

Lund's University
Department of Political Science

STV 004
Autumn 2006
Tutor: Bo Petersson

Terror- The Invisible and Ubiquitous Hydra

**A Study on the Problematic Nature of the Bush Administration's
War on Terrorism**

Toomaj Jahanbani

Abstract:

In this Master's thesis, the Bush administration's "war on terrorism" is examined. Taking a discursive approach, the study seeks to explicate how the "war on terror" has been linked to the concept of identity and ultimately to cast light on the problematic implications of the discourse. A fundamental aim in this regard has been to address a recent US intelligence report whose findings have indicated that the Iraq war- which the Bush administration has called the central front in the "war on terrorism"- has increased rather than diminished the terror threat against the United States. The theoretico-empirical analysis demonstrates that the Bush administration has failed to identify a main target and a tangible objective in its "war on terror" and that the identity construction has taken place in the cloak of oversimplified and absolutist dichotomies. The overall conclusion is that far from eliminating the multifaceted enemy, the discourse "war on terrorism" has produced the very "terrorists" it has sought to uproot.

Keywords: War on terror/terrorism, Discourse, Identity, George W Bush, Bush administration,

Additional Explanations

Borrowed Kettle:

Refers to an ensemble of inconsistent arguments, cited by Freud in the following way.

- 1) I never borrowed a kettle from you
- 2) I returned it to you intact
- 3) The kettle was already broken when I got it from you

Organization of Islamic Conference:

The highest supranational body of Muslim states.

Preemptive/Preventive War

Preemptive war is launched when it is clear that another country is about to attack. Preventive war, forbidden under international war, is waged before the attacked country poses an imminent threat.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Statement of Purpose.....	2
3. Methodological Considerations.....	3-4
4. Material and Limitations.....	5
5. Operationalisation of Key Concepts.....	6
5.1.1 Discourse.....	6
5.1.2 Power.....	6
5.1.3 Identity.....	7
6. Theoretical Considerations.....	8
6.1 Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory.....	8-9
7. Empirical Context.....	10
7.1.1. The Resurrection of a Suppressed and Ominous “Other”.....	10
7.1.2. “Good” declares “War” on “Evil”.....	10-12
7.1.3. An Unconventional War against an Elusive Enemy.....	12-14
7.1.4 Axis of Evil- The Stratagemical and Unholy Alliance between “Terrorists”.....	14-16
7.1.5. The Dice is Cast- All Roads lead to Baghdad.....	16-17
7.1.6. Iraq- The Borrowed Kettle.....	18
7.1.7. The Empty Signifier of Freedom.....	18-19
7.1.8. Terror- The Invisible and Ubiquitous Hydra.....	19-21
8. Summarizing Discussion- A Critical Assessment of Laclau and Mouffe’s theory.....	22-24
9. Concluding Remarks.....	25
10. References.....	26-34
Appendix 1- George W Bush’s Presidential Address to the Nation 11 September.....	35-36
Appendix 2- Excerpt from George W. Bush’s Address to the Joint Session of Congress Washington, DC September 20, 2001.....	37-42
Appendix 3- Excerpt from George W. Bush’s State of the Union Washington, DC January 29, 2002.....	43-48
Appendix 4- Excerpt from George W. Bush’s State of the Union Address Washington, DC January 28, 2003.....	49-54
Appendix 5- George W. Bush, Iran & The War on Terror: Address to the Military Officers Association of America Washington, DC September 5, 2006.....	54-63

1. Introduction

On September 11 2001, 19 terrorist hijackers launched the most devastating terrorist attacks ever on American soil. Crashing two airplanes into World Trade Center and one into Pentagon, they struck at the financial and military heartland of the world's only remaining superpower, killing close to 3000 people. These unprecedented terrorist attacks have marked a dramatic turning point in international politics, George W Bush declaring a "war on terrorism". The 9/11 attacks and its aftermath has furthermore brought to the fore the ineluctable pertinence of identity in the realm of politics. From the outset the Bush administration has argued that it is engaged in a different kind of war against a different kind of enemy. In the course of this ongoing "war" which has seen the fall of the Taleban regime in Afghanistan and the Baathist regime of Saddam Hussein in Iraq, the US President has continuously claimed that his country is winning the "war on terrorism". In reality, an unconventional war against an unconventional enemy has turned out to be a highly problematical one, outlined in the findings of a major intelligence report in April 2006, based on that the terror threat against the United States has increased rather than diminished. Why then has terror taken the shape of a breeding hydra? In order to shed light on the problematic nature of the "war on terror", one must first grasp the Bush administration's understanding of terrorism and the multifaceted enemy. The elusive character of the "war on terror" and its concomitant problematic implications cannot be elucidated without scrutinizing the pronounced intentions and objectives of its author.

2. Problem formulation and Statement of Purpose

The overall aim of this Master's thesis is to problematize the Bush-administration's "war on terrorism". The background to my scientific inquiry is a major US intelligence report whose findings have indicated that the terror threat against the United States has increased rather than diminished despite the intensive and far-flung counterterrorism efforts of the Bush administration. The broadness of the subject necessitating a clear-cut demarcation, the focal point of my study will be the articulation of the Bush administration's war rhetoric and its problematic implications. Moreover, the study will be approached from the perspective of identity. Succinctly put, my endeavor is to cast light on following questions marks: What has been the objective and hence the target of the Bush-administration's "war on terrorism"? How has this "war" been related to the question of identity? What problematic implications have followed from the Bush administration's articulation of the "war on terrorism"? The first question has an empirical character while the second is theory-oriented. In addressing the third and final question, the empirical and theoretical part will be interwoven. At the outset, it must be stated that the questions are inexorably intertwined and overlap each other, which implicates that they cannot be examined in a strict chronological order.

3. Methodological considerations:

Insofar as my aim is to look into the Bush administration's "war on terror" as a case study, I will adopt a discursive approach. The reason is that while articulated by a given institution, the complex and wider implications of the "war on terror" goes well beyond the formalist rules of power institutions, trivializing an all too restricted focus on their logic and hence the institutionalist perspective. The feminist approach can be fruitful to the extent that it challenges the naturalist premises of metaphysics (Haslanger 2000: 107). However, mainstream feminism fails itself to transcend the essentialist and reductionist focus on gender in power relations to the detriment of other important identity-based perspectives such as class, religion, nation and race, acknowledged by black feminist scholars (Abbott & Wallace 1998: 60). Furthermore, the "war on terror" cannot be measured and quantified in positivistic fashion (Lundquist 1993: 42), and thus be either verified or falsified in the quest for an objective truth (Popper 2003: 90). Nor can the "war on terror" be posited as the ideological phantom of an underlying structure obscuring and distorting the true nature of reality which must be unmasked in furtherance of a liberating truth. Rather it is a response to a major historical event, specific in time and contingent in character. Above all, the "war on terror" is a discourse which has to be subject of deconstruction so that the coherence of its own internal logic can be scrutinized.

Postmodern and poststructural thought, having an indelible influence on the discursive approach, begins its philosophical trajectory by impugning ontological essentialism and epistemological foundationalism. More specifically, the total philosophies of history, meta-narratives such as Hegelianism or Marxism, propounding the grandiose claim to have grasped the ultimate truth, are challenged (Lyotard 1979: 7). In this regard, Nietzsche's strident attacks on the project of objective, scientific truth (Nietzsche 2001: 200f) and implacable hostility to the essentialist underpinnings of metaphysics in general (Nietzsche 1989: 10), have served as major source of inspiration for great poststructural and postmodern thinkers such as Michel Foucault (Foucault 1988: 8, 32), Jacques Derrida (Derrida 2002: 35).

The discursive approach does not constitute a monolithic school despite some fundamental shared assumptions (Howarth 2000: 10). Far from being an eclectic weakness, it must be regarded as the dynamic strength of discourse theory providing the possibility to critically draw upon its different perspectives and combine its strands in order make sense of a complex and multifaceted reality. A crucially important ontological assumption is luminously illustrated by an example from Laclau and Mouffe:

An earthquake or the falling of a brick is an event that certainly exists, independently of my will. But whether their specificity as objects is constructed in terms of "natural phenomena" or "expressions of wrath of God", depends upon the structuring of a discursive field (Laclau & Mouffe 1985:108).

The world being socially and discursively constructed, the primary aim of the social researcher must accordingly be to study these constructions and diagnose and evaluate their implications (Marsh & Stoker 2002: 26, Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 28). In this vein, language comes to the fore as it shapes and structures the field of meaning into which social actors themselves are interwoven (Heidegger 1993: 398). Insofar as language is constitutive of social reality, we must take the Wittgensteinian advice seriously and plough through language (Bloor 1997: 356, Wittgenstein 1993: 131)

The centrality of language in discourse analysis (Bergström & Boréus 2005: 305) making it highly pertinent for my study, can be reflected in the postmodern dictum that language not only shapes social reality but also forms human identity (Sheenan 2004: 23, Hardy & Phillips 2002: 32). To sum up, the “war on terror” is a discourse produced by language in which truth and power are inextricably intertwined grasped in Foucault’s following statement:

Truth is a thing of this world; it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its “general politics” of truth; that is, the types of discourses which it accepts and makes function as true (Foucault 1980:131).

4. Material and Limitations

The prospect of conducting a scientific study is ineluctably limited by the material available. Furthermore, it is important to note that not all my sources will have a strict scientific character. The unscientific nature of these sources can best be circumvented by a reflective, critical outlook and limiting oneself to the relevant facts. I will make use of primary sources such as scientific books and articles, as well as secondary sources such as newspapers. The speeches of George W Bush in which the “war on terror” is articulated, are going to form an important basis for my research project. However, my analysis cannot completely be restricted to a textual one, as it also must take into account the events and practices which indubitably have implications for the production and reproduction of the discourse.

5. Operationalisation of Key Concepts

5.1.1 Discourse

Discourse is far from a crystal-clear concept. In an etymological sense, it emanates from the Latin word *discurrere*, meaning running back and forth (Lübcke et al 1998: 117) and its lexical definition includes conversations, narratives, arguments and speeches (Blackburn 1996: 107). Michel Foucault's archeological-genealogical approach is widely acknowledged as the most influential for modern discourse analysis (Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 19). In his pioneering study *Archeology of Knowledge*, Foucault defines discourses as groups of statements belonging to single system of formation (Foucault 2002: 121) and generally being autonomous systems of statements being structured by history-laden specific formation rules. Foucault particularly focuses on the rules according to which a given statement is made and another is excluded (Deleuze 1988: 17, Foucault 2002: 30f). Genealogy, by contrast, introduces a broader definition of discourse which includes social non-linguistic practices (Bergström & Boréus 2005: 311). The focus is now on the relation between power and knowledge (Flynn 1994: 34, Howarth 2000: 77). Discourses are a series of discontinuous segments in which power and knowledge interplay. Discourses are not simply subjected to power but it is rather a question of a complex relation in which a given discourse can be an instrument of power as well as its effect. But it can also function as an obstacle to power, a point of resistance and a starting point for a counter-strategy (Foucault 1976: 133). The conclusion that can be drawn from Foucault's broad and somewhat ambiguous definition is that *discourses are constructed and historically specific systems of representations of reality that include power relations and social and political forms of exclusion* (Foucault 1993: 8, Howarth 2000: 48, 56, Kinnvall 2003: 17, Hall 2003: 115).

5.1.2 Power

Foucault reconceptualization of power has also been path-breaking (Hoy 1986: 123,128). At the heart of traditional perspectives such as Marxism, power is considered as the repressive machinery, possessed by the dominant class, stripping from the subordinate class, its vital and creative forces (Adams 1999: 250, Marx 2003: 290-299). Through ideological practices, power distorts the true nature of reality and produces false consciousness (Marx & Engels 1998: 67ff). Foucault has a number of objections to this. Firstly, power is a complex strategic situation rather than something of mere possession. (Foucault 1976: 123) Secondly, he rejects the idea of an objective truth (Taylor 1986: 70). Thirdly and most importantly, although power indeed displays repressive mechanisms, it is constitutive at the same time (Simons 2004: 191). In fact, Foucault argues that power and knowledge imply each other in the sense that truth is produced by the exercise of power and that power cannot be exercised except through the production of truth (Foucault 1997: 543). The Marxist perspective solely concerned with the repressive form of power, is blind for the dynamic relationship between power and knowledge (Rouse 1994: 113). In contrast to the Marxist viewpoint, for him, the truth, far from being universal and liberating, is relative and manipulative. Power permeating the social dimensions of everyday life, categorizes the individual by imposing on him a given identity, attaching him to this identity, forces upon him a law of truth that not only he must recognize, but that furthermore others have to recognize in him.

This form of power makes individuals subjects in that that they become tied to an imposed identity (Foucault 2000: 331).

5.1.3 Identity

The deconstructive project of Jacques Derrida, considered as the most forceful challenge to essentialism (Calhoun 1994: 14), has paved the way for the rethinking of the concept of identity. Following Nietzsche, Derrida is critical of what he sees as the recurrent theme in the Western philosophical tradition, namely logocentrism (Derrida 1967: 11f, Schrift 2005: 335). In Derridean terms, logocentrism refers to idea that the truth has an origin and hence a determinant center (Derrida 1967: 11f, Derrida 2006: 352f). The enterprise of Western thought has been predicated on binary oppositions, i.e. good vs evil, spirit vs matter, male vs female etc. Moreover, a hierarchical order has been imposed on these opposed pairs (Borradori 2003: 138). Concisely put, deconstruction aims to decenter logos (i.e. demonstrate the contradictions inherent in any logocentric paradigm) by challenging the traditional and simplistic dichotomies which are defended as natural categories (Royle 2003: 15, Derrida 1992: 6). An example of metaphysical thinking which has exerted much influence on the concept of identity is Hegel's master-slave dialectics (Beiser 1999: 130, De Beauvoir 1993: 9,68f, Norris 1982: 76, Taylor 1986: 197). Here, Hegel approaches the relation between the *Self* and the *Other* in the disguise of Master and Slave (Hegel 1977: 111-119). The Hegelian shortcoming in a Derridean sense, is to rely on a higher synthesis rather than transcending the binary opposition itself (Howarth 2000: 43). In the words of Gramsci, the difference between "East" and "West" is a historico-cultural construction rather than objectively real (Gramsci 1971: 447). The problematic relation between the *Self* and the *Other* is elaborated in Said's *Orientalism* in which the "West" has defined itself by constructing its supposed opposite pole, namely the "Orient" (Said 1993: 64). It is in the process of a gap that the relation of the *Self* (subject) to the *Other* is constructed (Lacan 1998: 206). Identity, then, as argued by Derrida, in a paradoxical sense, both presupposes difference and involves its suppression (Eriksson et al. 2005: 34, Zaretsky 1994: 200). Language occupies a central role in the process of identity construction functioning as the medium of representation, through which the Self is constructed in the relation to the Other (Stavrakakis 2004: 24f, Lacan 1989: 132, Payne 1993: 54, 58) Moreover, active (practical) language, *parole*, is ambiguous and contextual to the same extent that identity is relative, multidimensional and changeable (Barthes 1966: 58, Petersson 2003: 36, Saussure 2002: 273)

6. Theoretical considerations

Embarking on a discursive course, I will employ Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory in order to conduct the empirical analysis. Not only have they explicitly focused on the political context, but drawing upon distinct approaches as Marxism, structuralism/poststructuralism and the theories of Foucault and Derrida (Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 32), Laclau and Mouffe have managed to introduce the most sophisticated and meaningful theoretical machinery and conceptual tools to conduct discourse analysis.

6.1 Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory

The departure point for Laclau and Mouffe, is the linguistic theory of Ferdinand de Saussure (Bergström & Boréus 2005: 314). A basic assumption in Saussurian theory is that construction of meaning takes place within a closed system of signs (Howarth 2000: 19). Saussure moreover argues that meaning, through the interplay of signs, is produced through relational differences (Saussure 1949: 167). Laclau and Mouffe while accepting that identities are relational, contest the closure of the system and argue that meaning is not fixed (Laclau & Mouffe 1985: 96). The structuralist account is criticized on the basis that there is no underlying principle to the social order (Laclau & Mouffe 1985: 96). Discourses are considered as partial fixations of meaning seeking to disclose the system by imposing order on the field of meaning. However, this endeavor will remain unrealizable due to the contingency of meaning. Moreover, as any discourse is given an identity by its relational difference to another discourse, it is necessarily dependent on those meanings it precludes. A discursive Self (inside) then, to make sense of its identity, always presuppose a discursive Other (outside). This means that a political project can dominate but never completely exhaust the discursive field as it needs a constitutive outside to define itself (Howarth 2000: 103, Laclau & Mouffe 1985: 111, Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 34). This leads to what Laclau and Mouffe call *dislocation*, which arises from the emergence of events and refers to the new spaces in the social field that a given discourse fails to incorporate within itself (Torfing 1999: 301). Dislocations, in turn, pave the way for emergence of *myths* which are defined as the constructions of new spaces of representation that aim to suture the dislocated elements by articulating fresh social demands. The closure of the socio-discursive field existing as an ideal, necessitates the production of *empty signifiers*, signifiers emptied of any clear meaning due to vague definitions or conflicting interpretations (Howarth et al. 2000: 74, Torfing 1999: 301)

Laclau and Mouffe give their discourse theory a political dimension by introducing the concept of antagonism. Discourses, seeking to dominate the social field through the articulation¹ of a given set of social relations, are inherently political constructions realized by the construction of antagonisms and power exercise (Howarth 2000: 104). Concisely put, antagonism is the outcome of different identities blocking each other (Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 55). In Laclau and Mouffe's account, antagonism takes place due to the incapability of social agents in attaining their identities, resulting in the construction of an enemy blamed for this failure (Howarth 2000: 104f).

