments expressed in the American Declaration of Independence and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the objectives of the United States can be likened to those of

	<p>the United Nations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like the United Nations, the United States distinguishes a clear divide between right and wrong. • The clear divide between right and wrong is seen when oppressive governments support terror and free governments oppose terror. • Freedom is inimical to the growth of terrorism.
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September the 11th has changed how America must look at the world. • Threats must be neutralised before they fully materialise. • Freedom will prevent terrorism as seen when free nations reject terror and embrace peace. • It is expedient to pursue a strategy of freedom around the world.
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world. • It is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democracy in every nation and culture with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world. • Freedom and democracy are interconnected.
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The US will lead the world economy. • The US will lead freedom's advance.
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The terrorists, evil men without conscience but not madmen, are drawn by a radical and perverted vision of Islam which seeks to establish a Caliphate, a totalitarian Islamic empire encompassing all current and former Muslim lands, across the Middle East and further afield.

A perusal of Table 8.2 suggests three groupings of the Emergent Lines of Argument in the topics of:

- September the 11th /Defence Strategies
- Freedom/Democracy/Globalisation
- Innocence/Terrorism.

Each line of argument is allocated to an appropriate grouping in Table 8.3.

Table 8.3 Emergent Lines of Argument from Bush Texts Numbered and Grouped

Grouping	Argument
September the 11 th / Defence Strategies (S)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. September the 11th has changed how America must look at the world. 2. Threats must be neutralised before they fully materialise. 3. Freedom is compromised when radicalism and technology meet. 4. Terrorists must be prevented at all costs from using modern technological weaponry. 5. Deterrence is no longer an adequate defence strategy to protect the American nation. 6. The very existence and nature of modern technological weaponry demands an American defence strategy based on preemption. 7. Addressing terrorism means fighting a military-style offensive at its source.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. It is expedient to pursue a strategy of freedom around the world. 9. It is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democracy in every nation and culture with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world. 10. It is every nation's duty to join America in the fight against terrorism. 11. What is at stake in the fight against terrorism is the freedom of civilisation.
Freedom/ Democracy/ Globalisation (F)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. America is destined to advance freedom and democracy around the world. 2. Embracing American-style democracy is the hope of all humanity. 3. What is at stake in the fight against terrorism is the freedom of civilisation. 4. Trade ultimately creates the prerequisites for freedom. 5. The habits of freedom create the expectations of democracy. 6. Economic and political freedoms reinforce each other. 7. Freedom is compromised when radicalism and technology meet. 8. Free markets defeat poverty. 9. Free markets bring freedom. 10. Free markets bring peace. 11. Free trade, freedom and peace are inextricably linked. 12. The clear divide between right and wrong is seen when oppressive governments support terror and free governments oppose terror. 13. Freedom is inimical to the growth of terrorism. 14. Freedom will prevent terrorism as seen when free nations reject terror and embrace peace. 15. It is expedient to pursue a strategy of freedom around the world. 16. The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world. 17. It is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democracy in every nation and culture with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world. 18. Freedom and democracy are interconnected. 19. The US will lead the world economy. 20. The US will lead freedom's advance.
Innocence/ Terrorism (I)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is the terrorists who are the sole cause of the conflict that we find ourselves in. 2. America is inherently good and heroic while the terrorists are evil and cowardly. 3. It would be of no value to attempt to understand the terrorists' motives for they are only inspired by evil. 4. What is at stake in the fight against terrorism is the freedom of civilisation. 5. Through sharing similar commitments expressed in the American Declaration of Independence and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the objectives of the United States can be likened to those of the United Nations. 6. Like the United Nations, the United States distinguishes a clear

	<p>divide between right and wrong.</p> <p>7. The clear divide between right and wrong is seen when oppressive governments support terror and free governments oppose terror.</p> <p>8. Freedom is inimical to the growth of terrorism.</p> <p>9. Addressing terrorism means fighting a military-style offensive at its source.</p> <p>10. The terrorists, evil men without conscience but not madmen, are drawn by a radical and perverted vision of Islam which seeks to establish a Caliphate, a totalitarian Islamic empire encompassing all current and former Muslim lands, across the Middle East and further afield.</p>
--	---

In the following discussion lines of argument strands are grouped as they appear in Table 8.3 in the following order: September the 11th/Defence strategies, Freedom/Democracy/Globalisation and Innocence/Terrorism.

Discussion on Lines of Argument relating to September the 11th/Defence Strategies

President Bush has very clearly enunciated that September the 11th has changed how America must look at the world (S1)⁶⁹. In fact, September the 11th is being presented by the Bush Administration as the organising principle for two major policy changes to be manifested in a difference of defence strategies. The first policy change is preemption. I will discuss preemption here. Preemption is presented as being determined by the belief that freedom is compromised when radicalism and technology meet (S3). When radicalism and technology meet, it is argued, outlaw regimes could give or sell nuclear, chemical and biological weaponry to terrorist allies who would use them mercilessly (Bush 2003a: 5). Terrorists, therefore, must be prevented at all costs from using modern technological weaponry (S4). Threats must be neutralised before they fully materialise (S2). This principle, in effect, spells out a move away from a defence strategy of deterrence as it is no longer an adequate defence strategy to protect the American nation (S5). Addressing terrorism now means fighting a military-style offensive at its source (S7). The battle must be taken to the enemy. In fact, the very existence and nature of modern technological weaponry demands an American defence strategy based on preemption (S6). The War on Terror is based on this defence rationale. We are told that what is at stake is the freedom of civilization (S11). Hence, it is every nation's duty to join America in the fight (S10).

⁶⁹ These convictions are supported by a discourse. As discussed in Part One, a discourse must be differentiated from what is "actual". While a discourse allows us to make sense of our world, at the same time, it can be used by the powerful to serve certain ends.

It is disconcerting that President Bush promotes the idea of preemption so liberally and with so much conviction. Preemption in today's world had come to be regarded with civilised restraint. Of course, as seen above, Bush advances preemption as a strategy in response to the events of September the 11th which is designed to lend it some credibility. As shown in Chapter Five, however, September the 11th could be seen as a pivotal point of history which brought to the forefront a radical plan for US control of the post Cold war world which had been taking shape for a decade. In Chapter Five, I postulated that preemptive war waged to remake the geopolitical map was an American neo-conservative vision ready to be played out. This is not as unrealistic as it might seem. As discussed in Chapter Five, America has for the past several centuries been expanding its power and influence base. Expansion of territory and influence has been, in fact, an inexorable reality of American history. In addition, recent developments of American military capacity have included a new generation of nuclear weaponry. What is of concern is that the Bush Administration had usurped its own Congressional authority over some aspects of this nuclear weapons program. The revitalised nuclear posture of the United States helps to create a new arms race with the possibilities of so-called "rogue states" preparing for what *they* see as a possible US preemptive attack. Another set of circumstances of grave concern was that Bush released The National Security Strategy (2002) which clearly abandoned deterrence as a strategic concept because traditional concepts of deterrence were considered to be unsuccessful against a terrorist enemy. Bush replaced this with a pre-emptive strategy directed against hostile states and terrorist groups. To restate an observation from Chapter Five, the Bush Administration was completely unambiguous on the doctrine of preemption: 'To forestall or prevent such⁷⁰ hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States will, if necessary, act pre-emptively.' In March 2003, President Bush ordered the first preemptive war in modern American history committing US Forces to Iraq without United Nations Security Council approval.

War in Iraq was arguably less about WMD or terrorism and more about seeing that the US used its power to rearrange the world to suit its own interests. Iraq produced no WMD and there was no proven connection between Bin Laden and Saddam Hussein yet Iraq was linked with al-Qaeda as one and the same target in the macro-level GWOT discourse. The Bush arguments, as stated above, indeed provide a very logical framework for the cause of

⁷⁰ This pertains to terrorists and rogue states.

preemption. However, they could also be the outcome of careful planning and craftsmanship. Thus, the events of September the 11th have provided an extremely sound but also preposterously convenient justification for the US defence strategy of preemption at the source rather than deterrence. In addition, as outlined in Chapter Five, strong evidence suggests the evolution of the Bush Administration's nuclear posture preceded 9/11. These events taken together strongly suggest the Bush Administration's vigorous pursuit of US dominance in world affairs.

The National Security Strategy (2006) reaffirms President Bush's preemptive policy against terrorists and enemy nations. Bush states in the foreword to this document that, "We seek to shape the world, not merely be shaped by it" (The National Security Strategy 2006: 2). At the time of writing (September 2006), the US may be preparing for war with Iran. If war does eventuate, it will be another war pre-empted by the US.

At the beginning of this discussion I referred to two policy decisions for which September the 11th has been the organising principle. I have discussed the first principle, preemptive action. The second principle is the exportation of freedom and democracy around the world. It is expedient to pursue a strategy of freedom around the world (S8). It is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democracy in every nation and culture with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world (S9). I wish to reinforce the point that it is a stated goal of America's national security strategy. It is claimed that the support of democratic movements and institutions is to help create a world of democratic, well-governed states that as well as meeting the needs of their citizens can conduct themselves responsibly in the international system. It is held that 'this is the best way to provide enduring security for the American people' (The National Security Strategy 2006: 1). I now examine some of the arguments that relate to this second principle.

Discussion on Lines of Argument relating to Freedom/Democracy/Globalisation

This group of arguments indicates what are held to be core American convictions⁷¹. America is a nation whose destiny it has been to advance freedom and democracy around the world

⁷¹ The discourse of American exceptionalism (America's unique attributes and its salvational role in the world) was not invented by the Bush Administration. It can be traced much further back. Seymour Martin Lipset writes that 'American values are quite complex, particularly because of paradoxes within our culture that permit pernicious and beneficial social phenomena to arise simultaneously from the same basic beliefs. The American Creed is something of a double-edged sword: it fosters a high sense of personal responsibility, independent

(F1). American-style democracy is perceived as the hope of all humanity (F2). What are also highlighted are the Bush Administration's lofty aims of exporting freedom and democracy around the world. Plainly, Bush is a keen supporter of globalisation. In his speeches he talks eagerly about America leading the world economy (F19). He deftly connects the idea of trade with the notion of freedom (F4) and then with democracy (F5). He holds as a fundamental principle that free markets defeat poverty and bring freedom and peace (F8, F9, F10). According to Bush, there is a fundamental linkage between free trade, freedom and peace (F11). While it may be true that economic and political freedoms reinforce each other to *some* extent and that trade and globalisation can in a *limited* way, stimulate political reform by giving more freedom to people in their daily lives, it cannot be accurately concluded that globalisation can be successful in spreading broader freedoms and democracy around the world, a tenet which tightly underpins US foreign policy (F15, F16). Angell (1972) (1909) made a similar claim in the early 20th century. He postulated that as the economies of different nations become more integrated with one another, their political systems would become more democratic with the result that the world would move further toward peace. His vision was shattered by the outbreak of World War One.

In practice, increasing global economic integration can be a destabilising force. Today, globalisation perpetuates the marginalisation of the Muslim world once subject to the marginalising forces of British colonialism. It does this through not only threatening the identity of Islamic peoples and affronting their sensibilities as discussed in Chapter Three but also through economic and social dispossession. A principle downside of globalisation is that it is based upon unrestrained economic growth which ultimately benefits corporate power over the needs of people. If globalisation is purely an economic force, however, then how does it affect relations between Islam and the West? As I have discussed in Chapter Three, the reality is that economic might has severe political and therefore cultural implications. American culture has seized a global hegemony and imposed its own brand of monoculture on indigenous cultures around the world. As well as creating inequalities in wealth, this American-led globalisation does not facilitate the flowering of other cultures or the existence of difference. It does not promote coexistence. Contextualising these events against a global

initiative, and voluntarism even as it also encourages self-serving behavior, atomism and a disregard for the communal good. More specifically, its emphasis on individualism threatens traditional forms of community morality, and thus has historically promoted a particularly virulent strain of greedy behavior. At the same time, it represents a tremendous asset, encouraging the self-reflection necessary for responsible judgment, for fostering the strength of voluntary communal and civic bonds, for principled opposition to wars, and for patriotism' (Lipset 1997: 268).

postmodern reality it can be said that the globalised world economy which is the underlying regime of “truth” developed by the West and founded upon neoliberal ideals, has challenged the identity of Islamic peoples. In turn, there are elements, both moderate and radical within Islam, which are mounting a response to meet this challenge. A century ago the alternative ideology to historical forms of globalisation was Marxism, an ideology which is now no longer viable. In some respects, Islam can be seen as an ideological opposition which can offer some resistance to globalisation amongst Muslim groups today.

In the colonial encounter between America and the Middle Eastern countries which are the targets of the Bush Administration’s proselytizing democratisation, what is apparent is the extreme position of superiority the colonial authority assumes. To be confident of leading freedom’s global advance, as Bush is (F20), is a dangerous conceit. There is no recognition of the significance in terms of history or culture that the Middle Eastern area holds for humankind. Mutuality is not considered in George W. Bush’s roadmap. In any event, surely democracy must come from *inside* each particular country. The Egyptian presidential election of 2005, for example, held on 7 September was the first allegedly contested presidential election in Egypt’s history and is an example of a largely indigenous attempt at a multiple party election. Certainly, Egypt, being an ally of the US, was undoubtedly pressurised by the latter to apply democratic reform but there was also undoubtedly pressure from within the country itself to democratise. There were oppositions to the election. Those opposing say the electoral reforms did not go far enough because the election regulations severely restricted independent candidates and overwhelmingly favoured the National Democratic Party (NDP). While the result was a Mubarak⁷² victory, many also noted that it was a step toward democratisation in Egypt, even though it had been marred by irregularities (Asser 2006: 1-2). Indigenous democratisation is surely to be preferred over an enforced model.

Although Bush does concede that democracies in the Middle East ‘will not look like our own’ (Bush 2006: 3), the vision is of liberty, a product of globalisation, becoming ‘the right and hope of all humanity’ (Bush 2006: 3), the derivation of which is a US vision, a US concept, a US construct. In Iraq, this vision contrasts strongly with ‘the chaotic blundering reality’ (Gray 2006: 4). Already deeply divided as a result of European colonial

⁷² Hosni Mubarak was sworn in as President of Egypt on 14 October 1981, eight days after a group of Islamist militants shot Mr Sadat at a military parade in Cairo (BBC News 2006: 1).

intervention and now by claims to its resources through American invasion, Iraq is not necessarily headed toward stability but to further fragmentation where radical Islam will most likely benefit from enhanced power. While for Bush, freedom and democracy are interconnected (F18), the visions are thus far different from the realities in Bush's program of democratisation. How can the Arab world thus become convinced that US commitment is genuine and not just propaganda? Surely the US has to *earn* credibility in the region. In order to earn credibility, the US has to abolish acts that breach democratic principles under international law such as Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo Bay, the invasion of Iraq and avoid double standards such as favouritism amongst Arab states and the unconditional support of Israel.

Messianic crusades to export democracy, in any case, are not in touch with the reality of the dynamics of Muslim communities. As I have explained in Chapter Four, the Muslim community is conceived, especially by fundamentalists, as one inseparable nation. Here, "nation" is only a substitute word for the concept of a religious oneness that transcends the narrow boundaries of nationhood. Law is accepted as revealed in Islamic scripture. Even in traditional Islam, as discussed in Chapter Seven, Imams are akin to legal counsel who can be consulted on matters of religious law. Throughout Islamic history imams and mullahs have issued *fatawa* which have the force of law among Muslims. This is similar to a ruling by a Western court. These factors seriously impede compatibility with liberal democracy. Although Islam is undergoing renewal within itself as outlined in Chapter Seven, it is by no means certain whether Islam will accommodate the transformation of states into democratic forms with which the West is so familiar. These are further reasons for pause in the Bush Administration's zeal to democratise the Middle East. A more informed course of action for the US would be to renounce the long-term policy of sustaining despotic regimes and allow self-determination in the Arab world, including the creation of a viable Palestinian state. This means allowing the dynamic of internal reform to develop freely without foreign intervention where the pressure from within a state becomes the catalyst for change.

The inhabitants of the Middle East have keenly suffered through their marginalisation. Being deprived of material wealth and cultural expression and having the prospect of democratisation being forced upon them, Islamic peoples (the "Other") are angry at their existential condition. They direct this anger toward America. Their hostility is heightened by a powerlessness which breeds an ongoing frustration and alienation. This explosive mix can

therefore act as a trigger for terrorism. As discussed in Chapter Three, terrorism can be triggered by alienation.

Discussion on Lines of Argument relating to Innocence/Terrorism

This group of arguments focuses upon the dichotomy of innocence and terrorism. The starting point is again freedom. America is a nation which clearly perceives that what compromises its freedom is terrorism (14). There is a clear divide between right and wrong expressed when free governments oppose terror and oppressive governments support terror (17). The two sides of the divide support two political realities: America and free governments and terrorists and oppressive governments. This is a binary opposition: the good and the bad, the true and the false. Referring back to my analysis on Postmodernism/Postcolonialism, Chapter Four, I showed how power relations shape values, how there's an incontestable relationship between the true and the powerful. The values of goodness/badness underpinning the dichotomy this discourse represents are not powerful because they are true; they are true because they are powerful. It is powerfully appealing that we can say Arab peoples form oppressive governments that support terror. It is equally powerfully appealing that we can believe on the other hand that Western people form democracies which are the bastions of freedom. As part of the mechanism of power, however, disciplinary forces act to separate what is not normal and put it aside for marginalisation or disposal (Chapter Three). Hence Arab peoples are more easily subjected to denigration because of these discourses. All of Islam, in particular, is a logical target for demonisation through this association.

Another argument which reflects the binary opposition between the good and the bad, the true and the false is that freedom is inimical to the growth of terrorism (18), i.e. free nations do not have terrorism while oppressed nations do. As Payne (2005: 1) notes, a formulation that binds such concepts is alluring – freedom is a good thing, democracy is a good thing and putting an end to terrorism is a good thing. But as Payne (2005:1) asks, does the relationship hold empirically? Is it, in fact, accurate to say that in free and democratic countries terrorism is not a problem? This is not accurate as freedom provides an opportunity for extremists to

organise allowing a plethora of domestic terrorist groups to flourish in the West⁷³. So it goes against the evidence that freedom prevents the rise of terrorism. However, it can be, in fact, a good justifying tool for what the US government *wants* to do. Campaigns advancing freedom and democracy can be self-serving, fulfilling purposes such as creating and maintaining a presence and securing access to precious resources. So, in effect, power and truth become related which reflects the postmodern finding I have invoked in the preceding paragraph. That the United States is committed to advancing freedom and democracy across the Middle East as the alternative to repression and radicalism is a powerful gambit. Many people would believe this without reservation owing to the sheer power and daring it possesses. Given the history of the United States, however, with the nature of its foreign policy and imperialistic interventions⁷⁴, surely this must be *seen* to be believed. In Iraq, the decisions to democratise have been taken primarily by an occupying invader with an economic and political investment in the resultant outcome. Thus, the US must prove its sincerity by its actions that it is not simply offering a Trojan horse for US influence. However, even if US motives are pure, is democratisation going to be a successful counter to terrorism?

In addition to Payne's observation above that freedom and terrorism are not mutually exclusive, other challenges to the success of democratisation stem from the fact that national boundaries in the Middle East were arbitrarily drawn by European colonialist powers after the war resulting in diverse religious and ethnic groups subsisting within the one nation. In Iraq, for example, about 75 percent of the population is Arab. The Arabs, however, include the Shia population and most of the Sunni Muslims of central Iraq. Kurds, most of whom practice Sunni Islam, are considered distinct in ethnicity and language and they form the largest ethnic minority, constituting 15 to 20 percent of the Iraqi population (Encarta msn 2006: 2). There is thus a secular and a religious division and primarily a further Islamic based division between Shia and Sunni. These differences fuel ethnic conflict.

This conflict was evident in the framing of the Constitution (Iraqi Constitution 2005). Opposed by the United States, this document assigns a primary role to Islam as a source for legislation. Language guaranteeing "rights and freedoms" is subordinate to this. For

⁷³ Some domestic terrorist groups in the West that are non-Islamic include the Black Panthers and the Weather Underground in the US, the IRA and the Ulster Freedom Fighters in Britain, Basque terrorists in Spain, the Red Brigades in Italy, the Baader-Meinhof gang in Germany to name but a few. They are too numerous to mention (Payne 2005: 1).

⁷⁴ See Appendix 2

example, Article 2 of the new Constitution calls Islam “a fundamental source of legislation”. The difference between *the* source and *a* source of legislation is significant to secular Kurds. While the difference may be subtle, it introduces an uncertainty as to how other possible sources of legislation may be interpreted for all concerned. Article 5 cites the law as sovereign and the people as the source of authority. In Islamic traditional eyes, God can be the only sovereign. The Islamic state is a polity ruled by God and legislative authority comes from God alone. Thus Article 5 is a barrier to Muslim/Western understanding.

The constitutional and democratic process crafted by the US has denied the ethnic divides that carve up the country, a timely legacy from the former imperial masters. The political unit in Iraq faces an identity crisis because the Sunni, Shia and Kurdish elements are in conflict over religious, economic and cultural survival. How is this reality going to defuse Islamic extremism? The state based solution that the Bush Administration applied, i.e. invading Iraq and attempting to set up a Western style democracy, does not address stateless Islamic extremism in the short term. That it might do so in the long term is doubtful given the chaotic democratic expression that is evident in Iraq today. If this form of expression means freedom, then it can be concluded that freedom is certainly not inimical to terrorism.

This group of discourses also reveals another American conviction: As the United Nations is held to be impartial and inherently good in its very nature, so the United States is projected to be likewise (15). This discourse establishes an image of America that is not only heroic but also innocent (16). Just like Said’s project of colonial discourse on the holding of hostages of the United States Embassy in Iran (Said 1981: xxii), Americans appear to be “outside history”. For anyone to target both the nation and/or its people is considered beyond rationality. Yet it is clear that an imperial reality dominates America’s foreign policy, a fact which hardly is compatible with innocence. I have outlined this extensive imperialist intervention in the Middle East in Chapter Six. In addition, reality demands more investment than the Bush Administration has prepared the American people for. As Gray (2006:2) notes, America lacks the crucial attributes of what constituted the European imperial power: a lack of long-term relationships of any kind. This lack of long-term commitment seriously compromises the containment of terrorism at the core of American military deployment nowadays, the reason being that to contain terrorism, as the Bush Administration has conceived it, requires not only political and economic obligations put into practice over long periods but also a continuing military engagement. The short term or transient investment

that American policy dictates only exacerbates a population's resentment and furthers mistrust and subsequent lawlessness. For example, overcoming the anarchy now present in Afghanistan and Iraq would conceivably require a sustained effort over generations.

It is also very much in keeping with US conception of innocence, that for the US, it is the terrorists who are the sole cause of the conflict in which the West finds itself (I1). The terrorists are evil and cowardly while America is inherently good and heroic (I2). It would be of no value to attempt to understand the terrorists' motives for they are only inspired by evil (I3). As Said (1981: xxxvi) stresses and as was discussed in Chapter Four, between the two sides of a conflict, neither side controls reality so absolutely as to completely dismiss the other. Yet these discourses find the US innocent and the terrorists ontologically guilty – the terrorists are guilty not only because of the crimes they commit but also simply by virtue of *existing*. They are guilty *in their very being*.

