



COMILLAS

UNIVERSIDAD PONTIFICIA

ICAI

ICADE

CIHS

Facultad de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

Grado en Comunicación Internacional

Trabajo Fin de Grado

El lenguaje y la guerra:

Análisis comparado de los discursos de
Bush y Netanyahu

Estudiante: María Beda Fresno Ablanado

Director/a: Antonio Tortosa López

Madrid, junio 2024

ÍNDICE

1.	Introducción: Finalidad y motivos.	3
2.	Contexto histórico y político	4
2.1.	Contexto de Estados Unidos	4
2.2.	Contexto de Israel	6
3.	Marco teórico	8
4.	Metodología	11
5.	Análisis	12
5.1.1.	Ellos vs nosotros	12
5.1.2	Referencias religiosas	16
5.1.3.	Miedo a peligros fututos	20
5.1.4.	Referencias históricas	22
5.1.5.	Unidad de la ciudadanía	25
5.1.6.	Apelación a las víctimas	27
5.2.	Contexto	29
5.2.1.	Discursos de Netanyahu	29
5.2.2.	Discursos de George W. Bush	31
6.	Conclusión	34
7.	Biliografía	38
8.	Anexos	40

1. Introducción: Finalidad y motivos.

En el campo de la lingüística política, el análisis crítico del discurso se presenta como una herramienta esencial para comprender cómo el lenguaje no solo refleja, sino que también moldea la realidad política y social. Esta rama del conocimiento se centra en desentrañar las estrategias lingüísticas y retóricas utilizadas por los actores políticos para legitimar sus acciones, persuadir a la audiencia y consolidar su poder. Dentro del análisis del discurso político, uno de los aspectos más fascinantes es la manera en la que los líderes comunican en tiempos de crisis, ya que se en dicho contexto sus discursos de cargan de valoraciones sentimentales e ideológicas y tienen una carga persuasiva muy alta.

En este trabajo analizaremos y compararemos los discursos de Benjamin Netanyahu, primer ministro de Israel, y de George W. Bush, ex presidente de Estados Unidos, tras los atentados terroristas que tuvieron lugar en sus países durante el 7 de octubre de 2023 y el 11 de septiembre de 2001, respectivamente. La finalidad de este análisis es examinar críticamente sus discursos identificando las marcas lingüísticas y los mecanismos de legitimación empleados para justificar sus políticas y acciones bélicas posteriores.

Se han elegido estos casos concretos porque ambos líderes tomaron acciones directas de contrataque tras los atentados, por lo que sus discursos estaban muy orientados a persuadir a la ciudadanía, generar un sentimiento de unión y justificar posteriores acciones bélicas. Es decir, los discursos de ambos mandatarios no se centraban exclusivamente en consolar a la nación y a las víctimas, sino que buscaban definir la línea de acción que seguían sus países y buscar el apoyo y la simpatía de la comunidad nacional e internacional. Por ello, se podría decir que se trata de discursos persuasivos y cargados de simbolismo y emocionalidad, en los que el *pathos* se vuelve el elemento más importante.

Además, en ambos casos los ataques fueron perpetrados por terroristas de religión musulmana, por lo que ambos oradores crearon una narrativa de “ellos vs. nosotros” tintada de islamofobia que hizo que la religión musulmana quedara permanentemente asociada al terrorismo en el imaginario colectivo. «Desde el 11 de septiembre, la mayoría de los ciudadanos-individuos euroamericanos utilizan de facto la metonimia “terroristas - musulmanes”» (Beshara, 2018, pg 89). Por ello, cuando se

analicen el contexto y las consecuencias sociales y políticas de dichos discursos se comentará cómo han podido afectar a los prejuicios que existen sobre el mundo musulmán.

Por un lado, en este trabajo buscamos identificar las estrategias concretas utilizadas por Bush y Netanyahu en sus discursos para compararlas en busca de similitudes y diferencias. De esta forma, podremos identificar cuáles son las estrategias más utilizadas por los oradores en este tipo de situaciones y las que tienen mayor impacto simbólico en la audiencia, teniendo en cuenta que ambos líderes contaron con el apoyo incondicional de gran parte de la ciudadanía. Por otro lado, también se comentará el impacto que han tenido estos discursos en la imagen que se tiene el mundo musulmán, especialmente en países europeos y norteamericanos. Por otro lado, además de analizar los discursos desde un punto de vista lingüístico también se pondrá el foco tanto en el contexto social, ya que, como se explicará más adelante, juega un papel fundamental en interpretación de información.