¹ Laclau and Mouffe define articulation as "any practice establishing a relation among elements such that their identity is modified as a result of the articulatory practice". Elements are defined as "any difference that is not discursively articulated"

Identity is constructed and contingent rather than preconstituted and fixed (Howarth 2000: 106, Laclau & Mouffe 1985: 111). In this regard, Laclau and Mouffe however fail to build upon Jacques Lacan's fruitful theoretical concept of *master signifier*, around which the identity of subjects is discursively organized (Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 40).

How then does the construction of antagonistic relations concretely occur in political discourses? In this respect, Laclau and Mouffe introduce two important concepts, the *logic of equivalence* and the *logic of difference* (Laclau & Mouffe 1985: 127). In the former logic, a given political project seeks to suppress the differences that exists between different forces by appealing to something identical underlying them all, namely an external threat (ibid 1985: 127). The *logic of equivalence* is hence employed to divide the social field around two antagonistic and irreconcilable poles (Howarth 2000: 107). The *logic of difference*, by contrast, is aimed at displacing the antagonistic relations to the social periphery (Laclau & Mouffe 1985: 130). This is done by accentuating the difference between different political forces. It is through the opposed logic of equivalence and difference that power relations are constructed and exercised. Power far from being foundational, is constructed and exercised internally to the social, in a pragmatic way (Laclau & Mouffe 1985: 142).

Intimately linked to antagonism is another central political concept in Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory, namely *hegemony*. Building upon the theory of Gramsci (Gramsci 1971: 57), *hegemonic practices* are considered as articulatory practices by any political force to intertwine different identities and political movements into a common project (Howarth 2000: 109).

The hegemonic project's endeavor is to construct *nodal points* by articulating and hegemonizing *floating signifiers* which are signifiers open for different meanings and interpretations (Bergström & Boréus 2005: 316, Howarth et al. 2000: 15). Nodal points, which underpin and organize social orders and which Laclau and Mouffe have borrowed from Lacanian psychoanalysis, is explained as privileged signifiers and can be seen as reference points around which discourses are organized (Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 35).

In dealing with the question of subjectivity and agency, Laclau and Mouffe draw upon Althusser's Marxist-structuralist theory to the extent that subjects are discursively constructed through ideological practices (Howarth 2000: 108, Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 22). However whereas Althusser subjects ideology to an essentialist critique (Althusser 1996: 70, Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 22) Laclau and Mouffe simply view it as the desire for total closure of the social field by different political forces (Howarth 2000: 122).

To summarize, power is exercised by political projects through ideological and hegemonic practices, seeking to completely dominate the politico-discursive field. It is in the process of power exercise that our knowledge is formed and our identities and relations to each other are shaped (Jørgensen & Phillips 2000: 45). While individuals are discursively constructed within structures, these structures themselves have a contingent rather than a determinist character. (Howarth 2000: 108f, 122).

7. Empirical Context

7.1.1 The Resurrection of a Suppressed and Ominous “Other”

History has come to an end, declared Francis Fukuyama in the aftermath of the Cold War, meditating on the triumph of American capitalism over Soviet communism. His grandiose meta-claim, based on a diagnosis of the dialectical philosophy of Hegel, concluded that Western liberalism had emerged as the victorious and unsurpassed ideology of history and thus destined to hegemonize every corner of the globe (Fukuyama 1989). As it turned out, however, the hegemonic ambitions of the United States in a unipolar world would not remain unchallenged for long. More precisely, the demise of the Soviet Union came to constitute an identity crisis for US foreign policy. Implicitly acknowledged by defense secretary Dick Cheney as early as 1992, this identity-ideological vacuum was echoed by the administration of George W Bush in 2000. In the words of Condoleezza Rice: “The United States has found it exceedingly difficult to define its national interest in the absence of Soviet power” (Robin 2004: 143). The dislocatory effects of the new world order, thus, necessitated a fresh outlook and approach from the American superpower in dealing with international challenges. George W Bush, once installed as President, signaled however that domestic issues was going to be the priority of his administration (Moens 2004:88). On the international front, the United States would henceforth unilaterally pursue its own strategic interests (Herring 2002: 454). The Bush administration’s unilateralist course in foreign policy not only left America in a thorny relationship to Russia and China but also alienated important allies in Europe (Crockatt 2003: 143, Moens 2004: 97, 113-115). Moreover, despite repeated warnings over a growing terrorist threat to the United States, Bush chose not to move up the issue to its list of priorities (Daadler & Lindsay 2005: 73f).

7.1.2 September 11th – “Good” declares “War” on “Evil”

The cataclysmic terrorist attacks on September 11th targeting the financial and military epicenter of US power, unsurprisingly, entailed a dramatic change in the policies of the Bush administration (Moens 2004: 123). In his presidential address on the same day George W Bush made clear why his country had been subject to attack:

America was targeted for attack because we’re the highest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world (Bush 2003: 3)

Bush, here, for the first time touched upon the “war against terrorism” (Silberstein 2002:6) and referring to the perpetrators as “evil” he concluded that the United States would continue to defend “freedom and all that is good and just in our world”. (Bush 2003:3). The following day, the American President declared that his country was “in a monumental struggle of good versus evil” (Jervis 2005: 55). Bush gave his vision a historical dimension in a ceremony for the 9/11 victims two days later:

Our responsibility to history is already clear to answer to these attacks and rid the world of evil (Griffith 2002: 272).

Acknowledging the elusiveness of the enemy (Woodward 2002: 117), Bush in the immediate aftermath of 9/11 indicated that the conflict would be an unconventional one (Bush 2003: 8). By now the Bush administration was convinced that Al-Qaeda, the radical Islamic network of Osama Bin Laden, was behind the attack. On 16 September the US President declared: “This *crusade*, this war on terrorism, is going to take a while” (Hiro 2002: 319). This statement was significant due to the fact that Bin Laden often branded his American foe as a crusader, referring to the medieval invasion of Muslim land by Christian crusaders and the subsequent war between the two religious communities (Mamdani 2004: 25f) As a result of the equivalential logic, the discursive field was now criss-crossed by a binary division between two opposed poles. George W Bush, realizing that the term *crusade* would alienate and antagonize the wider Muslim world, very soon recognized his terminological blunder and erased the controversial word from his vocabulary (Moens 2004: 135). The Bush administration was aware that in order to isolate Al Qaeda and Bin Laden, it needed to discursively incorporate and hegemonize a crucial floating signifier, namely “Islam”. Accordingly, the discursive strategy it now opted for was the differential logic. In a visit to the Islamic Center of Washington, the American President did so, disassociating Islam from terrorism:

The face of terror is not the true faith of Islam. That is not what Islam is all about. Islam is peace. These terrorists don't represent peace. They represent evil and war (Bush 2003: 9)

“Islam” was hence articulated into the hegemonic discourse through the nodal points of “peace” and “goodness”. At the same time, Bush aimed to suture the socio-discursive field to forestall the proliferation of antagonism between Muslims and non-Muslims within the American society. Otherwise, the logic of weakening the bonds between the “good” Muslims and the “bad” Muslims, he understood, would prove to be fruitless. The strategy was to appeal to a common American identity:

America counts millions of Muslims amongst our citizens, and Muslims make an incredibly valuable contribution to our country. [...] They need to be treated with respect. Americans must treat each other with respect (Bush 2003: 10).

However, the Patriot Act, initiated by the Bush administration (Hersh 2004: 115) was considered as Anti-Muslim by Muslim associations and civil rights groups (Haddad 2004: 104f). More generally, it restricted civil liberties for all American citizens.

It was first on 20 September that George W Bush in a portentous speech to the joint session of Congress, declaring “war on terrorism”, for the first time officially pointed out those responsible for the terrorist attacks, calling it “an act of war”:

On September the 11th, the enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country [...] The evidence we have gathered all points to a collection of loosely affiliated terrorist organizations known as Al-Qaeda (Bush 2001: 50f).

The American *Self* was discursively organized around the *master signifier* of “freedom”.

Americans are asking: Why do they hate us? [...] They hate our freedoms, our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other (Bush 2001: 52).

Most importantly, the US President outlined the objective and consequently his administration's target in the "war on terrorism".

Our war on terror begins with al Qaeda, but it does not end here. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated (Bush 2001: 52).

Continuing to draw upon the logic of difference in order to broaden the identity gap between America's Muslim allies from its Muslim enemies, Bush again pinpointed that "Islam" was not the source of conflict, the terrorists attempting to hijack its "good" and "peaceful" teachings (Bush 2001: 52, Kean 2004: 337) In this instrumental speech, the Bush-doctrine sketched out on September 11th in the words "We will make no distinction between the terrorists that committed these acts and those who harbor them" (Singer 2004: 144) was summed up in form of a bold ultimatum (Kellner 2003: 61):

Every nation, in every region, has now a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. (Bush 2001: 53).

Bush concluded by linking the "war on terrorism" to the historico-religious mission of the "civilized world" under the leadership of the United States:

This is not [...] just America's fight... This is the world's fight. This is the civilization's fight. This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism, tolerance and freedom [...] The advance of human freedom- the great achievement of our time, and the great hope of every time- now depends on us. We will rally the world to this cause [...] Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them (Bush 2001: 53f).

The speech, setting the agenda for the Bush administration's "war on terrorism", led to the division of the political space into two antagonistic poles, in which a third option was vehemently suppressed. Employing the equivalential logic through the prism of a Manichean dichotomy, the US President in his speech issued a non-negotiable ultimatum to Afghanistan's ruling Talebans. They had to crack down on Al Qaeda and handover Bin Laden or as Bush admonished "share in their fate" (Bush 2001: 52)

7.1.3. An Unconventional War against an Elusive Enemy

The Bush administration argued from the outset that the "war on terrorism" was both unconventional and would be waged on many fronts (Hiro 2003: 320, Juergensmeyer 2003: 234). Rather than pinpointing the target for his "war on terror", the US President repeatedly mystified the enemy:

We are facing a different enemy than we have ever faced. This enemy hides in the shadows (Hiro 2002: 307). We fight an enemy who hides in caves in Afghanistan, and in the shadows within in our own society (Bush 2003: 61)

Although the American President contended that the “war on terrorism” would extend beyond Bin Laden and Al Qaeda (White House 2001), Bush was unequivocal about his priority:

The focus right now is on Osama Bin Laden, no question about it (Ivie 2005: 151)

So far it seemed that the hegemonic discourse had been successful in dividing the international political sphere in two antagonistic poles and hegemonizing the politico-discursive field, as many countries pledged their support in the “war on terror” (Croft 2006: 120). Not only did NATO invoke its common defense clause, but all European states, supported the war against the Taleban and Al Qaeda (Moens 2004: 145f). More significantly, Russia and China both embraced the “war on terrorism” (Daadler & Lindsay 2005: 88) and Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, two of only three states recognizing the Taleban regime, now turned their back on their former ally (Hiro 2003: 257, 314, 332). Worth to mention in this respect, is that the Pakistani government, previously sanctioned by the US for possession of nuclear weapons, was impelled to make an U-turn in foreign policy due to the equivalential ultimatum of Bush and now found itself as a key US ally in the “war on terror” (Moens 2004: 137).

The Taleban regime reluctant to hand out the Al Qaeda leader, the US military accompanied by Britain began striking enemy targets in Afghanistan. The goal was to destroy “terrorist” infrastructure, disrupt the military capability of the Talebans and to capture Osama Bin Laden and other Al Qaeda leaders (Daadler & Lindsay 2005: 104). The initial name of the operation was “Infinite Justice” but later changed name to “Enduring Freedom” due to the objection of American Muslim clerics since in the Muslim faith, only God can deliver “Infinite Justice” (Zizek 2005: 65). Bush stepping up his war rhetoric during the military campaign, in a speech to military personnel, referred to the enemy as stateless evildoers without any ideological conviction:

I want to assure the people of the world that our military fights not against Muslims or...the Islam religion; we fight against evil people [...] We fight against people who have no country, no ideology, they're motivated by hate (Bush 2003: 46).

The military campaign in Afghanistan was successful in that it ousted the Taleban from power (Daadler & Lindsay 2005: 108), but the United States failed to achieve the key stated objective of capturing or killing Bin Laden, Mullah Omar and other senior Al Qaeda leaders (Crockatt 2003: 160, Hiro 2003: 368, Lakoff 2003: 395). Touching upon the military success on Afghanistan and juxtaposing the “civilized” *Self* and the “barbaric” *Other* in dichotomic fashion (Bush 2003: 85f), the US President clarified his definition of terrorism:

Terror is a movement, an ideology that respects no boundary of nationality or decency [...] The terrorists are the heirs to fascism. They have the same will to power, the same disdain for the individual, the same mad global ambitions (ibid 2003: 86)

This definition was in stark contrast to his earlier statement in which he had dubbed the “terror” employed by the “terrorists” as blind hatred without any ideological ambitions. Due to the self-contradiction of Bush, “terrorism” now became an *empty signifier*, devoid of any clear meaning.

Nevertheless, the Bush administration had so far garnered widespread international support for the “war on terrorism” around the mythical space of “peace” and “freedom”. Bush had already declared to UN and his European allies that the realization of “peace” and “freedom”, were both the agenda and vision of the “civilized world” (Bush 2003: 60, 71). America had been attacked because it was the abode and fortress of “freedom” and consequently, the “war on terror” had to be waged in order to save “civilization” itself (ibid 2003: 55 Croft 2006: 70).

7.1.4. Axis of Evil- The Stratagemical and Unholy Alliance between “Terrorists”

The United States bringing about regime change in Afghanistan, the question was now who would be the next target for the Bush administration’s “war on terror”. The administration considered the war in Afghanistan only as the first phase in the broader “war on terrorism”. Moreover, it soon turned out that European powers such as France and Germany had gravely misread Bush’s hegemonic ambitions and unilateralist course (Daadler & Lindsay 2005: 80, Hiro 2003: 410) Clarifying his position, George W Bush soon underlined that it was the United States and not the European Union or the United Nations that would set the political agenda for the coalition.

The best way that we hold this coalition together is to be clear on our objectives and to be clear that we are determined to achieve them. You hold a coalition together by strong leadership and that’s what we intend to provide (Dietrich 2005: 44)

Bush’s statement was the outcome of a power struggle causing a rift within the administration itself. The Secretary of State Colin Powell favored a multilateralist approach and consultations with Washington’s allies whereas Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld believed that “the mission should determine the coalition” and not vice versa. Bush sided with Rumsfeld (Daadler & Lindsay 2005: 103).

On January 29, 2002 the US President in his annual speech to the State of the Union outlined the future path in the “war on terror”. George W Bush, here singled out fresh “terrorist” targets such as Hamas, Hezbollah, (Palestinian) Islamic Jihad, Jaish-i-Mohammed and stated that the United States was active in “counterterrorist” operations in diverse countries such as Bosnia, Somalia and the Philippines (Bush 2002: 60). The American President now found himself in uncharted territory as the struggle of Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad was/is restricted to Israel (Henderson 2001: 47, State Department 2006: 98, 100f, Tan 2006: 152) and that of Jaish-e-Mohammad did not extend itself beyond India (BBC 2002, State Department 2006: 106). Neither of these mentioned groups had any global ambitions à la Al Qaeda and an organization such as Hamas, which had never operated outside the Israel and the Palestinian territories, could hardly be considered of being of a “global reach”. In fact, some scholars have argued that George W Bush tacitly dropped his “global reach” parameter (Jervis 2005: 94), thus broadening the discourse through the inclusion of fresh targets.

Another key objective of his administration, Bush argued, would be to “prevent regimes that sponsor terror from threatening America or our friends and allies with weapons of mass destruction” (Bush 2002: 60). Singling out North Korea, Iran and Iraq the US President amplified his point:

States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred (Bush 2002: 61).

Interestingly, Iran had become an important unofficial US ally in the “war on terror” in the aftermath of 9/11, providing instrumental assistance to the United States prior to and during the war in Afghanistan (Pollack 2005: 345-347). However, US-Iranian relations darkened when Israel intercepted an Iran-made arsenal of weaponry destined for the Palestinian Authority. An administration official later acknowledged that Iraq was the real target of the speech but that Iran and North Korea were added to avoid immediate confrontation with Iraq (ibid 2005: 352, Woodward 2004: 87).

The axis of evil-speech, signaling the new phase in the “war on terror”, ineluctably transformed the political configuration of the discursive field. Not only did it entail a more aggressive anti-US policy by Iran and North Korea (Adams 2004: 227, Pollack 2005: 353), but most notably, it aroused strenuous objections from the European Union. Chris Patten, the European Commissioner for international relations, lambasted the Bush administration’s new policy as “absolutist and simplistic” (Hiro 2003: 389) In May 2002, the Bush administration would expand the “axis of evil” the US undersecretary of State, John Bolton adding Cuba, Libya and Syria to the list of “rogue states” (BBC 2002) thus integrating them into discourse and making them targets of the “war on terror”. Subsequently, the link between “terrorist groups” and “rogue states” was powerfully reproduced (Croft 2006: 129)

Moreover, George W Bush blamed Yassir Arafat to side with the “terrorists” in failing to confront them (ibid 2006: 159). This not only weakened his position, but the entire Israeli-Palestinian peace process (Gurtov 2006: 106, Hiro 2003: 422-425). Indirectly denouncing Bush administration’s approach, the Organization of Islamic Conference, spurned any attempt to link “terrorism” to the Palestinian struggle in furtherance of the establishment of an independent state (Hiro 2003: 412f, OIC 2002). This further consolidated the semantical character of the concept terrorism as an *empty signifier*.

The hegemonic discourse was continuously given an historical dimension and contoured around the mythical vision of “peace” and “freedom”.