Postcolonialism informs us of how such a mindset can work to canonise cultural notions. For example, knowledge of such a complex phenomenon as Islam comes about not only through direct embodiments of Islam but through images and experiences which are merely interpretations of it (Said 1981: 149). Bush displays that he has only a colonialist knowledge of Islam through his omission to acknowledge the importance of the Caliphate to Muslim people and that the idea of a Caliphate (not necessarily Bin Laden's concept of the Caliphate) is esteemed by many ordinary Muslims. He calls the Caliphate 'a totalitarian Islamic empire' to which the terrorists, evil men without conscience, are drawn by 'a radical and perverted vision of Islam' (I10). In Chapter Six, I have outlined what constituted this form of political system. It was a government built upon a concept of citizenship that incorporated different ethnic groups and creeds. The intermingling of race and religion enhanced its dynamic culture. Vick (2006: 1) claims that interviews have shown that Muslims regard themselves as members of the *umma*, or community of believers, that is at the heart of Islam and as the earthly head of that community, the caliph is cherished as a memory and as an ideal. Such respect within the Muslim population for the historical concept of the Caliphate resonates with Bin Laden's stated goal⁷⁵ of its reestablishment even though Bin Laden is a radical. The Caliphate, in fact, serves as a rallying point between those

⁷⁵ In Ayman al-Zawahiri's letter to Abu Musab al-Zarqawi of December 2005, Zawahiri, bin Laden's deputy, advised Zarqawi to use Iraq's Sunni areas as the base for 'an Islamic authority or emirate, then develop it and support it until it achieves the level of a caliphate' (Zawahiri 2005:2)

who are radical and those who are more moderate. The idea of the Caliphate has a historical authenticity as well as Islamic legitimacy that Western democracy is not able to furnish to Muslim people.

To say then that terrorists are ontologically guilty, that they have no real substantial cause for their actions, feeds into the cultural orthodoxy of Islamic society and sets up a base for the belief that Islamic peoples are unstable, inferior and given to terrorism. This material enters the cultural canon where changing it becomes a great challenge. Postmodernism has prompted us to see that modernity has elevated the cultural order of Western civilisation to the point where it becomes the sole preserve of truth. Civilisation can thus be seen as a Western construct that is used as a marker to assess the non-Western world. In addition, within Western Civilisation itself, Postmodernism, as discussed in Chapter Three, further shows that institutions exist to exercise a power of normalisation upon individuals, that individuals do not have freedom *per se*, they only have freedom to be normal. Hence, it is a very limited and narrow measuring stick that is used in the evaluation. This is seen in the very distorted image many of us here in the West have produced of Islam, marginalising it and focusing on its fundamentalist face to the detriment of all others. It is also seen in the reification of democracy, in treating the variant existing in the West particularly that in the US and also in Western Europe as democracy's only possible expression.

Islam, on the contrary, has been shown in Chapter Seven to be a multi-dimensional world religion in the throes of transformation. It comprises a diversity of religious attitudes which belies a label of "monolithic". Like other contemporary world religions, Islam possesses fundamentalist, traditional, liberal and mystic faces. It is true that Islam's fundamentalist face has manifested violent expression, popularly described as terrorism, and it is crucial to be cognizant here that these extremists cannot be ontologically guilty while those of us in the West who are unthinking about the global terrorist problem, remain forever innocent. There are two outcomes to this realisation. Firstly, we need to analyze the voices of the Other, i.e. the "terrorists". A propos of this, a CDA will be done on bin Laden in the following chapter. Secondly, we need also to see the violence and terror involved in fighting Islamic extremists by the West and its allies in the so-called War on Terror. Such violence and terror can be seen in a number of ways. There are the innocents who have been killed as a result of the Iraq invasion, a number far greater than would have been the victims of Saddam Hussein. There are the people whose livelihood has been snatched from them like the widow described

in Chapter Four, an Iraqi who was unable to appreciate the lofty goals of democratisation when her house and source of revenue had been obliterated by the invasion and who expressed her rage accordingly. Her rage was incomprehensible to a New York Times reporter who could only think from the perspective of the invading army and its goals. Then there are the dealings with terrorist suspects.

Today some terrorist suspects are sent by the US for interrogation by security officials in other countries in a process known as “rendition”. Many of these receiving countries including Syria and Egypt are accused of using torture on these prisoners (Isaacs 2005: 1). Bush (2006c: 4) assured the world in unequivocally rejecting all accusations of torturing terrorist suspects: ‘The United States does not torture. It’s against our laws, and it’s against our values. I have not authorized it – and I will not authorize it’. The practice of rendition, however, aims to bring terrorist suspects *outside* the influence of any jurisdiction and to keep them there with the purpose of extracting as much information as possible from them. When terror suspects are interrogated far from the jurisdiction of the American legal system, this makes Bush’s statement clinically correct but morally impoverished. Dershowitz (2003), referred to in Chapter Five for his stance against refusing to attempt to understand the causes of terrorism, goes so far as to suggest, in tune with the more offensive leanings of the Bush Administration, that a legal framework could be devised to regulate the use of torture in War on Terror situations. This judicialisation of torture, however repulsive it sounds, could result in torture becoming even more grotesque if it were to become the rule rather than the exception to the rule which is likely to happen if indeed it were to become legitimised. Indeed, there are many of us in the West who can surrender our claims to innocence.

Linking the Strands of Argument

The three strands of argument, September the 11th and Defence Strategies, Freedom, Democracy and Globalisation and Innocence and Terrorism define a version of civilisation that George W. Bush Inc. promote as the best expression of cultural, religious, political and social truth. September the 11th has been presented as the organising principle *for* the defence strategies of preemption and the export of democracy to reshape the Middle East, not as a *consequence* of certain Western nations’ interferences in Middle Eastern countries’ economies and political affairs. In the colonial encounter in the Middle East, the US assumes the position of extreme superiority endowed with the conviction that globalisation is a liberating force for all nations and that it is US destiny to lead the advance of freedom around

the world. While the US has used terrorism as the justification for its colonialist democratising attempt in the Middle East, it also sees that terrorism compromises its freedom. Terrorists are promoted to be seen as evil without cause while the US postures innocence, such innocence that it wins the privilege of standing outside history. Yet how can this be accepted by an American people? Binary constructions of us vs. them, good vs. evil, civilised vs. uncivilised, constructions that have been repeatedly used by leaders in the US and plainly evident in the texts under analysis, reduce complex histories to simplistic trends that completely erase the impact of US foreign policy in the Middle East. The absence of the knowledge and acknowledgment of US global hegemony allows the condition of “innocence” to obtain. While US leaders are not about to publicly articulate past US interferences in the Middle East thus changing the situation, the deep entrenchment of conservatism blinds people to present hegemony, marginalising voices of dissent and stemming the flowering of enquiry.

The above description defines Bush’s neoconservative truth. Postmodernism will tell us there are no absolute truths, however. That the US espouses the benefits of globalisation and embraces the philosophy of exporting democracy does not make these beliefs the cornerstone of truth. They may become the truth to many people especially those in the domestic sphere because the most powerful country in the world has adopted them and projects them as the truth. The values underpinning US superiority have indeed become reified while in the murky depths beneath the ideals, lays the continuing search for influence that will secure US dominance. What confronts us at this juncture is the dawning realisation that the “terrorists” are not the sole cause of the conflict that we are in. The terrorists do, in fact, have a real cause and we cannot remove their tactics from that cause. As discussed in Chapter Three, it is in effect the cause that we need to understand. Before moving on to consider that cause in the next chapter, I wish to promote further understanding of the Bush discourses by exploring Postmodern and Postcolonial concerns on that subject.

The Bush Discourses: Postmodern and Postcolonial Considerations

Central to the Bush universe is the discourse on freedom. A focus of George W. Bush’s presidency has been to spread and defend freedom. This statement is supported by the fact that every text, with the exception of Text 11, has an argument whose topic relates to freedom. This can be quickly seen by looking at Table 8.2. In addition, each argument grouping in Table 8.3 contains entries that relate to the freedom discourse. The second

discussion on Freedom/Democracy/Globalisation and the third discussion on Innocence/Terrorism both have “freedom” as their point of departure. It is, however, a radical conservative construct of freedom that Bush is advocating. The traditional and progressive idea of freedom has given way to a shift to the right, to radically right-wing values for not only does the freedom of civilisation depend on a positive outcome of the fight against terrorism (S11, F3, I4), freedom is connected in a fundamental way with free trade and peace (F11) and also with right as opposed to wrong (I7). There has therefore been a construction of new “knowledge” about “freedom”. “Freedom” is connected to the battle against evil (the terrorists and those in league with the terrorists), to God’s commandments and most importantly, to economic freedoms. As economic and political freedoms reinforce each other (F6), freedom now has new connotations. Freedom now is more deeply connected with the globalised world where power is decided by the market, the underlying legitimate authority, and to frontiers where the good fight the evil and put in place structures where that authority, the market, can take on its role, i.e. democracy in Iraq. Freedom has become a rallying cry for the liberal democratic liberation of the autocratic regime in general and for the democratisation of the Middle East in particular. Through the conduit of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Bush (2003d: 4) reverently declared the birth of this new freedom: ‘In Iraq, the world is witnessing something dramatic, and something important. We’re seeing the deep and universal desire of men and women to live in freedom.’

As discussed in Chapter Three, Foucault (1980) held that an individual identifies with a system of “truth” formed by the dominating ideology. In this way in the postmodern world, truth can be seen as a fiction produced by the market and also the media. The new capitalism eschews people pulling together in solidarity; people are to compete, to alienate each other, to win at any cost. In any case people are not really seen as ends in themselves but as commodities to serve the state. They are important only insofar as they are “consumers”, as they are “soldiers”, as they are “servants”, as they are to be completely unacknowledged as “men” and “women” and “poor” and “black”. Hence people are moulded to serve the state, to accept their positions as the defenders of “freedom” in the way that the state defines it. Conformity of thought is encouraged. It is in the position of “Otherness”, however, that the operation of the network of power becomes visible which makes it imperative to consider the motivations of those who are considered the “Evil”, an aim that will be pursued in the following chapter. By recourse to postmodern ontology, it can be stated that such dualisms as the Good and the Evil are not based on “natural” social or cultural differences but are

woven from the networks of language. Conviction and belief cannot be justified except by 'the power of construction and reiteration in discourse' (Reuber 2003: 2). No matter how we may regard something as the final "truth", deconstruction reveals only conventions which attain the status of truth only by the power of what Foucault would describe as a hegemonic discursive formation (Foucault 1980). As a consequence of the hegemonic neo-liberal discursive formation surrounding such terms as "freedom" and "democracy", discourses that Bush has very assiduously created and built upon, a vast military machine was set in motion in Afghanistan and later in Iraq. It was mobilised and justified in the name of freedom and democracy and carried out against the ostensibly Evil from a constructed position of Good. Thus the neo-liberal discourse has been used to articulate US military aggression as a liberal democratic form. This has been effected through the construction of new knowledge.

The Bush texts analysed show how use is made of liberal-democratic discursive formations to achieve a primary neo-conservative function: to project militarisation as an accepted practice and to quell dissent in the face of it. The Bush texts show how the discourses emanating from 9/11 events frame the US as an innocent actor on the world stage wherein US people were innocent bystanders, invaded without any particular provocation on their part. The US, however, cannot be labeled an innocent nation; since the last World War the US has built up a grand imperial narrative. Despite this narrative, knowledge is effectively constructed of a nation that is inherently good, innocent and under attack by evil forces. Such a construction relies upon a narrative of victimisation to define the attacks as without motive and without logic. The call for a united "America" within a binary construction of "us vs. them" prevented an effective assessment of the US government at that time. The use of the binary reduced complicated histories to a simplistic narrative that obscured the reality of US dominance, especially US foreign policy in the Middle East. The appropriation of liberal discourses aided the conservative rhetoric in projecting Americans to be victimised but heroic. Heroic Americans victimised by evil men, as a consequence would have to strike back to protect not only their way of life but the way of life of Western peoples. This juxtaposes freedom and militarism. As Rowe and Malhotra (2003: 5) contend, Bush appropriated liberal suggestions that the US drop food on Afghanistan instead of bombs, by doing both of these actions. Thus liberal sentiments were co-opted which painted the conservative militaristic agenda as a compassionate one. Bush also used feminist critiques of the Taliban regime to justify the Afghanistan war. The media narrated US military action as a campaign to "save" women in Afghanistan who had been forced to live under the repressive regime. This was a

blatant co-optation of feminism to justify the use of force (Rowe and Malhotra 2003: 5). In this way, rhetorical conservatism hijacked liberal discourses.

America's sacred narrative, that it is a beacon, protector and protagonist of universal ideals and human rights is reflected in various arguments that come from the analysis of the Bush texts (S8, S9, S11, F1, F2, F3, F14, F15, F16, F17, F19, F20, I2, I4, I5, I6). Yet this narrative is accompanied by American militarism in the invasion of Iraq and its new postcolonial legacy. While the economic is structured into the narrative, the cultural is not: the veneration of the market completely obscures the value of culture and its diversity. As discussed in Chapter Six, the Marginalisation of the Peoples of Islam, the areas surrounding Iraq has been justifiably called the "cradle of civilization". It was the birthplace of writing, mathematics, medicine and codified law some 5,000 years ago. As members of the human race we are all indebted to Iraq for that. Eleanor Robson, a council member of the British School of Archeology in Iraq, claims there has been a plundering of Iraqi antiquities that seriously compromises its cultural heritage. Robson compares this destruction to the Mongol sacking of Baghdad in 1258 and the fifth-century destruction of the library of Alexandria (Robson 2003: 1). Professor Roger Matthews, chairman of the British School of Archaeology in Iraq, said: 'Since the fall of Saddam Hussein's regime the occupying powers in Iraq have signally failed to invest the funds and energies needed to protect the cultural heritage of Iraq which is ultimately under their guardianship' (Woolf 2007:2). The loss of many of Iraq's precious artifacts and even entire ancient cities (Woolf 2007:1) is a tragedy of great proportions considering that the origins of this civilization rival those of Western civilization in terms of narrative power.

While the US Defence Department had made it a priority to protect the Iraqi Ministry of Oil (Persram 2003: 4), Former Defense Secretary, Donald Rumsfeld, made light of the looting situation in 2003, saying, 'Freedom's untidy, and free people are free to make mistakes and commit crimes and do bad things.' He added, 'Stuff happens' (Loughlin 2003:1). This concept of freedom as revealed by one of the hegemon of globalisation illustrates the ability of newly-formed subjects of European-style colonial occupation to show the world their capacity to self-destruct (Persram 2003:4). This reduces their entire civilization to an irrational episode allowing modernity, the "stuff" of Western civilization, to retain its monopoly.

Conclusion

This chapter began with the CDA analysis of 11 texts which were excerpts from speeches made by the President of the United States, George W. Bush. The emergent lines of argument arising from the texts were tabularised and three strands chosen to present a further analysis were September the 11th/Defence Strategies, Freedom/Democracy/Globalisation and Innocence/Terrorism. The thrust of the findings from the analysis is that September the 11th has been used as justification for the promulgation of new US foreign policies: preemption and the exporting of democracy. This accords with US pursuit of global dominance. Iraq has shown resistance to the new colonial program as it becomes a hotbed of “terrorist” resistance and insurgency. Postmodernist responses to the Bush texts allow a juxtapositioning of freedom and militarism which resulted in liberal discourses being hijacked by neo-conservative forces and being employed to paint a militaristic agenda as a compassionate one. New knowledge has been constructed to accommodate an ultra conservative view of “freedom”. Postcolonialist responses show the callous attitude of the new master who idly stands by while the visible remnants of a civilization are pillaged thus securing the unquestioned ascendancy of Western civilization and modernity, its deliverer. This chapter exposed the discursive reproduction in society by those holding power, the Bush Administration and the neoconservative right.

Can the US understand why the American dream can be a Muslim’s nightmare, why the Bush version of civilization is not acceptable to many a Muslim’s way of life? To understand that, we have to listen to the “terrorists”, not selectively, wholeheartedly. The following chapter will present an analysis of texts by Osama bin Laden.

Chapter Nine

Critical Discourse Analysis of Excerpts from Selected Texts of Osama bin Laden

Chapter Aim: This chapter comprises a critical discourse analysis on 14⁷⁶ selected texts of Osama bin Laden in the context of his jihad⁷⁷ against the West. It aims to show how a response is made through Islam to the hegemonic discourses of those holding power in the West, i.e. the Bush Administration. Deconstruction is incorporated into the CDA.

Introduction

This analysis is expected to provide a better understanding of bin Laden and his people's grievances as well as the underlying causes of Al-Qaeda's emergence. I do not see my role to be one of challenging bin Laden's arguments but to find out what they are and provide further elucidation. In order to gain any understanding of bin Laden's actions we must move past the despised figure he is *projected* to be in the collective mind of the world. We need to *listen* to what bin Laden says to understand his point of view, to see things from his perspective, to determine what those grievances are and why he has mobilised an insurrectionary organisation whose aims are directed at the destruction of calculated Western targets. We need to find out what is his case against the West. Sun Tzu, responsible for the oldest military treatise in the world, said these famous words: 'If you know the enemy and know yourself, you need not fear the result of a hundred battles (Sun Tzu (500BC) 1910: III(18)).' Taking Sun Tzu at his word, I think it's necessary to get to know the ideas, the thinking, the rationale of bin Laden.

Therefore, the first part of this chapter, the CDA on 14 texts, will be based on what bin Laden is actually saying embedded within the historical context of his statement. Bin Laden's personal history that surrounds the events of which he speaks will also be discussed as this is integral to the understanding of his mission and the creation of al-Qaeda. Robert Fisk claimed that each time he saw bin Laden, he (bin Laden) was 'fascinated' to hear not what his enemies thought of him but of what Muslim ulema and militants said of him (Fisk 2005:8). This private revelation is reminiscent of a postmodern/ postcolonial perspective, that the West is not the only version of civilization.

⁷⁶ The reason there are more texts than in the Bush CDA is because textual coverage begins earlier for bin Laden with the first four texts being from 1996.

⁷⁷ See Chapter 7 "Islamic Fundamentalism *Jihad*" for an explanation of this term.

In terms of the thesis research, I perform this analysis on bin Laden's statements because it provides a contrast to Western discourses. In the previous chapter I have analysed, G. W. Bush, as president of the USA, and his neo-conservative hegemony defined "truth" and "freedom" through their discourses. Truth was connected to democracy while freedom took on an economic outlook and was linked to militarism. Thus "truth" and "freedom" in this particular context became knowledge that was constructed. Bush wielded power with this knowledge and won public approval to start the first preemptive war in modern American history which was later proved to be based on a lie. It is necessary to uncover the discourses and their corresponding arguments that issue from the bin Laden viewpoint in the interaction between Islam and the West, such discourses that may challenge the discursive reproduction of neo-conservative domination.

After the CDA analyses on the 14 texts have been performed, the emergent lines of argument from all texts are presented in two tables. Table 9.2 lists the emergent lines of argument against the text number. I have used this table to prepare Table 9.3 which categorises the emergent lines of argument into five groupings: (1) We, the Victims (2) Finding Ways to Correct What has Happened to the Islamic World (3) Acting to Dispel the Enemy (4) Fundamentalism as a Response and (5) Incongruity in September the 11th Stories. These five groupings are then discussed with the linkages made evident between them. The results of the analysis will show that bin Laden sees Muslims as victims of the hegemonic practices of the West and how he did not initiate any militant action until he and his followers had firstly persistently pursued peaceful means to present grievances and resolve conflicts. For bin Laden, Islam means fighting for the rights of Muslim people against the oppression of Western, particularly American, domination. Bin Laden's response is one of a particular brand of Islamic fundamentalism, the implications of which are explored in the analysis. Bin Laden's call to arms is located in the Western discourse of modernity: his movement is as much a product of modernity as a response to it. Through the outward expressions of the enemy, it is shown that the inside enemy he is attacking is Western rationalist epistemology. As the previous chapter exposed the discursive reproduction of domination of the Bush Administration, this chapter presents a counter discourse, labelled "terrorist" to this hegemonic discourse.

Textual Analyses

Fourteen (14) texts are presented in chronological order below for analysis. They are extracts from interviews of Osama bin Laden as well as audiotapes and videotapes that have been presented to newspapers, *Al Quds Al Arabi*, an Arabic London-based newspaper, the Pakistani newspaper *Ummat*, and Arab television station *al-Jazeera*. As all have been translated from Arabic, it cannot be completely ruled out that the translations may contain some minor errors. Table 9.1 provides a description of the text from which the excerpt to be analysed has been taken and a date the text was produced⁷⁸.

Table 9.1 Texts used in CDA of Osama bin Laden

Text	Description of Text Excerpt	Date
1	First interview by Robert Fisk	1996
2	Second Interview by Robert Fisk	1996
3	Interview by Abdel Bari Atwan	1996
4	Fatwa entitled "Declaration of War against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places"	23.08.1996
5	Interview by Peter Arnett	March 1997
6	Fatwa of the World Islamic Front	23.02.1998
7	Interview by Al-Jazeera television correspondent, Tayseer Alouni	October 2001
8	Interview published originally in Pakistani newspaper <i>Ummat</i>	28.09.2001
9	Text of an audio message identified to be from Osama bin Laden broadcast by al-Jazeera	11.02.2003
10	Text of an audio message identified to be from Osama bin Laden broadcast by al-Jazeera	04.01.2004
11	Text of an audio message identified to be from Osama bin Laden broadcast by al-Arabiya and al-Jazeera	15.04.2004
12	Text of an audio message identified to be from Osama bin Laden broadcast by al-Jazeera	30.10.2004
13	Text of an audio message identified to be from Osama bin Laden broadcast by al-Jazeera	19.01.2006
14	Text of an audio message identified to be from Osama bin Laden broadcast by al-Jazeera	23.04.2006

The textual analyses follow in numerical order.

Text: 1

Type: Extract from the first Interview by Robert Fisk

⁷⁸ This table first appeared as Table 2.2 in Chapter Two.

Date: This interview was published in *The Independent* on December 6 1996 so the actual interview was sometime before that date. The extract was taken from *The Great War For Civilisation: the Conquest of the Middle East* by Robert Fisk.

What I lived through in two years there, I could not have lived in a hundred years elsewhere. When the invasion of Afghanistan started, I was enraged and went there at once – I arrived within days, before the end of 1979, and I went on going back for nine years. I felt outraged that an injustice had been committed against the people of Afghanistan. It made me realise that people who take power in the world use their power under different names to subvert others and to force their opinions on them. Yes, I fought there, but my fellow Muslims did much more than I. Many of them died and I am still alive. . .

. . . We beat the Soviet Union. The Russians fled . . . My time in Afghanistan was the most important experience of my life.

Bin Laden, O. quoted in Fisk (2005: 7-8)

Macro propositions/Implications

1. Bin Laden's experience in Afghanistan touched him profoundly.
2. Bin Laden has acted on the notion that an injustice has been committed against the people of Afghanistan.
3. Bin Laden postulates that people who take power in the world use it under different names to subvert others.
4. Bin Laden's forces overcame the Soviet Union.

Overall macro proposition/Implication

- Bin Laden, acting on the notion that injustice was committed against the people of Afghanistan and believing that people who take power in the world use it under different names to subvert others, fought with success against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. Implicit in this passage is how the notion of injustice has played a major role in the formation of bin Laden's attitudes and his consequent actions.

Hyperbole

Bin Laden appears to believe that his efforts and those of his fellow combatants alone actually beat the superpower, the Soviet Union. He is reducing something that is ripe in complexity to something that is very simple. Simplification is a process that bin Laden engages in and this will be pointed out in later texts.