Este análisis es especialmente relevante en el contexto de hoy en día. Especialmente en Europa, pero también a nivel mundial, se puede constatar un auge de los discursos populistas y los extremismos políticos en la conversación pública. Existe un descontento social para con la política tradicional que ha hecho que los discursos que se alejan de lo racional para apoyarse en las emociones tengan cada vez más éxito en el público. Por ello, entender cuáles son los métodos usados por los políticos a la hora de persuadir a la ciudadanía puede resultar útil para evitar caer en estos discursos populistas. Una vez somos conscientes de cuáles son esos mecanismos de “manipulación” emocional podemos identificarlos en los discursos y asimilarlos de una forma mucho más crítica y analítica, en lugar de caer en sentimentalismos.

2. Contexto histórico y político

2.1.Contexto de Estados Unidos

Antes de los ataques del 11 de septiembre de 2001, las relaciones entre Estados Unidos e Iraq estaban marcadas por una serie de eventos y tensiones políticas. Desde la Guerra del Golfo en 1990-1991, las relaciones entre los dos países habían sido frágiles. Las sanciones impuestas por la comunidad internacional a Iraq tras la invasión

de Kuwait, así como las continuas disputas sobre el cumplimiento de las resoluciones de la ONU, contribuyeron a una relación tensa. La administración de George W. Bush llegó al poder con una postura beligerante hacia Iraq, alimentada por la creencia de que Saddam Hussein representaba una amenaza tanto regional como global. Esta percepción se vio reforzada por las afirmaciones de que Iraq estaba desarrollando armas de destrucción masiva y tenía vínculos con organizaciones terroristas, lo que aumentó la desconfianza y la hostilidad entre los dos países.

El 11 de septiembre de 2001, el mundo fue testigo de una serie de ataques terroristas sin precedentes perpetrados por el grupo terrorista Al-Qaeda. Para perpetrar los ataques, el grupo extremista secuestró cuatro aviones comerciales, con la intención de estrellarlos en puntos estratégicos en ataques kamikazes. Dos de los aviones fueron estrellados contra las Torres Gemelas del World Trade Center en Nueva York, uno golpeó el Pentágono en Washington D.C., y el cuarto avión, después de una lucha heroica de los pasajeros, se estrelló en un campo en Pensilvania. Estos ataques causaron la muerte de casi 3,000 personas e indujeron una sensación de vulnerabilidad y urgencia en Estados Unidos y en la comunidad internacional, lo que llevó a una búsqueda implacable de los responsables y una reevaluación de las políticas de seguridad nacional (Suárez, A., 2021).

La respuesta de Estados Unidos a los ataques del 11 de septiembre fue una movilización a gran escala en lo que se conoció como la «Guerra contra el terrorismo». Esta respuesta no solo implicó la invasión de Afganistán para derrocar al régimen talibán, que había brindado refugio a Al-Qaeda, sino también la justificación de la intervención en Iraq en 2003. La administración Bush argumentó que Iraq representaba una amenaza inminente debido a su presunta posesión de armas de destrucción masiva y sus supuestos vínculos con el terrorismo. La invasión de Iraq desató una guerra prolongada y muy controvertida que resultó en la caída de Saddam Hussein, pero también en la desestabilización de la región y el surgimiento de una insurgencia que desafió los esfuerzos por establecer un gobierno estable y democrático. A pesar de la captura y ejecución de Saddam Hussein en 2006, la guerra y sus consecuencias continúan siendo objeto de debate y han dejado un legado duradero en la política exterior de Estados Unidos y en el escenario global (Suárez, A., 2021).

Los ataques del 11 de septiembre tuvieron un impacto a nivel mundial en el ámbito de la política, pues fueron el desencadenante de la llamada Guerra contra el terrorismo. Sin embargo, también dejaron una huella enorme a nivel cultural, ya que tanto los medios de comunicación como la industria del entretenimiento se aprovecharon del creciente interés de la audiencia por temas como el yihadismo, y crearon una narrativa en la que se retrataba a los musulmanes como terroristas y solo se hablaba del mundo árabe si era para relacionarlo con la violencia. «Las secuelas de los atentados siguen estructurando el discurso político y cultural estadounidense y, a medida que aumenta la distancia cronológica de los ataques terroristas del 11-S, el número de discursos político-filosóficos y literarios en torno al acontecimiento sigue multiplicándose» (Carlini, 2009, pg 2).