We understand history has called us into action, and we are not going to miss that opportunity to make the world more peaceful and more free (Jervis 2005: 83).

Asked about the failure to capture Osama bin Laden and the magnitude of danger he posed, the US President replied that the Al Qaeda leader nevertheless had been marginalized and his network and host government destroyed. Bin Laden was thus no source of concern (White House 2002).

In 2002, a second pillar was added to the Bush-doctrine, namely the strategy of preemptive war (Daadler & Lindsay 2005: 80). The doctrine is traced to Bush’s speech in West Point in June (Moens 2004: 170), in which the US President signaled a new phase in the “war on terrorism”.

We must take the battle to the enemy, disrupt his plans, and confront the worst threats before they emerge...to be ready for preemptive action when necessary to defend our liberty (Bush 2003: 160f).

The doctrine, enshrined in the National Security Strategy in September, argued that the United States preserved the right to resort to preemptive war against states harboring “terrorism” (Jackson 2005: 126). Some scholars argued that the doctrine conflated preemptive and preventive war (Chomsky 2004: 20f, Daadler & Lindsay 2005: 125).

The target of the “war on terror” the document stated, would be “terrorist organizations of global reach and any terrorist or state sponsor of terrorism which attempts to gain or use weapons of mass destruction or their precursors” (ibid 2002). This discursive reconfiguration demonstrated that the Bush administration had not dropped the parameter of “global reach” or alternatively, had reinstated it into the hegemonic discourse.

7.1.5. The Dice is Cast- All Roads lead to Baghdad

Of the “axis of evil” and “rogue states”, Saddam Hussein’s regime soon found itself the main target of the Bush administration’s war rhetoric (Daadler & Lindsay 2005: 126).

As early as 17 September, Bush himself had indicated that he believed that Iraq was involved in the September 11 attacks (Gershkoff & Kushner 2005: 526). Just one day before Powell had denied that any link between Al Qaeda and Saddam had been found (Crockatt 2003: 156). By contrast, both Rumsfeld and assistant defense secretary Paul Wolfowitz had since 9/11 argued that there were links between the two and now according to Vice President Dick Cheney, it was indubitable that the Iraqi President possessed weapons of mass destruction (Daadler & Lindsay 2005: 128, 135, 158). In mid 2002, a fresh internal conflict flared up in the administration now between Powell and Cheney, the former insisting on taking Iraq’s case to the United Nations, the latter advocating a unilateralist approach, i.e. going to war without UN-consultation (Moens 2004: 176). This time Bush decided to rely on Powell (Gordon 2004: 107).

In his address to UN in September, George W Bush exclusively focused on Iraq, accusing the regime of Saddam of violation of international law and posing an overriding danger to world peace in continuing to develop weapons of mass destruction. Invoking “freedom” as moral cause to “liberate” the Iraqi people, Saddam not only was suppressing their “liberty”, but had moreover forged an alliance with Al Qaeda, whose “terrorists” according to the US President had escaped from Afghanistan and were now in Iraq (Bush 2002: 86-89) As in the previous phase of the “war on terror”, the language of identity was ubiquitous in the discourse through the binary opposition of “good” versus “evil” discursively represented as “freedom” versus “terror”. Furthermore, the unilateralist intentions of Bush unveiled itself, the American President raising the stakes:

Will the United Nations serve the purpose of its founding, or will it be irrelevant? (Bush 2002: 88)

Bush implied thus that if the UN did not act forcefully to disarm Iraq, his country would. The unilateralist position of the Bush administration opened up a deep political fissure in the international community. More specifically, the US-led “coalition of the willing” strongly divided Europe (Habermas 2006: 86). France and Germany firmly opposed military action while Britain, joined by Spain, Italy and Poland supported the stance of the United States (Moens 2004: 187).

The Bush administration now employed the *logic of difference* in order to further displace European unity, Rumsfeld dismissing the Franco-German anti-war alliance as the “old Europe” and referring to East European US allies supporting Bush’s Iraq policy as the “new Europe” (CNN 2003). Condoleezza Rice would go even further, opining that France would be castigated for its strong anti-American stance (Rorty 2003: 34). Not only did France, Germany and a number of other European oppose a war against Iraq, but the United States failed to secure the backing of the Arab world and other important allies in the “war on terror” such as Russia and China (Dietrich 2005: 193, 215, Hiro 2003: 433). The American President in his State of the Union address 2003, reacted defiantly to the vigorous international opposition to his Iraq policy:

The course of this nation does not depend on the decision of others (Habermas 2006: 182)

Depicting Saddam’s regime as a grave and mounting menace to the United States, its friends and allies and world peace, Bush reiterated that Saddam harbored Al Qaeda and continued to develop weapons of mass destruction (Bush 2003: 218f). History, he claimed, had called on the United States to defend the safety of the American people and hopes of all mankind. It had come to the right country and the United States accepted such a responsibility (Bush 2003: 216, 220). The Iraqi people would be “liberated” from a tyrannical and terrorist-harboring regime by the self-declared defender of “freedom”:

And as we and our coalition partners are doing in Afghanistan, we will bring to the Iraqi people food and medicines and supplies- and freedom [...] Americans are a free people, who know that freedom is the right of every person and the future of every nation. The liberty we prize is not America’s gift to the world, it is God’s gift to humanity (Bush 2003: 220)

The American *Self*, speaking in the name of universalism, continued to represent its identity through the master signifier of “freedom” in attempting to fully hegemonize the politico-discursive field.

On March 20, 2003, the United States, joined by Britain, Australia and Poland, began its military campaign in Iraq under the banner of “Operation Iraqi Freedom” (Dietrich 2005: 77, Lee Anderson 2004: 351). The Bush administration accusing the Iraqi regime of breaching international law, now found itself doing the same, going to war without UN-backing and thereby weakening the world organization.

On May 1, George W Bush announced that major combat operation had ended and that the United States and its allies had prevailed. The liberation of Iraq was a crucial advance in the campaign against “terror”, he explained, pointing to the alliance of Saddam and Al Qaeda (Bush 2003: 95f). The removal of Saddam did however not mean that the “war on terror” had ended.

Our mission continues. Al Qaeda is wounded, not destroyed. The scattered cells of the terrorist network still operate in many nations [...] (ibid 2003: 97).

7.1.6. Iraq- The Borrowed Kettle

Contrary to what the Bush administration had insisted upon, no weapons of mass destruction could be found in Iraq (Moens 2004: 194). Accordingly, the legal basis upon which the preemptive war had been justified, was now completely fractured (Mead 2005: 140). Moreover, Bush himself conceded that there was no evidence suggesting a liaison between Saddam and Al Qaeda attacks of 11th September (Clarke 2004: 268). In reality, the Bush administration had received reliable information of the lack of such a connection from well-informed sources prior to the Iraq war (Hiro 2003: 390) The American President now began to justify the war in terms of the liberation of the Iraqi people (Daadler & Lindsay 2005: 197).

The triumph of democracy and tolerance in Iraq... would be a grave setback for international terrorism. Everywhere that freedom takes hold, terror will retreat (Bush 2003: 98f)

Notwithstanding the absence of weapons of mass destruction and lack of Al Qaeda connection, Bush similarly continued to argue that the removal of Saddam Hussein's regime had made his country safer (Bush Defending the War 2004)

Reelected as President 2004, George W Bush insinuated embracing a multilateralist approach, promising to reach out to allies and friends. But the appointment of John Bolton, a strong opponent of multilateral agreements as a UN-ambassador, again evinced the Bush had no plans of abandoning his unilateralist course (Daadler & Lindsay 2005: 196-199)

7.1.7. The Empty Signifier of Freedom

In a speech released shortly before the 2004 US presidential elections, Osama Bin Laden appeared on a video footage and delivered following message to the American people:

Contrary to Bush's claim that we hate freedom... 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 we shall lay waste to yours (Croft 2006: 278).

The significance of this statement stemmed from the fact that it boldly challenged the hegemonic discourse of the Bush administration, emphasizing all along that US had been attacked not for its policies, but for what it represented, namely "freedom".

By articulating it into the counter-hegemonic discourse, "freedom" now became an *empty signifier*, floating in diametrically opposed directions in the field of meaning.

Interestingly, George W Bush himself would later acknowledge that the 11th attacks had been the bitter fruit of misguided US policy.

For decades, American policy sought to achieve peace in the Middle East by pursuing stability at the expense of liberty. The lack of freedom in that region helped create conditions where anger and resentment grew, and radicalism thrived, and terrorists found willing recruits. And we saw the consequences on September 11th, when the terrorists brought death and destruction to our country. That policy wasn't working (Bush, Iran & War on Terror 2005)

This statement again demonstrated the inconsistency of the discourse as it palpably contradicted the discursive approach of Bush hitherto; that the United States had come under attack not because of its policies, but rather for its essence, namely the embodiment of freedom.

7.1.8 Terror- The Invisible and Ubiquitous Hydra

The success of “Operation Iraqi Freedom” proved shortlived as American troops increasingly came under fierce attacks from insurgents inside Iraq (Moens 2004: 193). Confident in quelling the insurgency in mid 2003, George W Bush, even challenged the rebels in a provocative manner: “Bring them on, we’ve got the force necessary to deal with the security situation” (Dietrich 2005: 79). However, contrary to the Bush administration’s belief that the insurgency was limited and would diminish and be brought under control, the violence escalated, the attacks growing in both number and magnitude (Daadler & Lindsay 2005: 175-177). Neither the capture of Saddam Hussein, nor the control over the rebel stronghold of Falluja, managed to decrease the mounting violence and restore order. The deteriorating security situation prompted the United States to increase its troops when having planned to reduce them (Rogers 2006: 80ff, 85). Insurgency continuing throughout 2004, Bush’s war rhetoric increasingly targeted Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the alleged chief operator of Al Qaeda in Iraq. His supposed symbiotic relationship with Osama Bin Laden in the eyes of the Bush administration provided evidence for the links between Iraq and the “war on terror” (ibid 2006: 135). Having downplayed the threat posed by Bin Laden prior to the Iraq war, the Al Qaeda leader and his network, became the renewed focus of the incumbent US administration. In fact, Bush went as far as saying “Stopping him (Bin Laden) is the greatest challenge of our day” (USA Today 2005). The US President now called Iraq the central front in the “war on terror”:

The terrorists have made clear that Iraq is the central front in their war against humanity. *And so we must recognize Iraq as the central front in the war on terror* (Bush Iraq War Strategy 2005).

While the Bush administration ascribed to Al Qaeda a pivotal role in the Iraq insurgency, evidence suggested otherwise. In terms of detainees, the Al Qaeda affiliated foreign fighters accounted for a very small part of the insurgency. Furthermore, there was no indication of a centralized leadership, as the fighters to a large extent, operated independently (Rogers 2006: 136). To Bush, the enemy in Iraq other than Al Qaeda, was comprised of two groups, Saddam loyalists and the rejectionists, formed by Sunni extremists who were resentful over no longer being the privileged group (Bush, Iraq War Strategy 2005) This classification, however, was a huge oversimplification as the centrifugal Iraqi forces involved in the insurgency had a much more heterogeneous character and very different ambitions. The only common objective indicated on disrupting the American occupation (Dietrich 2005: 79, White 2006: 4f). In reality, the US President still failed to identify a concrete target in his “war on terror”.

I understand there is still an enemy which lurks out there [...] Since we’re not able to track vast battalions and armadas, we’ve got to have intelligence...to help us locate the dark corners of earth where these people hide (Bush, the War on Terror, Home and Abroad 2006).

George W Bush moreover hinted that the “terrorist” enemy still could operate in the United States (ibid 2006) Despite the devastating cycle of violence and attacks continuing in Iraq, Bush in his address to the State of the Union 2006, remained intransigent in refusing to change his strategy: “Fellow citizens, we are in this fight to win, and we are winning”. Moreover, the US President did not give up the endeavor to hegemonize “Islam”, calling Al Qaeda’s ambitions “the perversion of a noble faith into an ideology of terror and death” (Bush, State of the Union 2006). The nodal point of the discourse was still “good” in opposition to “evil” dissociating “civilized Islam” from “barbaric Islam”.

The death toll of American soldiers constantly rising in Iraq, the US President and his administration came under increasing pressure to justify the Iraq war and continued presence of American troops on Iraqi soil.

The war on terror is broader than Iraq, but Iraq is the key battlefield right now. *And the enemy has made it so* [...] Is it worth in Iraq? You bet it is. It’s worth it to protect ourselves in the short-run, but it’s necessary and worth it to lay the foundation of peace for generations to come (Bush, War on Terror 2006).

In a parallel development, Afghanistan witnessed the steady increase of Taleban activity in spring 2005, the insurgency escalating throughout 2006 and claiming more than 4000 lives (Rogers 2006: 149, Guardian 2006). In mid 2006, an authoritative verdict on the Bush administration’s “war on terror” came from the National Intelligence Estimate, based on the shared view of 16 distinct spy agencies, in form of a classified intelligence report concerning the trends in global terrorism (New York Times 2006) It appraised that the global jihadist movement was decentralized, lacked a coherent core global strategy. Furthermore, the emergence of new jihadist cells and networks with anti-American agendas was increasingly likely. Most importantly, it assessed that the Iraq war was forming a new generation of terrorist leaders and operatives (National Intelligence Estimate 2006). Bush however, seemed to ignore the findings of the report. In his 9/11 address 2006, he simply reproduced the recurrent leitmotif in the “war on terror”.

The war against this enemy is... the decisive ideological struggle of the 21st century [...] One of the strongest weapons in our arsenal is the power of the freedom. The terrorists fear freedom as much as they do our firepower [...] In truth, it is a struggle for civilization [...] We will lead the 21st century into a shining age of human liberty (Bush 9/11 address, 2006)

In late 2006, the Bush administration attested to a number of setbacks in its “war on terror”. The Democratic Party securing a majority in both chambers of Congress largely due to the growing discontent with the development in Iraq, Donald Rumsfeld, widely regarded as the architect of the Iraq war, resigned (IHT 2006) The new defense secretary Robert Gates for the first time acknowledged that the US was not winning the war in Iraq (BBC 2006). Finally, George W Bush on 20 December adopted the perspective of his top military adviser in saying” We’re not winning, we’re not losing” and later acknowledged the need for a change of strategy in Iraq. The political mood of the US President had changed remarkably compared to prior to the congressional elections in November when he adamantly had argued that the United States was winning the war (CNN 2006, Washington Post 2006).

In an equally crucial development, the foreign office of Britain, the staunchest ally of the United States in the “war on terrorism”, urged government officials to stop using the term “war on terror” (Washington Times 2006). The hegemonic discourse was now being challenged and undermined by its very “inside”.

8. Summarizing Discussion- A Critical Evaluation of Laclau and Mouffe's Theory

From the outset, George W Bush made it clear that the objective of the "war on terror" would be to eliminate all terrorist groups of a global reach. Al Qaeda would be the first target of this unconventional law but far from the last one. Of the many groups enlisted as foreign terrorist organizations by the US State Department, the Bush administration failed to spell out which groups qualified themselves as terrorist organizations of global reach, exempting the network of Bin Laden. The corollary of the Bush doctrine moreover made any state harboring terrorism in the eyes of the Bush administration a legitimate target in the "war on terror". Afghanistan's ruling Talebans was the first target of this logic, refusing to heed Bush's ultimatum and continuing to provide a safe haven for Al Qaeda. The Talebans removed, the Bush administration gradually shifted its focus from Bin Laden's network to the links between terrorist organizations and "outlaw regimes" developing or possessing weapons of mass destruction (Ivie 2005: 151). Vilified as an axis of evil by the US President, North Korea, Iran and Iraq was epitomized as the quintessential prototypes of such states. Simultaneously, other alleged terrorist organizations such as Hamas and Hezbollah, neither having the global reach of Al Qaeda nor any affiliation to the terrorist network (Wilkinson 2006: 41f, Harik 2004: 91) were integrated into and targeted by the Bush administration's "war on terror". The target of the discourse has further been expanded by the incorporation of other "rogue states" such as Cuba, Libya and Syria and the nexus between these states and terrorists.

The empirical analysis evinces that the Bush administration has failed to identify a main target and a clear objective in the "war on terrorism". In reality, the US President has done quite the opposite, mystified the enemy through his conceptual obscurantism and further blurred boundaries by continuously broadening the target for his "war on terror" in an incoherent and disparaging way. In this regard, the theory of Laclau and Mouffe has a grave shortcoming, namely the lack of a critical edge. More precisely, ignoring the normative underpinnings of ideology and hegemony, they fail to account for the latent and obfuscating mechanisms of a given discourse. In the "war on terrorism" a vital US ally such as Saudi Arabia has hardly been mentioned in tandem with terrorism or have been subject to any substantial pressure. Not only did Saudi Arabia actively sponsor and support the Taliban regime prior to 9/11, but the 9/11 attacks was financed with Saudi money and the Saudi government refused to provide CIA and FBI with valuable information on the Saudi hijackers (Hersh 2004: 325). Moreover, it is no secret that the Saudi kingdom has backed Hamas financially (Napoleoni 2003: 71). In similar vein, Musharraf's Pakistan has become the protégé of the Bush administration in the aftermath of 9/11. When it was revealed that the architect behind Pakistan's nuclear program had provided Libya, Iran and North Korea with nuclear material, most likely with the knowledge the Pakistani government, (ibid 311f, 316) there were no loud protests from Washington, let alone sanctions. Furthermore, one cannot neglect asking oneself why Bush has failed to lecture his other Arab states in the region on freedom and democracy when the US President vividly has argued that the liberation of the Iraqi people from political subjugation has been a great moral victory. Why has George W Bush preferred to remain silence in the face of unrelenting political oppression and human rights abuses committed by US allies when subjecting the regime of Saddam to his moralist mantra? (Chomsky 2001: 88).