Summary and Discussion

This was bin Laden's first interview with a Western journalist, Robert Fisk. Fisk (2005:7) explains that initially bin Laden was reluctant to talk as he thought he was going to be

interrogated about terrorism. When he realised he was being asked about Afghanistan, despite the reserve he felt towards a foreigner, he acted on a wish to explain how 'his experience there had shaped his life' (Fisk 2005: 7).

Thus a picture of bin Laden begins to emerge as a man who appears outraged at the injustice that an atheist superpower was delivering to a neighbouring Muslim nation. For the first time since World War II, non-Muslim forces had occupied a Muslim country. The Saudi regime itself encouraged religious leaders to recruit mujahideen for the anti-Soviet jihad (Jones 2005:4). As stated in Chapter Seven, this defensive jihad was legitimised by the duty to challenge Soviet domination of Islamic land and peoples. Thus thousands of jihadis travelled to Afghanistan. As Ward (2005:12) contends, bin Laden's access to money and equipment was the factor that raised his profile among the mujahideen in the Afghan-Soviet War. Familial contacts and his charity and ability to deliver made his reputation and gave him status. However, initially, it was his notion of injustice that formed a mindset which prompted bin Laden to action.

While there were many others involved in Afghanistan fighting the Russians, as can be seen from the hyperbole in the excerpt, bin Laden appears to believe he and his mujahideen had beaten the Soviet Union, that their efforts had brought down a superpower. He appears to take personal credit for this although he is keen to acknowledge the efforts of his fellow Muslims albeit in a self-effacing manner. Bin Laden's interpretation is clearly a simplification. The legacy of the jihad, however, was indeed a belief that Islam was a powerful political tool that had conquered a global superpower, a consequence of which was the radicalisation of bin Laden and his followers (Jones 2005:4). The fact that bin Laden claims his time in Afghanistan was 'the most important experience' in his life (at the time of his interview) indicates that he derived a great deal of meaning in being able to defend his Muslim faith in Afghanistan, that the importance of his faith to him was paramount. There could very well have been some personal aggrandisement in his commitment to this Afghan cause but it does not detract from the fact, as reported by Hamza Mohammed, a Palestinian volunteer and quoted in the Foundation for Defense of Democracies (FDD) (2005: 2), that he fought with his fellow mujahideen on the front line in this cause and compromised his own life, certainly not a cowardly act.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- The notion of injustice has played a major role in determining bin Laden's future actions.
- Bin Laden is given to simplification of complex realities as when he attests that he and his mujahideen brought down a superpower.

Text: 2

Type: Excerpt from an Interview by Robert Fisk

Date: Exact date unspecified although the year was 1996. The extract was taken from *The Great War For Civilisation: The Conquest of the Middle East* by Robert Fisk.

When the American troops entered Saudi Arabia, the land of the two holy places, there was a strong protest from the ulema and from students of sharia law all over the country against the interference of American troops. This big mistake by the Saudi regime of inviting the American troops revealed their deception. They were giving their support to nations which were fighting against Muslims. They helped the Yemeni communists against the southern Yemeni Muslims and are helping Arafat's regime fight Hamas. After it insulted and jailed the ulema eighteen months ago, the Saudi regime lost its legitimacy. . .

The Saudi people have remembered now what the ulema told them and they realise America is the main reason for their problems . . . the ordinary man knows that his country is the largest oil-producer in the world yet at the same time he is suffering from taxes and bad services. Now the people understand the speeches of the ulemas in the mosques – that our country has become an American colony. They act decisively with every action to kick the Americans out of Saudi Arabia. What happened in Riyadh and al-Khobar is clear evidence of the huge anger of Saudi people against America. The Saudis now know their real enemy is America.

Bin Laden, O. quoted in Fisk (2005:23-24)

Macro propositions/Implications

1. The ulema and students of Sharia law protested when the American troops entered Saudi Arabia.
2. In inviting American troops the Saudi regime revealed their deception.
3. The people understood the speeches of the ulemas in the mosques that Saudi Arabia has become an American colony.
4. The people act to kick the Americans out of Saudi Arabia.
5. The Saudis now know their real enemy is America.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- In inviting the American troops, the Saudi regime deceived the people who understanding the speeches of the ulemas in the mosques that Saudi Arabia has become an American colony, now know that the real enemy is America.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. The most provocative and insightful of bin Laden's statements in this text is 'our country has become an American colony'. Bin Laden sees the US presence in Saudi Arabia to be one of conquerors, of colonisers. He sees the ruling elite as complicit slaves of the colonisers. Through this complicity, he sees the ruling elite have surrendered legitimacy with the result that the colonisers will not leave the country on their own. It is up to the Saudi people to expel the Americans, with violence if necessary.

Omissions

Bin Laden has omitted some personal history which explains even more why he is so vitriolic toward the Saudi regime. Bin Laden returned from Afghanistan a hero in what Orbach (2001: 2) calls 'a watershed moment in Islamic solidarity'. When Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, in 1990, bin Laden offered to protect Saudi Arabia from Iraqi forces with his mujahideen. He was rejected. The royal request for US protection must have been a stunning blow to his pride and also to the vision of his world. After all, in bin Laden's mind, his mujahideen had already beaten a superpower; surely Saudi Arabia did not need a superpower's protection. Now with the infiltration of US forces, a new conflict emerged. Bin Laden's criticism of the Saudi regime led to his expulsion (Orbach 2001: 2).

Summary and Discussion

In this excerpt bin Laden stridently protests the domination by the US of Saudi Arabia. Although there quite possibly is resentment for the lack of acknowledgment by the Saudi regime for what he did in Afghanistan, what bin Laden says has found resonance within the ulema itself. Bin Laden praises the ulema, how it opposed the introduction of American troops, how consequently it was insulted and some members were imprisoned. This has conveniently opened the door for an argument of dissent based on Islam. Bin Laden, when speaking, has taken on an authoritative position, as if he were classing himself as a member of the ulema, the religious leadership of Saudi Arabia. From bin Laden's perspective, he attempts to articulate the behaviour that compromises the practice of Islam viz, helping communists, helping Arafat's regime, and courting the US at the expense of the Saudi people. He claims that the Saudi people have come to realise that their real enemies are the Americans and that they act to expel them from Saudi Arabia as shown in the events at Riyadh and the American military camp at al-Khobar where collectively 24 Americans among others were killed. The bombings are thought by US authorities to have been instigated by bin Laden himself (ERRI Risk Assessment Services 1998: 2-3).

Bin Laden's open assertion of Western, principally American domination, even though bin Laden does not form part of the religious leadership of Saudi Arabia, still serves to stress the basic fact of foreign domination strongly, with emotive appeal to the Saudi Arabian people, a fact that is undeniable.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- Through complicity with the US presence, the ruling elite of Saudi Arabia have surrendered legitimacy.
- The behaviour of the Saudi regime has compromised the practice of Islam.

Text: 3

Type: Extract from *The Secret History of Al-Qaida* by Abdel Bari Atwan, editor in chief of the daily newspaper *Al-Quds Al-Arabi*. Atwan interviewed Bin Laden in 1996. Part of this interview is incorporated into this extract.

Date: While the interview took place in 1996, the book was published in 2006 by Saqi Books.

NB Bin Laden's speech in the extract is italicised.

He (bin Laden) told me about past Al-Qaeda attacks on the Americans — including the 1993 ambush on American troops in Mogadishu, which he said had been wrongly blamed on the Somali warlord Mohamed Farah Aidid.

More attacks were in the planning stages, he said, and he emphasised that these "*operations*" took a long time to prepare. He hinted at a strike at the Americans on their home territory, but I confess I did not register the enormity of what he implied when he came out with an unforgettable statement: "*We hope to reach ignition point in the not-too-distant future.*"

Bin Laden also explained his long-term anti-American strategy. He told me he knew he would never be able to defeat America on its own soil using conventional weapons. He had another plan, one that would take years to reach fruition.

"We want to bring the Americans to fight us on Muslim land," he said as we walked through the woods in the high mountains at Tora Bora. *"If we can fight them on our own territory we will beat them, because the battle will be on our terms in a land they neither know nor understand."*

Bin Laden, O. quoted in Atwan (2006:2)

Macro propositions/Implications

1. We hope to reach ignition point for our operations against the Americans in the not-too-distant future.
2. We want to bring the Americans to fight us on Muslim land.

3. If we can fight them on our own territory we will beat them, because the battle will be on our own terms in a land they neither know nor understand.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- While we hope to complete our operations against the Americans in the near future, we really want to fight the Americans here on Muslim land because we know we will beat them here.

Implicit or indirect Meanings

1. If we take bin Laden at his word regarding his admission to Atwan regarding the Al-Qaeda 1993 ambush of American troops in Mogadishu, his references to “operations” and “ignition point” could quite possibly refer to the 9/11 attacks eight years before they took place. This sounds like a planned war on the USA, a post-modern war perhaps.

Summary and Discussion

In this excerpt bin Laden refers to his long-term anti-American strategy. That bin Laden should reveal his actions to Atwan shows that perhaps there is some mutual respect between the two. Respect is not something that the coalition partners in the War on Terror have given bin Laden. They do not perceive him as earning respect as an adversary, perhaps because they do not “listen” to him to discover that he has legitimate grievances. Experience has shown that he means what he says.

Consider, for example, the prophetic third and final paragraphs of the text. Bush (2005b: 6) defends existing strategy in 2005 by declaring that ‘we’ve made the decision to defeat the terrorists abroad so we don’t have to face them here at home’ yet the arrival of 150,000 US troops in Iraq in March 2003 created a defining moment for bin Laden, a defining moment which ushered in exactly the environment al-Qaeda needed to flourish. As Atwan (2006: 3) contends, Iraq is in many ways a better base for al-Qaeda than Afghanistan, providing an Arabic speaking culture. It is in the heart of the region geographically and in Islamic terms it is as important as Arabia and Palestine. In historical terms, Iraq was the central province of the ‘Abbasid Caliphate in the 8th century. Furthermore, the insurgency raging north and west of Baghdad is dominated by Sunni Arabs (Oweis 2005: 1) who have been politically marginalised by occupation election dynamics (Negus 2005: 1). They have become isolated from state institutions in a humiliating manner. It is among these Sunni Arabs that Al-Qaeda’s most ruthless fighters are being recruited (Atwan 2006: 3). The invasion of Iraq

has thus created the situation that accords with bin Laden's strategy. Michael Scheuer, the founding head of the CIA's bin Laden unit, goes so far as to say that the invasion of Iraq accelerated the transformation of al-Qaeda from 'a man and an organisation into a philosophy and a movement' (Scheuer as quoted in interview with Perry 2006a: 3).

Emergent Lines of Argument

- We want to bring the Americans to fight us on Muslim land.
- If we can fight the Americans on our own territory we will beat them.

Text: 4

Type: Extracts from the fatwa or declaration of war entitled "Declaration of War against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places"

Date: This text was first published in *Al Quds Al Arabi*, a London-based newspaper, on 23 August, 1996.

In this document, bin Laden moves from elaborating the sufferings visited upon the peoples of Islam (First Extract) to a consideration of how to address the problem of what has happened to the Islamic world in general (Second Extract). In the Third Extract he focuses on the rewards that Muslim youth will be given in fighting the enemy, principally the Americans and in the Fourth Extract there is a call to arms for all Muslims to fight the enemies of Islam in all its sacred sites especially the Land of the Two Holy Places.

First Extract

It should not be hidden from you that the people of Islam had suffered from aggression, iniquity and injustice imposed on them by the Zionist-Crusaders alliance and their collaborators; to the extent that the Muslims blood became the cheapest and their wealth as loot in the hands of the enemies. Their blood was spilled in Palestine and Iraq. The horrifying pictures of the massacre of Qana, in Lebanon are still fresh in our memory. Massacres in Tajakestan, Burma, Cashmere, Assam, Phillipine, Fatani, Ogadin, Somalia, Erithria, Chechnia and in Bosnia-Herzegovina took place, massacres that send shivers in the body and shake the conscience. . .

The latest and the greatest of these aggressions, incurred by the Muslims since the death of the Prophet (Allah's blessing and salutations on him) is the occupation of the land of the two Holy Places – the foundation of the house of Islam, the place of the revelation, the source of the message and the place of the noble Ka'ba,⁷⁹ the

⁷⁹ The Ka'ba is a large masonry structure in the shape of a cube situated in Mecca and is a focal point for prayer. Muslims face this direction during prayer. The Ka'ba is the holiest place in Islam. For the Muslim community, the Ka'ba holds a place analogous to that of the Temple Mount in Jerusalem for ancient Jewry (Wikipedia 2006 Kaaba), (ArchNet 2007 Ka'ba)

Qiblah⁸⁰ of all Muslims – by the armies of the American Crusaders and their allies. (We bemoan this and can only say: “No power and power acquiring except through Allah”)

Bin Laden (1996:2)

Macro propositions/Implications

1. The people of Islam have suffered from aggression and injustice imposed on them by the Zionist-Crusaders alliance and their collaborators.
2. This injustice has been committed in many places.
3. The greatest injustice is the occupation of the land of the two Holy Places which is the foundation of the house of Islam.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- The people of Islam have suffered greatly in many places from injustices imposed by the Zionist-Crusader alliance but the greatest injustice is the occupation of the land of the two Holy Places which is the foundation of the house of Islam.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. Bin Laden presents the sufferings as if they were a methodical and deliberate massacre of Muslims, as if they were part of a growing war on Islam for which the US should be censured. This view is not substantiated in the text nor in the rest of the fatwa but bin Laden writes from this perspective. In Chapter Six, I have outlined how the peoples of Islam have been marginalised by originally European and later American imperialist forces. While each particular “aggression” that bin Laden lists cannot be justified with this rationale, it can be said that Islam in its entirety has been progressively the subject of debilitating, marginalising Western forces spanning back to the 16th century when the Ottoman Empire granted concessions called the ‘Capitulations’ to European powers (Islam and Islamic History in Arabia and the Middle East 2004: 1)⁸¹. Bin Laden’s critique of the West, therefore, while not totally representative of events does possess some credibility.
2. In this text, bin Laden is referring to Islamic peoples all over the world. Therefore he is considering places outside of the Old Caliphate. Perhaps we could define it as the New Caliphate or places where Islam has established across the globe. However, he is not implying that the whole world should become or forced to be Muslim in the same way as for example communism was said to be spreading across the globe.

⁸⁰ The Qiblah is the direction to the Ka’ba for any reference point on the earth (Wikipedia 2006 Qibla), (ArchNet 2007 Qiblah)

⁸¹ See also Chapter 6 for a discussion on the marginalisation of the peoples of Islam.

Apart from Russian communists, all of these attacks on Islam are by Christians and Jews. So bin Laden's response appears as a kind of Crusade in the Modern period, a New Crusade.

Hyperbole

These aggressions are tragic. However, at the same time, to blame America for all of them is unsubstantiated. Can bin Laden attribute blame to America for the Russian slaughter of Chechens who want independence? Is it that bin Laden considers Russia a collaborator of America? Is America to take the blame for the Muslims killed in the Yugoslav civil war? In this situation, Bin Laden does not acknowledge the humanitarian efforts of the US in Bosnia. In Burma, Cashmere and Assam, Muslim persecution was not done by either Christians or Jews, but by Hindu and Buddhist rulers. Is Bin Laden blaming the US for supplying arms to the forces that attacked these places? Bin Laden does not provide the answers that his claim raises.

Summary and Discussion

This extract evokes the sufferings visited upon the peoples of Islam by the "Zionist-Crusaders alliance and their collaborators" (collectively the West but chiefly America and Israel). The phraseology invokes both "Zionism" and "the crusades", extraordinary powerful themes in Islamic history. Bin Laden breaches into the collective Muslim psyche by declaring that from Palestine to Iraq and from Chechnya to Bosnia, Muslims have been killed in large numbers and their livelihood taken from them. He cites the names of many places where massacres have taken place. Qana, for instance, is particularly horrific where the killing of hundreds of Lebanese civilians by Israeli Forces at the existing UN base situated there resulted in a civilian slaughter. Fisk (1996: 1), an eyewitness, called it a "massacre", a "bloodbath". Photographic pictures of the mutilated bodies of innocent people including children are an affront to the mind. The UN issued a report on Qana which determined that it was 'highly unlikely' that human or mechanical error caused the deaths. No investigation ensued, however (Heller 2006: 2). However, because bin Laden includes Russian, Hindu and Buddhist persecution in the text and masquerades this as perpetrated by the US and Israel, he is making untrue historical claims to support his construction of the "Zionist-Crusader" vs Islam binary.

The focus of bin Laden's anger in this text, however, is the "occupation"⁸² of the land of the two Holy Places (Mecca and Medina). For bin Laden, this is the greatest of all aggressions. The American presence was permitted by the corrupt Al-Saud regime at the time of Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait. Bin Laden had informed the royal family that he and his Arab Afghans were prepared to defend the kingdom. The offer was rejected and in its place the Saudis invited in US troops for the first time (Beyer 2001: 3). However while there is this personal aspect underlying bin Laden's anger toward the Saudi ruling regime there is, as well, a religious and cultural one – Saudi Arabia has a singular place among Islamic countries as the cradle of Islam, as home to Mecca and Medina where access is prohibited to non-Muslims. To have foreign military personnel stationed there is a sacrilegious affair. As bin Laden says in the text, Saudi Arabia is 'the foundation of the house of Islam'. From the 1991 Gulf War to August 2003, the US has had a base of 5,000 troops stationed in Saudi Arabia (BBC News 2003: 1). Bradley (2003: 1) maintains that the US deployment once reached 500,000 troops during the war with Iraq. The last American military unit quit Saudi Arabia in August 2003 for stated US policy reasons that there was no longer a threat from deposed Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein (Hedges 2003: 1). In the second paragraph, Bin Laden clearly expresses the view that the presence of the American troops is a betrayal of the Islamic community. Despite the fact that there is implicit in the text the idea that there is a war on Islam by America and Israel and hyperbole in blaming these countries for all of the aggressions bin Laden lists, in cultural and religious terms, there is some validity in bin Laden's indictment against the US and the Saudi regime for allowing the American placement of troops in Islam's holiest sites.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- We are the victims of a growing war on Islam for which the US should be censured.
- It is a sacrilege against Islam for the Americans to have occupied the land of the two Holy Places.

Second Extract

From here, today we begin the work, talking and discussing the ways of correcting what had happened to the Islamic world in general, and the Land of the two Holy Places in particular. We wish to study the means that we could follow to return the situation to its normal path. And to return to the people their own rights, particularly after the large damages and the great aggression on the life and the religion of the people. An injustice that had affected every section and group of the people; the civilians, military and security men, government officials

⁸² To call the stationing of US troops in Saudi Arabia an "occupation" is an inflammatory appellation amounting to an exaggeration.

and merchants, the young and the old people as well as schools and university students. Hundred of thousand of the unemployed graduates, who became the widest section of the society, were also affected.

Bin Laden (1996:3)

Macro propositions/Implications

1. We begin the work of discussing ways of correcting what has happened to the Islamic world.
2. We wish to study the means of how to return the rights of the people.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- We work to discuss ways of correcting what has happened to the Islamic world and in particular to study the means of how to return the rights of the people.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. Bin Laden subtly presents himself as if he is a learned authority of Islam. While there is some duplicity here, it could be argued that he is simply taking on the role of leader, a task that no one else who can get the message across has done.

Summary and Discussion

These are not the words of a fanatic in quest of a target. They are the words of a victim speaking to a people in order to rally them and redress a wrong that has been committed upon them. In the previous extract, bin Laden portrays the Muslim civilisation as being victimised. Looking from the perspective of the Western marginalisation of Islam lends understanding to bin Laden's words in this extract. As well as anger, there is concern and sincerity in them. Here and throughout the Declaration in general, it is probable that bin Laden's intention is to address members of the middle class who uphold strict Muslim values in the hope of creating discord between them and the ruling regime in Saudi Arabia. Bin Laden is scathing toward the regime throughout his epistle, at one stage accusing it of using the resources of the kingdom – the army, the guards and the security men – to protect the “invaders” (the Americans) which further deepens the humiliation and betrayal which has already been felt by the Saudi people at the arrival of the Americans.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- It is necessary to find ways of correcting what has happened to the Islamic world.
- It is necessary to return the people's rights to them.

Third Extract

Those youths know that their rewards in fighting you, the USA, is double than their rewards in fighting some one else not from the people of the book. They have no intention except to enter paradise by killing you. An infidel, and enemy of God like you, cannot be in the same hell with his righteous executioner.

Bin Laden (1996:22)

Macro propositions/Implications

1. Those (Al Qaeda) youths who fight the USA will receive double their rewards in fighting some one else not from the people of the book.
2. Those (Al Qaeda) youths are intent on entering paradise by killing you, an American, an enemy of God.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- Those (Al Qaeda) youths intent on entering paradise by killing you, an American, an enemy of God, will receive double their rewards in fighting someone else not from the people of the book.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. The passage implies that the Muslim religion does not tolerate other “People of the Book”, i.e. Jews and Christians, when in fact the Quran (5: 66) urges Muslims to show respect toward them. This is a contradiction where bin Laden strives to make Islam or Muslims more exclusive than Christians and Jews.

Summary and Discussion

This extract shows very blatantly that bin Laden is subject to a certain “tweaking” of the Quran in order to serve political purposes. The Quran commands Muslims to show respect to the ‘People of the Book’, believers in the one true God. This includes Jews and Christians (Quran 5:66). The revelations of the prophets, Noah, Abraham, Moses and Jesus are not regarded as being revoked by the Prophet Muhammad. The Quran states that, as with Muhammad, a covenant was made with them (Quran 33.7). The Quran thus does not provide a basis for Muslim antagonism toward Jews and Christians. It is noteworthy, however, that in the whole of Text 4, bin Laden makes 17 direct references to the Quran. By doing this he is setting himself up as a learned scholar of Islam. By taking an extract of the whole text, nevertheless shows how he builds his case for his jihad against the West.

In the above extract, there is perhaps a possibility that bin Laden is recognising the USA and Israel as New Enemies of God because of their attitude toward Muslims in spite of the fact that Muslims are also ‘people of the book’. I think it more probable, however, that Bin Laden corrupts or misrepresents the Quranic text for the purposes of rousing support. This is a

dangerous state of affairs for the Muslim religion as Al Qaeda can be interpreted as the truth for some Muslims or prospective Muslims. This misinterpretation is something that needs to be addressed within the Muslim world.

Emergent Line of Argument

- Al Qaeda youths aim to kill Americans who are enemies of God, for they will be doubly rewarded than fighting those not from the people of the book.

Fourth Extract

My Muslim Brothers of the World:

Your brothers in Palestine and in the land of the two Holy Places are calling upon your help and asking you to take part in fighting against the enemy – your enemy and their enemy – the Americans and the Israelis. They are asking you to do whatever you can, with one own means and ability, to expel the enemy, humiliated and defeated, out of the sanctities of Islam.

Bin Laden (1996:28)

Overall Macro propositions/Implication

- My Muslim brothers of the world, your brothers in Palestine and in the land of the two Holy Places are asking you to expel the enemy, the Americans and the Israelis, out of the sanctities of Islam.