Tras los ataques, George W. Bush, en aquel momento presidente de Estados Unidos, dio una serie de discursos de los cuales tenemos constancia gracias a un archivo de la Casa Blanca donde aparecen recopilados los discursos más relevantes de Bush, llamado *Selected Speeches of President George W. Bush*. Esta publicación será una de las más importantes para el análisis ya que los discursos a analizar proceden directamente de ella, de esta forma, se puede garantizar la veracidad de los discursos.

2.2. Contexto de Israel

La relación histórica entre Israel y Palestina es una de las más complejas y conflictivas del mundo contemporáneo. Se remonta al final del siglo XIX y principios del XX, cuando se intensificó el movimiento sionista, que abogaba por el establecimiento de un estado judío en la región histórica de Palestina, que en ese momento estaba bajo dominio otomano y, posteriormente, bajo mandato británico. El conflicto se intensificó tras la partición de Palestina en 1947 por las Naciones Unidas, que asignó territorios para un estado judío y uno árabe. Esto llevó a la guerra árabe-israelí de 1948, que resultó en la creación del Estado de Israel y la dispersión de cientos de miles de refugiados palestinos. Desde entonces, ha habido numerosos conflictos armados, incluyendo la guerra de los Seis Días en 1967, la guerra de Yom Kippur en 1973 y varias intifadas palestinas (National Geographic, 2024).

Desde su creación, Israel ha ido avanzando sobre territorio que según las Naciones Unidas pertenece a Palestina, pero su superioridad militar y el apoyo de Estados Unidos le ha permitido hacerse con el control de la zona. En ese contexto violento se creó en torno a la década de los 80 el grupo Hamas, que surgió en sus orígenes como un grupo de ayuda humanitaria que se centraba en actividades sociales y de caridad, pero eventualmente se involucró en acciones militantes contra Israel, incluidos atentados suicidas y lanzamientos de cohetes. Actualmente, está considerado como un grupo terrorista por muchos países occidentales como Estados Unidos o la Unión Europea.

El 8 de octubre de 2023, Hamás y otros grupos armados palestinos de la Franja de Gaza ocupada llevaron a cabo un ataque sin previo aviso a Israel. Lanzaron miles de cohetes hacia el sur del país y cruzaron la frontera, atacando varias localidades, en las que llevaron a cabo ejecuciones sumarias y secuestraron más de 200 personas, en su mayoría civiles. Dos días más tarde, el que era primer ministro, Benjamin Netanyahu, declaró oficialmente la guerra.

El 9 de octubre, Israel impuso un asedio completo sobre Gaza impidiendo el suministro de electricidad, combustible y alimentos, exacerbando una crisis humanitaria ya acuciante para más de 2,2 millones de personas atrapadas en su territorio. Desde entonces, debido a los implacables ataques de Israel en la Franja de Gaza, incluidos a hospitales, campamentos de personas refugiadas, mercados y muchas otras instalaciones civiles, han muerto más de 27.300 personas palestinas, y a marzo de 2024 se calcula que más de 12.000 niños (Amnistía Internacional, 2024).

Este conflicto está teniendo un impacto muy significativo a nivel mundial y no ha dejado a nadie indiferente. Por una parte, está afectando a las relaciones diplomáticas tanto dentro del mundo árabe como a las relaciones entre países occidentales e Israel, ya que son cada vez más países europeos los que le dan la espalda a Israel en sus acciones bélicas. Además, las relaciones diplomáticas entre Estados Unidos e Israel jamás se habían tensado tanto, pues Biden ha amenazado recientemente con cortar el suministro de armas al país. Por otro lado, lo sucedido en Palestina también ha generado una reacción de la opinión pública a nivel global y cada vez surgen más manifestaciones, protestas y debates en los medios de comunicación con respecto al conflicto.

Para este trabajo, que se centra en el análisis el discurso del jefe de estado israelí, no buscamos analizar las acciones bélicas del país ni entrar en el debate público Israel – Palestina. Se ha ofrecido una breve explicación sobre lo sucedido para poner en contexto los discursos a analizar, pero el estudio se limitará a un análisis de discurso de Netanyahu como orador, por lo que no nos adentraremos en cuestiones políticas.