In this respect, Laclau and Mouffe's theory, enmeshed and suspended in the web of its own linguistical model, hence fails to build upon the critical fecundity of Marxism, in contrast to the critical discourse theory of Norman Fairclough (Fairclough 1995: 70-83).

From the perspective of the Bush administration, the "war on terror" has fundamentally been a war of identities. As we have seen, George W Bush has fallen in the metaphysical trap of logocentrism, imposing a binary structure and a hierarchical order on the field of meaning. The "war" has been defended as the natural and monumental struggle of good versus evil in a cloak of a historico-religious mission. In the quest of fully dominating the politico-discursive field, Bush has suppressed alternative perspectives and in general sense, a third way. Laclau and Mouffe's theory has fruitfully drawn upon the insights of Derridean deconstruction in addressing the question of identity. Al Qaeda and generally the terrorist enemy, has replaced Soviet communism as the novel constitutive outside of the American identity. The war of identities has been discursively translated as struggle between freedom and terror. Freedom has not only served as the embodiment of the American *Self*, but the universal value of all mankind and the mythical vision of the civilized world. Consequently, the United States of America, discursively represented as the pinnacle of civilization and the sole guarantor of a perpetual peace, must take upon itself its historical responsibility to lead the world and mankind towards the realization of its God-given destiny. As dark forces of evil, represented as barbarian terrorists, stand in the way, an irreconcilable antagonism and ultimately war is inevitable. The empirical analysis shows that the Bush administration was initially successful to hegemonize the political space through the *logic of equivalence*. However, the impossibility of a final suture unveiled itself as the Bush administration never managed to discursively hegemonize the crucial signifier of Islam, despite the initial success of the *logic of difference* that alienated the Talebans and Al Qaeda from other Muslim governments. A key reason was the American stance in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, in which the Bush administration actively undermined the legitimate leadership of Yassir Arafat, ostracizing him diplomatically and refusing to deal with him. George W Bush's conceptual mutations, theoretico-practical contradictions, and war declaration on militant Islamic organizations such as Hezbollah and Hamas, perceived as freedom fighters rather than terrorist by Muslim states, hardly improved image of the Bush administration in the Muslim world. As a result, even America's staunchest Arab and Muslim allies failed to support a US-led war in Iraq. The fundamental strength of Laclau and Mouffe's theory is its anti-essentialist approach and powerful account of the contingency of identity. The repeated internal conflicts in the Bush administration show that it does not have an essentially fixed character. The relativity and contextuality of identity has been even more evident in the international configuration of the politico-discursive field. Great powers such as Russia, China, France and Germany has interchangeably found themselves as US allies and antagonists, dependent upon the specific context. By the same token, the relation between the United States and different Muslim countries such as Pakistan and Iran has brightened and darkened as a result of the contingency of events. A very significant conclusion that follows from Laclau and Mouffe's theory is that the *Bush administration has waged a "war" against an empty signifier, terrorism, in the name of another empty signifier, freedom*. The Bush administration has employed both concepts in a highly ambiguous and variable way, and furthermore encountered insurmountable resistance in aiming to hegemonize their meaning.

Finally, the Bush administration's articulation of the "war on terrorism" has give rise to a number of problematic implications. This study has been too limited to elaborate on all of them, such as the dehumanizing treatment of alleged terrorists in Iraq's notorious Abu Ghuraib prison as a direct and logical consequence of the discourse. The Bush doctrine's either-or logic has strongly undermined the Palestinian-Israeli peace process. In so doing, it has increased antipathy and antagonism towards the United States not only in the Middle East but across the Muslim world. Moreover, it has weakened the United Nations and thwarted its efforts to uphold the respect for international law and ironically curbed civil liberties in the United States. The axis of evil-speech galvanized both North Korea and Iran to pursue an even more aggressive anti-US policy and embark on a dangerously unilateralist course in international diplomacy. To the dismay of the international community, Iran has gone ahead with its nuclear program while North Korea has gone even further, conducting a test of its nuclear weapons for the first time. The axis of evil-speech and its concomitant implications effectively illuminates and clearly demonstrates the power of language. This troubling mechanism is an inherent component of the most fundamental and problematic implication which this study has endeavored to elucidate and whose significance supersedes all the others as it is endemic to the discourse. *The "war on terrorism" has generated the very calamity and evil it has sought to uproot, it has produced the very terrorists it has aimed to disarm.* This has been done by an active exercise of power through the medium of language and imposing an absolutist identity on subjects, in this case "terrorists". Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory thus grasps the great Foucaultian insight of the constitutive character of power. Notwithstanding, it must be noted that their account is much less explicit and powerful than that of Foucault. The recruits of Al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Iraq, the Al Qaeda affiliated elements responsible for the bombings in Istanbul, Bali, Madrid, London and elsewhere and the Iraqi insurgents blamed for continuous devastating terrorist attacks are all products of the discourse. Moreover, Bush's statements regarding the war in Iraq (see italics p 22-23) evinces that the Bush administration it has played into the hands the "enemy" by allowing them to dictate the conditions of this "war". In sum, the findings of National Intelligence Estimate should hardly be greeted with surprise. Due to its inherent contradictions, the "war on terrorism" is self-defeating as it produces its own grave-diggers.

At last, a critical note on Laclau and Mouffe's Foucaultian conception of power. While it luminously manages to identify the empirical symptom, it nevertheless falls short of a normative critique. In short, the critical deficit inherent in Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory and abstract conceptualization of power makes it difficult to attack the point where power produces its pestiferous effects. While power is far more complex than being reduced to a determinant center, it is nevertheless continuously exerted- not seldom in an arbitrarily and obfuscated fashion- by self-declared masters over fettered slaves.

9. Concluding Remarks

This study has aimed to go beyond a critical approach towards the “war on terrorism” from the “outside” by challenging from its very “inside”, the logocentric nucleus of the discourse. It has demonstrated that far from being natural, logical and consistent, the discourse “war on terrorism” is ambivalent, contextual and self-defeating. The Bush administration has endeavored to portray this “war” as an apocalyptic historico-ideological struggle between good and evil. In depicting America as the self-declared champion and vindicator of civilization leading history towards absolute freedom, George W Bush has fallen in the trap of Hegelian dialectics. Oversimplifying antagonism in a bifurcated fashion, the US President does not differ himself from the Nietzschean priest who seeks negation (i.e. an antithetical Other) in order to establish its own power (Deleuze 1983: 196). As Nietzsche observed, language is a form of ontological interpretation and interpretation is a form of will to power. Congruent with this argument, Bush has dangerously postulated his interpretations of political reality as self-evident truths, imposing his simplistically dangerous vision on the world. The discourse “war on terrorism” must be strongly resisted since it produces rather than disarms “terrorists” and perpetuates war rather than creating the propitious conditions for a durable world peace.

10. References

Books:

Abbott, Pamela, Wallance, Claire, 1997. *Introduktion till Sociologi – Feministiska Perspektiv*. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Adams, Simon, 2004. *All the Troubles- Terrorism, War and the World after 9/11*. Freemantle: Freemantle Arts Centre Press

Adams, William, 2003 “Aesthetics- Liberating the senses” in Carver, Terrell, 1999. *Cambridge Companion to Marx*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Althusser, Lois, 1996. *For Marx*. London: Verso

Barthes, Roland, 1966. *Critique et Verité*. Paris: Gallimard.

Bergström, Göran, Boréus, Kristina, 2005. *Textens mening och makt: metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys*. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Best, Steven, Kellner, Douglas, 1991. *Postmodern Theory- Critical Interrogations*. New York: The Guilford Press

Blackburn, Simon, *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University

Bloor, David, 1997 “The Question of Linguistical Idealism Revisited” in Sluga, Hans, Stern David G, 1997. *The Cambridge Companion to Wittgenstein*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Borradori, Giovanna, 2003. *Philosophy in a time of terror- Dialogues with Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bush, George W, 2003. *We will prevail: President George W Bush on war, terrorism and freedom/ selected and edited by the National Review; Foreword by Peggy Noonan; Introduction by Jay Nordlinger*. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd.

Bush, George W, 2001, “Declaring a War on Terrorism” in Dietrich , John W, 2005, *The George W Bush Foreign Policy Reader- Presidential Speeches with Commentary*. London and New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc.

Bush, George W, 2002 “Remarks at the United Nations” in Dietrich , John W, 2005, *The George W Bush Foreign Policy Reader- Presidential Speeches with Commentary*. London and New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc.

Bush, George W, 2003 “End of Major Combat Operations” in Dietrich , John W, 2005, *The George W Bush Foreign Policy Reader- Presidential Speeches with Commentary*. London and New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc.

Bush, George W, 2003 “Future of Iraq” in Dietrich , John W, 2005, *The George W Bush Foreign Policy Reader- Presidential Speeches with Commentary*. London and New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc.

Calhoun, Craig, 1994, “Social Theory and Politics of Identity” in Calhoun, Craig, 1994. *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*. Blackwell:Oxford

Chomsky, Noam, 2001. *11/9*. Stockholm: Ordfront

Chomsky, Noam, 2004. *Hybris, USA:s strävan efter global dominans*. Stockholm: Ordfront

Clarke, Richard, 2004. *Against all Enemies- Insides America's War on Terror*. Sidney: Simon & Schuster.

Connor, Steven, 2004. *Cambridge Companion to Postmodernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crockatt, Richard, 2003. *America Embattled*. London: Routledge

Croft, Stuart, 2006. *Culture, Crisis and America's War on Terror*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Daadler, Ivo H, Lindsay, James M, 2005. *America Unbound- The Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

De Beauvoir, Simone, 1993. *The Second Sex*. London: Every Man's Library

Deleuze, Gilles, 1983. *Nietzsche & Philosophy*. London: The Athlone Press.

Deleuze, Gilles, 1986. *Foucault*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Derrida, Jacques, 1967. *De la grammatologie*. Paris: Minuit.

Derrida, Jacques, Ferraris, Maurizio, 2001, *A Taste for the Secret*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Derrida, Jacques, 2006. *Writing and Difference*. London: Routledge.

Dietrich , John W, 2005, *The George W Bush Foreign Policy Reader- Presidential Speeches with Commentary*. London and New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc.

Engels, Friedrich, Marx, Karl, 1998. *The German Ideology*. New York: Prometheus Books.

Eriksson, Catharina, Eriksson, Maria Baaz, Thörn, Håkan, 2005. *Globaliseringens kulturer- Den postkoloniala paradoxen, rasismen och det mångkulturella samhället*. Falun: Nya Doxa

Fairlough, Norman, 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis- The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman

Flynn, Thomas, 1994. "Foucault's mapping of history" in Gutting, Gary, 1994. *Cambridge Companion to Foucault*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Foucault, Michel, 1976. *Histoire de la sexualité 1- La volonté de savoir*. Paris: Gallimard.

Foucault, Michel, 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. New York: Pantheon Books

Foucault, Michel, 1988, *Politics, Philosophy, Culture- Interviews and other writings 1977-1984*. New York: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel, 1993. *Diskursens ordning*, Stehag: Symposion.

Foucault Michel, 1997, "Power, Right, Truth" in Goodin, Robert E, Pettit, Philip, 1997. *Contemporary Political Philosophers*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Foucault, Michel, 2000, *Power*. London: London Penguin Press.

Foucault, Michel, 2003. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Gordon, Phillip, Schapiro, Jeremy, 2004. *Allies at War- America, Europe and the Crisis over Iraq*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies

Forster, Michael, 1999. "Hegel's Dialectical Method" in Beiser, Fredrick C, 1999. *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Gramsci, Antonio, 1971. *Selections from Prison Notebooks*. Oxford: University Printing House

Griffith, Lee, 2002, *The War on Terrorism and The Terror of God*. Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Gurtov, Mel, 2006, *Superpower on Crusade- The Bush Doctrine in US Foreign Policy*. Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc.

Habermas, Jurgen, 2006. *The Divided West*. Cambridge: Polity

Haddad, Yvonne, 2004 "The shaping of a moderate North American Islam: Between "Mufti" Bush and "Ayatollah" Ashcroft" in Gabriel, Tehodore, Geaves, Ron, Haddad, Yvonne, Smith Idealman, Jane, 2004. *Islam & The West Post 9/11*. Burlington: Ashgate

Haslanger, Sally, 2000, "Feminism in Metaphysics- Negotiating the Natural" in Frickner, Miranda, Hornsby, Jennifer, 2000. *The Cambridge companion to Feminism in Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, Martin, 2003 "Diskursanalys av nationell identitet" in Petersson, Bo, Robertson, Alexa, 2003. *Identitetsstudier i praktiken*, Malmö: Liber.

Hardy, Cynthia, Phillips, Nelson, 2002. *Discourse Analysis- Investigating Processes of Social Construction*. London: Sage Publications

Harik Palmer, Judith, 2004. *Hezbollah- The Changing Face of Terrorism*. London & New York: I.B. Tauris

Hegel, George, Wilhelm, Friedrich, 1977. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heidegger, Martin, 1993. *Basic Writings*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco

Henderson, Harry, 2001. *Global Terrorism- The Complete Reference Guide*. New York: Checkmark Books.

Herring, George C, 2002 "From the Persian Gulf War to 9/11/2001: Confronting a New World Order" in Chafe, William, Sitkoff, Harvard, Bailey, Beth, 2003. *A History of Our Time*. New York: Oxford University Press

Hersh, Seymour, 2004. *The Chain of Command: The Road from 9/11 to Abu Ghraib*. London: Penguin Group

Hiro, Dilip, 2002. *War without End*. London and New York: Routledge

Hoy, Couzens, David, 1986. *Foucault- A critical reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Howarth, David, 2000. *Discourse*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Howarth, David, Norval, J. Aletta, Stavrakakis, Yannis, 2000. *Discourse theory and political analysis : identities, hegemonies and social change*. Manchester : Manchester University Press, 2000

Ivie, Robert L., 2005. *Democracy and America's War on Terror*. Alabama: Alabama University Press.

Jackson, Phil, 2005. *Writing The War on Terrorism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Jervis, Robert, 2005. *American Foreign Policy in a New Era*. New York: Routledge

Juergensmeyer, Mark, 2003. *Terror in the Mind of God*. Berkley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press.

Jørgensen Winther, Marianne, Phillips, Louise, 2000. *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Kean, Thomas H, 2004. *The 9/11 Commission Report*. New York: W.W. Norton

Kellner, Douglas, 2003. *From 9/11 to Terror War- The Dangers of Bush Legacy*. London and New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Kinnvall, Catarina, 2003 "Identitetsstudier- En översikt" in Petersson, Bo, Robertson, Alexa, 2003. *Identitetsstudier i praktiken*, Malmö: Liber.

Lacan, Jacques, 1989. *Ecrits- Spegelstadiet och andra skrifter*. Stockholm: Natur& Kultur.

Lacan, Jacques , 1998. *The four fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis*. London: Vintage.

Laclau, Ernesto, Mouffe, Chantal, 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.

Lee Anderson, Jon, 2004. *The Fall of Baghdad*. New York: The Penguin Press

Lakoff, Robin T, 2003 "War Talk" in Abrams, Irvin, Gungwu Wang, 2003. *The Iraq War and its Consequences Vol. 1- Thoughts of Nobel Peace Laureates and Eminent Scholars*. Singapore; New Jersey : World Scientific Publishing Co.

Lubcke, Poul, 1988. *Filosofilexkonet*. Stockholm: Bokförlaget Forum AB

Lytard, Jean-Francois, 1979. *La Condition Postmoderne*. Paris: Minuit.

Mamdani, Mahmood, 2004. *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim*. New York: Pantheon Books

Marx, Karl, 2003 "Kapitalet" in Liedman, Sven-Eric, 2003. *Karl Marx- Texter i urval*. Stockholm: Ordfront

Marsh, David- Stoker, David, 2002. *Theory and Methods in Political Science*. New York; Macmillan

Mead, Russell Walter, 2005. *Power, Terror, Peace and War: America's Grand Strategy in a World at Risk*. New York and Toronto: Vintage Books

Moens, Alexander, 2004. *The Foreign Policy of George W Bush: Values, Strategy, Loyalty*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company

Napoleoni, Loretta, 2003. *Modern Jihad- Tracing the Dollars behind the Terror Networks*. London: Pluto Press.

Nietzsche, Friedrich, 1989. *Beyond Good and Evil- Prelude to a Philosophy a Future*. New York: Vintage Book Edition

Nietzsche, Friedrich, 2001. *The Gay Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norris, Christopher, 1982. *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd.

Payne, Michael, 1993. *Reading theory: an introduction to Lacan, Derrida and Kristeva*. Oxford : Blackwell.

Petersson Bo, 2003 "Intervjubarade studier av kollektiva identiteter" in Petersson, Bo, Robertson, Alexa, 2003. *Identitetsstudier i praktiken*, Malmö: Liber.

Pollack, Kenneth M, 2005. *The Persian Puzzle- The Conflict between Iran and America*. New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks

Popper, Karl, 2003. *The Open Society and Its Enemies: Volume Two: Hegel and Marx*. New York: Routledge.

Robin, Corey, 2004. *The history of a Political Idea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rogers, Paul, 2006. *Iraq and the War on Terror- Twelve months of insurgency 2004/2005*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Rorty, Richard, 2003 "Humiliation or Solidarity?" in Levy, Daniel, Pensky, Max, Torpey, John, 2005. *Old Europe, New Europe, Core Europe- Transatlantic Relations after the Iraq War*. London and New York: Verso.

Rouse, Joseph, 1994. "Power/Knowledge" in Gutting, Gary, 1994. *Cambridge Companion to Foucault*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Royle, Nicholas, 2003. *Jacques Derrida*. New York: Routledge.