Summary and Discussion

This extract contains a very passionate call to arms. It appears towards the end of the Declaration. In it bin Laden issues a call for all Muslims to join in an effort, in whatever way is possible; to expel the Americans from sacred Muslim lands particularly the Land of the Two Holy places. This call to arms ties in with descriptions of exhortations in the earlier part of the Declaration by the Saudi people to the al Saud regime calling for the removal of the “crusader forces”, to no avail. Bin Laden claims that this infringement of the al Saud regime, the inviting of “crusader forces” to occupy sacred land, the Land of the Two Holy Places, in addition to the suspension of Shari’ah Law threatens the very existence of Islamic principles (Bin Laden 1996: 5).

Emergent Line of Argument

- My Muslim brothers of the world, you must act to expel the enemy, the Americans and the Israelis, out of the sanctities of Islam.

Summary of Entire Declaration

Throughout this Declaration, bin Laden has portrayed Muslim civilisation as conquered. There has, in fact, been a marginalisation of Islamic peoples since the 16th century so this affords an understanding as to why he would make this claim. His anger at both the Saudi regime and the Americans who occupied the Land of the Two Holy Places is rational as

Saudi Arabia is the cradle of Islam. However, bin Laden's demonising of Jews and Christians in general (the People of the Book) is without support from the Quran. In this distorted version of civilisation, the division into "us" and "them" precludes a peaceful outcome unless there can be ultimately some sort of transcendence in terms of conflict transformation. Bin Laden's framing of the conflict, however, is a simple one, ignoring the complex dynamics that are involved, revealing his outlook to be fundamentalist. He has set out in this manifesto to radicalise dissidence.

Text: 5

Type: These extracts have been taken from the first-ever television interview with Osama bin Laden. The interview was conducted by Peter Arnett in eastern Afghanistan.

Date: Late March 1997

First Extract

REPORTER: Mr. Bin Ladin, will the end of the United States' presence in Saudi Arabia, their withdrawal, will that end your call for jihad against the United States and against the US ?

BIN LADIN: The cause of the reaction must be sought and the act that has triggered this reaction must be eliminated. The reaction came as a result of the US aggressive policy towards the entire Muslim world and not just towards the Arabian peninsula. So if the cause that has called for this act comes to an end, this act, in turn, will come to an end. So, the driving-away jihad against the US does not stop with its withdrawal from the Arabian peninsula, but rather it must desist from aggressive intervention against Muslims in the whole world.

Bin Laden, O. as interviewed by Arnett (1997: 2)

Macro propositions/Implications

1. The act that has triggered the jihad (reaction) must be eliminated before the call for jihad ends.
2. The jihad came as a result of US aggressive policy towards the entire Muslim world and not just towards the Arabian Peninsula.
3. For the jihad to stop, the US must desist from aggressive intervention against Muslims in the whole world.

Overall Macro proposition

- The jihad was triggered as a result of US aggressive foreign policy and for the jihad to stop, the US must desist from aggressive intervention against Muslims in the whole world.

Summary and Discussion

In this response, bin Laden clarifies the scope of his Declaration of War against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places, the subject of the previous texts. Is this hyperbole? I do not think so. Bin Laden wants the US to ‘desist from aggressive intervention against Muslims in the whole world’. His goal is to get US military forces out of all Muslim lands. Bin Laden is not saying he wants to destroy America; he is very focused in what he does want – the cessation of US aggression towards the entire Muslim world⁸³. Here is a strategy of Defence of the Muslim World. Bin Laden goes beyond the Caliphate of Old to restore Islamic rule to the entire Muslim world.

Emergent Line of Argument

- If the US wants the jihad to stop, then it must desist from aggressive intervention against Muslims all over the world.

Second Extract

REPORTER: Now, the United States government says that you are still funding military training camps here in Afganistan for militant, Islamic fighters and that you are a sponser of international terrorism; but others describe you as the new hero of the Arab-Islamic world. Are these accusations true? How do you describe yourself?

BIN LADIN: . . . The US today as a result of the arrogant atmosphere has set a double standard, calling whoever goes against its injustice a terrorist. It wants to occupy our countries, steal our resources, impose on us agents to rule us based not on what God has revealed and wants us to agree on all these. If we refuse to do so, it will say you are terrorists. With a simple look at the US behaviors, we find that it judges the behavior of the poor Palestinian children whose country was occupied: if they throw stones against the Israeli occupation, it says they are terrorists whereas when the Israeli pilots bombed the United Nations building in Qana, Lebanon while was full of children and women, the US stopped any plan to condemn Israel. At the time that they condemn any Muslim who calls for his right, they receive the highest top official of the Irish Republican Army (Gerry Adams) at the White House as a political leader, while woe, all woe is the Muslims if they cry out for their rights. Wherever we look, we find the US as the leader of terrorism and crime in the world . . .

Bin Laden, O. as interviewed by Arnett (1997:4)

Macro propositions/Implications

1. The US has set a double standard, calling whoever goes against its injustice a terrorist.
2. The US wants us to agree to its imposition of rule upon us which is not based on what God has revealed.
3. If we refuse to comply with its imposition of rule, the US will say we are terrorists.
4. US behaviour condemns Palestinian children while failing to censure Israel when it bombs children and women.
5. The US is deaf to Muslims who cry out for their rights.
6. Wherever we look we find the US as a leader of terrorism and crime in the world.

⁸³ Please refer to Chapter 6 “Some Facts concerning American and Anglo-American Intervention in the Middle East” for a listing of aggression towards the Muslim world.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- If we refuse to comply with US imposition of rule upon us, which is not based on what God has revealed, the US, a leader of terrorism and crime in the world, will say *we* are terrorists.

Lexical Choice

The first thing to note in bin Laden's response to the question is that he evades it and through a system of using positive self-presentation and negative "other" presentation he chooses lexical items to suit such as self-descriptions like "poor Palestinian children" and "other" descriptions like 'the US as the leader of terrorism and crime in the world'. He thus leaves implicit his own group's negative properties. He pursues the ideological objective of de-emphasizing his bad things and their good things taken to the limit. In answering, "how do you describe yourself", he thus begins a litany of US denigration whilst ignoring completely what he, himself, is responsible for, the deaths of many people. This ideological discourse represents the familiar 'us' versus 'them' so characteristic of simplistic fundamentalist thinking that was seen in the Bush discourses.

Summary and Discussion

Yet what is Bin Laden to do – go on without acknowledging the domination and accepting Western rhetoric on terrorism? In effect, he chooses to forcefully acknowledge the domination, eschewing Western rhetoric on terrorism, from what could be called a fundamentalist perspective. It would be doubtful that bin Laden would be allowed to pursue a dialogue in Washington from his perspective on terrorism. Yet some of bin Laden's accusations are indeed valid. The US double standard of the failure to censure Israel with regard to the killings at Qana, described in the first extract of the previous text is a point well made. The subordination of the US to Israeli interests over Islamic interests is well illustrated in the makeup of the neoconservative lobby, which includes prominent Jewish representatives, that dominates the Bush presidency and the resultant policies that underscore the Arab-Israeli conflict in general. As I have shown in Chapter Five, the US relationship with Israel is extremely close with leading international-relations scholars calling, it bears repeating, US support for Israel 'unconditional' (Mearsheimer and Walt 2006b: 57) and 'unique' (Mearsheimer and Walt 2006a:30). Today, Israel is the strongest military power in

the Middle East. Mearsheimer and Walt (2006a: 32) cite a 2005 assessment by Tel Aviv University's prestigious Jaffe Center for Strategic Studies: 'The strategic balance decidedly favors Israel, which has continued to widen the qualitative gap between its own military capacity and deterrence powers and those of its neighbors.' Israel therefore openly acknowledges its own military supremacy in the region. While Israel is often portrayed as weak and struggling, this is not the case by Israel's own admission. However, the US continues to support Israel unequivocally. As discussed in Chapter 5, the recent (July/August 2006) war in Lebanon is a case in point. While almost every other nation including the UN condemned Israel's actions, the US gave unmitigated support. This can be better understood if the origin of Israel is taken into consideration; the UN had a plan to partition Palestine creating two states but the Arabs rejected this plan. Having rejected the partition plan, the Arabs then attempted to destroy Israel once Israel was created. Seen in this light, US support of Israel gains more comprehension. However, it can also be argued that the formation of the state of Israel depended on the displacement of the Palestinians. Israel's creation was fraught with controversy and continues to breed conflict today.

Bin Laden makes it clear in the extract that his hatred is provoked by resistance to what he regards as unjust US actions in the Middle East. He claims that when Muslims 'cry out for their rights', they are called 'terrorists'. Yet, in the US, it remains difficult for politicians to make minor criticisms of Israel's policies or show any understanding towards Israel's enemies and escape with impunity. Together with Jewish neoconservatives, the Christian right, also, has in the past attacked the Bush Administration for making even the slightest criticisms of Israel's military offensives, warning Bush against ceding the 'moral clarity' on the war on terrorism (Duffy and Ratnesar 2002: 25). When there is such an intersection of American Jewish and interest of the Christian right, this lends bin Laden's term "Zionist-Crusaders" some validity.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- The US wants to impose its rule which is not based on what God has revealed.
- If we refuse to comply with US imposition of rule, the US will call us "terrorists".
- The US is a leader of crime and terrorism in the world.

Text: 6

Type: This purports to be a religious ruling (fatwa). It was organised by Osama bin Laden and his associates, called the World Islamic Front. It was originally published in the Arabic Newspaper al-Quds al-Arabi (London, UK).

Date: 23 February 1998

All these crimes and sins committed by the Americans are a clear declaration of war on God, his messenger, and Muslims. And ulema have throughout Islamic history unanimously agreed that the jīhad is an individual duty if the enemy destroys the Muslim countries. This was revealed by Imam Bin-Qadamah in "Al- Mughni," Imam al-Kisa'i in "Al-Bada'i," al-Qurtubi in his interpretation, and the shaykh of al-Islam in his books, where he said: "As for the fighting to repulse [an enemy], it is aimed at defending sanctity and religion, and it is a duty as agreed [by the ulema]. Nothing is more sacred than belief except repulsing an enemy who is attacking religion and life."

On that basis, and in compliance with God's order, we issue the following fatwa to all Muslims:

The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies -- civilians and military -- is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it, in order to liberate the al-Aqsa Mosque and the holy mosque [Mecca] from their grip, and in order for their armies to move out of all the lands of Islam, defeated and unable to threaten any Muslim. This is in accordance with the words of Almighty God, "and fight the pagans all together as they fight you all together," and "fight them until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in God."

Bin Laden et al (1998: 2)

Part of this excerpt was included in Chapter Seven for an examination on the nature of "jihad". I include it here again to expand on that earlier discussion.

Key Macro propositions/Implications

1. The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies -- civilians and military -- is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it.
2. The ruling to kill Americans is in order to liberate the al-Aqsa Mosque and the holy mosque [Mecca] from their grip, and in order for their armies to move out of all the lands of Islam, defeated and unable to threaten any Muslim.
3. The ruling to kill Americans is in accordance with the words of Almighty God, "and fight the pagans all together as they fight you all together," and "fight them until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in God."

Overall Macro proposition

- The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies -- civilians and military -- which is a ruling in accordance with Almighty God, is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in order to liberate the al-Aqsa Mosque and the holy mosque [Mecca] from

their grip, and in order for their armies to move out of all the lands of Islam, defeated and unable to threaten any Muslim.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. Implicit in bin Laden's direction is Sayyid Qutb's militant philosophy. Qutb advocates that the Western, secularised world be replaced with an Islamic world order. He also decries the Westernisation of Muslim civilisation (Qutb 1990). Qutb (1990: 50) enhances the meaning of Islamic jihad as "a defensive movement", by changing the meaning of the word "defence" to 'the defence of man'. This then encompasses all those forces (obstacles) that limit man's "freedom" such as political systems based on economic, racial, or class distinctions. Qutb (1990:50-51) then claims that when this broad meaning of the word "defence" is taken, the true character of Islam is revealed in that it proclaims the universal freedom of every person and community from servitude. Although Qutb (1990: 51) reaffirms the Quranic injunction that 'there is no compunction in religion' (Quran 2:256), Qutb holds that obstacles need to be removed 'by force' so that when Islam is addressed to people's hearts and minds, they are free to accept it or reject it. His position is clear – since the objective of Islam is a declaration of man's freedom, it must employ jihad. So this is close to the ideas of international expansion of Islamic ideology. A metanarrative could emerge from this – Islamic globalisation.
2. Implicit in the fatwa is the attempt to make use of the principle of defensive jihad as discussed in Chapter Seven. Defensive Jihad is used to protect the Muslim community with each individual obliged to do whatever he or she can do to defend the land under attack. As I have argued in Chapter Seven, however, Bin Laden's fatwa (as exemplified above in the excerpt) takes the radical line to new extremes when it presents, as the individual duty for Muslims, the directive to kill Americans, civilian and military alike, in any country where it is possible to do it. This is not a defensive jihad as both Johnson (2002: 12) and Saeed (2002: 74) interpret it. A defensive jihad was waged in response to an emergency, a direct attack on the dar al-Islam by a force from some part of the dar al-harb. A defensive jihad was fought in the immediate area of the aggression and did, in fact, place a duty upon each individual Muslim to fight in whatsoever capacity he or she could (Johnson 2002: 13, Saeed 2002: 77). Lewis (1998: 15) also draws a distinction between offensive and defensive jihad and states that when the Muslim community is defending itself,

jihad becomes an individual obligation. However, while Bin Laden attempts to justify the need to mobilise the Islamic community into action on the grounds of self-defence, the fact of including *civilian* Americans with the military *in any country where it is possible* surely comes under the category of an offensive jihad which required the caliph/imam's authority and drew upon the religious unity of the entire Muslim community. This is a very important distinction of who the enemy is or could be under Islamic Jihad.

Summary and Discussion

According to the Arabic newspaper, *al-Quds al-Arabi* which published this fatwa, the statement was faxed to them under the signatures of Usama bin Laden and the leaders of militant Islamist groups in Egypt, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. This fatwa demonstrates that bin Laden had forged tactical alliances with other radical Islamic groups.

As to the message of the fatwa, the US military presence and the close political relationship of the US with the Saudi regime are identified as the root cause of the Muslim problem. The military presence is seen as a crime by the signatories in the statement and such crimes amount to 'a clear declaration of war by the Americans on God, his Prophet, and Muslims' through their policies in the Islamic world. In such circumstances, the excerpt from the declaration says, the *ulema* – authorities on Islamic law or Sharia – have unanimously ruled throughout the centuries that when enemies attack Muslim lands, jihad becomes every Muslim's personal duty. The excerpt goes on to say in the most important part of the declaration that 'to kill Americans and their allies, both civil and military, is an individual duty of every Muslim who is able, in any country where this is possible' until the al-Aqsa Mosque⁸⁴ and the Holy Mosque⁸⁵ in Mecca are freed and their armies move out of the lands of Islam.

As explained in Chapter Seven, Bin Laden's fatwa gains lucidity in the light of Sayyid Qutb's militant philosophy which is evident in Bin Laden's orientation. When Islam calls for peace, Qutb (1990: 51) maintains that its objective is not a superficial peace requiring that only 'the

⁸⁴ The al-Aqsa Mosque is the third holiest place of pilgrimage in Islam, which was annexed to Israel in 1967. Bin Laden has a personal connection to the Mosque as his father's construction company was responsible for its restoration in the 1960s (Bergen 2009: 2).

⁸⁵ This is a reference to the American placement of troops there and a strike on the legitimacy of the Saudi rulers.

part of the earth' where the followers of Islam are residing be secure. It means that the law of society in general be purified for Allah, that all people should obey Allah alone, and every system that permits some people to rule over others be abolished. Qutb (1990: 62) holds that Islam is the way of life 'ordained by Allah for all mankind'. Jihad in Islam strives to make this system of life prevail in the world. Thus wherever an Islamic community exists as a concrete example of the 'Divinely-ordained system of life' it has a 'Divinely-given right' to initiate and establish political authority in the Divine system on earth, while leaving the matter of belief to an individual's conscience (Qutb 1990: 62). Qutb's philosophy thus gives more latitude to wage jihad than the formal principles of defensive jihad permit for as pointed out in "Implicit Meanings" above, according to Islamic interpretation bin Laden's jihad really comes within the category of "offensive" jihad.

The 'crimes and sins' in the first line of the excerpt refer to the previous three paragraphs of the fatwa. They include the questioning of the use of Saudi Arabia as a US base, the plundering of its riches, the humiliation of its people, the overwhelming of its rulers as well as the eagerness to destroy Iraq and attempts to dismember all the states of the region whose division and weakness would ensure the survival of Israel and the continuation of the Crusader occupation of the lands of Arabia. In short, it means the complete marginalisation of Islam in the Arabian lands, something which I have discussed at some length in Chapter Six though not in the same terms as Bin Laden has used in this fatwa. The marginalisation of Islam is a regrettable fact in large part due to Western imperialist forces. These forces are preventing Islam from reasserting itself even in the sacred lands of Arabia. On a more generalised basis, Western imperialist forces, principally American imperialist forces, are preventing the law of society from being purified for Allah which otherwise would allow all people to obey Allah alone. Thus Qutb's philosophy provides a legitimation for bin Laden's violent confrontation with America, a confrontation which targets both military and civilian personnel.

It is a realistic speculation that Bin Laden is able to justify to himself the violence that his fatwa will cause because his expectation is that what the fatwa will do will lead to a radically new social and political order. It is not a question of violence for its own sake or even of retribution. As Ranstorp (1998: 325) contends, Bin Laden views himself as a "peace-maker" whose vision reinstates Islam to its former standing as part of a violent struggle aimed toward achieving peace at the end of the day. It is a war for peace. Such a view is supported in the

work of Juergensmeyer (1996) and Stern (2003). Juergensmeyer (1996: 4,14), in speaking of his study of religious nationalism, maintains that alleged perpetrators possess world views that justify to themselves the brutality of their terrorist acts by perceiving a need to defend their faiths and to issue in a new order where their faith holds supremacy. Stern (2003: 281) concludes in her study on why religious militants kill, that all the terrorist groups examined believe, or start out believing, that they are creating a more perfect world. From their perspective they are purifying the world of 'injustice, cruelty, and all that is antihuman' (Stern 2003: 281). They neatly divide up the world into good and evil, victim and oppressor where there is no room for uncertainty and ambivalence or the other's point of view. They know they are right politically and morally. They believe that God is on their side (Stern 2003: 282). This is the hallmark of the "us" versus "them" duality which Monroe and Kreidie (1997: 34) ascribe to fundamentalists.

To understand why Bin Laden raises the confrontational stakes from opposition to the fatwa which requires the killing of American civilians, Bergen (2001: 101-102) rightly points out that one must grasp that in Bin Laden's mind the US has been equally violent in its treatment of Muslim civilians. This is a theme running through all of Bin Laden's communiqués. It is true that throughout the centuries the West has brought violence to Islamic lands. During the period of Anglo-French domination of the Middle East, the imperial powers ruled Iraq, Syria, Palestine, Egypt and the Sudan. Oil brought a Western presence, principally American, to Saudi Arabia which transformed 'every aspect of Arabian life' (Lewis 1998: 18). The exploitation of oil changed the Saudi capital, Riyadh, from a small oasis town to a major metropolis bringing an influx of foreigners. Their presence in Saudi Arabia, the birthplace of Islam, was seen and is still seen by many as a desecration. As explained in the discussion on Text 4, Saudi Arabia has a special place among Islamic countries as the cradle of Islam where access to non-Muslims is severely restricted. From the perspective of how a Muslim might see it, Bergen (2001:101) eloquently quotes Akthar Raja, a London-based lawyer who specialises in defending Muslims: 'Give back what is ours, leave Saudi Arabia. What if I sent a jihad group into the Vatican?' I have outlined Western and American intervention in the Middle East, leading to the marginalisation of Islam more fully, in Chapter Six.

By issuing this fatwa, Bin Laden had acted according to Islamic principles. In Islamic law, an attack on an enemy must be preceded by a fatwa (Gunaratna 2002: 46). The February 1998 fatwa which had clearly called for the death of Americans, both civil and military,

preceded attacks on US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania by six months. Bin Laden also received the support of 40 Afghan clerics who issued a fatwa calling for a jihad against the Americans on 12 March 1998 and another similar fatwa by a group of Pakistan-based clerics, signed by Sheikh Ahmed Azzam, in April 1998. Thus critics who claimed that Bin Laden had no legal authority to issue a fatwa were 'neutralised' when these fatawa came to light (Gunaratna 2002: 47).

Emergent Lines of Argument

- The ruling to kill Americans and their allies is justified within the Islamic interpretation of jihad.
- Bin Laden aims to reinstate Islam to its former standing as part of a violent struggle aimed toward ultimately achieving peace.

Text: 7

Type: This is an excerpt of an interview between Al-Jazeera television correspondent, Tayseer Alouni and Osama bin Laden. The interview, performed in Arabic, was translated by the services of CNN.

Date: The interview took place in October 2001. The transcript was made available 5 February 2002.

Q How about the killing of innocent civilians?

BIN LADEN: The killing of innocent civilians, as America and some intellectuals claim, is really very strange talk. Who said that our children and civilians are not innocent and that shedding their blood is justified? That it is lesser in degree? When we kill their innocents, the entire world from east to west screams at us, and America rallies its allies, agents, and the sons of its agents. Who said that our blood is not blood, but theirs is? Who made this pronouncement? Who has been getting killed in our countries for decades? More than 1 million children, more than 1 million children died in Iraq and others are still dying. Why do we not hear someone screaming or condemning, or even someone's words of consolation or condolence?

How come millions of Muslims are being killed? Where are the experts, the writers, the scholars and the freedom fighters, where are the ones who have an ounce a faith in them? They react only if we kill American civilians, and every day we are being killed, children are being killed in Palestine. We should review the books. Human nature makes people stand with the powerful without noticing it. When they talk about us, they know we won't respond to them. In the past, an Arab king once killed an ordinary Arab man. The people started wondering how come kings have the right to kill people just like that. Then the victim's brother went and killed the king in revenge. People were disappointed with the young man and asked him, "How could you kill a king for your brother?" The man said, "My brother is my king." We consider all our children in Palestine to be kings.

We kill the kings of the infidels, kings of the crusaders, and civilian infidels in exchange for those of our children they kill. This is permissible in law and intellectually.

Q: So what you are saying is that this is a type of reciprocal treatment. They kill our innocents, so we kill their innocents.

BIN LADEN: . . . I agree that the Prophet Mohammed forbade the killing of babies and women. That is true, but this is not absolute. There is a saying, "If the infidels killed women and children on purpose, we shouldn't shy away from treating them in the same way to stop them from doing it again." The men that God helped [attack, on September 11] did not intend to kill babies; they intended to destroy the strongest military power in the world, to attack the Pentagon that houses more than 64,000 employees, a military center that houses the strength and the military intelligence.

Q: How about the twin towers?

BIN LADEN: The towers are an economic power and not a children's school. Those that were there are men that supported the biggest economic power in the world. They have to review their books. We will do as they do. If they kill our women and our innocent people, we will kill their women and their innocent people until they stop.

Bin Laden (2002c: 3-4)

Key Macro propositions/Implications

1. While millions of Muslims are being killed, there is only a reaction if we kill American civilians.
2. Human nature makes people stand with the powerful without noticing it.
3. We kill civilians in exchange for our children they kill.
4. The men (on September 11) did not intend to kill babies but to destroy the strongest military power in the world.
5. If they kill our women and our innocent people, we will kill their women and their innocent people until they stop.