Los discursos que se analizarán para este trabajo son aquellos que pronunció en Netanyahu en las semanas posteriores a los ataques, en los cuales declaró la guerra y sentó las bases de la que sería la respuesta militar posterior por parte de Israel tanto para la población de Israel como para la comunidad internacional. A diferencia de los discursos de Bush, los de Netanyahu no han sido aún recopilados por escrito en ninguna publicación oficial, pero sí hay vídeos publicados por medios de comunicación fiables tanto en inglés como en hebreo subtulado, y ese será el material con el que trabajaremos al largo de nuestro análisis.

3. Marco teórico

Muchos expertos han teorizado y escrito sobre el análisis crítico del discurso (ACD) y cada uno ha aportado su propio punto de vista y metodología para llevarlo a cabo. A continuación, a modo de introducción a este trabajo, se expondrán algunas de las teorías más célebres sobre análisis del discurso para proporcionarle a este estudio una base sólida sobre la que trabajar.

Primero, hablaremos del análisis del discurso según Fairclough. En su libro *Critical discourse analysis: the study of language*, el autor define y sienta las bases de lo que es para él el ACD. Según Fairclough, esta disciplina busca analizar las relaciones existentes entre el lenguaje, el poder y las ideologías (Fairclough, N, 1989). Para él, el lenguaje, en su definición más literal, es la lengua verbal, es decir, las palabras y las frases de un idioma en particular. Cuando el lenguaje adquiere una función social se convierte en discurso y tiene la capacidad de generar ideologías. Según Fairlough «las ideologías son representaciones de aspectos del mundo que contribuyen a establecer, mantener y cambiar las relaciones sociales de poder, dominación y explotación» (Fairclough, N, 2003, pg 9).

Para analizar un discurso, Fairclough utiliza una técnica tridimensional, cuyos pasos son los siguientes. Primero, se realiza el análisis textual, un estudio de las características lingüísticas del discurso, como su vocabulario, gramática y sus recursos retóricos. Después se lleva a cabo el análisis de los procesos de producción, esta parte se centra en cómo se crea e interpreta el discurso, incluidas las prácticas y procesos sociales involucrados en su creación y recepción: el contexto en el que se desarrolla el discurso, las estructuras sociales y las dinámicas de poder que lo afectan. Finalmente, se debe realizar un análisis sociocultural, en el que se estudia el contexto sociopolítico más amplio, que incluye ideologías, relaciones de poder y estructuras sociales.

En nuestro caso, el análisis textual consistiría en el estudio de los discursos de manera aislada, poniendo la atención únicamente en las palabras y sus connotaciones, la sintaxis y el uso del lenguaje. El análisis de los procesos de producción sería todo lo que tiene que ver con el contexto político en el que se desarrollan y se escriben los discursos, las relaciones de Estados Unidos con Irak, de Israel – Palestina, los atentados terroristas... Por último, el análisis sociocultural podría centrarse en las relaciones de poder de los países occidentes con Oriente Medio, las relaciones diplomáticas y la islamofobia como ideología.

En su libro *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*, Paul Chilton presenta el lenguaje como la herramienta básica para hacer política. Según Chilton, el lenguaje y el comportamiento político son facultades cognitivas intrínsecas del ser humano que están estrechamente ligadas y suelen funcionar juntas. Las secciones más relevantes de este libro para nuestro trabajo son el capítulo 7 y el 10. En el capítulo 7, se comentan algunas estrategias retóricas utilizando como ejemplo fragmentos del discurso *Rivers of Blood* de Enoch Powell. En su análisis, Chilton diferencia dos tipos de estrategias utilizadas por el orador para legitimar su discurso: epistémicas y deónticas. Por un lado, en el plano epistémico se presentan datos «objetivos» y «reales» para otorgarle al orador cierta autoridad sobre el tema a tratar. Por otro lado, los argumentos deónticos tienen un elemento más sentimental y buscan convencer al público de que el orador no tiene razón solo en un sentido cognitivo, sino que su moral es la correcta (Chilton, P., 2004).

Además, señala estrategias concretas usadas por Enoch Powell, y por muchos otros oradores, para convencer a la audiencia: miedo a peligros no especificados, miedo

al futuro, lealtad al grupo, paternalismo, sentimientos protectores hacia la familia, alusión bíblica... Todos estos recursos retóricos son recurrentes en muchos discursos políticos populistas, y pueden resultarnos útiles a la hora de analizar los discursos de Bush y Netanyahu que nos competen para este trabajo (Chilton, P., 2004).