Said, Edward, 1993. *Orientalism*. Stockholm: Ordfront.

Simons, John, 2004. *Contemporary Critical Theorists*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Singer, Peter, 2004. *The President of good and Evil*. London: Granta Books

Saussure, Ferdinand de, 1949. *Cours de Linguistique Générale*. Paris: Payot.

Saussure, Ferdinand de, 2002. *Ecrits de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard

Schrift, D, Alan, 2005. "Nietzsche's French Legacy" in Bernd, Magnus, Higgins, M, Kathleen, 2005. *The Cambridge Companion to Nietzsche*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stavrakakis, Yannis "Jacques Lacan" in Simons, John, 2004. *Contemporary Critical Theorists*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Tan, T. H. Andrew, 2006. *The Politics of Terrorism- A Survey*. London: Routledge

Taylor, Charles, 1986 "Foucault on Freedom and Truth" in Hoy, Couzens, David, 1986. *Foucault- A critical reader*. Oxford: Blackwell

Taylor, Charles, 1986. *Hegel*. Lund & Stockholm: Symposion

Torfinn, Jacob, 1999. *New Theories of Discourse- Laclau, Mouffe and Zizek*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Wilkinson, Paul, 2006. *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response*. London & New York: Routledge.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 1993. *Philosophical Occasions*. Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company

Woodward, Bob, 2002. *Bush at War*. London and New York: Pocket Books

Woodward, Bob, 2004. *Plan of Attack*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Zaretsky, Eli, 1994. "Psychoanalysis, Marxism, Post-Structuralism" in Calhoun, Craig, 1994. *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*. Blackwell:Oxford

Zizek, Slavoj, 2005. *Iraq- The Borrowed Kettle*. London and New York: Verso

Articles:

Fukuyama, Francis, 1989. *The End of History?* National Interest. Summer

Gerchhoff, Amy, Kushner, Shana, 2005. *Shaping Public Opinion: The 9/11-Iraq Connection in the Bush Administration's Rhetoric*. Perspectives on Politics 3, no.3, 525-37. Cambridge University Press.

White, Jeffrey, 2006. *An Adaptive Insurgency: Confronting Adversary Networks in Iraq*. The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, Policy Focus #58, September.

Internet:

A change at the Pentagon, 2006. International Herald Tribune, 8 November.

http://www.iht.com/articles/ap/2006/11/08/america/NA_GEN_US_Rumsfeld_Resigns.php

Adress in North Carolina on the War on Terror, 2006. George W Bush, 6 April

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/04.06.06.html>

Adress to the Nation on the Five-Year Anniversary of 9/11, 2006. George W Bush, 11 September <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/09.11.06.html>

Britain to drop "war on terror" 2006. Washington Times, 11

December <http://www.washtimes.com/world/20061210-110420-8872r.htm>

Bush calls stopping bin Laden 'greatest challenge', 2005. USA Today, 3 Mars.

http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2005-03-03-bush-binladen_x.htm

Declassified Key Judgments of the National Intelligence "Trends in Global Terrorism: Implications for the United States", 2006. April

http://www.dni.gov/press_releases/Declassified_NIE_Key_Judgments.pdf

Defending the War, Bush, 2004. George W Bush, 12 July

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/07.12.04.html>

Hadley: Bush knows changes needed in Iraq, 2006. CNN, 4 December.

<http://www.cnn.com/2006/POLITICS/12/03/hadley/index.html>

Iraq War Strategy: Speech at Naval Academy, 2005. George W Bush, 30 November

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/11.30.05.html>

Iran & War on Terror: Adress to the Military Officers Association of America, Washington DC, 2006. George W Bush, 5 September

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/09.05.06.html>

Kuala Lumpur Hosts the Extraordinary Conference of Foreign Ministers of Islamic States on Terrorism, 2002. OIC, 1 April

<http://www.oic-un.org/pr/2002/113.html>

"Suspects" condemn Bush's speech, 2002. BBC, 30 January

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/1791554.stm>

President Bush Holds Press Conference, 2001. The White House, 13 March.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/03/20020313-8.html>

Remarks by the President to Employees at the Pentagon, 2001. The White House, 17 September.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010917-3.html>

Rumsfeld: France and Germany are “problems” in Iraqi conflict, 2003. CNN, 23 January.
<http://www.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/meast/01/22/sprj.iq.wrap/>

Seven killed in Afghanistan bombing, 2006. Guardian, 6 December.
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/afghanistan/story/0,,1965359,00.html>

Spy Agencies Say Iraq War Worsens Terrorism Threat, 2006. New York Times, September 24.
<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/24/world/middleeast/24terror.html?ex=1316750400&en=da252be85d1b39fa&ei=5088&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss>

State of the Union Address, 2006. George W Bush, 31 January
<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/01.31.06.html>

The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, 2002, The White House, September.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.pdf>

The War on Terror: At Home and Abroad, 2006. George W Bush, 23 January
<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/01.23.06.html>

U.S Department of State, Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, The Terrorist enemy, Terrorist groups, 2006.
<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/45323.pdf>

US expands “axis of evil”, 2002. BBC, 6 May.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/1971852.stm>

US 'not winning conflict in Iraq', 2006. BBC, 5 December.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/6209356.stm>

U.S. Not Winning War in Iraq, Bush Says for 1st Time, 2006. Washington Post, 20 December.
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2006/12/19/AR2006121900880_pf.html

Appendix 1 – George W Bush’s Presidential Address to the Nation 11 September

Good evening. Today, our fellow citizens, our way of life, our very freedom came under attack in a series of deliberate and deadly terrorist acts. The victims were in airplanes, or in their offices; secretaries, businessmen and women, military and federal workers; moms and dads, friends and neighbors. Thousands of lives were suddenly ended by evil, despicable acts of terror.

The pictures of airplanes flying into buildings, fires burning, huge structures collapsing, have filled us with disbelief, terrible sadness, and a quiet, unyielding anger. These acts of mass murder were intended to frighten our nation into chaos and retreat. But they have failed; our country is strong.

A great people has been moved to defend a great nation. Terrorist attacks can shake the foundations of our biggest buildings, but they cannot touch the foundation of America. These acts shattered steel, but they cannot dent the steel of American resolve.

America was targeted for attack because we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world. And no one will keep that light from shining.

Today, our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature. And we responded with the best of America -- with the daring of our rescue workers, with the caring for strangers and neighbors who came to give blood and help in any way they could.

Immediately following the first attack, I implemented our government's emergency response plans. Our military is powerful, and it's prepared. Our emergency teams are working in New York City and Washington, D.C. to help with local rescue efforts.

Our first priority is to get help to those who have been injured, and to take every precaution to protect our citizens at home and around the world from further attacks.

The functions of our government continue without interruption. Federal agencies in Washington which had to be evacuated today are reopening for essential personnel tonight, and will be open for business tomorrow. Our financial institutions remain strong, and the American economy will be open for business, as well.

The search is underway for those who are behind these evil acts. I've directed the full resources of our intelligence and law enforcement communities to find those responsible and to bring them to justice. We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them.

I appreciate so very much the members of Congress who have joined me in strongly condemning these attacks. And on behalf of the American people, I thank the many world leaders who have called to offer their condolences and assistance.

America and our friends and allies join with all those who want peace and security in the world, and we stand together to win the war against terrorism. Tonight, I ask for your prayers for all those who grieve, for the children whose worlds have been shattered, for all whose sense of safety and security has been threatened.

And I pray they will be comforted by a power greater than any of us, spoken through the ages in Psalm 23: "Even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil, for You are with me."

This is a day when all Americans from every walk of life unite in our resolve for justice and peace. America has stood down enemies before, and we will do so this time. None of us will ever forget this day. Yet, we go forward to defend freedom and all that is good and just in our world.

Thank you. Good night, and God bless America.

Appendix 2- Excerpt from George W. Bush's Address to the Joint Session of Congress
Washington, DC September 20, 2001

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President Pro Tempore, members of Congress, and fellow Americans:

In the normal course of events, Presidents come to this chamber to report on the state of the Union. Tonight, no such report is needed. It has already been delivered by the American people.

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

We have seen the state of our Union in the endurance of rescuers, working past exhaustion. We have seen the unfurling of flags, the lighting of candles, the giving of blood, the saying of prayers -- in English, Hebrew, and Arabic. We have seen the decency of a loving and giving people who have made the grief of strangers their own. My fellow citizens, for the last nine days, the entire world has seen for itself the state of our Union -- and it is strong.

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

I thank the Congress for its leadership at such an important time. All of America was touched on the evening of the tragedy to see Republicans and Democrats joined together on the steps of this Capitol, singing "God Bless America." And you did more than sing; you acted, by delivering \$40 billion to rebuild our communities and meet the needs of our military.

Speaker Hastert, Minority Leader Gephardt, Majority Leader Daschle and Senator Lott, I thank you for your friendship, for your leadership and for your service to our country.

And on behalf of the American people, I thank the world for its outpouring of support. America will never forget the sounds of our National Anthem playing at Buckingham Palace, on the streets of Paris, and at Berlin's Brandenburg Gate.

We will not forget South Korean children gathering to pray outside our embassy in Seoul, or the prayers of sympathy offered at a mosque in Cairo. We will not forget moments of silence and days of mourning in Australia and Africa and Latin America.

Nor will we forget the citizens of 80 other nations who died with our own: dozens of Pakistanis; more than 130 Israelis; more than 250 citizens of India; men and women from El Salvador, Iran, Mexico and Japan; and hundreds of British citizens. America has no truer friend than Great Britain. Once again, we are joined together in a great cause -- so honored the British Prime Minister has crossed an ocean to show his unity of purpose with America. Thank you for coming, friend.

On September the 11th, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country. Americans have known wars -- but for the past 136 years, they have been wars on foreign soil, except for one Sunday in 1941. Americans have known the casualties of war -- but not at the center of a great city on a peaceful morning. Americans have known surprise attacks -- but never before on thousands of civilians. All of this was brought upon us in a single day -- and night fell on a different world, a world where freedom itself is under attack.

Americans have many questions tonight. Americans are asking: Who attacked our country? The evidence we have gathered all points to a collection of loosely affiliated terrorist organizations known as al Qaeda. They are the same murderers indicted for bombing American embassies in Tanzania and Kenya, and responsible for bombing the USS Cole.

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

The terrorists practice a fringe form of Islamic extremism that has been rejected by Muslim scholars and the vast majority of Muslim clerics -- a fringe movement that perverts the peaceful teachings of Islam. The terrorists' directive commands them to kill Christians and Jews, to kill all Americans, and make no distinction among military and civilians, including women and children.

This group and its leader -- a person named Osama bin Laden -- are linked to many other organizations in different countries, including the Egyptian Islamic Jihad and the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan. There are thousands of these terrorists in more than 60 countries. They are recruited from their own nations and neighborhoods and brought to camps in places like Afghanistan, where they are trained in the tactics of terror. They are sent back to their homes or sent to hide in countries around the world to plot evil and destruction. The leadership of al Qaeda has great influence in Afghanistan and supports the Taliban regime in controlling most of that country. In Afghanistan, we see al Qaeda's vision for the world.

Afghanistan's people have been brutalized -- many are starving and many have fled. Women are not allowed to attend school. You can be jailed for owning a television. Religion can be practiced only as their leaders dictate. A man can be jailed in Afghanistan if his beard is not long enough.

The United States respects the people of Afghanistan -- after all, we are currently its largest source of humanitarian aid -- but we condemn the Taliban regime. It is not only repressing its own people, it is threatening people everywhere by sponsoring and sheltering and supplying terrorists. By aiding and abetting murder, the Taliban regime is committing murder.

And tonight, the United States of America makes the following demands on the Taliban: Deliver to United States authorities all the leaders of al Qaeda who hide in your land. (Applause.) Release all foreign nationals, including American citizens, you have unjustly imprisoned. Protect foreign journalists, diplomats and aid workers in your country. Close immediately and permanently every terrorist training camp in Afghanistan, and hand over every terrorist, and every person in their support structure, to appropriate authorities. Give the United States full access to terrorist training camps, so we can make sure they are no longer operating.

These demands are not open to negotiation or discussion. The Taliban must act, and act immediately. They will hand over the terrorists, or they will share in their fate.

I also want to speak tonight directly to Muslims throughout the world. We respect your faith. It's practiced freely by many millions of Americans, and by millions more in countries that America counts as friends. Its teachings are good and peaceful, and those who commit evil in the name of Allah blaspheme the name of Allah. (Applause.) The terrorists are traitors to their own faith, trying, in effect, to hijack Islam itself. The enemy of America is not our many Muslim friends; it is not our many Arab friends. Our enemy is a radical network of terrorists, and every government that supports them.

Our war on terror begins with al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated.

Americans are asking, why do they hate us? They hate what we see right here in this chamber -- a democratically elected government. Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms -- our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other.

They want to overthrow existing governments in many Muslim countries, such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan. They want to drive Israel out of the Middle East. They want to drive Christians and Jews out of vast regions of Asia and Africa.

These terrorists kill not merely to end lives, but to disrupt and end a way of life. With every atrocity, they hope that America grows fearful, retreating from the world and forsaking our friends. They stand against us, because we stand in their way.

We are not deceived by their pretenses to piety. We have seen their kind before. They are the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the 20th century. By sacrificing human life to serve their radical visions -- by abandoning every value except the will to power -- they follow in the path of fascism, and Nazism, and totalitarianism. And they will follow that path all the way, to where it ends: in history's unmarked grave of discarded lies.

Americans are asking: How will we fight and win this war? We will direct every resource at our command -- every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war -- to the disruption and to the defeat of the global terror network. This war will not be like the war against Iraq a decade ago, with a decisive liberation of territory and a swift conclusion. It will not look like the air war above Kosovo two years ago, where no ground troops were used and not a single American was lost in combat.

Our response involves far more than instant retaliation and isolated strikes. Americans should not expect one battle, but a lengthy campaign, unlike any other we have ever seen. It may include dramatic strikes, visible on TV, and covert operations, secret even in success. We will starve terrorists of funding, turn them one against another, drive them from place to place, until there is no refuge or no rest. And we will pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism. Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime.

Our nation has been put on notice: We are not immune from attack. We will take defensive measures against terrorism to protect Americans. Today, dozens of federal departments and agencies, as well as state and local governments, have responsibilities affecting homeland security. These efforts must be coordinated at the highest level. So tonight I announce the creation of a Cabinet-level position reporting directly to me -- the Office of Homeland Security.

And tonight I also announce a distinguished American to lead this effort, to strengthen American security: a military veteran, an effective governor, a true patriot, a trusted friend -- Pennsylvania's Tom Ridge. He will lead, oversee and coordinate a comprehensive national strategy to safeguard our country against terrorism, and respond to any attacks that may come.

These measures are essential. 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.

We ask every nation to join us. We will ask, and we will need, the help of police forces, intelligence services, and banking systems around the world. The United States is grateful that many nations and many international organizations have already responded -- with sympathy and with support. Nations from Latin America, to Asia, to Africa, to Europe, to the Islamic world. Perhaps the NATO Charter reflects best the attitude of the world: An attack on one is an attack on all.

The civilized world is rallying to America's side. They understand that if this terror goes unpunished, their own cities, their own citizens may be next. Terror, unanswered, can not only bring down buildings, it can threaten the stability of legitimate governments. And you know what -- we're not going to allow it.

Americans are asking: What is expected of us? I ask you to live your lives, and hug your children. I know many citizens have fears tonight, and I ask you to be calm and resolute, even in the face of a continuing threat. I ask you to uphold the values of America, and remember why so many have come here. We are in a fight for our principles, and our first responsibility is to live by them. No one should be singled out for unfair treatment or unkind words because of their ethnic background or religious faith.

I ask you to continue to support the victims of this tragedy with your contributions. Those who want to give can go to a central source of information, libertyunites.org, to find the names of groups providing direct help in New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

The thousands of FBI agents who are now at work in this investigation may need your cooperation, and I ask you to give it.

I ask for your patience, with the delays and inconveniences that may accompany tighter security; and for your patience in what will be a long struggle.

I ask your continued participation and confidence in the American economy. Terrorists attacked a symbol of American prosperity. They did not touch its source. America is successful because of the hard work, and creativity, and enterprise of our people. These were the true strengths of our economy before September 11th, and they are our strengths today.

And, finally, please continue praying for the victims of terror and their families, for those in uniform, and for our great country. Prayer has comforted us in sorrow, and will help strengthen us for the journey ahead. Tonight I thank my fellow Americans for what you have already done and for what you will do. And ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, I thank you, their representatives, for what you have already done and for what we will do together.

Tonight, we face new and sudden national challenges. We will come together to improve air safety, to dramatically expand the number of air marshals on domestic flights, and take new measures to prevent hijacking. We will come together to promote stability and keep our airlines flying, with direct assistance during this emergency.

We will come together to give law enforcement the additional tools it needs to track down terror here at home. We will come together to strengthen our intelligence capabilities to know the plans of terrorists before they act, and find them before they strike.

We will come together to take active steps that strengthen America's economy, and put our people back to work.

Tonight we welcome two leaders who embody the extraordinary spirit of all New Yorkers: Governor George Pataki, and Mayor Rudolph Giuliani. As a symbol of America's resolve, my administration will work with Congress, and these two leaders, to show the world that we will rebuild New York City.

After all that has just passed -- all the lives taken, and all the possibilities and hopes that died with them -- it is natural to wonder if America's future is one of fear. Some speak of an age of terror. I know there are struggles ahead, and dangers to face. But this country will define our times, not be defined by them. As long as the United States of America is determined and strong, this will not be an age of terror; this will be an age of liberty, here and across the world.