Overall Macro propositions/Implications

- As human nature makes people stand with the powerful without noticing it, millions of Muslims are being killed without the world's acknowledgment so a strategy of reciprocal treatment will be implemented with respect to the killing of innocents.
- The men on September 11 did not intend to kill babies but to destroy the strongest military power in the world.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. Implicit within this text is a contradiction. This is the reason there are two overall macro propositions. The contradiction is that on the one hand, bin Laden is arguing the right to kill innocents (because so many Muslims have been killed and this has gone unacknowledged) but on the other hand he is insisting that the men who were responsible for the September 11 attack were not targeting innocents but were

attempting to destroy, symbolically, the strongest military power in the world. These two arguments do not fit together very well. They really are at cross purposes. September 11 had the hallmarks of a symbolic strike which has little to do contextually with the retribution of killing innocents. In the light of no further information on this subject, this remains a contradiction.

Summary and Discussion

The discussion is thus divided between these two events: (1) the retribution for the innocents and (2) the symbolic strike of September 11.

(1) Bin Laden's statement that 'Human nature makes people stand with the powerful without noticing it' is at once perceptive and the key to understanding his anger at American actions in the Muslim world. His statement implicitly acknowledges a postmodern claim – that power and truth are interrelated. As argued in Chapter Four, postmodernism holds that knowledge and truth are produced out of power struggles and are used in turn to legitimise the workings of power. Postcolonialism extends the power/knowledge/truth alliance to colonial conditions and "Orientalism" as a discourse. The Orientalist discourse confirms the superiority of the West over the East necessitating colonial intervention. Hence colonial and imperialist intervention is seen as a normal and reasonable occurrence, as something not to be questioned. Bin Laden's statement is an eloquent reflection of this postmodern/postcolonial perspective and is seen in the fact that the *umma* has been under attack consistently for the last two hundred years. The French invasion of Egypt in the last years of the 18th century was followed by the seizure of the Magreb in the 19th century and the carve-up of the whole Middle East by Britain and France at the end of World War One. The sponsorship of the Jewish colonisation of Palestine presaged the contemporary American control of the entire region. Thus the relationship between the West and the Muslim world is one of great disparity which makes Bin Laden's statement penetratingly precise.

Bin Laden freely admits earlier in the text that 'if killing those who kill our sons is terrorism, then let history be witness that we are terrorists' (Bin Laden 2002c: 1). Despite this admission, Bin Laden makes clear that the battle is not between al Qaeda and the US. It is a battle of Muslims against the 'global crusaders' (Bin Laden 2002c:1). Bin Laden is commonly seen by the West as a criminal who has hijacked Islam and is attacking the US

because he hates democracy and freedom⁸⁶. This is not compatible with Bin Laden's comments in this text. In responding to the charge of the killing of innocent civilians, it is clear Bin Laden is speaking as a representative for those suffering in Islam, for the children and civilians who have died through the actions of the globalising hegemony of the West⁸⁷. This is far more abstract in appreciation than is the deaths of 4,000 people on 9/11 and because it is more abstract it should not be simply dismissed. How the West has and continues to marginalise the peoples of Islam is an issue that continues to be explored in this thesis.

(2) As for the events of 9/11, although denying being the instigator at this stage, bin Laden speaks of the attacks as being directed against the military power of the US (the Pentagon) and the economic power of the US (the twin towers). Bin Laden thus views the attacks as being symbolic. What, in fact, was being targeted was the whole Western value-system and world order.

Bin Laden has thus interwoven the two themes of the retribution of the innocents and the symbolic strike of September 11. This inconsistency arises out of an interview which, unlike a speech, is more spontaneous and perhaps it is this spontaneity which produces such a contradiction. The interview occurred only weeks after the event of September 11 which also would have probably strained the interviewee. This could have also added to his conflicting approach. In any case they both offer a rationale for attacking the US and its allies.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- Bin Laden's view of September 11 is that it was a symbolic strike to the Western value system and world order.
- Because there have been so many Muslim deaths that have gone unacknowledged, we have the right to reciprocal killing which is justified in law and intellectually.

⁸⁶ See for example Bush's speech "Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People" (Bush 2001:3).

⁸⁷ See Chapter 6 "Some Facts concerning American and Anglo-American Intervention in the Middle East".

Text: 8

Type: This excerpt is from an interview published originally in the Pakistani newspaper *Ummat*.

Date: The date published was 28 September 2001.

UMMAT: A number of world countries have joined the call of the United States for launching attacks on Afghanistan. These also include a number of Muslim countries. Will Al-Qa'idah declare a jihad against these Islamic countries as well?

USAMA BIN LADEN: 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 say and what do the enemies of Islam want. Al-Qa'idah was set up to wage a jihad against infidelity, particularly to counter the onslaught of the infidel countries against the Islamic states. Jihad is the sixth undeclared pillar of Islam. [The first five being the basic holy words of Islam ("There is no god but God and Muhammad is the messenger of God"), prayers, fasting (in Ramadan), pilgrimage to Mecca and giving alms (zakat).] Every anti-Islamic person is afraid of jihad. Al-Qa'idah wants to keep jihad alive and active and make it a part of the daily life of the Muslims. It wants to give it the status of worship. We are not against any Islamic country. We do not consider a war against an Islamic country as jihad. We are in favour of armed jihad only against those infidel governments, which are killing innocent Muslim men, women and children just because they are Muslims.

Bin Laden (2001: 3)

Key Macro propositions/Implications

1. My duty is just to awaken the Muslims.
2. My duty is to tell the Muslims what is good for them and what is not.
3. My duty is to reveal what Islam says.
4. My duty is to reveal what the enemies of Islam want.
5. Al-Qa'idah was set up to wage a jihad against infidelity.
6. Jihad is the sixth pillar of Islam.
7. Al-Qa'idah wants to make jihad a part of the daily life of the Muslims.
8. We are in favour of armed jihad only against infidel governments.

Overall Macro proposition/ Implication

- My duty being just to awaken the Muslims and to reveal what Islam says, I set up Al-Qa'idah to wage jihad against infidels including infidel governments, making jihad a part of the daily life of the Muslims.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. Bin Laden is implicitly suggesting that his role is *limited* to one of inspiration and the inciting of Muslims to jihad. What is striking about bin Laden's response is the paradoxical nature of its humility. He is not claiming something which is ostensibly going to give him more power. He is implying that Al-Qaeda is only the vanguard of a larger movement whose aim should be to oust the US and its allies from all Islamic nations. He is not claiming that Al-Qaeda can achieve this objective by itself.
2. Bin Laden has set himself up as a well informed spokesperson for Islam. To be able to tell Muslims 'what is good for them and what is not' means he considers himself an authority on Islam, on par with Islamic scholars and religious leaders.

Hyperbole

Attempting to give jihad 'the status of worship' plainly is a controversial act. The goal of jihad today ought not to be to coerce people to accept Islam, because the Quran clearly encourages freedom of worship (Quran 2:256). Bin Laden says in the excerpt that jihad is the sixth undeclared pillar of Islam, a statement of hyperbole. This claim would be accepted by only a minority of Muslims. In Islam's early days, the Kharijite sect are said to have claimed that jihad was the sixth pillar of Islam. In this cultural setting, performing jihad was at least equivalent to that of *pilgrimage, zakat, fasting, prayer, and profession of faith* (the Sunni Five Pillars) (Schleifer 1983: 3). While the surviving Kharijites of the present day reject this doctrine, there is another more recent and relevant connection to this idea. The Egyptian founder of Islamic Jihad, Abd al-Salam Faraj published a pamphlet following Anwar Sadat's assassination called *The Neglected Duty* or the *Faridah* as it is known in Arabic, attempting to argue that jihad was the sixth pillar of Islam but that corrupt ulema had deliberately obscured this fact (The Global Oneness Commitment 2006:2). The central thesis of "The Neglected Duty" was that the establishment of an Islamic State and the reintroduction of the Caliphate were not only a prediction by the Apostle of God; they are part of the command of the Lord for which every Muslim should strive. Hence the reader is exhorted to perform jihad in this pursuit (Jansen 2002). However, while jihad may be viewed as a requirement by some, ulema have unanimously condemned jihad as a pillar (The Global Oneness Commitment 2006: 2).

Summary and Discussion

It is fruitful to briefly consider the document, the *Faridah*, and how it connects to bin Laden today. Jansen (2002: 7) in interview with Jean-Francois Mayer, said that the author, Muhammad al-Salaam Faraj, was an enthusiastic reader of classical works by authors such as Al-Ghazali, Ibn Taymiyyah and Sayyid Qutb. Ibn Taymiyyah is a connection between the author of the *Faridah* and bin Laden as his name appears in bin Laden's Fatwa of 1996. He is there represented as a scholar who worked in his own historical time to instigate the Ummah of Islam against its enemies. Also, mention has already been made of Qutb's influence on bin Laden⁸⁸. The author of the *Faridah* and bin Laden are to be seen, therefore, as drawing from the same sources. While this may not be extraordinary in itself, what is of note is the importance of common source documents to the different extremist movements. Jansen (2002: 4-5) contends that because governments in most Muslim countries are unpopular, people need a language in which to express themselves about this unpopularity. The discourse of Sayyid Qutb is, for example, highly suited for this purpose. Ibn Taymiyyah, the strict 14th century Islamic jurist, the theologian of war is also highly quoted. Sadat's assassins explain their action in the *Faridah* which, Kiener (1997: 233) claims, cites most liberally from Ibn Taymiyyah⁸⁹. The *Faridah* declares:

The rulers of this age are in apostasy from Islam (hukkam al-muslimin fi riddah 'ani-'l-islam). They were raised at the tables of imperialism, be it Crusaderism or Communism, or Zionism. They carry nothing from Islam but their names, even though they pray and fast and claim to be Muslim . . . an apostate has to be killed.

Muhammad abd al-Salaam Faraj as cited in Kiener (1997: 233)

Aside from the primary issue of targeting an apostate leader in government, there is an important secondary issue here. In Ibn Taymiyyah's time, the armies that fought against each other equally consisted of Muslims and non-Muslims. Ibn Taymiyyah had to make invalid the argument that you could not kill a Muslim even when he fought in the army of your enemy. He had, therefore, to develop a theory that justified fighting against other Muslims. The *Faridah* has taken up this issue. It quoted paragraphs from Ibn Taymiyyah that justified the killing of innocent bystanders. Viewing this through the perspective of the author of the *Faridah*, it looks very much like the defence of killing innocent bystanders, also killing Muslims (Jansen 2002: 10). There is a crucial point which relates to bin Laden. The fact that Muslims were killed on September 11 in the World Trade Centre attack, as well as other

⁸⁸ See Chapter 9, Text 6

⁸⁹ A copy of the *Faridah* is very difficult to obtain. The quotation that follows is thus from Kiener's text.

al-Qaeda attacks, is completely justified if one adopts the arguments of the *Faradah*. The *Faridah* can be used as a means of justification.

It appears that bin Laden's primary goal is only to inspire and incite Muslims to jihad and not to aspire for greater control of other extremist groups or arrogate power for himself although he does see himself as a religious leader. Regarding jihad becoming the 6th pillar of Islam, it seems this could only gain credence amongst extremist circles. It is improbable that traditional Islam could ever embrace such a principle. However, Mohhammad abd al-Salaam Faraj, the Egyptian founder of Islamic Jihad, has given Bin Laden the theoretical defence for killing innocent bystanders as well as Muslims, in jihad. It is likely that such a justification would have been well received.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- Al-Qa'idah is only the vanguard of a larger movement whose aim should be to oust the US and its allies from the Middle East.
- Al-Qa'idah wants to make jihad which should be considered the sixth pillar of Islam a part of the daily life of Muslims.

Text: 9

Type: This excerpt was taken from the text of an audio message broadcast on Arab television station al-Jazeera. The speaker was identified as being Osama bin Laden.

Date: The date was 11 February 2003, five weeks prior to the American invasion of Iraq.

We also stress to honest Muslims that they should move, incite, and mobilize the [Islamic] nation, amid such grave events and hot atmosphere so as to liberate themselves from those unjust and renegade ruling regimes, which are enslaved by the United States.

They should also do so to establish the rule of God on earth.

The most qualified regions for liberation are Jordan, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, the land of the two holy mosques [Saudi Arabia], and Yemen.

Needless to say, this crusade war is primarily targeted against the people of Islam.

Bin Laden (2003: 6-7)

Key Macro propositions/Implications

1. Honest Muslims should mobilise the Islamic nation to liberate themselves from renegade ruling regimes which are enslaved by the United States.
2. Honest Muslims should establish the rule of God on Earth.
3. This crusade war is primarily targeted against the people of Islam.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- In order to establish the rule of God on Earth, honest Muslims should mobilise the Islamic nation to liberate themselves from renegade ruling regimes which are enslaved by the United States for this crusade war is primarily targeted against the people of Islam.

Lexical Choice

The lexical choice used by bin Laden in the first paragraph supports a point raised in the previous text; that bin Laden's role in the jihad is one of inciting fellow Muslims to jihad. Bin Laden uses here inspirational terminology: 'We should *stress* to honest Muslims that they should *move*, *incite*, and *mobilize* the [Islamic] nation.' This tends to suggest that bin Laden does conceive of himself and al-Qaeda as a Vanguard movement of a much larger movement which should be directed at 'those unjust and renegade ruling regimes which are enslaved by the United States'. The regimes bin Laden states stretch right across the Muslim world with Pakistan and Nigeria, which is only 50 percent Muslim, (Beinart 2004: 2), the furthest from the Arab states.

Hyperbole

In the text under consideration, bin Laden is exhorting 'honest Muslims' to 'establish the rule of God on earth'. This aim ranks as one of hyperbole. But who is bin Laden to be demanding this? He is neither Mufti nor Imam nor Mullah; he is not a member of the Ulema, the learned class of Muslim scholars engaged in Islamic Studies. Bin Laden, however, does not pretend to be anything he is not yet his message finds an audience with large numbers of Muslims around the world for despite the fact that he has killed innocents and has earned the name of "terrorist", he is also a visionary and a defender of his faith. To many, he is a man who has had the courage to strike at a powerful adversary. This is not a cowardly act.

Summary and Discussion

Bin Laden's listing of those regimes ready for Islamisation is suggestive of a move toward the establishment of the Caliphate referred to in the previous chapter in a letter from al-Zawahiri to al-Zarqawi on 9 July 2005. Al-Zawahiri praises al-Zarqawi's efforts in taking steps toward the intended goal of establishing a caliphate 'in the manner of the Prophet' (Zawahiri 2005: 2). Although bin Laden does not discuss the caliphate directly in this text of 11 February 2003, he foreshadows a move towards it indicated by his selection of those countries marked for 'liberation'.

Bin Laden's voice is dissident but as Lawrence in interview with Bennett (2005: 3) states, it is a voice that has 'enormous range' and an appeal because of its 'rhetorical strength'⁹⁰. He claims bin Laden delivers his speeches in a pure early Arabic that is 'really quite spellbinding'. This may explain partly why his Muslim audiences find him so compelling.

From inciting Muslims to jihad, earmarking countries for the Caliphate and delivering religious messages, bin Laden, in this short text, shows that he is a particularly capable multi-skilled enemy of many Western governments, peoples, values and world views.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- Honest Muslims should mobilise the Islamic nation to liberate themselves from renegade ruling regimes which are enslaved by the United States.
- Honest Muslims should establish the rule of God on Earth.

Text: 10

Type: This excerpt was taken from a translated transcript of an audiotape identified as being of Osama Bin Laden, aired by al-Jazeera satellite channel.

Date: The date was 4 January 2004.

⁹⁰ Bruce Lawrence has annotated a translation of bin Laden's words into book form (Lawrence, B. (ed) Messages to the World (2005) London: Verso).

The following two extracts seek to clarify whether there is a millenarian aspect to bin Laden's political agenda as well examine his fundamentalist leaning. The question, is bin Laden doing more than just "awakening" Muslims, is investigated.

First Extract

The occupation of Iraq is a link in the Zionist-crusader chain of evil.

Then comes the full occupation of the rest of the Gulf states to set the stage for controlling and dominating the whole world.

For the big powers believe that the Gulf and the Gulf states are the key to controlling the world due to the presence of the largest oil reserves there.

O Muslims: The situation is serious and the misfortune is momentous.

By God, I am keen on safeguarding your religion and your worldly life.

So, lend me your ears and open up your hearts to me so that we may examine these pitch-black misfortunes and so that we may consider how we can find a way out of these adversities and calamities.

The West's occupation of our countries is old, yet new.

The struggle between us and them, the confrontation, and clashing began centuries ago, and will continue because the ground rules regarding the fight between right and falsehood will remain valid until Judgment Day.

Take note of this ground rule regarding this fight. There can be no dialogue with occupiers except through arms.

Bin Laden (2004a: 1)

Key Macro propositions/Implications

1. After the occupation of Iraq will come the full occupation of the rest of the Gulf States to set the stage for dominating the world.
2. Let us consider how to find a way out of these adversities.
3. The confrontation which began centuries ago will continue because the ground rules regarding the fight between right and falsehood will remain valid until Judgment Day.
4. There can be no dialogue with occupiers except through arms.

Overall Macro propositions/Implications

- Let us consider how to find a way out of these adversities for after the occupation of Iraq will come the full occupation of the rest of the Gulf States to set the stage for dominating the world.
- There can be no dialogue with occupiers except through arms for the confrontation which began centuries ago will continue because the ground

rules regarding the fight between right and falsehood will remain valid until Judgment Day.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. Implicit in bin Laden's exhortation to his fellow Muslims to 'open up your hearts so that we may examine these pitch-black misfortunes and so that we may consider how we can find a way out of these adversities and calamities' is a preliminary stage in an attempt to resolve a conflict, to solve a political problem. It is a political action. This is reflected in the first overall macro proposition.
2. Implicit in his statement that 'The struggle between us and them, the confrontation, and clashing began centuries ago, will continue because the ground rules regarding the fight between right and falsehood will remain valid until Judgment Day' is a millenarian vision in the sense of permanent warfare between Islam and the West. This is reflected in the second overall macro proposition.

Summary and Discussion

These two outlooks as described above in Implicit Meanings, the political bin Laden and the millenarian bin Laden are contradictory to each other. This is the reason why there are two Overall Macro propositions/Implications provided. What does this mean for the possibility of the West's engagement with him? Scheuer (2005a: 249) claims: 'The war is being waged against us (America) for specific, *quantifiable*⁹¹ reasons . . . and not as our leaders claim because a few Muslim fanatics hate democracy and freedom.' The 'quantifiable reasons' relate to US foreign policy in the Muslim World. This view accommodates a political agenda. And bin Laden certainly has a political agenda – the goal of jihad projected as a matter of self-defence where attack is the best form of defence.

In contrast, some of bin Laden's declarations do have an underlying millenarian vision to them as described above in Implicit Meanings 2. As Scheuer (2005a: xviii) notes, however, bin Laden's actions label him a 'practical warrior' and not given to terrorism derived from an apocalyptic vision. In this instance, nonetheless, the passage raises the question as to whether conflict could be resolved politically as bin Laden has formed a strong divide between the 'right' and the 'falsehood' much like Bush's divide between good and evil. Radical Islam is

⁹¹ My italics

in possession of the 'right' and the West is in 'falsehood'. Under these binding conditions what we are left with is a fixed political agenda much like Bush's political agenda as it relates to the War on Terror. So in respect of engagement with the West, both sides are indicating a non-negotiable situation. An interesting point, however, is that a principal feature of the millenarian vision is the coming of the Messiah. Does bin Laden purport to be the Messiah, the Mahdi? The answer to this question is "No". Like David Cooke as interviewed by Stephen Crittenden (2006:5), I see that bin Laden does not seem to have pushed a Messianic pretension about himself. Crittenden (2006: 5) further points out that Wahhabi Islam, which bin Laden is associated with, tends not to be interested in the idea of the Mahdi because the Mahdi is never mentioned in the Quran and Wahhabi Islam, being a puritanical form of Islam, does not too easily embrace mystical traditions.

In this text, bin Laden sees that after Iraq, the Zionist crusaders look set to take control of the world and labels the situation as being a 'momentous' misfortune. There is an ironic parallel to this vision – it is Bush's vision of bin Laden's subordinates taking control of the world. In the text excerpts I have examined, bin Laden does not claim to embrace violence for its own sake; he professes to discharge the responsibilities of informing Muslims what is the right path and defending the Muslim community from attack through jihad. This is seen specifically in Texts 4 and 6, the *fatawa*, where he issues a call to arms for all Muslims and also Text 8 where he declares that his duty is to "awaken" Muslims, to put them on the right path. These twin duties are evident throughout many of Bin Laden's texts. From this excerpt, it can be seen that bin Laden possesses the characteristics of the political and also the millenarian. This makes for an interesting mix and presents bin Laden as a most complex human being despite the simplification that his championing of a fundamentalist religious belief system affords and which will be investigated in the Second Extract.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- It is necessary to consider how to find a way out of these adversities.
- The confrontation will continue until Judgment Day because the ground rules regarding the fight between right and falsehood will remain in force.

Second Extract

We have reached this miserable situation because many of us lack the correct and comprehensive understanding of the religion of Islam.

Many of us understand Islam to mean performing some acts of worship, such as prayer and fasting.

Despite the great importance of these rituals, the religion of Islam encompasses all the affairs of life, including religious and worldly affairs, such as economic, military and political affairs, as well as the scales by which we weigh the actions of men - rulers, ulema and others - and how to deal with the ruler in line with the rules set by God for him and which the ruler should not violate.

Therefore, it becomes clear to us that the solution lies in adhering to the religion of God, by which God granted us pride in the past centuries and installing a strong and faithful leadership that applies the Koran among us and raises the true banner of jihad.

The honest people who are concerned about this situation, such as the ulema, leaders who are obeyed among their people, dignitaries, notables and merchants should get together and meet in a safe place away from the shadow of these suppressive regimes and form a council for Ahl al-Hall wa al-Aqd [literally those who loose and bind; reference to honest, wise and righteous people who can appoint or remove a ruler in Islamic tradition] to fill the vacuum caused by the religious invalidation of these regimes and their mental deficiency.

The right to appoint an imam [leader] is for the nation.

The nation also has the right to make him correct his course if he deviates from it and to remove him if he does something that warrants this, such as apostasy and treason

Bin Laden (2004a: 5)

Key Macro propositions/Implications

1. We have reached this miserable situation because we lack a comprehensive understanding of the religion of Islam.
2. The religion of Islam encompasses all the affairs of life.
3. The solution to our miserable situation lies in adhering to the religion of God.
4. Honest people who are concerned about this situation should meet in a safe place away from the shadow of the suppressive regimes in order to form a council to fill the vacuum caused by the religious invalidation of these regimes.
5. The right to appoint an imam is for the nation as is the nation's right to make him correct his course if he deviates from it.

Overall Macro propositions/Implications

- The solution to our miserable situation lies in adhering to the religion of God for the religion of Islam encompasses all the affairs of life and we have reached this miserable situation because we lack a comprehensive understanding of Islam.