Como se mencionó previamente, el capítulo 10 de *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice* también contiene información relevante para este análisis ya que se analiza el discurso de Bush del 7 de octubre de 2001. Al ser uno de los discursos a analizar en nuestro trabajo, se utilizarán como base algunas reflexiones de Chilton para nuestro propio análisis.

Según Teun A. van Dijk, lingüista e investigador en el campo del discurso, el ACD busca estudiar las relaciones entre discurso, poder, dominación y desigualdad social y el trabajo de una analista es descubrir qué estructuras, estrategias u otras propiedades del texto, del habla, de la interacción verbal o de los acontecimientos comunicativos desempeñan un papel en estos modos de reproducción de las dinámicas de poder social (van Dijk, T. A., 1993). Para van Dijk, el foco del análisis debe ponerse en la cognición social, ya que este es el nexo entre el discurso y el poder. Es decir, debemos centrarnos en la forma en la que las personas procesamos la información que recibimos en nuestras interacciones sociales.

Además, van Dijk también ha escrito sobre las ideologías, cómo se construyen y su papel a la hora de reproducir sistemas de poder social como el racismo. Una ideología puede definirse como un conjunto de ideas, valores y creencias que rigen la forma en la que una persona o un grupo social interpreta el mundo. Según van Dijk, las ideologías se encuentran en un plano entre lo cognitivo, el discurso y lo social. Al tratarse de un sistema de creencias entran dentro del plano simbólico y del intelecto humano. Sin embargo, estas ideologías se crean y se transmiten a través del discurso y de la comunicación y cumplen un papel social ya que afectan a las dinámicas de poder y en muchos casos están relacionadas con las luchas o los problemas entre grupos sociales (Oktar, L., 2001).

Aunque no existe una definición unánime de lo que es el análisis crítico del discurso ni de los pasos a seguir para realizarlo, los investigadores coinciden en la gran importancia que tiene el contexto a la hora de analizar un discurso. Todos los expertos señalados anteriormente hacen hincapié en el estudio del contexto social y político que

rodea a los discursos. Por ello, no deben ser estudiados de forma aislada, únicamente desde un punto de vista lingüístico, sino entenderse dentro de un contexto social. Además, otro punto en común entre los expertos es que la función principal del ACD es tratar de buscar respuesta a la siguiente pregunta: ¿Cómo afecta el discurso a las dinámicas de poder social?

4. Metodología

A continuación, se explicará qué discursos se van a analizar, cómo han sido seleccionados y qué pasos se van a seguir a la hora de estudiarlos y compararlos. De esta forma, la estructura del análisis será mucho más clara. Comenzaremos explicando la selección de discursos de Bush y después la de Netanyahu.

Los discursos de Bush han sido más fáciles de seleccionar gracias a una publicación de la Casa Blanca donde aparecen recopilados una serie de sus discursos más célebres. Gracias a este documento se han podido seleccionar los discursos y garantizar su veracidad. Los discursos a analizar son los siguientes: *Address To The Nation On The September 11 Attacks* (11 de septiembre del 2001, Oficina Oval, Washington D.C.), *National Day Of Prayer And Remembrance Servic* (14 de septiembre del 2001, Catedral Nacional de Washington, Washington D.C.), *Address To The Joint Session Of The 107th Congress* (20 de septiembre del 2001, Capitolio de los Estados Unidos, Washington, D.C.), *Department Of Defense Service Of Remembrance At The Pentagon* (11 de octubre del 2001, El Pentágono, Arlington, Virginia), *Address To The United Nations General Assembly* (10 de noviembre del 2001, Organización de las Naciones Unidas, Nueva York) y *State Of The Union Address To The 107th Congress* (29 de febrero del 2002, Capitolio de los Estados Unidos, Washington, D.C.).

Por el contrario, los discursos de Netanyahu han sido más difíciles de seleccionar y recopilar, ya que aún no están recogidos por escrito. Se trata de dos discursos en vídeo en los que el presidente de Israel se dirige a un público internacional o estadounidense y lo hace por tanto en inglés. Los discursos de han transcrito para poder analizarlo con más facilidad y, al igual que los de Bush, aparecen en el anexo. El primer discurso data del 30 de octubre del 2023, tan solo algunos días tras el ataque de

Hamas a Israel, en él Netanyahu se dirige a la comunidad internacional durante una rueda de prensa para declarar que rechaza la petición de un alto al fuego. En el segundo discurso tuvo lugar el 18 de febrero de 2024, en La Conferencia de presidentes de las Mayores Organizaciones Judías de los Estados Unidos.