Great harm has been done to us. We have suffered great loss. And in our grief and anger we have found our mission and our moment. Freedom and fear are at war. The advance of human freedom -- the great achievement of our time, and the great hope of every time -- now depends on us. Our nation -- this generation -- will lift a dark threat of violence from our people and our future. We will rally the world to this cause by our efforts, by our courage. We will not tire, we will not falter, and we will not fail.

It is my hope that in the months and years ahead, life will return almost to normal. We'll go back to our lives and routines, and that is good. Even grief recedes with time and grace. But our resolve must not pass. Each of us will remember what happened that day, and to whom it happened. We'll remember the moment the news came -- where we were and what we were doing. Some will remember an image of a fire, or a story of rescue. Some will carry memories of a face and a voice gone forever.

And I will carry this: It is the police shield of a man named George Howard, who died at the World Trade Center trying to save others. It was given to me by his mom, Arlene, as a proud memorial to her son. This is my reminder of lives that ended, and a task that does not end.

I will not forget this wound to our country or those who inflicted it. I will not yield; I will not rest; I will not relent in waging this struggle for freedom and security for the American people.

The course of this conflict is not known, yet its outcome is certain. Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them.

Fellow citizens, we'll meet violence with patient justice -- assured of the rightness of our cause, and confident of the victories to come. In all that lies before us, may God grant us wisdom, and may He watch over the United States of America.

Thank you

Appendix 3- Excerpt from George W. Bush's State of the Union Washington, DC January 29, 2002

Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Vice President Cheney, members of Congress, distinguished guests, fellow citizens: As we gather tonight, our nation is at war, our economy is in recession, and the civilized world faces unprecedented dangers. Yet the state of our Union has never been stronger. (Applause.)

We last met in an hour of shock and suffering. In four short months, our nation has comforted the victims, begun to rebuild New York and the Pentagon, rallied a great coalition, captured, arrested, and rid the world of thousands of terrorists, destroyed Afghanistan's terrorist training camps, saved a people from starvation, and freed a country from brutal oppression. (Applause.)

The American flag flies again over our embassy in Kabul. Terrorists who once occupied Afghanistan now occupy cells at Guantanamo Bay. (Applause.) And terrorist leaders who urged followers to sacrifice their lives are running for their own. (Applause.)

America and Afghanistan are now allies against terror. We'll be partners in rebuilding that country. And this evening we welcome the distinguished interim leader of a liberated Afghanistan: Chairman Hamid Karzai. (Applause.)

The last time we met in this chamber, the mothers and daughters of Afghanistan were captives in their own homes, forbidden from working or going to school. Today women are free, and are part of Afghanistan's new government. And we welcome the new Minister of Women's Affairs, Doctor Sima Samar. (Applause.)

Our progress is a tribute to the spirit of the Afghan people, to the resolve of our coalition, and to the might of the United States military. (Applause.) When I called our troops into action, I did so with complete confidence in their courage and skill. And tonight, thanks to them, we are winning the war on terror. (Applause.) The man and women of our Armed Forces have delivered a message now clear to every enemy of the United States: Even 7,000 miles away, across oceans and continents, on mountaintops and in caves -- you will not escape the justice of this nation. (Applause.)

For many Americans, these four months have brought sorrow, and pain that will never completely go away. Every day a retired firefighter returns to Ground Zero, to feel closer to his two sons who died there. At a memorial in New York, a little boy left his football with a note for his lost father: Dear Daddy, please take this to heaven. I don't want to play football until I can play with you again some day.

Last month, at the grave of her husband, Michael, a CIA officer and Marine who died in Mazur-e-Sharif, Shannon Spann said these words of farewell: "Semper Fi, my love." Shannon is with us tonight. (Applause.)

Shannon, I assure you and all who have lost a loved one that our cause is just, and our country will never forget the debt we owe Michael and all who gave their lives for freedom.

Our cause is just, and it continues. Our discoveries in Afghanistan confirmed our worst fears, and showed us the true scope of the task ahead. We have seen the depth of our enemies' hatred in videos, where they laugh about the loss of innocent life. And the depth of their hatred is equaled by the madness of the destruction they design. We have found diagrams of American nuclear power plants and public water facilities, detailed instructions for making chemical weapons, surveillance maps of American cities, and thorough descriptions of landmarks in America and throughout the world.

What we have found in Afghanistan confirms that, far from ending there, our war against terror is only beginning. Most of the 19 men who hijacked planes on September the 11th were trained in Afghanistan's camps, and so were tens of thousands of others. Thousands of dangerous killers, schooled in the methods of murder, often supported by outlaw regimes, are now spread throughout the world like ticking time bombs, set to go off without warning.

Thanks to the work of our law enforcement officials and coalition partners, hundreds of terrorists have been arrested. Yet, tens of thousands of trained terrorists are still at large. These enemies view the entire world as a battlefield, and we must pursue them wherever they are. (Applause.) So long as training camps operate, so long as nations harbor terrorists, freedom is at risk. And America and our allies must not, and will not, allow it. (Applause.)

Our nation will continue to be steadfast and patient and persistent in the pursuit of two great objectives. First, we will shut down terrorist camps, disrupt terrorist plans, and bring terrorists to justice. And, second, we must prevent the terrorists and regimes who seek chemical, biological or nuclear weapons from threatening the United States and the world. (Applause.)

Our military has put the terror training camps of Afghanistan out of business, yet camps still exist in at least a dozen countries. A terrorist underworld -- including groups like Hamas, Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad, Jaish-i-Mohammed -- operates in remote jungles and deserts, and hides in the centers of large cities.

While the most visible military action is in Afghanistan, America is acting elsewhere. We now have troops in the Philippines, helping to train that country's armed forces to go after terrorist cells that have executed an American, and still hold hostages. Our soldiers, working with the Bosnian government, seized terrorists who were plotting to bomb our embassy. Our Navy is patrolling the coast of Africa to block the shipment of weapons and the establishment of terrorist camps in Somalia.

My hope is that all nations will heed our call, and eliminate the terrorist parasites who threaten their countries and our own. Many nations are acting forcefully. Pakistan is now cracking down on terror, and I admire the strong leadership of President Musharraf. (Applause.)

But some governments will be timid in the face of terror. And make no mistake about it: If they do not act, America will. (Applause.)

Our second goal is to prevent regimes that sponsor terror from threatening America or our friends and allies with weapons of mass destruction. Some of these regimes have been pretty quiet since September the 11th. But we know their true nature. North Korea is a regime arming with missiles and weapons of mass destruction, while starving its citizens.

Iran aggressively pursues these weapons and exports terror, while an unelected few repress the Iranian people's hope for freedom.

Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop anthrax, and nerve gas, and nuclear weapons for over a decade. This is a regime that has already used poison gas to murder thousands of its own citizens -- leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over their dead children. This is a regime that agreed to international inspections -- then kicked out the inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world.

States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic.

We will work closely with our coalition to deny terrorists and their state sponsors the materials, technology, and expertise to make and deliver weapons of mass destruction. We will develop and deploy effective missile defenses to protect America and our allies from sudden attack. (Applause.) And all nations should know: America will do what is necessary to ensure our nation's security. We'll be deliberate, yet time is not on our side. I will not wait on events, while dangers gather. I will not stand by, as peril draws closer and closer. The United States of America will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons. (Applause.)

Our war on terror is well begun, but it is only begun. This campaign may not be finished on our watch -- yet it must be and it will be waged on our watch.

We can't stop short. If we stop now -- leaving terror camps intact and terror states unchecked -- our sense of security would be false and temporary. History has called America and our allies to action, and it is both our responsibility and our privilege to fight freedom's fight. (Applause.)

Our first priority must always be the security of our nation, and that will be reflected in the budget I send to Congress. My budget supports three great goals for America: We will win this war; we'll protect our homeland; and we will revive our economy.

September the 11th brought out the best in America, and the best in this Congress. And I join the American people in applauding your unity and resolve. (Applause.) Now Americans deserve to have this same spirit directed toward addressing problems here at home. I'm a proud member of my party -- yet as we act to win the war, protect our people, and create jobs in America, we must act, first and foremost, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans. (Applause.)

It costs a lot to fight this war. We have spent more than a billion dollars a month -- over \$30 million a day -- and we must be prepared for future operations. Afghanistan proved that expensive precision weapons defeat the enemy and spare innocent lives, and we need more of them. We need to replace aging aircraft and make our military more agile, to put our troops anywhere in the world quickly and safely.

Our men and women in uniform deserve the best weapons, the best equipment, the best training -- and they also deserve another pay raise. (Applause.)

My budget includes the largest increase in defense spending in two decades -- because while the price of freedom and security is high, it is never too high. Whatever it costs to defend our country, we will pay. (Applause.)

The next priority of my budget is to do everything possible to protect our citizens and strengthen our nation against the ongoing threat of another attack. Time and distance from the events of September the 11th will not make us safer unless we act on its lessons. America is no longer protected by vast oceans. We are protected from attack only by vigorous action abroad, and increased vigilance at home.

Once we have funded our national security and our homeland security, the final great priority of my budget is economic security for the American people. (Applause.) To achieve these great national objectives -- to win the war, protect the homeland, and revitalize our economy -- our budget will run a deficit that will be small and short-term, so long as Congress restrains spending and acts in a fiscally responsible manner. (Applause.) We have clear priorities and we must act at home with the same purpose and resolve we have shown overseas: We'll prevail in the war, and we will defeat this recession. (Applause.)

Members, you and I will work together in the months ahead on other issues: productive farm policy -- (applause) -- a cleaner environment -- (applause) -- broader home ownership, especially among minorities -- (applause) -- and ways to encourage the good work of charities and faith-based groups. (Applause.) I ask you to join me on these important domestic issues in the same spirit of cooperation we've applied to our war against terrorism. (Applause.)

During these last few months, I've been humbled and privileged to see the true character of this country in a time of testing. Our enemies believed America was weak and materialistic, that we would splinter in fear and selfishness. They were as wrong as they are evil. (Applause.)

The American people have responded magnificently, with courage and compassion, strength and resolve. As I have met the heroes, hugged the families, and looked into the tired faces of rescuers, I have stood in awe of the American people.

None of us would ever wish the evil that was done on September the 11th. Yet after America was attacked, it was as if our entire country looked into a mirror and saw our better selves. We were reminded that we are citizens, with obligations to each other, to our country, and to history. We began to think less of the goods we can accumulate, and more about the good we can do.

For too long our culture has said, "If it feels good, do it." Now America is embracing a new ethic and a new creed: "Let's roll." (Applause.) In the sacrifice of soldiers, the fierce brotherhood of firefighters, and the bravery and generosity of ordinary citizens, we have glimpsed what a new culture of responsibility could look like. We want to be a nation that serves goals larger than self. We've been offered a unique opportunity, and we must not let this moment pass. (Applause.)

My call tonight is for every American to commit at least two years -- 4,000 hours over the rest of your lifetime -- to the service of your neighbors and your nation. (Applause.) Many are already serving, and I thank you. If you aren't sure how to help, I've got a good place to start. To sustain and extend the best that has emerged in America, I invite you to join the new USA Freedom Corps. The Freedom Corps will focus on three areas of need: responding in case of crisis at home; rebuilding our communities; and extending American compassion throughout the world.

One purpose of the USA Freedom Corps will be homeland security. America needs retired doctors and nurses who can be mobilized in major emergencies; volunteers to help police and fire departments; transportation and utility workers well-trained in spotting danger.

Our country also needs citizens working to rebuild our communities. We need mentors to love children, especially children whose parents are in prison. And we need more talented teachers in troubled schools. USA Freedom Corps will expand and improve the good efforts of AmeriCorps and Senior Corps to recruit more than 200,000 new volunteers.

And America needs citizens to extend the compassion of our country to every part of the world. So we will renew the promise of the Peace Corps, double its volunteers over the next five years -- (applause) -- and ask it to join a new effort to encourage development and education and opportunity in the Islamic world. (Applause.)

This time of adversity offers a unique moment of opportunity -- a moment we must seize to change our culture. Through the gathering momentum of millions of acts of service and decency and kindness, I know we can overcome evil with greater good. (Applause.) And we have a great opportunity during this time of war to lead the world toward the values that will bring lasting peace.

All fathers and mothers, in all societies, want their children to be educated, and live free from poverty and violence. No people on Earth yearn to be oppressed, or aspire to servitude, or eagerly await the midnight knock of the secret police.

If anyone doubts this, let them look to Afghanistan, where the Islamic "street" greeted the fall of tyranny with song and celebration. Let the skeptics look to Islam's own rich history, with its centuries of learning, and tolerance and progress. America will lead by defending liberty and justice because they are right and true and unchanging for all people everywhere. (Applause.)

No nation owns these aspirations, and no nation is exempt from them. We have no intention of imposing our culture. But America will always stand firm for the non-negotiable demands of human dignity: the rule of law; limits on the power of the state; respect for women; private property; free speech; equal justice; and religious tolerance. (Applause.)

America will take the side of brave men and women who advocate these values around the world, including the Islamic world, because we have a greater objective than eliminating threats and containing resentment. We seek a just and peaceful world beyond the war on terror.

In this moment of opportunity, a common danger is erasing old rivalries. America is working with Russia and China and India, in ways we have never before, to achieve peace and prosperity. In every region, free markets and free trade and free societies are proving their

power to lift lives. Together with friends and allies from Europe to Asia, and Africa to Latin America, we will demonstrate that the forces of terror cannot stop the momentum of freedom. (Applause.)

The last time I spoke here, I expressed the hope that life would return to normal. In some ways, it has. In others, it never will. Those of us who have lived through these challenging times have been changed by them. We've come to know truths that we will never question: evil is real, and it must be opposed. (Applause.) Beyond all differences of race or creed, we are one country, mourning together and facing danger together. Deep in the American character, there is honor, and it is stronger than cynicism. And many have discovered again that even in tragedy -- especially in tragedy -- God is near. (Applause.)

In a single instant, we realized that this will be a decisive decade in the history of liberty, that we've been called to a unique role in human events. Rarely has the world faced a choice more clear or consequential.

Our enemies send other people's children on missions of suicide and murder. They embrace tyranny and death as a cause and a creed. We stand for a different choice, made long ago, on the day of our founding. We affirm it again today. We choose freedom and the dignity of every life. (Applause.)

Steadfast in our purpose, we now press on. We have known freedom's price. We have shown freedom's power. And in this great conflict, my fellow Americans, we will see freedom's victory.

Thank you all. May God bless. (Applause.)

Appendix 4- Excerpt from George W. Bush's State of the Union Address Washington, DC
January 28, 2003

Mr. Speaker, Vice President Cheney, members of Congress, distinguished citizens and fellow citizens: Every year, by law and by custom, we meet here to consider the state of the union. This year, we gather in this chamber deeply aware of decisive days that lie ahead.

You and I serve our country in a time of great consequence. During this session of Congress, we have the duty to reform domestic programs vital to our country; we have the opportunity to save millions of lives abroad from a terrible disease. We will work for a prosperity that is broadly shared, and we will answer every danger and every enemy that threatens the American people. (Applause.)

In all these days of promise and days of reckoning, we can be confident. In a whirlwind of change and hope and peril, our faith is sure, our resolve is firm, and our union is strong. (Applause.)

This country has many challenges. We will not deny, we will not ignore, we will not pass along our problems to other Congresses, to other presidents, and other generations. (Applause.) We will confront them with focus and clarity and courage.

The qualities of courage and compassion that we strive for in America also determine our conduct abroad. The American flag stands for more than our power and our interests. Our founders dedicated this country to the cause of human dignity, the rights of every person, and the possibilities of every life. This conviction leads us into the world to help the afflicted, and defend the peace, and confound the designs of evil men.

In Afghanistan, we helped liberate an oppressed people. And we will continue helping them secure their country, rebuild their society, and educate all their children -- boys and girls. (Applause.) In the Middle East, we will continue to seek peace between a secure Israel and a democratic Palestine. (Applause.) Across the Earth, America is feeding the hungry -- more than 60 percent of international food aid comes as a gift from the people of the United States. As our nation moves troops and builds alliances to make our world safer, we must also remember our calling as a blessed country is to make this world better.

This nation can lead the world in sparing innocent people from a plague of nature. And this nation is leading the world in confronting and defeating the man-made evil of international terrorism. (Applause.)

There are days when our fellow citizens do not hear news about the war on terror. There's never a day when I do not learn of another threat, or receive reports of operations in progress, or give an order in this global war against a scattered network of killers. The war goes on, and we are winning. (Applause.)

To date, we've arrested or otherwise dealt with many key commanders of al Qaeda. They include a man who directed logistics and funding for the September the 11th attacks; the chief of al Qaeda operations in the Persian Gulf, who planned the bombings of our embassies in East Africa and the USS Cole; an al Qaeda operations chief from Southeast Asia; a former director of al Qaeda's training camps in Afghanistan; a key al Qaeda operative in Europe; a

major al Qaeda leader in Yemen. All told, more than 3,000 suspected terrorists have been arrested in many countries. Many others have met a different fate. Let's put it this way -- they are no longer a problem to the United States and our friends and allies. (Applause.)

We are working closely with other nations to prevent further attacks. America and coalition countries have uncovered and stopped terrorist conspiracies targeting the American embassy in Yemen, the American embassy in Singapore, a Saudi military base, ships in the Straits of Hormuz and the Straits the Gibraltar. We've broken al Qaeda cells in Hamburg, Milan, Madrid, London, Paris, as well as, Buffalo, New York.

We have the terrorists on the run. We're keeping them on the run. One by one, the terrorists are learning the meaning of American justice. (Applause.)