Hyperbole

Is it a hyperbole to state that ‘the religion of Islam encompasses all the affairs of life?’ Used in the sense bin Laden is using it, I suggest that it is hyperbole. Monroe and Kreidie’s analysis which was referred to in Chapter Seven, suggested that Islamic fundamentalism attracts because it furnishes a basic identity. Such an identity provides a foundation for daily living. They quote Muhammad Hussein Fadl Allah, then head of HizbAllah, who succinctly expressed the fundamentalist view: ‘Islam is a complete way of life’ (Monroe and Kreidie 1997:31). Bin Laden in this extract affirms this orientation by saying, ‘the religion of Islam encompasses all the affairs of life’ and then further qualifies this perspective by invoking ‘religious and worldly affairs, such as economic, military and political affairs’. Not stopping there, bin Laden goes on to include ‘the scales by which we weigh the actions of men – rulers, ulema and others’ and finally he incorporates ‘how to deal with the ruler in line with the rules set by God for him and which the ruler should not violate’. This is one very comprehensive account of the view of Islam, an account which is fundamentalist in its very essence.

Summary and Discussion

Monroe and Kreidie (1997:31) found in their study that the Quran and *sharia* were followed compliantly because fundamentalists believe the truth emanates only from God as written in the Quran and the revelations; fundamentalists reject the Enlightenment’s emphasis on reason, believing that reason itself can address the important questions of life only within a context set by religion. Referring back to Chapter Three, however, postmodernism cautions that the Enlightenment was a uniquely European phenomenon, a phenomenon that brought in modernity and it is the individual’s intersection and confrontation with modernity that should also be considered as a factor as to why an individual might adopt a fundamentalist approach to their chosen religion.

Considering bin Laden’s words in Paragraph Three, bin Laden conceives of Islam as being like a formula to life. Texts are interpreted in a literalistic sense so that interpretation becomes the formula. A formula simplifies and orders. As discussed in Chapter Seven, however, according to Abdurrahman Wahid (2002: 1), Muslim and former president of Indonesia, interpretation of Quranic texts is a subtly nuanced task – documents from the 7th and 8th centuries need to be *carefully* applied to present day circumstances. It’s a fact that we

may crave certainty but what confronts us in the world today is confusion, uncertainty and ambivalence. Surely it is the task of religion to help us deal with that. Simplification at all costs might make us feel better but it does not solve the pressing issues that epitomise the modern world. Fundamentalism is not, in fact, a well-adjusted way to negotiate the world. It can be seen moreover as a coping mechanism to deal with the complexities with which the world confronts us or the injustices that beset us. It is in this way that fundamentalism can be seen as a response to Western domination of Islamic countries and Islamic peoples. This text projects the imposition from bin Laden of a certain type of hegemony as opposed to the hegemony of the West. As discussed in Chapter Three, however, Islamic fundamentalism is not an initiative, it is a response. This is evident in this text. The “miserable situation” describes the legacy of Western domination. The “solution” lies in “adhering to the religion of God”. Islamic fundamentalism is a pronounced articulation against the Western threat. In it there is a claim for equality and justice and a desire to take the lead from the West because of the West’s hegemony upon the world and replace it with a hegemony based on an Islamic fundamentalist formula. There is much to think about in Tibi’s contention in Chapter Three that the concept of the world order posed by Islamic fundamentalists challenges Western universalism (Tibi 2004: 337).

These two extracts establish that bin Laden exhibits both the political and the millenarian and pushes a fundamentalist way of interpreting Islam. Pointing out what is the right path for Muslims to follow and emphasising the individual duty of jihad are but two of the tasks bin Laden has taken upon himself. As has been discussed in Chapter Seven, however, Islam is a multi-dimensional religion. Fundamentalism is but one facet of this religion. In attempting to steer Muslims along a fundamentalist path and therefore arrogating that authority to himself, bin Laden is doing more than just “awakening” Muslims as was claimed in Text 8. As Feldman (2006: 1) says, bin Laden is trying to make himself their ‘legitimate decision maker and thus their leader’. In his fundamentalist response, bin Laden seeks intercivilisational justice and also to compete with Western universalism.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- Fundamentalist Islam is a response to Western domination of Islamic countries.
- Bin Laden seeks to make himself legitimate decision maker and leader.

Text: 11

Type: This excerpt was taken from the text of an audiotape identified to be from Osama Bin Laden and broadcast by the pan-Arab al-Arabiya and al-Jazeera satellite channels.

Date: The date was 15 April 2004

The greatest rule of safety is justice, and stopping injustice and aggression. It was said: Oppression kills the oppressors and the hotbed of injustice is evil. The situation in occupied Palestine is an example. What happened on 11 September [2001] and 11 March [the Madrid train bombings] is your commodity that was returned to you.

. . . We would like to inform you that labelling us and our acts as terrorism is also a description of you and of your acts. Reaction comes at the same level as the original action. Our acts are reaction to your own acts, which are represented by the destruction and killing of our kinfolk in Afghanistan, Iraq and Palestine.

. . . Which religion considers your killed ones innocent and our killed ones worthless? And which principle considers your blood real blood and our blood water? Reciprocal treatment is fair and the one who starts injustice bears greater blame.

Bin Laden (2004b: 1-2)

Key Macro propositions/Implications

1. What happened on 11 September [2001] and 11 March [the Madrid train bombings] is your commodity that was returned to you.
2. Labeling us and our acts as terrorism is also a description of you and of your acts.
3. Our acts are reaction to your own acts.
4. Reciprocal treatment is fair with the one starting the injustice bearing greater blame.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- Labeling us and our acts as terrorism is also a description of you and of your acts for our acts are reaction to your own acts which makes reciprocal treatment fair but laying greater blame on the one starting the injustice.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. Bin Laden speaks in Paragraph Two in terms of action and reaction (Macro propositions 2 and 3) – ‘our acts are reaction to your own acts’; ‘labeling us and our acts as terrorism is also a description of you and of your acts’. This is insightful on bin Laden’s part. The Western perspective of this action and reaction is that what the

West commits to is war in self-defence and what bin Laden commits is terrorism. A bin Laden perspective is what al Qaeda commits to is self-defence and what the West commits is terrorism. Breaking through this relativism is a complex affair. It was seen in Text 6 that Bin Laden's fatwa of 23 February 1998 raised the confrontational stakes to the killing of American civilians. The harshness of such a move heralded a more deadly relationship between the two enemies. It was likely that bin Laden effected such a major change because he saw the US as being especially violent in its treatment of Muslim civilians. While this relates to historical events, it also relates to contemporary events such as those in Afghanistan, Iraq and Palestine which bin Laden has cited in Paragraph Two. Now the implicit meaning here is that bin Laden accepts the label of terrorist but only on the condition that America accepts that it is not only terrorist also but the one who began the injustice and therefore liable to bear the greater blame.

2. In this text, bin Laden states, 'Reciprocal treatment is fair and the one who starts injustice bears greater blame' (Macro proposition 4), a statement which implicitly equates reciprocal treatment to justice.

Summary and Discussion

Since 2001 bin Laden has been advocating a very simple formula of reciprocal treatment which can be encapsulated by the term; just as you kill, you shall be killed. As stated in the Implicit Meanings, reciprocal treatment equates to justice – you kill our innocents so we kill your innocents. This is addressed by bin Laden in Text 7 (October 2001) where he concedes, 'I agree that the prophet Mohammed forbade the killing of babies and women. That is true'. However, he then goes on to say, 'but this is not absolute. There is a saying, "If the infidels killed women and children on purpose, we shouldn't shy away from treating them in the same way to stop them from doing it again."' While it seems unlikely that such a philosophy could find acceptance in the Quran, bin Laden (2002a: 3) claims that the killing of innocents is 'permissible in Islamic law and logic'. Notwithstanding his failure to authenticate this tenet, reciprocal treatment encompassing the killing of innocents is the bedrock upon which bin Laden and deputy, al-Zawahiri, have planned attacks upon the West.

According to Michael Scheuer, bin Laden and al-Zawahiri have reiterated this message over time and have designated 23 countries by name as allies of the US in Afghanistan, Iraq, or both, and given an undertaking that all would be attacked. As of October 2006, Scheuer

claims that all 23 have been attacked, either domestically or in the theatres of war where their forces are deployed for the war on terrorism (Scheuer 2006a:1). While not all of these attacks could have been under bin Laden's command and control, it looks like more than coincidence, however, that al-Qaeda and its allies have been able to attack every country on the list.

It has been shown in Chapter Six that Western colonialism and American imperialism have severely impacted on the very fabric of Islamic civilisation. The West, particularly the US, must bear its share of responsibility or "blame" for this. Was this done in a terrorist manner? No, it was not done in the same manner that bin Laden caused the deaths of innocent people on 11 September 2001 (the New York attacks) or 11 March 2004 (the Madrid train bombings) or 7 July 2005 (London bombings). It was done through what could be described as "legitimate" means which meant that the means were in the hands of the most powerful – the hands of the US and European countries which could dictate the terms of their colonial and imperial engagement.

Referring back to reciprocal treatment, in the Introduction of this thesis, Primoratz's definition of terrorism was presented. It involved the deliberate use of violence, or threat of its use, against innocent people with the aim of intimidating some other people into a course of action they otherwise would not take (Primoratz 2002:32). The Western way of looking at this in relation to reciprocal treatment is to say that reciprocal treatment can only be part of justice if X attacks Y and Y strikes back at X, not at some innocent third party, Z. When you strike Z, this does not constitute reciprocal treatment. Still taking a Western perspective, one could say that bin Laden's argument is with the government of the United States and with the government of its allies. He should strike at those governments not at the innocent party Z⁹². However, unlike the US which wants to fight a conventional war, it is impossible for bin Laden to fight a conventional war – al Qaeda is not a nation, it is a network, a threat seeking to challenge Western influence in the Muslim world. While it has political aims, those aims are not the aims of a nation or even a national liberation movement. Those aims relate to addressing the suffering visited upon the peoples of Islam by 'the Zionist-Crusaders alliance and their collaborators' (Bin Laden 1996: 2). In effect, bin Laden has made himself Islam's representative and appropriated to himself the authority to speak and act accordingly in

⁹² See Roderick Long (2003) *An Open Letter to Osama bin Laden* for an interesting approach to reciprocal treatment.

promulgating jihad whose targets include the civilians of America and her allies. The face of war has changed.

The text, from which the excerpt under study was taken, also contained a 'reconciliation initiative' from bin Laden: 'I also offer a reconciliation initiative to them, whose essence is our commitment to stopping operations against every country that commits itself to not attacking Muslims or interfering in their affairs – including the US conspiracy on the greater Muslim world.' This pledge, in effect, goes hand in hand with the promise of reciprocal violence. So the formula becomes, if you attack us, we will attack you but if you refrain from assisting in Washington's war on terrorism, we pledge not to attack. Scheuer (2006a: 2) asks if al-Qaeda's policy has resulted in any decrease in the will of US allies to support US military operations against the group and its allies. Scheuer (2006a: 2) suggests that the doctrine is beginning to have some impact seen in the following political events:

1. The conservative, pro-U.S. government of Spanish Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar was defeated in an election soon after the March 2003 Madrid attack. The victorious socialist regime of Prime Minister Jose Luis Rodriguez Zapatero, less pro-American, withdrew Spanish troops from Iraq.
2. In the summer of 2006, Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi's conservative, pro-U.S. government was defeated by a narrow margin, much of which appears to have consisted of those voters opposed to Rome's support for the U.S.-led war in Iraq. The new Italian government planned to reduce the number of Italian troops in Iraq.
3. After facing rebellion this summer in his Labor Party, British Prime Minister Tony Blair acted to placate dissenters by announcing that he would step down from the premiership. The Labor Party's anger stemmed from Blair's support for Washington's war on terrorism, a fact which was backed by public opinion polls.
4. In October 2006, a group of Thai military officers staged a coup that removed Prime Minister Thaksin Shinawatra from office. The generals appear to have acted to stop Thaksin's harsh military operations against Islamist separatists in the country's three Muslim-dominated southern provinces. The coup leaders named a Muslim Thai general as the new prime minister, and contrary to

Thaksin's policy, immediately announced his willingness to slow military operations and consider increased autonomy for the southern provinces.

5. In mid-October 2006, sources "close to the [French] military" leaked information showing that President Jacques Chirac's government was formulating plans to withdraw its Special Forces from Afghanistan in 2007 as a result of continuing violence in Afghanistan and public condemnation of the war in Iraq.
6. In the fall of 2006, Iraqi Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki and Afghan President Hamid Karzai repeatedly tried to distance themselves from "excessive" military operations conducted by the United States in their countries.

What these political events reveal is that US allies are taking bin Laden's policy on reciprocal treatment and his initiative for reconciliation seriously. This means an erosion of support for the war on terrorism among US allies leaving the US more vulnerable and isolated than ever before.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- Reciprocal treatment is justice.
- We accept the label of terrorist but only on the condition that America accepts that it is not only terrorist also but the one who began the injustice and therefore liable to bear the greater blame.
- If you attack us, we will attack you but if you refrain from assisting in Washington's war on terrorism, we pledge not to attack.

Text: 12

Type: This is an extract of an English transcript of Osama bin Laden's speech from a videotape sent to al-Jazeera.

Date: 30 October 2004

Peace be upon he who follows the guidance: People of America this talk of mine is for you and concerns the ideal way to prevent another Manhattan, and deals with the war and its causes and results.

Before I begin, I say to you that security is an indispensable pillar of human life and that free men do not forfeit their security, contrary to Bush's claim that we hate freedom.

If so, then let him explain to us why we don't strike for example - Sweden? And we know that freedom-haters don't possess defiant spirits like those of the 19 - may Allah have mercy on them.

No, we fight because we are free men who don't sleep under oppression. We want to restore freedom to our nation, just as you lay waste to our nation. So shall we lay waste to yours.

No one except a dumb thief plays with the security of others and then makes himself believe he will be secure. Whereas thinking people, when disaster strikes, make it their priority to look for its causes, in order to prevent it happening again.

But I am amazed at you. Even though we are in the fourth year after the events of September 11th, Bush is still engaged in distortion, deception and hiding from you the real causes. And thus, the reasons are still there for a repeat of what occurred.

Bin Laden (2004c: 1)

Key Macro propositions/Implications

1. Free men do not forfeit their security.
2. We fight because we are free men who don't sleep under oppression.
3. We want to restore freedom to our nation.
4. Just as you lay waste to our nation, so shall we lay waste to yours.
5. When disaster strikes, thinking people make it their priority to look for its causes.
6. Bush is still hiding from you the real causes of September the 11th allowing a repeat of what occurred.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- We fight because we want to restore freedom to our nation for when disaster strikes, thinking people make it their priority to look for its causes but Bush is still hiding from you the real causes of September the 11th allowing a repeat of what occurred.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. As stated in the first paragraph of the extract, the thrust of this speech is an explicit warning to the *people* of America as to what they must do to avoid another attack, another 'Manhattan'. The speech is not directed to American leaders and politicians but to the American people at large. The message is that the US people can obtain their security by changing 'the policy of the White House'. At the conclusion to the full speech, Bin Laden says to them: 'I tell you in truth, that your security is not in the hands of Kerry, nor Bush, nor al-Qaida. No. Your security is in your own hands. And every state that doesn't play with our security has automatically guaranteed its own security.' What is therefore implicit in this extract is a naiveté coming from bin

Laden about the role of a people in democratic government. In bin Laden's Letter to America⁹³, bin Laden (2002b: 3) writes: 'The American people have the ability and choice to refuse the policies of their Government and even to change it if they want'. There may be some truth in this but it is certainly easier said than done. Seeing that policies perceived by Muslims as attacks on Islam have been in place for a very long time, it is likely that Bin Laden concludes, as Scheuer (2005b: 1) explains, that the American people as a whole approve of and support anti-Islamic policies. Protesters and anti-war activists staged demonstrations in the US and around the world against the war on Iraq but this did not effect change in US government policy. In the face of a powerful governmental authority the individual's power to change the system is weak even in a democracy. It is possible, as peace activists have shown, but it is not usual. To regard it as a common affair is a simplistic interpretation of an undertaking that is extremely challenging. Bin Laden is therefore holding an impractical outlook of people power in a democracy and entertaining unrealistic expectations of the American people.

Summary and Discussion

Bin Laden seeks to establish that he speaks for an oppressed people who seek their freedom, that there are well-founded reasons why he and his followers strike America and not Sweden, for example. It is an allusion to America's foreign policy which bin Laden claims has been so destructive to the Islamic world and there is also a reference to reciprocal treatment when bin Laden says, '... just as you lay waste to your nation. So shall we lay waste to yours' (Macro proposition 4).

In the final paragraph of the extract, bin Laden builds credibility by attacking Bush for hiding from the American people the 'real causes' of September the 11th. Bin Laden is effectively denying President Bush's repeated accusation that bin Laden and his followers "hate freedom". Bin Laden retorts earlier that, 'we fight because we are free men who don't sleep under oppression' (Macro proposition 2). The extract finishes with the threat from bin Laden that 'the reasons are still there for a repeat of what occurred (i.e. September the 11th)'.

⁹³ There appears to be some controversy whether bin Laden actually wrote this. In the extracts I have drawn upon, I have used an interview or a transcript from a transmission from a reputable source such as al Jazeera to preserve authenticity. However, Michael Scheuer, former head of the CIA's Bin Laden Unit recognises this source as accurate in 'Al-Qaeda's Completed Warning Cycle – Ready to Attack?' of the *Jamestown Foundation* 3/3/2005.

The extract from this text shows a warning from bin Laden to the American people, a warning that is unreasonably formed as to the powers that the American people at large have. What they can do is limited to lobbying government and voting in a new leader who will take a different path which is, to say the least, a long-term venture. It also reiterates bin Laden's views on the oppressive nature of US foreign policy toward Islam, his reciprocal treatment policy and a challenge to Bush as to what free men do.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- People of America, your security is in your own hands.
- Just as you lay waste to our nation, so we lay waste to yours.
- We fight because we are free men who don't sleep under oppression.

Text: 13

Type: This is an extract of an English transcript of Osama bin Laden's speech from an audiotape sent to al-Jazeera.

Date: The date is 19 January 2006.

We do not object to a long-term truce with you on the basis of fair conditions that we respect.

We are a nation, for which God has disallowed treachery and lying.

In this truce, both parties will enjoy security and stability and we will build Iraq and Afghanistan, which were destroyed by the war.

There is no defect in this solution other than preventing the flow of hundreds of billions to the influential people and war merchants in America, who supported Bush's election campaign with billions of dollars.

Hence, we can understand the insistence of Bush and his gang to continue the war.

. . . I would like to tell you that the war is for you or for us to win. If we win it, it means your defeat and disgrace forever as the wind blows in this direction with God's help.

If you win it, you should read the history. We are a nation that does not tolerate injustice and seek revenge forever.

Days and nights will not go by until we take revenge as we did on 11 September, God willing, and until your minds are exhausted and your lives become miserable and things turn [for the worse], which you detest.

As for us, we do not have anything to lose. The swimmer in the sea does not fear rain. You have occupied our land, defiled our honour, violated our dignity, shed our blood, ransacked our money, demolished our houses, rendered us homeless, and tampered with our security. We will treat you in the same way.

You tried to deny us the decent life, but you cannot deny us a decent death. Refraining from performing jihad, which is sanctioned by our religion, is an appalling sin. The best way of death for us is under the shadows of swords.

Bin Laden (2006a: 3)

Key Macro propositions/Implications

1. We present a long-term truce to you on the basis of fair conditions.
2. By having this truce, it will prevent the money going to the war merchants in America.
3. We understand therefore Bush and his gang's insistence to continue the war.
4. If we win the war it means your defeat and disgrace forever.
5. If you win the war, as a nation we will seek revenge as on September the 11th.
6. As for us, we do not have anything to lose for you have taken everything from us.
7. The best way of death for us is under the shadows of swords.

Overall Macro proposition/Implication

- Presenting a truce to you will prevent money going to the war merchants in America so we understand Bush and his gang's insistence to continue the war but if we win the war it means your defeat and disgrace forever and if you win the war we will seek revenge as on September the 11th for we do not have anything to lose because you have taken everything from us and the best way of dying for us is under the shadows of swords.

Lexical Choice

Bin Laden's lexical choice in his reference to Bush and his supporters as "Bush and his gang" and "the war merchants in America" means that the truce is not couched in the language of sincerity. Such a choice works to nullify any good intentions bin Laden may have. As Bush shows no respect for his enemy, bin Laden shows no respect for his. Choice of language thus indicates a strong possibility that the offer could be intended to be rejected.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. Implicit within the text and raised under Lexical Choice above is the question, Why is the offer of truce made? If the offer of truce is not sincere, then one has to ask why the offer was made. One reason could simply be to confirm to Bin Laden's supporters that he is alive. Another could be that he wants to be seen to be doing the honourable

and fair thing but political considerations prevent him from being sincere. If the truce *is* meant sincerely, it may be because bin Laden is formulating it from a position of weakness as the underdog perhaps or at least much smaller than a superpower.

Hyperbole

The third last paragraph on the subject of revenge contains hyperbole: “Days and nights will not go by until we take revenge as we did on 11 September . . .” Do the attacks of September 11 reduce down to “revenge”? In October 2001, Bin Laden spoke eloquently about jihad being an Islamic duty, about the ‘values’ of this Western civilisation being destroyed, about the attacks being directed against the military and economic power of the US (Bin Laden 2002c:2). Revenge is really another thing. Asghar Ali Engineer, progressive Muslim thinker, emphasises that Islam does not permit killing for revenge. There is no role for revenge in Islam. Thus revenge killing is not a religious act (Engineer 2001: 5).

Summary and Discussion

Bin Laden claims that he’d be supportive of a truce with the US so that he and his followers can build Iraq and Afghanistan. But it is likely his own position is strategically weak. At the time of his recording, January 2006, Bin Laden would have been aware of the success of Iraq’s election in December and the failure of al-Qaeda to establish local support among Iraq’s people (Hutchens 2006,:1; DHinMI 2006: 1-2). As DHinMI (2006: 2) contends, one of the least discussed dynamics in Iraq was⁹⁴ the apparent ideological and strategic rift between the leader of Al Qaeda in Iraq, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and the bin Laden/Zawahiri-led al Qaeda “establishment”. Zarqawi had begun advocating expanding operations in Iraq to fighting Shiites and inciting sectarian war between Iraq’s Sunni and Shiites. This rift was confirmed by John Tierney, member of the US Congress who pointed out that bin Laden objected to Zarqawi’s targeting of Shiites (Report of the US House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence 2006: 5).

Also, conflict in Iraq has developed between the indigenous insurgents and the Jihadis with the Iraqis turning against the Jihadis. By early 2006, the split between the Sunni insurgents and the Zarqawi-led foreign fighters had grown dramatically, and Sunni insurgents began targeting al Qaeda forces for assassination. Iraqis were increasingly saying that they regard al Qaeda as a ‘foreign-led force, whose extreme religious goals and desires for sectarian war against Iraq’s Shiite majority override Iraqi tribal and nationalist traditions’ (Tavernise and Filkins 2006: 1). On January 13 2006 Army Lt. Gen. John R. Vines, commanding general

⁹⁴ Abu Musab al-Zarqawi was killed in an air strike 06.08.2006 (BBC NEWS 2006: 3).

of Multinational Corps Iraq and the 18th Airborne Corps said that ‘Al Qaeda is increasingly in disarray’ (Gilmore 2006: 1) although it must be kept in mind that the US Army may have political reasons for declaring this.