As we fight this war, we will remember where it began -- here, in our own country. This government is taking unprecedented measures to protect our people and defend our homeland. We've intensified security at the borders and ports of entry, posted more than 50,000 newly-trained federal screeners in airports, begun inoculating troops and first responders against smallpox, and are deploying the nation's first early warning network of sensors to detect biological attack. And this year, for the first time, we are beginning to field a defense to protect this nation against ballistic missiles. (Applause.)

I thank the Congress for supporting these measures. I ask you tonight to add to our future security with a major research and production effort to guard our people against bioterrorism, called Project Bioshield. The budget I send you will propose almost \$6 billion to quickly make available effective vaccines and treatments against agents like anthrax, botulinum toxin, Ebola, and plague. We must assume that our enemies would use these diseases as weapons, and we must act before the dangers are upon us. (Applause.)

Since September the 11th, our intelligence and law enforcement agencies have worked more closely than ever to track and disrupt the terrorists. The FBI is improving its ability to analyze intelligence, and is transforming itself to meet new threats. Tonight, I am instructing the leaders of the FBI, the CIA, the Homeland Security, and the Department of Defense to develop a Terrorist Threat Integration Center, to merge and analyze all threat information in a single location. Our government must have the very best information possible, and we will use it to make sure the right people are in the right places to protect all our citizens. (Applause.)

Our war against terror is a contest of will in which perseverance is power. In the ruins of two towers, at the western wall of the Pentagon, on a field in Pennsylvania, this nation made a pledge, and we renew that pledge tonight: Whatever the duration of this struggle, and whatever the difficulties, we will not permit the triumph of violence in the affairs of men -- free people will set the course of history. (Applause.)

Today, the gravest danger in the war on terror, the gravest danger facing America and the world, is outlaw regimes that seek and possess nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. These regimes could use such weapons for blackmail, terror, and mass murder. They could also give or sell those weapons to terrorist allies, who would use them without the least hesitation.

This threat is new; America's duty is familiar. Throughout the 20th century, small groups of men seized control of great nations, built armies and arsenals, and set out to dominate the weak and intimidate the world. In each case, their ambitions of cruelty and murder had no limit. In each case, the ambitions of Hitlerism, militarism, and communism were defeated by the will of free peoples, by the strength of great alliances, and by the might of the United States of America. (Applause.)

Now, in this century, the ideology of power and domination has appeared again, and seeks to gain the ultimate weapons of terror. Once again, this nation and all our friends are all that stand between a world at peace, and a world of chaos and constant alarm. Once again, we are called to defend the safety of our people, and the hopes of all mankind. And we accept this responsibility. (Applause.)

America is making a broad and determined effort to confront these dangers. We have called on the United Nations to fulfill its charter and stand by its demand that Iraq disarm. We're strongly supporting the International Atomic Energy Agency in its mission to track and control nuclear materials around the world. We're working with other governments to secure nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union, and to strengthen global treaties banning the production and shipment of missile technologies and weapons of mass destruction.

In all these efforts, however, America's purpose is more than to follow a process -- it is to achieve a result: the end of terrible threats to the civilized world. All free nations have a stake in preventing sudden and catastrophic attacks. And we're asking them to join us, and many are doing so. Yet the course of this nation does not depend on the decisions of others. (Applause.) Whatever action is required, whenever action is necessary, I will defend the freedom and security of the American people. (Applause.)

Different threats require different strategies. In Iran, we continue to see a government that represses its people, pursues weapons of mass destruction, and supports terror. We also see Iranian citizens risking intimidation and death as they speak out for liberty and human rights and democracy. Iranians, like all people, have a right to choose their own government and determine their own destiny -- and the United States supports their aspirations to live in freedom. (Applause.)

On the Korean Peninsula, an oppressive regime rules a people living in fear and starvation. Throughout the 1990s, the United States relied on a negotiated framework to keep North Korea from gaining nuclear weapons. We now know that that regime was deceiving the world, and developing those weapons all along. And today the North Korean regime is using its nuclear program to incite fear and seek concessions. America and the world will not be blackmailed. (Applause.)

America is working with the countries of the region -- South Korea, Japan, China, and Russia -- to find a peaceful solution, and to show the North Korean government that nuclear weapons will bring only isolation, economic stagnation, and continued hardship. (Applause.) The North Korean regime will find respect in the world and revival for its people only when it turns away from its nuclear ambitions. (Applause.)

Our nation and the world must learn the lessons of the Korean Peninsula and not allow an even greater threat to rise up in Iraq. A brutal dictator, with a history of reckless aggression,

with ties to terrorism, with great potential wealth, will not be permitted to dominate a vital region and threaten the United States. (Applause.)

Twelve years ago, Saddam Hussein faced the prospect of being the last casualty in a war he had started and lost. To spare himself, he agreed to disarm of all weapons of mass destruction. For the next 12 years, he systematically violated that agreement. He pursued chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, even while inspectors were in his country. Nothing to date has restrained him from his pursuit of these weapons -- not economic sanctions, not isolation from the civilized world, not even cruise missile strikes on his military facilities.

Almost three months ago, the United Nations Security Council gave Saddam Hussein his final chance to disarm. He has shown instead utter contempt for the United Nations, and for the opinion of the world. The 108 U.N. inspectors were sent to conduct -- were not sent to conduct a scavenger hunt for hidden materials across a country the size of California. The job of the inspectors is to verify that Iraq's regime is disarming. It is up to Iraq to show exactly where it is hiding its banned weapons, lay those weapons out for the world to see, and destroy them as directed. Nothing like this has happened.

The United Nations concluded in 1999 that Saddam Hussein had biological weapons sufficient to produce over 25,000 liters of anthrax -- enough doses to kill several million people. He hasn't accounted for that material. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed it.

The United Nations concluded that Saddam Hussein had materials sufficient to produce more than 38,000 liters of botulinum toxin -- enough to subject millions of people to death by respiratory failure. He hadn't accounted for that material. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed it.

Our intelligence officials estimate that Saddam Hussein had the materials to produce as much as 500 tons of sarin, mustard and VX nerve agent. In such quantities, these chemical agents could also kill untold thousands. He's not accounted for these materials. He has given no evidence that he has destroyed them.

U.S. intelligence indicates that Saddam Hussein had upwards of 30,000 munitions capable of delivering chemical agents. Inspectors recently turned up 16 of them -- despite Iraq's recent declaration denying their existence. Saddam Hussein has not accounted for the remaining 29,984 of these prohibited munitions. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed them.

From three Iraqi defectors we know that Iraq, in the late 1990s, had several mobile biological weapons labs. These are designed to produce germ warfare agents, and can be moved from place to a place to evade inspectors. Saddam Hussein has not disclosed these facilities. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed them.

The International Atomic Energy Agency confirmed in the 1990s that Saddam Hussein had an advanced nuclear weapons development program, had a design for a nuclear weapon and was working on five different methods of enriching uranium for a bomb. The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production. Saddam Hussein has not credibly explained these activities. He clearly has much to hide.

The dictator of Iraq is not disarming. To the contrary; he is deceiving. From intelligence sources we know, for instance, that thousands of Iraqi security personnel are at work hiding documents and materials from the U.N. inspectors, sanitizing inspection sites and monitoring the inspectors themselves. Iraqi officials accompany the inspectors in order to intimidate witnesses.

Iraq is blocking U-2 surveillance flights requested by the United Nations. Iraqi intelligence officers are posing as the scientists inspectors are supposed to interview. Real scientists have been coached by Iraqi officials on what to say. Intelligence sources indicate that Saddam Hussein has ordered that scientists who cooperate with U.N. inspectors in disarming Iraq will be killed, along with their families.

Year after year, Saddam Hussein has gone to elaborate lengths, spent enormous sums, taken great risks to build and keep weapons of mass destruction. But why? The only possible explanation, the only possible use he could have for those weapons, is to dominate, intimidate, or attack.

With nuclear arms or a full arsenal of chemical and biological weapons, Saddam Hussein could resume his ambitions of conquest in the Middle East and create deadly havoc in that region. And this Congress and the America people must recognize another threat. Evidence from intelligence sources, secret communications, and statements by people now in custody reveal that Saddam Hussein aids and protects terrorists, including members of al Qaeda. Secretly, and without fingerprints, he could provide one of his hidden weapons to terrorists, or help them develop their own.

Before September the 11th, many in the world believed that Saddam Hussein could be contained. But chemical agents, lethal viruses and shadowy terrorist networks are not easily contained. Imagine those 19 hijackers with other weapons and other plans -- this time armed by Saddam Hussein. It would take one vial, one canister, one crate slipped into this country to bring a day of horror like none we have ever known. We will do everything in our power to make sure that that day never comes. (Applause.)

Some have said we must not act until the threat is imminent. Since when have terrorists and tyrants announced their intentions, politely putting us on notice before they strike? If this threat is permitted to fully and suddenly emerge, all actions, all words, and all recriminations would come too late. Trusting in the sanity and restraint of Saddam Hussein is not a strategy, and it is not an option. (Applause.)

The dictator who is assembling the world's most dangerous weapons has already used them on whole villages -- leaving thousands of his own citizens dead, blind, or disfigured. Iraqi refugees tell us how forced confessions are obtained -- by torturing children while their parents are made to watch. International human rights groups have catalogued other methods used in the torture chambers of Iraq: electric shock, burning with hot irons, dripping acid on the skin, mutilation with electric drills, cutting out tongues, and rape. If this is not evil, then evil has no meaning. (Applause.)

And tonight I have a message for the brave and oppressed people of Iraq: Your enemy is not surrounding your country -- your enemy is ruling your country. (Applause.) And the day he and his regime are removed from power will be the day of your liberation. (Applause.)

The world has waited 12 years for Iraq to disarm. America will not accept a serious and mounting threat to our country, and our friends and our allies. The United States will ask the U.N. Security Council to convene on February the 5th to consider the facts of Iraq's ongoing defiance of the world. Secretary of State Powell will present information and intelligence about Iraqi's legal -- Iraq's illegal weapons programs, its attempt to hide those weapons from inspectors, and its links to terrorist groups.

We will consult. But let there be no misunderstanding: If Saddam Hussein does not fully disarm, for the safety of our people and for the peace of the world, we will lead a coalition to disarm him. (Applause.)

Tonight I have a message for the men and women who will keep the peace, members of the American Armed Forces: Many of you are assembling in or near the Middle East, and some crucial hours may lay ahead. In those hours, the success of our cause will depend on you. Your training has prepared you. Your honor will guide you. You believe in America, and America believes in you. (Applause.)

Sending Americans into battle is the most profound decision a President can make. The technologies of war have changed; the risks and suffering of war have not. For the brave Americans who bear the risk, no victory is free from sorrow. This nation fights reluctantly, because we know the cost and we dread the days of mourning that always come.

We seek peace. We strive for peace. And sometimes peace must be defended. A future lived at the mercy of terrible threats is no peace at all. If war is forced upon us, we will fight in a just cause and by just means -- sparing, in every way we can, the innocent. And if war is forced upon us, we will fight with the full force and might of the United States military -- and we will prevail. (Applause.)

And as we and our coalition partners are doing in Afghanistan, we will bring to the Iraqi people food and medicines and supplies -- and freedom. (Applause.)

Many challenges, abroad and at home, have arrived in a single season. In two years, America has gone from a sense of invulnerability to an awareness of peril; from bitter division in small matters to calm unity in great causes. And we go forward with confidence, because this call of history has come to the right country.

Americans are a resolute people who have risen to every test of our time. Adversity has revealed the character of our country, to the world and to ourselves. America is a strong nation, and honorable in the use of our strength. We exercise power without conquest, and we sacrifice for the liberty of strangers.

Americans are a free people, who know that freedom is the right of every person and the future of every nation. The liberty we prize is not America's gift to the world, it is God's gift to humanity. (Applause.) We Americans have faith in ourselves, but not in ourselves alone. We do not know -- we do not claim to know all the ways of Providence, yet we can trust in them, placing our confidence in the loving God behind all of life, and all of history.

May He guide us now. And may God continue to bless the United States of America. (Applause.)

Appendix 5- George W. Bush, Iran & The War on Terror: Address to the Military Officers Association of America Washington, DC September 5, 2006

Thank you all very much. (Applause.) Thank you all. Please be seated. General Hendrix, thank you for the invitation to be here. Thanks for the kind introduction. I'm honored to stand with the men and women of the Military Officers Association of America. I appreciate the Board of Directors who are here, and the leaders who have given me this platform from which to speak. I'm proud to be here with active members of the United States military. Thank you for your service. I'm proud to be your Commander-in-Chief. (Applause.)

I am pleased also to stand with members of the diplomatic corps, including many representing nations that have been attacked by al Qaeda and its terrorist allies since September the 11th, 2001. (Applause.) Your presence here reminds us that we're engaged in a global war against an enemy that threatens all civilized nations. And today the civilized world stands together to defend our freedom; we stand together to defeat the terrorists; and were working to secure the peace for generations to come.

I appreciate my Attorney General joining us today, Al Gonzales. Thank you for being here. (Applause.) The Secretary of Homeland Security, Michael Chertoff, is with us. (Applause.) Three members of the United States Senate -- I might say, three important members of the United States Senate -- Senate President Pro Tem Ted Stevens of Alaska. Thank you for joining us, Senator. (Applause.) Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator Thad Cochran of Mississippi. (Applause.) The Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, John Warner of Virginia. (Applause.)

I thank Norb Ryan, as well, for his leadership. I do appreciate all the folks that are at Walter Reed who have joined us today. I'm going to tell the parents of our troops, we provide great health care to those who wear the uniform. I'm proud of those folks at Bethesda and Walter Reed -- are providing you the best possible care to help you recover from your injuries. Thank you for your courage. Thank you for joining us here today. May God bless you in your recovery. (Applause.)

Next week, America will mark the fifth anniversary of September the 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks. As this day approaches, it brings with it a flood of painful memories. We remember the horror of watching planes fly into the World Trade Center, and seeing the towers collapse before our eyes. We remember the sight of the Pentagon, broken and in flames. We remember the rescue workers who rushed into burning buildings to save lives, knowing they might never emerge again. We remember the brave passengers who charged the cockpit of their hijacked plane, and stopped the terrorists from reaching their target and killing more innocent civilians. We remember the cold brutality of the enemy who inflicted this harm on our country -- an enemy whose leader, Osama bin Laden, declared the massacre of nearly 3,000 people that day -- I quote -- "an unparalleled and magnificent feat of valor, unmatched by any in humankind before them."

In five years since our nation was attacked, al Qaeda and terrorists it has inspired have continued to attack across the world. They've killed the innocent in Europe and Africa and the Middle East, in Central Asia and the Far East, and beyond. Most recently, they attempted to strike again in the most ambitious plot since the attacks of September the 11th -- a plan to blow up passenger planes headed for America over the Atlantic Ocean.

Five years after our nation was attacked, the terrorist danger remains. We're a nation at war -- and America and her allies are fighting this war with relentless determination across the world. Together with our coalition partners, we've removed terrorist sanctuaries, disrupted their finances, killed and captured key operatives, broken up terrorist cells in America and other nations, and stopped new attacks before they're carried out. We're on the offense against the terrorists on every battlefield -- and we'll accept nothing less than complete victory. (Applause.)

In the five years since our nation was attacked, we've also learned a great deal about the enemy we face in this war. We've learned about them through videos and audio recordings, and letters and statements they've posted on websites. We've learned about them from captured enemy documents that the terrorists have never meant for us to see. Together, these documents and statements have given us clear insight into the mind of our enemies -- their ideology, their ambitions, and their strategy to defeat us.

We know what the terrorists intend to do because they've told us -- and we need to take their words seriously. So today I'm going to describe, in the terrorists' own words, what they believe, what they hope to accomplish, and how they intend to accomplish it. I'll discuss how the enemy has adapted in the wake of our sustained offensive against them, and the threat posed by different strains of violent Islamic radicalism. I'll explain the strategy we're pursuing to protect America, by defeating the terrorists on the battlefield, and defeating their hateful ideology in the battle of ideas.

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."

We know what this radical empire would look like in practice, because we saw how the radicals imposed their ideology on the people of Afghanistan. Under the rule of the Taliban and al Qaeda, Afghanistan was a totalitarian nightmare -- a land where women were imprisoned in their homes, men were beaten for missing prayer meetings, girls could not go to school, and children were forbidden the smallest pleasures like flying kites. Religious police roamed the streets, beating and detaining civilians for perceived offenses. Women were publicly whipped. Summary executions were held in Kabul's soccer stadium in front of cheering mobs. And Afghanistan was turned into a launching pad for horrific attacks against America and other parts of the civilized world -- including many Muslim nations.

The goal of these Sunni extremists is to remake the entire Muslim world in their radical image. In pursuit of their imperial aims, these extremists say there can be no compromise or dialogue with those they call "infidels" -- a category that includes America, the world's free nations, Jews, and all Muslims who reject their extreme vision of Islam. They reject the possibility of peaceful coexistence with the free world. Again, hear the words of Osama bin Laden earlier this year: "Death is better than living on this Earth with the unbelievers among us."

These radicals have declared their uncompromising hostility to freedom. It is foolish to think that you can negotiate with them. (Applause.) We see the uncompromising nature of the enemy in many captured terrorist documents. Here are just two examples: After the liberation of Afghanistan, coalition forces searching through a terrorist safe house in that country found a copy of the al Qaeda charter. This charter states that "There will be continuing enmity until everyone believes in Allah. We will not meet the enemy halfway. There will be no room for dialogue with them." Another document was found in 2000 by British police during an anti-terrorist raid in London -- a grisly al Qaeda manual that includes chapters with titles such as "Guidelines for Beating and Killing Hostages." This manual declares that their vision of Islam "does not make a truce with unbelief, but rather confronts it." The confrontation calls for the "dialogue of bullets, the ideals of assassination, bombing, and destruction, and the diplomacy of the cannon and machine gun."

Still other captured documents show al Qaeda's strategy for infiltrating Muslim nations, establishing terrorist enclaves, overthrowing governments, and building their totalitarian empire. We see this strategy laid out in a captured al Qaeda document found during a recent raid in Iraq, which describes their plans to infiltrate and take over Iraq's western Anbar Province. The document lays out an elaborate al Qaeda governing structure for the region that includes an Education Department, a Social Services Department, a Justice Department, and an "Execution Unit" responsible for "Sorting out, Arrest, Murder, and Destruction."

According to their public statements, countries that have -- they have targeted stretch from the Middle East to Africa, to Southeast Asia. Through this strategy, al Qaeda and its allies intend to create numerous, decentralized operating bases across the world, from which they can plan new attacks, and advance their vision of a unified, totalitarian Islamic state that can confront and eventually destroy the free world.

These violent extremists know that to realize this vision, they must first drive out the main obstacle that stands in their way -- the United States of America. According to al Qaeda, their strategy to defeat America has two parts: First, they're waging a campaign of terror across the world. They're targeting our forces abroad, hoping that the American people will grow tired of casualties and give up the fight. And they're targeting America's financial centers and economic infrastructure at home, hoping to terrorize us and cause our economy to collapse.

Bin Laden calls this his "bleed-until-bankruptcy plan." And he cited the attacks of 9/11 as evidence that such a plan can succeed. With the 9/11 attacks, Osama bin Laden says, "al Qaeda spent \$500,000 on the event, while America lost -- according to the lowest estimate -- \$500 billion -- meaning that every dollar of al Qaeda defeated a million dollars of America. Bin Laden concludes from this experience that "America is definitely a great power, with unbelievable military strength and a vibrant economy, but all of these have been built on a very weak and hollow foundation." He went on to say, "Therefore, it is very easy to target the

flimsy base and concentrate on their weak points, and even if we're able to target one-tenth of these weak points, we will be able to crush and destroy them."

Secondly, along with this campaign of terror, the enemy has a propaganda strategy. Osama bin Laden laid out this strategy in a letter to the Taliban leader, Mullah Omar, that coalition forces uncovered in Afghanistan in 2002. In it, bin Laden says that al Qaeda intends to "launch," in his words, "a media campaign to create a wedge between the American people and their government." This media campaign, bin Laden says, will send the American people a number of messages, including "that their government will bring them more losses in finances and casualties." And he goes on to say that "they are being sacrificed to serve the big investors, especially the Jews." Bin Laden says that by delivering these messages, al Qaeda "aims at creating pressure from the American people on the American government to stop their campaign against Afghanistan."

Bin Laden and his allies are absolutely convinced they can succeed in forcing America to retreat and causing our economic collapse. They believe our nation is weak and decadent, and lacking in patience and resolve. And they're wrong. (Applause.) Osama bin Laden has written that the "defeat of American forces in Beirut" in 1983 is proof America does not have the stomach to stay in the fight. He's declared that "in Somalia, the United States pulled out, trailing disappointment, defeat, and failure behind it." And last year, the terrorist Zawahiri declared that Americans "know better than others that there is no hope in victory. The Vietnam specter is closing every outlet."

These terrorists hope to drive America and our coalition out of Afghanistan, so they can restore the safe haven they lost when coalition forces drove them out five years ago. But they've made clear that the most important front in their struggle against America is Iraq -- the nation bin Laden has declared the "capital of the caliphate." Hear the words of bin Laden: "I now address the whole Islamic nation. Listen and understand. The most serious issue today for the whole world is this Third World War that is raging in Iraq." He calls it "a war of destiny between infidelity and Islam." He says, "The whole world is watching this war," and that it will end in "victory and glory, or misery and humiliation." For al Qaeda, Iraq is not a distraction from their war on America -- it is the central battlefield where the outcome of this struggle will be decided.

Here is what al Qaeda says they will do if they succeed in driving us out of Iraq: The terrorist Zawahiri has said that al Qaeda will proceed with "several incremental goals. The first stage: Expel the Americans from Iraq. The second stage: Establish an Islamic authority or amirate, then develop it and support it until it achieves the level of caliphate. The third stage: Extend the jihad wave to the secular countries neighboring Iraq. And the fourth stage: The clash with Israel."

These evil men know that a fundamental threat to their aspirations is a democratic Iraq that can govern itself, sustain itself, and defend itself. They know that given a choice, the Iraqi people will never choose to live in the totalitarian state the extremists hope to establish. And that is why we must not, and we will not, give the enemy victory in Iraq by deserting the Iraqi people. (Applause.)

Last year, the terrorist Zarqawi declared in a message posted on the Internet that democracy "is the essence of infidelity and deviation from the right path." The Iraqi people disagree. Last December, nearly 12 million Iraqis from every ethnic and religious community turned out to

vote in their country's third free election in less than a year. Iraq now has a unity government that represents Iraq's diverse population -- and al Qaeda's top commander in Iraq breathed his last breath. (Applause.)

Despite these strategic setbacks, the enemy will continue to fight freedom's advance in Iraq, because they understand the stakes in this war. Again, hear the words of bin Laden, in a message to the American people earlier this year. He says: "The war is for you or for us to win. If we win it, it means your defeat and disgrace forever."

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.)

Five years into this struggle, it's important to take stock of what's been accomplished -- and the difficult work that remains. Al Qaeda has been weakened by our sustained offensive against them, and today it is harder for al Qaeda's leaders to operate freely, to move money, or to communicate with their operatives and facilitators. Yet al Qaeda remains dangerous and determined. Bin Laden and Zawahiri remain in hiding in remote regions of this world. Al Qaeda continues to adapt in the face of our global campaign against them. Increasingly, al Qaeda is taking advantage of the Internet to disseminate propaganda, and to conduct "virtual recruitment" and "virtual training" of new terrorists. Al Qaeda's leaders no longer need to meet face-to-face with their operatives. They can find new suicide bombers, and facilitate new terrorist attacks, without ever laying eyes on those they're training, financing, or sending to strike us.

As al Qaeda changes, the broader terrorist movement is also changing, becoming more dispersed and self-directed. More and more, we're facing threats from locally established terrorist cells that are inspired by al Qaeda's ideology and goals, but do not necessarily have direct links to al Qaeda, such as training and funding. Some of these groups are made up of "homegrown" terrorists, militant extremists who were born and educated in Western nations, were indoctrinated by radical Islamists or attracted to their ideology, and joined the violent extremist cause. These locally established cells appear to be responsible for a number of attacks and plots, including those in Madrid, and Canada, and other countries across the world.

As we continue to fight al Qaeda and these Sunni extremists inspired by their radical ideology, we also face the threat posed by Shia extremists, who are learning from al Qaeda, increasing their assertiveness, and stepping up their threats. Like the vast majority of Sunnis, the vast majority of Shia across the world reject the vision of extremists -- and in Iraq, millions of Shia have defied terrorist threats to vote in free elections, and have shown their desire to live in freedom. The Shia extremists want to deny them this right. This Shia strain of Islamic radicalism is just as dangerous, and just as hostile to America, and just as determined to establish its brand of hegemony across the broader Middle East. And the Shia extremists have achieved something that al Qaeda has so far failed to do: In 1979, they took control of a major power, the nation of Iran, subjugating its proud people to a regime of tyranny, and using that nation's resources to fund the spread of terror and pursue their radical agenda.

Like al Qaeda and the Sunni extremists, the Iranian regime has clear aims: They want to drive America out of the region, to destroy Israel, and to dominate the broader Middle East. To achieve these aims, they are funding and arming terrorist groups like Hezbollah, which allow them to attack Israel and America by proxy. Hezbollah, the source of the current instability in Lebanon, has killed more Americans than any terrorist organization except al Qaeda. Unlike al Qaeda, they've not yet attacked the American homeland. Yet they're directly responsible for the murder of hundreds of Americans abroad. It was Hezbollah that was behind the 1983 bombing of the U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut that killed 241 Americans. And Saudi Hezbollah was behind the 1996 bombing of Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia that killed 19 Americans, an attack conducted by terrorists who we believe were working with Iranian officials.

Just as we must take the words of the Sunni extremists seriously, we must take the words of the Shia extremists seriously. Listen to the words of Hezbollah's leader, the terrorist Nasrallah, who has declared his hatred of America. He says, "Let the entire world hear me. Our hostility to the Great Satan [America] is absolute. Regardless of how the world has changed after 11 September, 'Death to America' will remain our reverberating and powerful slogan: Death to America."

Iran's leaders, who back Hezbollah, have also declared their absolute hostility to America. Last October, Iran's President declared in a speech that some people ask -- in his words -- "whether a world without the United States and Zionism can be achieved. I say that this goal is achievable." Less than three months ago, Iran's President declared to America and other Western powers: "open your eyes and see the fate of pharaoh. If you do not abandon the path of falsehood, your doomed destiny will be annihilation." Less than two months ago, he warned: "The anger of Muslims may reach an explosion point soon. If such a day comes, America and the West should know that the waves of the blast will not remain within the boundaries of our region." He also delivered this message to the American people: "If you would like to have good relations with the Iranian nation in the future, bow down before the greatness of the Iranian nation and surrender. If you don't accept to do this, the Iranian nation will force you to surrender and bow down."

America will not bow down to tyrants. (Applause.)

The Iranian regime and its terrorist proxies have demonstrated their willingness to kill Americans -- and now the Iranian regime is pursuing nuclear weapons. The world is working together to prevent Iran's regime from acquiring the tools of mass murder. The international community has made a reasonable proposal to Iran's leaders, and given them the opportunity

to set their nation on a better course. So far, Iran's leaders have rejected this offer. Their choice is increasingly isolating the great Iranian nation from the international community, and denying the Iranian people an opportunity for greater economic prosperity. It's time for Iran's leader to make a different choice. And we've made our choice. We'll continue to work closely with our allies to find a diplomatic solution. The world's free nations will not allow Iran to develop a nuclear weapon. (Applause.)

The Shia and Sunni extremists represent different faces of the same threat. They draw inspiration from different sources, but both seek to impose a dark vision of violent Islamic radicalism across the Middle East. They oppose the advance of freedom, and they want to gain control of weapons of mass destruction. If they succeed in undermining fragile democracies, like Iraq, and drive the forces of freedom out of the region, they will have an open field to pursue their dangerous goals. Each strain of violent Islamic radicalism would be emboldened in their efforts to topple moderate governments and establish terrorist safe havens.

Imagine a world in which they were able to control governments, a world awash with oil and they would use oil resources to punish industrialized nations. And they would use those resources to fuel their radical agenda, and pursue and purchase weapons of mass murder. And armed with nuclear weapons, they would blackmail the free world, and spread their ideologies of hate, and raise a mortal threat to the American people. If we allow them to do this, if we retreat from Iraq, if we don't uphold our duty to support those who are desirous to live in liberty, 50 years from now history will look back on our time with unforgiving clarity, and demand to know why we did not act.

I'm not going to allow this to happen -- and no future American President can allow it either. America did not seek this global struggle, but we're answering history's call with confidence and a clear strategy. Today we're releasing a document called the "National Strategy for Combating Terrorism." This is an unclassified version of the strategy we've been pursuing since September the 11th, 2001. This strategy was first released in February 2003; it's been updated to take into account the changing nature of this enemy. This strategy document is posted on the White House website -- whitehouse.gov. And I urge all Americans to read it.

Our strategy for combating terrorism has five basic elements:

First, we're determined to prevent terrorist attacks before they occur. So we're taking the fight to the enemy. The best way to protect America is to stay on the offense. Since 9/11, our coalition has captured or killed al Qaeda managers and operatives, and scores of other terrorists across the world. The enemy is living under constant pressure, and we intend to keep it that way -- and this adds to our security. When terrorists spend their days working to avoid death or capture, it's harder for them to plan and execute new attacks.

We're also fighting the enemy here at home. We've given our law enforcement and intelligence professionals the tools they need to stop the terrorists in our midst. We passed the Patriot Act to break down the wall that prevented law enforcement and intelligence from sharing vital information. We created the Terrorist Surveillance Program to monitor the communications between al Qaeda commanders abroad and terrorist operatives within our borders. If al Qaeda is calling somebody in America, we need to know why, in order to stop attacks. (Applause.)

I want to thank these three Senators for working with us to give our law enforcement and intelligence officers the tools necessary to do their jobs. (Applause.) And over the last five years, federal, state, and local law enforcement have used those tools to break up terrorist cells, and to prosecute terrorist operatives and supporters in New York, and Oregon, and Virginia, and Texas, and New Jersey, and Illinois, Ohio, and other states. By taking the battle to the terrorists and their supporters on our own soil and across the world, we've stopped a number of al Qaeda plots.

Second, we're determined to deny weapons of mass destruction to outlaw regimes and terrorists who would use them without hesitation. Working with Great Britain and Pakistan and other nations, the United States shut down the world's most dangerous nuclear trading cartel, the AQ Khan network. This network had supplied Iran and Libya and North Korea with equipment and know-how that advanced their efforts to obtain nuclear weapons. And we launched the Proliferation Security Initiative, a coalition of more than 70 nations that is working together to stop shipments related to weapons of mass destruction on land, at sea, and in the air. The greatest threat this world faces is the danger of extremists and terrorists armed with weapons of mass destruction -- and this is a threat America cannot defeat on her own. We applaud the determined efforts of many nations around the world to stop the spread of these dangerous weapons. Together, we pledge we'll continue to work together to stop the world's most dangerous men from getting their hands on the world's most dangerous weapons. (Applause.)

Third, we're determined to deny terrorists the support of outlaw regimes. After September the 11th, I laid out a clear doctrine: America makes no distinction between those who commit acts of terror, and those that harbor and support them, because they're equally guilty of murder. Thanks to our efforts, there are now three fewer state sponsors of terror in the world than there were on September the 11th, 2001. Afghanistan and Iraq have been transformed from terrorist states into allies in the war on terror. And the nation of Libya has renounced terrorism, and given up its weapons of mass destruction programs, and its nuclear materials and equipment. Over the past five years, we've acted to disrupt the flow of weapons and support from terrorist states to terrorist networks. And we have made clear that any government that chooses to be an ally of terror has also chosen to be an enemy of civilization. (Applause.)

Fourth, we're determined to deny terrorist networks control of any nation, or territory within a nation. So, along with our coalition and the Iraqi government, we'll stop the terrorists from taking control of Iraq, and establishing a new safe haven from which to attack America and the free world. And we're working with friends and allies to deny the terrorists the enclaves they seek to establish in ungoverned areas across the world. By helping governments reclaim full sovereign control over their territory, we make ourselves more secure.

Fifth, we're working to deny terrorists new recruits, by defeating their hateful ideology and spreading the hope of freedom -- by spreading the hope of freedom across the Middle East. For decades, American policy sought to achieve peace in the Middle East by pursuing stability at the expense of liberty. The lack of freedom in that region helped create conditions where anger and resentment grew, and radicalism thrived, and terrorists found willing recruits. And we saw the consequences on September the 11th, when the terrorists brought death and destruction to our country. The policy wasn't working.

The experience of September the 11th made clear, in the long run, the only way to secure our nation is to change the course of the Middle East. So America has committed its influence in the world to advancing freedom and liberty and democracy as the great alternatives to repression and radicalism. (Applause.) We're taking the side of democratic leaders and moderates and reformers across the Middle East. We strongly support the voices of tolerance and moderation in the Muslim world. We're standing with Afghanistan's elected government against al Qaeda and the Taliban remnants that are trying to restore tyranny in that country. We're standing with Lebanon's young democracy against the foreign forces that are seeking to undermine the country's sovereignty and independence. And we're standing with the leaders of Iraq's unity government as they work to defeat the enemies of freedom, and chart a more hopeful course for their people. This is why victory is so important in Iraq. By helping freedom succeed in Iraq, we will help America, and the Middle East, and the world become more secure.

During the last five years we've learned a lot about this enemy. We've learned that they're cunning and sophisticated. We've witnessed their ability to change their methods and their tactics with deadly speed -- even as their murderous obsessions remain unchanging. We've seen that it's the terrorists who have declared war on Muslims, slaughtering huge numbers of innocent Muslim men and women around the world.

We know what the terrorists believe, we know what they have done, and we know what they intend to do. And now the world's free nations must summon the will to meet this great challenge. The road ahead is going to be difficult, and it will require more sacrifice. Yet we can have confidence in the outcome, because we've seen freedom conquer tyranny and terror before. In the 20th century, free nations confronted and defeated Nazi Germany. During the Cold War, we confronted Soviet communism, and today Europe is whole, free and at peace.

And now, freedom is once again contending with the forces of darkness and tyranny. This time, the battle is unfolding in a new region -- the broader Middle East. This time, we're not waiting for our enemies to gather in strength. This time, we're confronting them before they gain the capacity to inflict unspeakable damage on the world, and we're confronting their hateful ideology before it fully takes root.

We see a day when people across the Middle East have governments that honor their dignity, and unleash their creativity, and count their votes. We see a day when across this region citizens are allowed to express themselves freely, women have full rights, and children are educated and given the tools necessary to succeed in life. And we see a day when all the nations of the Middle East are allies in the cause of peace.

We fight for this day, because the security of our own citizens depends on it. This is the great ideological struggle of the 21st century -- and it is the calling of our generation. All civilized nations are bound together in this struggle between moderation and extremism. By coming together, we will roll back this grave threat to our way of life. We will help the people of the Middle East claim their freedom, and we will leave a safer and more hopeful world for our children and grandchildren.

God bless. (Applause.)