If the truce *is* meant sincerely, then what this message does I believe is highlight the real troubles bin Laden and al Qaeda are facing at this juncture. Rather than exalting over an imminent victory, bin Laden goes on to discuss the revenge that will be taken if al Qaeda loses the war. The word “revenge” is interesting in this context. As stated above in hyperbole, revenge is different to the symbolic strikes against western civilisation that embodied September 11. In the very next line Bin Laden says, ‘As for us, we do not have anything to lose’ which is followed by an eloquent listing of the execrable acts committed upon Muslims by the West. It sounds as if Bin Laden may be fatigued and stressed, but still very much alive and making his presence felt. What he has accomplished in this message is to confirm that he is alive, a very big issue for his supporters. However, one cannot positively rule out that if the truce is meant sincerely then there is the possibility that he *is* offering the closest thing to an olive branch that there has been in this conflict. In choosing between this possibility and the possibility that al-Qaeda are facing difficulties, I choose the more pragmatic alternative which is that al-Qaeda are facing difficulties.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- Bin Laden’s offer of truce highlights Al-Qaeda’s problems.
- Bin Laden’s context of revenge contradicts meaning in September 11 symbolic strikes against Western civilisation.

Text: 14

Type: This is an extract of an English transcript of Osama bin Laden’s speech from an audiotape sent to al-Jazeera.

Date: The date is 23 April 2006.

The war is a responsibility shared between the people and the governments. The war goes on and the people are renewing their allegiance to their rulers and masters.

They send their sons to armies to fight us and they continue their financial and moral support while our

countries are burned and our houses are bombed and our people are killed.

Bin Laden (2006b: 1)

Macro propositions/Implications

1. The war is a responsibility shared between the people and their governments.
2. As the war goes on the people renew their allegiance to their rulers and masters.
3. As the war goes on their governments send their sons to armies to fight us.
4. As the war goes on governments continue their financial and moral support.
5. As the war goes on our countries are burned and our houses are bombed and our people are killed.

Overall Macro proposition

- Our countries are burned and our houses are bombed and our people are killed as the war goes on and while their governments continue their financial and moral support and send their sons to armies to fight us, people renew their allegiance to their rulers and their masters showing that war is a responsibility shared between the people and their governments.

Implicit or Indirect Meanings

1. Implicit in this excerpt is the subject of the people's status in a democratic government. This was touched on in Text 12. It is here presented in Macro propositions 1 and 2. Bin Laden does not perceive the people in a democratic society as innocent; they are in allegiance with the elected government. While this may be theoretically true, practically it is a naïve vision that, for bin Laden, paves the way for legitimating the killing of innocents.

Summary and Discussion

Democracy is perhaps the most complex and difficult of all forms of government. It is filled with tensions and contradictions and is not designed for efficiency but for accountability: a democratic government may not be able, for example, to act as quickly as a dictatorship. Democracy provides the people with the opportunity to express themselves in electoral processes. This happened in the November 2006 election in the US. The American people spoke loudly in this election, removing from office many of those who shared President Bush's thinking on the Iraq issue. The Democrats won control of both houses of Congress for the first time since 1994.

However, when there is reason to doubt whether those elected are heeding the people's will, there is a responsibility for the people to speak with an even louder voice and this includes various forms of demonstration. In considering the Vietnam War, for example, from 1965, when the first troops landed in Vietnam, to 1973, when the last troops left, there were thousands of protests against the war. These protests grew from representing a small minority of American students to the majority of the country (Katch 2007: 1). The American antiwar movement played a major role in ending the war but gathering the machinery of protest took time. So nearly four years into US combat in Iraq, the antiwar movement has yet to generate the kind of mass protest seen during the Vietnam War. In January 2007, however, peace activists from across the US gathered in Washington in what was the largest demonstration to date against the Iraq War (Glantz 2007: 1).

Bin Laden's expectations that democracy is a fast track process are misguided. His notion that the people share power with the government to a great extent is flawed. He cannot base the killing of innocent people on this premise. As ever, bin Laden is mindful and eloquent as to his people's sufferings.

Emergent Lines of Argument

- Because war is a responsibility shared between the people and their governments, all people collectively lose their innocence in war paving the way for them to become legitimate targets.
- As the war goes on the people of our countries continue to be assaulted.

As was done with the Bush texts, I present the information derived from the Emerging Lines of Argument in tabular form. This is shown in Table 9.2 below.

Table 9.2 Lines of Argument Emerging from CDA performed on Bin Laden Texts

Text	Emergent Lines of Argument
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The notion of injustice has played a major role in determining Bin Laden's future actions. • Bin Laden is given to simplification of complex realities as when he attests that he and his mujahideen brought down a superpower.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through complicity with the US presence, the ruling elite of Saudi

	<p>Arabia have surrendered legitimacy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The behaviour of the Saudi regime has compromised the practice of Islam.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We want to bring the Americans to fight us on Muslim land. • If we can fight the Americans on our own territory we will beat them.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are the victims of a growing war on Islam for which the US should be censured. • It is a sacrilege against Islam for the Americans to have occupied the land of the two Holy Places. • It is necessary to find ways of correcting what has happened to the Islamic world. • It is necessary to return the people's rights to them. • Al-Qaeda youths aim to kill Americans who are enemies of God, for they will be doubly rewarded than fighting those not from the people of the book. • My Muslim brothers of the world, you must act to dispel the enemy, the Americans and the Israelis, out of the sanctities of Islam.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the US wants the jihad to stop, then it must desist from aggressive intervention against Muslims all over the world. • The US wants to impose its rule which is not based on what God has revealed. • If we refuse to comply with US imposition of rule, the US will call us "terrorists". • The US is a leader of crime and terrorism in the world.
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ruling to kill Americans and their allies is justified within the Islamic interpretation of jihad. • Bin Laden aims to reinstate Islam to its former standing as part of a violent struggle aimed toward ultimately achieving peace.
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bin Laden's view of September 11 is that it was a symbolic strike to the Western value system and world order. • Because there have been so many Muslim deaths that have gone unacknowledged, we have the right to reciprocal killing which is justified in law and intellectually.
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Al-Qaeda is only the vanguard of a larger movement whose aim should be to oust the US and its allies from the Middle East. • Al-Qaeda wants to make jihad which should be considered the sixth pillar of Islam a part of the daily life of Muslims.
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Honest Muslims should mobilise the Islamic nation to liberate themselves from renegade ruling regimes which are enslaved by the United States. • Honest Muslims should establish the rule of God on earth.
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is necessary to consider how to find a way out of these adversities. • The confrontation will continue until Judgment Day because the ground rules regarding the fight between right and falsehood will remain in force. • Fundamentalist Islam is a response to Western domination of Islamic countries • Bin Laden seeks to make himself legitimate decision maker and leader.

11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reciprocal treatment is justice. • We accept the label of terrorist but only on the condition that America accepts that it is not only terrorist also but the one who began the injustice and therefore liable to bear the greater blame. • If you attack us, we will attack you but if you refrain from assisting in Washington's war on terrorism, we pledge not to attack.
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People of America, your security is in your own hands. • Just as you lay waste to our nation, so we lay waste to yours. • We fight because we are free men who don't sleep under oppression.
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bin Laden's offer of truce highlights Al-Qaeda's problems. • Bin Laden's context of revenge contradicts meaning in September 11 symbolic strikes against Western civilisation.
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because war is a responsibility shared between the people and their governments, all people collectively lose their innocence in war paving the way for them to become legitimate targets. • As the war goes on the people of our countries continue to be assaulted.

A perusal of Table 9.2 suggests five groupings of the Emergent Lines of Argument in the topics of:

- We, the victims
- Finding ways to correct what has happened to the Islamic world
- Acting to dispel the enemy
- Fundamentalism as a response
- Incongruity in September 11th stories

Each line of argument is allocated to an appropriate grouping in Table 9.2.

Table 9.3 Emergent Lines of Argument from Bin Laden Texts Numbered and Grouped

Grouping	Argument
We, the Victims (V)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The notion of injustice has played a major role in determining bin Laden's future actions. 2. Through complicity with the US presence, the ruling elite of Saudi Arabia have surrendered legitimacy. 3. The behaviour of the Saudi regime has compromised the practice of Islam. 4. We are the victims of a growing war on Islam for which the US should be censured. 5. It is a sacrilege against Islam for the Americans to have occupied the land of the two Holy Places. 6. As the war goes on the people of our countries continue to be assaulted.

<p>Finding Ways to Correct What has Happened to the Islamic World (C)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is necessary to find ways of correcting what has happened to the Islamic world 2. It is necessary to return the people's rights to them. 3. Bin Laden aims to reinstate Islam to its former standing as part of a violent struggle aimed toward ultimately achieving peace. 4. Honest Muslims should establish the rule of God on earth. 5. It is necessary to consider how to find a way out of these adversities. 6. We fight because we are free men who don't sleep under oppression.
<p>Acting to Dispel the Enemy (D)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We want to bring the Americans to fight us on Muslim land. 2. If we can fight the Americans on our own territory we will beat them. 3. Al Qaeda youths aim to kill Americans who are enemies of God, for they will be doubly rewarded than fighting those not from the people of the book. 4. My Muslim brothers of the world, you must act to dispel the enemy, the Americans and the Israelis, out of the sanctities of Islam. 5. If the US wants the jihad to stop, then it must desist from aggressive intervention against Muslims all over the world. 6. If we refuse to comply with US imposition of rule, the US will call us "terrorists". 7. The US is a leader of crime and terrorism in the world. 8. Because there have been so many Muslim deaths that have gone unacknowledged, we have the right to reciprocal killing which is justified in law and intellectually. 9. Honest Muslims should mobilise the Islamic nation to liberate themselves from renegade ruling regimes which are enslaved by the United States. 10. Bin Laden seeks to make himself legitimate decision maker and leader. 11. Reciprocal treatment is justice. 12. We accept the label of terrorist but only on the condition that America accepts that it is not only terrorist also but the one who began the injustice and therefore liable to bear the greater blame. 13. If you attack us, we will attack you but if you refrain from assisting in Washington's war on terrorism, we pledge not to attack. 14. People of America, your security is in your own hands. 15. Just as you lay waste to our nation, so we lay waste to yours. 16. Because war is a responsibility shared between the people and their governments, all people collectively lose their innocence in war paving the way for them to become legitimate targets.
<p>Fundamentalism as a Response (F)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bin Laden is given to simplification of complex realities as when he attests that he and his mujahideen brought down a superpower. 2. The US wants to impose its rule which is not based on what God has revealed.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The ruling to kill Americans and their allies is justified within the Islamic interpretation of jihad. 4. Al-Qaeda is only the vanguard of a larger movement whose aim should be to oust the US and its allies from the Middle East. 5. Al-Qaeda wants to make jihad which should be considered the sixth pillar of Islam a part of the daily life of Muslims. 6. Honest Muslims should establish the rule of God on Earth. 7. The confrontation will continue until Judgment Day because the ground rules regarding the fight between right and falsehood will remain in force. 8. Fundamentalist Islam is a response to Western domination of Islamic countries.
Incongruity in September 11 Stories (S)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bin Laden's view of September the 11th is that it was a symbolic strike to the Western value system and world order. 2. Bin Laden's offer of truce highlights al-Qaeda's problems. 3. Bin Laden's context of revenge contradicts meaning in September the 11th symbolic strikes against Western civilization.

In the following discussion lines of argument strands are grouped as they appear in Table 9.3 in the following order: We, the Victims, Finding Ways to Correct What has Happened to the Islamic World, Acting to Dispel the Enemy, Fundamentalism as a Response and Incongruity in September 11 Stories.

Discussion on Lines of Argument relating to We, the Victims

The essential claim that underlies bin Laden's rhetoric and actions is that Muslims are victims. Muslims have been victimized by the West. Postcolonialism discussed in Chapter Four and Chapter Six established that Islam has suffered mainly through Western imperialism. It is true that the Western presence, principally American, brought by oil, infiltrated Arabian life to the fullest. This changed Riyadh, the Saudi capital, to a major metropolis bringing an incursion of foreign people whose presence in Saudi Arabia, the birthplace of Islam, is seen by many as a desecration. Such a desecration is itself a violence. Saudi Arabia is perceived by Muslims as the cradle of Islam where access is restricted to non-Muslims (Lewis 1998: 18). It is also true that Islam in its entirety has been subject to marginalising forces by the West for a much longer period. This could perhaps be dated to the 16th century when the Ottoman Empire began to grant Capitulations to European powers which gave those powers liberal concessions (Islam and Islamic History in Arabia and the Middle East 2004:1). There was then the French invasion of Egypt in the 18th century, the seizure of the Magreb in the 19th century and the British and French carve-up after World

War One. In addition there is the more contemporary conflict, between Islam and the West, where Muslims are being killed and of which bin Laden speaks so passionately such as the massacres at Qana, Tajakistan, Burma, Cashmere, Assam, Philippines, Fatani, Ogadin, Somalia, Erithria, Chechnia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina as well as the blood spilling that has gone on in Palestine and Iraq for which he holds the West, particularly America, responsible (Text 4, First Extract) (Bin Laden 1996:2).

The notion of injustice has played a major role in determining bin Laden's actions (V1). This is seen in bin Laden's involvement in the anti-Soviet jihad. This defensive jihad against an enemy which sought to eliminate Islam from the country (Scheuer 2005a: 10) touched him profoundly (Text 1) which undoubtedly contributed later to his anger at both the US presence in Saudi Arabia and the Saudi regime itself for allowing this presence (V2, V5). To bin Laden, the behaviour of the Saudi regime compromised the practice of Islam (V3). For bin Laden, his stand is principally against the United States which he considers an evil entity with a long record of vilifying Islam and devastating Muslims. What he wants is for all US aggression towards the entire Muslim world to cease (Text 5, First Extract) (Arnett 1997:2). Bin Laden's anger is provoked by unjust US actions in the Middle East. He sees in US policies a clear favouring of Christian and Jewish interests which is substantiated in the text critique by references to Mearsheimer and Walt (2006a: 30.32; 2006b: 57) (Text 5, Second Extract) (Arnett 1997:4). Bin Laden sees that he and his people are victims of a growing war on Islam for which the US should be censured (V4). As this war goes on, now currently entrenched in Iraq, bin Laden sees that Islamic peoples continue to be victims (V6). His is a voice for the people of Islam who suffer this ongoing and deepening marginalisation.

Discussion on Lines of Argument relating to Finding Ways to Correct What has Happened to the Islamic World.

Angered by the Saudi regime's betrayal and embrace of foreign occupation, bin Laden and fellow reformers persistently took up the issue with influential members of the regime. Petition after petition only met with rejection and ridicule. More memoranda and petitions were sent based on a Shari'ah approach pointing out the anomalies in the regime's foundations but these all were to no avail with some of the petitioners being humiliated and imprisoned (Ranstorp 1998: 325). Bin Laden demonstrated that he exhausted all avenues of

peaceful remonstrance (Scheuer 2006: 13). Thus for bin Laden, the move from petition to arms was preceded by a long period of peaceful and law-abiding agitation.

But it was necessary to find ways of correcting what happened to the Islamic world (C1); it was necessary to return the people's rights to them (C2). Time and again bin Laden poses the question as to how to find a way out of these adversities (C5). As Esposito (1999: 280) contends, there is a 'tendency in the international system to regard those in power as legitimate rulers or governments, regardless of how they came to power or whether they are autocratic or repressive'. Bin Laden's words impart gravity and resolve to the matter: 'It is no longer possible to be quiet'. It is not acceptable to give a blind eye to this matter' (Text 4) (Bin Laden 1996: 5). Bin Laden ultimately comes to the conclusion, as many revolutionaries before him have done, that the time for supplication is over, that it is a time to fight. This particular moment has arisen in the histories of many nations many times. As a consequence, rebels or freedom fighters as they are sometimes known, have organised and worked to overthrow the existing political order for a political cause. Sometimes they have been successful, sometimes not but this has been a feature of politics for centuries. Why do they risk their reputations, their comfort, their safety? Bin Laden gets to the heart of the matter: 'We fight because we are free men who don't sleep under oppression' (C6).

So the impending violence is not just violence for its own sake. There is a rejection of the legitimacy of the government of the day, the Saudi regime, and its foreign sponsors, the US. Bin Laden's aim is to reinstate Islam to its former standing as part of a violent struggle aimed toward ultimately achieving peace (C3). His vision is that honest Muslims should establish the rule of God on earth (C4). As discussed in text 9, however, bin Laden is not a member of the Ulema, the learned class of Muslim scholars engaged in Islamic Studies. He does not therefore have the authority to be demanding this yet bin Laden does not claim to be anything he is not. In spite of his lack of formal Islamic credentials, he is a defender of his faith whose voice has a very wide appeal across the Muslim world which attests to the fact that his high ideals and ruthless deeds have earned him the respect of many Muslims.

Discussion on Lines of Argument relating to Acting to Dispel the Enemy

Bin Laden's exhortation that honest Muslims should mobilise the Islamic nation to liberate themselves from renegade ruling regimes which are enslaved by the United States (D9) illustrates the concepts that underlie the fight taken by bin Laden and his Al-Qaeda organisation. It is a worldview in which they are the vanguard of forces that will ultimately

liberate Muslim lands from areas such as Jordan, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Yemen in order that bin Laden's brand of Islam can prevail. Bin Laden had first issued this call to arms to his Muslim brothers in 1996 to dispel the enemy, the Americans and Israelis, out of the sanctities of Islam, the land of the two Holy Places (D4). Bin Laden claimed that the Al Saud regime through the inviting of "crusader forces" to occupy sacred land and the suspension of Shari'ah Law threatened the existence of Islamic principles (Text 4).

Just as bin Laden's forces are seen as terrorists by the US, the US is seen by bin Laden as a leader of crime and terrorism in the world (D7). Bin Laden perceives that if he and his forces refuse to comply with US imposition of rule, the US will call them "terrorists" (D6). But why should the US domination go unacknowledged? Why should bin Laden accept Western rhetoric on terrorism? Bin Laden's reply is that he accepts the label of terrorist but only on the condition that America accepts that it is not only terrorist but the one who began the injustice and therefore liable to bear the greater blame (D12). If the US wants the jihad to stop, then it must desist from aggressive intervention against Muslims all over the world (D5). Bin Laden does seek to make himself legitimate decision maker and leader (D10). He speaks of reciprocal killing as justice (D11). Because there have been so many Muslim deaths that have gone unacknowledged, he argues that he and his forces have the right to reciprocal killing which is justified in law and intellectually (D8). He warns the people of America that their security is in their own hands (D14): 'Just as you lay waste to our nation, so we lay waste to yours' (D15) (Text 12) (Bin Laden 2004c: 1). As far as the War on Terror is concerned, bin Laden informs all countries that if they attack, he will attack but if they refrain from assisting in Washington's War on Terror, he pledges not to attack (D13). It can clearly be seen that for bin Laden, Islam means standing up for your rights and actively fighting against tyranny and oppression. As Ahmed (1999b: 694) said in 1999 his words find resonance in the Muslim world and I think that is also very true today.

However, as much as bin Laden eloquently cites the Quran to support his moves to jihad, there is a problem in his philosophy with the killing of innocents. As discussed in Text 6, the jihad he is calling for the killing of civilians or innocents is really an offensive jihad which required the caliph/imam's authority and drew upon the religious unity of the entire Muslim community. The killing of civilians or innocents is therefore not sanctioned by the Quran in bin Laden's context. However, bin Laden explicitly calls for this (D3, D8, D11). Looking

through his ideological lens reveals a belief that because war is a responsibility shared between the people and their governments, all people collectively lose their innocence in war which paves the way for them to become legitimate targets (D16). To bin Laden, the people in a democratic society are in allegiance with the elected government; they are not innocent. This is a very thin line of argument indeed. As early as 1996, however, bin Laden expressed a wish to bring Americans to fight him on Muslim land (D1). He claimed that if he and his forces fought the Americans on their own territory, they would beat them (D2). The targeting of innocents should therefore not be considered a form of weakness on bin Laden's part. Iraq is providing fertile ground for bin Laden's forces to combat American military.

The influence of the ideologue Sayyid Qutb appears to have shaped bin Laden's thought with respect to killing innocents. Qutb's philosophy broadens the concept of defensive jihad by changing the meaning of the word "defence" to the "defence of man" (Text 6) (Qutb 1990: 50). This is not just a question of semantics. When this broad meaning of the word "defence" is taken, according to Qutb (1990: 50-51), the true character of Islam is revealed proclaiming the universal freedom of *every* person. What this means, Qutb contends, is that Islam becomes the way of life 'ordained by Allah for all mankind' and Jihad in Islam strives to make this system of life prevail in the world (Qutb 1990: 62). Hence, by implication and using Qutb's concept, defensive jihad can rightly be extended to include the civilians of one's enemy.

What is at issue is the basic question, Does bin Laden hold authority in Islamic terms to be issuing fatawa and promoting himself as a spokesperson for Islam, a self-proclaimed prophet? It is true bin Laden's February 1998 fatwa was followed by the support of 40 Afghan clerics calling for a jihad against the Americans in a fatwa in March 1998 and a further support of a group of Pakistan-based clerics in a fatwa in April 1998. So what is clear is that bin Laden certainly does have some form of membership among Islamic clerics. What of the Muslim population at large? Daniel Pipes reports according to survey research finds, in separate polls both overseen by US organisations, that fully one quarter of the populations in Pakistan and the Palestinian Authority consider the September the 11th attacks acceptable according to the laws of Islam (Pipes 2001: 2). In the aftermath of the attacks, people in parts of the Muslim world expressed jubilation. People shared sweets and chanted slogans against America (Ahmed 2005: 105). These facts are suggestive that a significant body of Muslim

opinion is in agreement with bin Laden's philosophy and methods but as to legitimate Islamic authority, I believe bin Laden does not possess this.

Discussion on Lines of Argument relating to Fundamentalism as a Response

Bin Laden was given to the simplification of complex realities when he attested that he and his mujahideen brought down a superpower (F1). This simplifying down of complexities can be seen in his Islamic orientation which can be called "fundamentalist". It is necessary to briefly examine the characteristics of Islamic fundamentalism in order to investigate bin Laden's response to the West. A portrait of an Islamic Fundamentalist was given in Chapter Four using the perspective of Monroe and Kreidie (1997). A chief feature of this portrait is that there is no separation between the private and the political: it aims to bring all society under the sovereignty of God. This is clearly illustrated in bin Laden's case when he exclaims that the US imposes agents to rule the Muslim world 'based not on what God has revealed' (F2). Bin Laden's retreat into a fundamentalist position can be seen as a reaction to Western hegemony and Postcolonialism. In order to clarify this statement it is necessary to examine some other attributes of Islamic fundamentalism.

While there is no accepted definition of this term, Islamic fundamentalism, it carries with it both positive and negative aspects. I now examine three further perspectives. Toshio Kuroda, a professor at the International University of Japan, emphasizes the positive aspects. He defines an Islamic fundamentalist as a person who is trying to go back to the original teaching of Islam in the 7th century and to reinterpret her/his beliefs in today's world. S/he tries to strengthen the social solidarity of believers and positively develop the quality of her/his community by purifying her/his own beliefs as a catalyst and thereby facilitate political and social reform in the end. The social aspects of Islam are thus emphasized (Kuroda 2001: 1-2). While Kuroda does not include extremists in his definition, I maintain that the extremist may not be in the fundamentalist but the fundamentalist is in the kind of extremist under study here. In my Text 10 commentary, I stated that bin Laden conceives of Islam as being like a kind of formula where texts are interpreted in a literalistic sense and become the formula to life, a formula which simplifies and orders (Text 10) (Second Extract) (Paragraph 3). This behaviour is seen in Kuroda's profile above. A desire to go back to the original teaching of Islam is also seen in Al Qaeda's wanting to make jihad the sixth pillar of Islam and a part of the daily life of Muslims (F5). In Islam's early days, the Kharijite sect are

said to have claimed that jihad was the sixth pillar of Islam. Today, Ulema have unanimously condemned it as a pillar of Islam (Text 8).

Ahmed (2003) approaches the definition very differently. He says that terms like “fundamentalist”, “terrorist” and “extremist” are very misleading and prefers to use the concepts of “inclusivism” and “exclusivism” to describe these phenomena. These concepts will be explored more fully in Part Three of this thesis. While inclusivists are prepared to accommodate and be influenced by others, exclusivists create social boundaries. They provide social cohesion and group loyalty that *can* facilitate stability in society (Ahmed 2003: 18-19). This can be seen in the environment that Al Qaeda fosters – it gains popularity through its reassertion of cultural identity. Too much rigidity, however, results in violence against the other. Exclusivism needs to be assuaged with compassion otherwise there is a strong possibility that it will lead to conflict and thence to confrontation. Exclusivism looks to simple solutions rather than the complex. (Ahmed 2003: 18-19). This is seen in Text 6 where bin Laden holds that the ruling to kill Americans and their allies is justified within the Islamic interpretation of jihad (F3). A resort to jihad is a far simpler mechanism than the demanding process of dialogue with its uncertain results and necessary follow-ups. Jessica Stern, prominent researcher on the ultimate Islamic conflict, Holy War, comments: ‘The bottom line, I now understand, is that purifying the world through holy war is addictive. Holy war intensifies the boundaries between Us and Them, satisfying the inherently human longing for a clear identity and a definite purpose in life, creating a seductive state of bliss’ (Stern 2003: 137). Bin Laden’s call to jihad, in providing identity and purpose as Stern suggests, offers a personal and social transformative framework which to bin Laden’s followers enables the West to be repelled.

Bin Laden’s fundamentalism is a violent reaction against the modern way of practicing religion. He exhorts “honest Muslims” to “establish the rule of God on earth” (F6) yet he does not have the credentials to do this other than that he is a defender of his faith. By telling Muslims ‘what is good for them and what is not’ (Text 8) (Bin Laden 2001: 3), bin Laden is claiming he knows exactly what Islam says and means and it is along this fundamentalist path that he attempts to steer Muslims. In this there is a claim to know the one and only truth. As Habermas contends, religious orthodoxy leans toward fundamentalism when the representatives of the faith ignore ‘the epistemic situation of a pluralistic society and insist – even to the point of violence – on the universally binding character and political acceptance

of their doctrine' (Borradori 2003: 31). Bin Laden is doing more than just 'awakening' Muslims as he claims in Text 8 (Bin Laden 2001:5). He is actually leading them and spelling out for them what they are to believe. In text 8 he is implying that his is not the entire movement but only the vanguard of a larger movement whose aim should be to oust the US and its allies from the Middle East (F4). So the range of bin Laden's initiatives is extensive – in theory, if the US and its allies leave the holy lands then all will be well. Within the complexity of modern conditions, the exclusivity of such claims is unsustainable. However, it is important to recognise that his political agenda is the goal of jihad projected as a matter of self-defence. It is Islam and the people of Islam that he sees himself defending despite the exclusive language and methods he uses.

Defending the Muslim community from attack through jihad is a political act. As discussed above, the basis of this act is grounded within a fundamentalist configuration. Another aspect of bin Laden's behaviour which is also subsumed under the fundamentalist umbrella is a millenarian one. Bin Laden claims that the confrontation between what he is fighting for and the West will continue until Judgment Day because the ground rules regarding the fight between right and falsehood will remain in force (F7). The emphasised divide between "right" and "falsehood" here is reminiscent of Bush's division between "right" and "wrong". Sandeen (1970) connects fundamentalism with millenarianism in the Western Christian sense, arguing that the Fundamentalist movement of the 1920s in America was only the millenarian movement renamed. The three main monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, all possess millenarian tendencies. Millenarians hold earthly objects and political regimes in low esteem claiming that in the endtimes (the end of time), the current order will be destroyed and all that is good restored at the end. The crucial foundation for millenarianists is a literalistic understanding of scriptural apocalyptic literature (Bouman 1971: 334). Rinehart (2006) argues that millenarian expectations stand at the very core of Al Qaeda doctrine and in the process shape the creed of the movement. Based on textual readings of bin Laden's speeches, I do not agree with this argument. As F7 stated above indicates, there is undeniably a millenarian *aspect* to bin Laden's fundamentalism but he is too focused on the perceived injustices of the West to make this millenarian aspect dictate his *modus operandi*. As David Cook who is known as a US expert on apocalyptic literature says, 'The End of the West, not the End of the World appears to be his primary motivation' (Cook 2001: 2). Although this was written in 2001 and millenarian utterances

have been made since then by bin Laden, his 2001 attacks indicate the touch of a pragmatist and idealist who is very much attached to the realities of this world.

There is speculation that bin Laden may lay claim to the caliphate. While this has millenarian overtones, it would also be very much a political move in fundamentalist terms. Bin Laden has made no explicit reference to the Caliphate. However, in Text 9, Bin Laden (2003: 6-7), the regimes listed for liberation (Islamisation) is suggestive of a move toward the establishment of the Caliphate. In addition his public statements indicate that he may be thinking in these terms. Furnish (2002: 55) lists three reasons to indicate bin Laden is seriously thinking about assuming the Caliphate:

- (1) Bin Laden calls his Afghan base “Khurasan”, a term remembered by Muslims as the area of Afghanistan and central Asia where the eighth century Abbasids launched their quasi-messianic rebellion against the Umayyads, to reestablish the true Caliphate
- (2) Bin Laden takes the lead and issues instructions for all Muslims, in particular regarding the killing of Americans
- (3) Bin Laden reminds Muslims of eighty years of “humiliation” and “disgrace”, a probable reference to the destruction of the Ottoman Caliphate, which occurred eighty years ago

Bin Laden, should he survive, has thus set the stage for a possible caliphal claim. As has been discussed in Bush Text 11 (Bush 2006b: 2), the idea of the caliphate is esteemed by many Muslims. It is not something that is esoteric and deemed completely radical. Seyyed Hossein Nasr, well-known Muslim writer and philosopher, writes reverently of the concept of the caliphate in many of his books⁹⁵. The idea of a restoration of the caliphate possibly serves as a rallying point for many Muslims, particularly those who represent fundamentalist Islam.

Bin Laden’s brand of fundamentalism, however, comes as an expression of Muslims as victims (Text 4, First and Second Extract) (Bin Laden 1996: 2, 3). As has been repeatedly claimed in this thesis, Muslim people have suffered from a sense of great loss and rage at

⁹⁵ See, for example, *An Introduction to Islamic Cosmological Doctrines* (1993) New York: State University, New York Press.

their powerlessness in the face of Western hegemony. This discussion has presented fundamentalism as a reaction to the current world order (F8), a world order in which some Muslims feel they must organise to resist. Bin Laden not only belongs to this tradition of protest against Western power in Muslim lands, he has taken his fundamentalist principles a step further into action. He has created a global network to fight against Western hegemony. A large portion of the world calls this style of fighting “terrorism”. Whatever name it is given, the casualties are not only people in the West who are injured and killed but also young Muslims who are driven into bin Laden’s camp seeking purpose and meaning in their lives, suffering alienation in their existential predicament caused by an unjust world order. Fundamentalism can therefore be seen as a response to Western domination of Islamic countries.

Discussion on Lines of argument relating to Incongruity in September the 11th Stories

In Text 7, bin Laden speaks of the symbolic nature of the 2001 attacks although he had not admitted responsibility for the attacks at that stage. Indications are that the entire Western value system and world order were being targeted. Bin Laden confirms this view in an earlier, unexamined part of the text:

The values of this Western civilization under the leadership of America have been destroyed. Those awesome symbolic towers that speak of liberty, human rights, and humanity have been destroyed. They have gone up in smoke.

(Bin Laden 2002c: 2)

In terms of 9/11 it was not innocent people who were targeted although it must be stressed that innocent people died. It was the symbolic object which was targeted: (the pentagon) military power, (the twin towers) economic power and possibly political power as the fourth hijacked plane which crashed into a field in southern Pennsylvania, was suspected to be bound for a high-profile target (the White House) in Washington. It was the symbolic object which the attacks were intended to demolish. From a postmodern perspective, Bin Laden and his supporters mounted a pure symbolic form of rebellion to the historical and political order (S1).

In Text 13, bin Laden’s offer of truce possibly highlights al-Qaeda’s problems (S2) meaning al-Qaeda is in disarray. This is perhaps the reason why bin Laden has resorted to using the word “revenge” to describe his mission in lieu of the symbolic stance taken earlier. I find

these two perspectives, the symbolic form of rebellion and revenge a contradiction (S3)⁹⁶. That a terrorist act expressed on the level of a symbol can disintegrate into a quest for revenge shows that terrorism presents itself as a response in a situation that keeps on escalating. It is tit for tat. The situation keeps on worsening until one group gives up. Who becomes the most terrorist? Borradori asks this question of Derrida who replies, "I am resorting to terrorism as a last resort, because the other is more terrorist than I am" (Borradori 2003: 107). To determine who the first aggressor, the victim, is, can be a complex affair. It is in this way that wealthy nations or imperialist powers are accused of practicing state terrorism. This forces us to openly ask the question, "Has there been an injustice as bin Laden claims?"

As has been stressed many times in this thesis, Postmodernism and Postcolonialism look to European colonialism as the cause of deep and fierce resentment of Muslim peoples. As Minns (2001: 1-2) argues, the European invaders brought with them their own notions of racial, cultural and religious superiority. They supplanted ways of life and economies with their own while keeping the most lucrative aspects of the economy for themselves. The regimes of the Muslim world which were affected ranged from Northwest Africa to Iran, regimes that were not able to mount an effective resistance. They became colonies or were incorporated into the empires of European powers. Such oppression could only be fought by states which could become stronger Muslim states but how this was to be effected was problematic given the deepening domination of the West.

As discussed in Chapter 6, Muslim populations were geographically defined and organised into states by the colonial powers. When the states became independent they were generally ruled by military elites, as in Algeria, Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Pakistan and other cases. The new states made their goal economic development whether they were defined in capitalist or socialist terms. These programs represented the interests of the political elites who usually promoted the deliberate de-Islamization, if not entire secularization, of their societies (Lapidus 1997:445-446). Even though the new states defined themselves in nationalist terms, the practice was to absorb Islamic loyalties into the national identity. As massive changes in the fabric of society followed, a vast cultural gap opened between elites and the common people. While elites adapted a Western style of living, the common people persisted

⁹⁶ What could be said about the attacks of September the 11th is that while they were not primarily symbolic, they contained a significant symbolic element.

in a traditional lifestyle which meant that the lives of the masses were profoundly disrupted. Thus colonial and then independent states helped to break down traditional forms of social solidarity. Guilds disappeared as did Sufi brotherhoods while migrants flooded from the country to cities looking for work to the detriment of village life (Lapidus 1997: 445-446).

Bin Laden's fundamentalist response is situated as a response to this history as well as the more contemporary grievances that stem from Western intervention into Islamic affairs which have been outlined and analysed in this chapter. Like other fundamentalist movements, bin Laden's movement does not share in political power and most importantly, it does not share in the trappings of the culture of modernity such as consumerism and individual fulfillment although it makes use of modern technology. However, it is a product of modernity as much as it is a reaction to it. Despite having ancient roots, insofar as there is a desire to go back to 7th century interpretations, Islamic fundamentalism is a relatively modern phenomenon. It was not until the 1970s that a political mass Islamic revivalism emerged (Minns 2001: 1). As Euben (1997: 449) claims, Qutb's Islamic fundamentalist political thought (upon which bin Laden draws) and which was discussed in Chapter Seven is both a 'child of modernity and one of its fiercest critics'. The Islamic fundamentalist way of knowing the world is fundamentally different from modern knowledge. The former expresses a yearning for transcendent meaning and certainty while the latter expresses an ability to cope in a world where human beings mould their own definitions of knowledge. Tibi (1995: 20) argues: "At the turn of the twentieth century, we are living in an age of the global confrontation between secular cultural modernity and religious culture. The challenge of Islamic fundamentalism has a most prominent place in this confrontation". So I turn to answer the question posed earlier – if there has been an injustice as bin Laden claims. Modernity has sorely abused its child, Islamic fundamentalism, which, in turn, must fight in order to survive. Yes there has been most assuredly an injustice. Bin Laden is enunciating this injustice not only in the violence of his attacks but also in his discourses. The modern Western view of Islamic fundamentalism is essentially racist. It perceives the actions of bombers ready to kill themselves and others with them as either insanity or as something "mysteriously" buried in Islamic tradition (Minns (2001: 3). A postmodern glance sees Islamic fundamentalism as both product of its colonialist heritage and response to the horrors that Western capitalism has let loose upon the Islamic world; product of modernity and response to modernity's fallout.

Linking the Strands of Argument

The discussion on lines of argument relating to *We, the Victims* establishes that Bin Laden sees Muslims as victims of the hegemonic practices of the West and that in historical and contemporary conflict, Muslims are dying. He sees in US policies an obvious and definite bias toward Christian and Jewish interests while for Muslims, there is war and continuing marginalisation. In the discussion on lines of argument relating to *Finding Ways to Correct What has Happened to the Islamic World*, it is seen that bin Laden and fellow reformers persistently made issue with the Saudi regime concerning its embrace of foreign occupation through petitions based on Shari'ah Law. Bin Laden poses the question time and again as to how to find a way out of the adversities that beset Islam. Bin Laden finds that there is no way out of these adversities through peace. He claims that he and his supporters must fight because they cannot stand by and abide the oppression any longer. Discussion on lines of argument relating to *Acting to Dispel the Enemy* shows bin Laden exhorting honest Muslims to mobilise the Islamic nation to fight for liberation from US enslavement. It is crucial to consider why the US domination should go unacknowledged by the world. Bin Laden refuses to accept Western rhetoric on terrorism and sees the US as a leader of crime and terrorism in the world. If the US wants the jihad to stop, it must stop its intervention against Muslims all over the world. For bin Laden, Islam means standing up for your rights and this means fighting against oppression. However, this involves what we in the West would call the killing of "innocents". Although bin Laden explicitly calls for this, it is not sanctioned by the Quran. Sayyid Qutb's philosophy broadens the concept of defensive jihad, however, to include the civilians of one's enemy and it is from Qutb, it is conjectured, that bin Laden draws. A significant body of Muslim opinion supports bin Laden but does this give bin Laden authority to be a spokesperson for Islam and to be issuing fatawa? Maybe not.

Lines of argument relating to *Fundamentalism as a Response* illuminate differing perspectives of Islamic fundamentalism which include going back to the rigid teaching of Islam in the 7th century and re-interpreting these beliefs for today's world as well as enunciating the wish for a clear identity and purpose in life. Such objectives aid in defining a form of exclusivism which values simple solutions over the complex. This is seen in the willingness of bin Laden to continue the jihad as opposed to his pursuing some form of dialogue even though previous efforts were not productive. The call to jihad, however, fosters solidarity among bin Laden's followers enabling the West to be repelled. It is against Western hegemony that Muslim people have suffered powerlessness and rage. Young

Muslims particularly those who are experiencing alienation are driven into bin Laden's camp seeking purpose and meaning. Thus the terrorist cycle is perpetuated and fundamentalism presents itself as a response to Western domination of Islamic countries. Discussion on lines of argument relating to Incongruity in September the 11 stories highlights the incongruity present between expression of a terrorist act on the level of a symbol and one on the quest for revenge. This discussion also posits that the Islamic fundamentalist way of knowing the world is fundamentally different from modern knowledge. The former seeks certainty in a transcendent realm while the latter devises his/her own definitions of knowledge and the limits to it. Islamic fundamentalism is projected as not only the response to modernity but also its product thus aiding to give bin Laden's claim of injustice validity.

The Counter Discourse Response Labeled "Terrorist": Meaning and Modernity

It has been shown through the analysis and subsequent commentary that a response has been made to the domination of those holding power in the West, i.e. the Bush administration and the neoconservative right. This counter discourse, labeled "terrorist" finds expression in bin Laden's militant action and rhetoric. What meaning can be ascribed to this response in terms of the values of modernity? This has already been touched on in the Chapter but I should like to explore it in more detail here.

In Chapter Three I discussed the passage of thought from modernity to the postmodern. It was seen how the Enlightenment enthroned reason as the source of truth, knowledge and authority. Thus reason became the basis of Western epistemology. By its insistence on divine sovereignty, Islamic fundamentalism rebuts Western rationalist epistemology. In the fundamentalist view the West's rejection of transcendent principles means the impoverishment of morality. This is seen in lines of arguments emerging from the bin Laden Texts. C3 and C4 particularly are arguments for the reinstating of Islam to its former standing and the establishment of the "rule of God on earth". D3 speaks against Americans who are "enemies of God". F2 refers to the US wanting to impose its rule which is not based on "what God has revealed". These connections are not just peculiar to bin Laden's organisation alone. Chapter Seven establishes that Sayyid Qutb is recognised to be the theoretical father of Islamic fundamentalism and extremism. Indeed bin Laden's speeches and discourses and the arguments that derive from these sources are reflected in Qutb's philosophy.

As discussed in Chapter Seven, Qutb (1990) offers a diagnosis of modernity as a condition of *jahiliyyah*, a term specifically meaning ignorance in Arabia prior to the Revelation. Used by Qutb, however, *jahiliyyah* becomes a “condition”, a state of ignorance into which a society falls whenever it deviates from the Islamic way. While ancient *jahiliyyah* was caused by ignorance, modern *jahiliyyah* is an outright denial of God’s authority. The essence of the *jahili* society is a rejection of Allah’s sovereignty in favour of an epistemology where people claim the right to define values and rules and the authority on how life is to be lived. Qutb (1990) argues that the path to true progress, freedom and justice is a rejection of the Western measurement of what constitutes a civilisation and a nurturing of the Islamic society where real moral freedom and justice abound.

Euben (1997: 444) notes that Qutb’s target is not just secularism; he is in the final analysis concerned with the rationalist epistemology that validates secularist power. Euben defines her use of modern rationalism to mean the assumption that truths about the world can be reached by way of human faculties. Euben (1997: 444) argues that such rationalism places human comprehension as the determinant not only of how we come to know the world, but also what constitutes legitimate knowledge. When Qutb rejects human sovereignty, he is rejecting this human centred theory of knowledge, the source of which is located in the European Enlightenment. So what is challenged here is Western rationalist epistemology. This is clear when Qutb (1990: 5-10) argues that the danger to our moral existence is located in philosophy. For it is modern Western philosophy that has allowed enquirers to reach the truth⁹⁷ through reason, to an explicit denial of the authority of divine metaphysical truths both politically and morally. So while bin Laden conceives his enemy to be the Crusader-Zionist alliance, this is only part of his enemy. His other enemy is Western rationalist epistemology but of this it is likely that he is not conscious. In fact the examination of his texts has showed that he is not conscious of this.

Qutb’s evaluation of modernity as a condition of *jahiliyyah* is a direct repudiation of rationalist ways of defining and organising the world. It is a protest lodged not only against Western power and its proxies, but against an epistemology itself that defines what is knowledge and what is worth knowing. This protest is directed against the terms of human comprehension as opposed to divine truths. The division between the West and the Islamic

⁹⁷ I am talking here about modernity and modern values. This is in contrast to postmodernism which I have used to inform this thesis in other places.

fundamentalist reveals a confrontation between two incommensurate ways of knowing the world: a contest between Islamic knowledge and modern secular knowledge, the former expressing fundamentalists' yearning for 'meaning and unwillingness to live in a world of radical doubt', the latter expressing the Western ability to cope with a world in which 'human beings define the parameters of their knowledge and employ such knowledge to create a way of being at home in the world' (Euben 1997: 450).

Tibi (2004: 336-337) claims that the writings of the ideologue Sayyid Qutb demonstrate that the world order posed by these fundamentalists *competes* with Western universalism, i.e. their vision is not simply rhetoric. They are out to implement their ideas according to the means at their disposal. This is seen in bin Laden's conviction that 'this battle is not between al Qaeda and the US. This is a battle of Muslims against the global crusaders' (Bin Laden 2002c: 1). As Tibi would agree, Bin Laden's call for jihad is an Islamic *response*, however, to the powerful Western external threat. It is not an Islamic *initiative*. Lapidus (1997: 457) raises up the example of the Prophet (PBUH) whose teachings and life became the model for Islam, as a founder of a revivalist movement:

He brought religious truth, formed socio-political movements in a conflicted society in the midst of important changes that were breaking down the traditional family and clan solidarity. In a cultural atmosphere rife with competing pagan, shrine based, and monotheistic religious views, he brought a clarifying religious vision. As a response to the political and economic stresses of the time he organized the first of the Islamic "reform" movements, set the precedent for waging war and forming an Islamic state in the name of Islamic ideals and in the interest of Muslim peoples. The example of the Prophet ... implicitly underlies all revivalist tendencies throughout Islamic history. The revivalist movements of the present era, then, are a response to and an expression of Muslim modernity, but they are also rooted in a deep historical and cultural paradigm for how Muslim peoples should cope with changing political, economic and cultural realities.

Lapidus (1997: 457)

Bin Laden's call to arms is located in the Western discourse of modernity: the Islamic fundamentalism that describes his movement is both a product and response of modernity. His call to arms in some ways resembles that of the Prophet (PBUH) who organised the first of the Islamic "reform" movements. These ways includes setting the precedent for waging war and working for an Islamic state in the interest of Muslim peoples.

Conclusion

Fourteen (14) texts originating from Osama bin Laden have been presented and analysed. The picture of the man that emerges shows that he is at once multi-talented, practical, passionate and single-minded and can articulate the Muslim position with a voice that has

wide appeal. Bin Laden offers meaning and a cause to believe in to many young Muslims who respond with enthusiasm to this appeal. Bin Laden's form of Islamic fundamentalism is a response to Western domination of Islamic countries. For bin Laden, it is not acceptable to go on without acknowledging this domination and fighting against it. His political agenda is jihad as self-defence. In steering Muslims along a fundamentalist path, however, and telling them what they should and should not do in terms of their religion, bin Laden is a man who claims to know the mind of God. This claim is one of absolute truth. Such simplistic thinking produces a world where Muslims are perpetually pitted against Jews and Christians. While Bin Laden's fundamentalism promotes Muslims as victims, there is an historical basis to this proposal. The West has imposed its hegemony based upon neoliberal ideals on the world. This has marginalised the peoples of Islam allowing fundamentalism to emerge as a response. Fundamentalism is neither the cause nor the solution to the crisis in our world. Islamic fundamentalism is better seen as fallout from and response to modernity. It is Western rationalist epistemology that is being challenged in favour of divine truths, a rejection of Enlightenment values and an embrace of the sovereignty of Allah. These are two incommensurate ways of knowing the world.

Both Bush and bin Laden have claimed the moral high ground in the present conflict. Each possesses a black and white moralistic view of their positions. From his own perspective, each claims to know truth. Chapter Eight exposed the discursive reproduction of domination in society by those holding power, i.e. the Bush Administration and the neoconservative right while this present Chapter shows how a response has been made through Islam in the development of a counter discourse, which can be labeled "terrorist", to those hegemonic discourses. The following Part will explore how dialogue can be a possible means of addressing terrorism.