5. Análisis

Para el análisis nos basaremos en la estrategia propuesta por Fairclough. Primero, realizaremos un análisis textual, centrándonos en los recursos retóricos usados por ambos oradores. Tomaremos como ejemplo un análisis que Chilton realizó en su libro *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice* del discurso *Rivers Of Blood*. En él Chilton busca identificar los tipos de función legitimadora y emotiva a través de recursos léxicos. Según el autor «el orador intenta fundamentar su postura en sentimientos o interpretaciones morales incuestionables. Se evocan ciertos esquemas mentales intuitivos, vinculados a las emociones. Es evidente que se exaltan ciertas emociones que pueden considerarse razonablemente básicas en cierto modo: el miedo, la ira, la sensación de seguridad, la protección, la lealtad, por ejemplo» (Chilton, P., 2004). Muchas de las estrategias retóricas son las mismas que las utilizadas por Netanyahu y George W. Bush.

Después, hablaremos brevemente del contexto de los discursos, ya que el contexto histórico y político ya se ha dado en la introducción, y nos centraremos en cómo afectan los lugares elegidos para cada uno de ellos, la audiencia y los eventos más concretos que están sucediendo en ese momento preciso. Finalmente, se realizará una conclusión a modo de resumen en la que comentaremos las inferencias que se han extraído tras el análisis.

5.1 Análisis textual

5.1.1. Ellos vs nosotros

Este recurso de «ellos versus nosotros» ha sido estudiado por muchos investigadores de análisis crítico del discurso ya que es muy frecuente y útil en discursos políticos. Consiste básicamente en crear una distinción ideológica entre dos grupos sociales enfrentados y presentar al grupo que nos es favorable como moralmente

superior y al grupo «enemigo» como moralmente inferior. Es decir, se presentan dos realidades completamente polarizadas: el bien y el mal, que, además, aparecen definidas de forma completamente categórica, no hay matices ni grises, solo se presentan dos grupos completamente opuestos, los «buenos» y los «malos».

Una de las consecuencias de este tipo de discursos es la creación de estereotipos y de brechas entre grupos sociales, ya que en muchos casos las diferencias entre los grupos se exageran hasta el extremo y las similitudes ni siquiera se contemplan. Este tipo de recursos suelen ir relacionados con las ideologías racistas, ya que existen diferencias culturales y una diferencia evidente entre el endogrupo (el nosotros) y el exogrupo (el ellos). Esta estrategia tiene un efecto doble en la audiencia ya que por un lado genera un sentimiento de comunidad y por otro presenta un enemigo común del que defenderse. Además, el éxito de esta estrategia de «ellos versus nosotros» se basa en dos cualidades del ser humano: el planteamiento egocéntrico y la necesidad de una autoimagen positiva. Es decir, las personas tendemos a definir a otros tomándonos a nosotros mismos como ejemplo y a la hora de compararnos con otras personas que consideramos diferentes solemos pensar que nosotros (endogrupo) somos superiores a ellos (exogrupo) (Oktar, L., 2001).

A continuación, se expondrán una serie de ejemplos extraídos de los discursos de Bush y Netanyahu en los que se he detectado este uso del «nosotros versus ellos». Después, se comentarán los ejemplos y se compararán las similitudes y diferencia.

Orador	Cita	Discurso
Netanyahu	Victory over these enemies begins with moral clarity . It begins with knowing the difference between good and evil , between right and wrong.	Netanyahu addresses calls for cease-fire. 30 de octubre del 2023.
Netanyahu	It means making a moral distinction between the deliberate murder of the innocent and the unintentional casualties that accompany every legitimate war.	Netanyahu addresses calls for cease-fire. 30 de octubre del 2023.

Netanyahu	Today we draw a line between the forces of civilization and the forces of barbarism .	Netanyahu addresses calls for cease-fire. 30 de octubre del 2023.
Netanyahu	Since October 7 Israel has been in war. Israel did not start this war. Israel did not want this war , but Israel will win this war.	Netanyahu addresses calls for cease-fire. 30 de octubre del 2023.
Netanyahu	This monstrous entity that executes anybody who disagrees with them, they are now as we are making every effort to get civilian out of Harm's Way, Hamas is doing every effort to keep them In Harm's Way and when we provide safe corridors, and the Gazans begin to move there they try to stop them at gunpoint.	US Jewish Leaders Conference, 18 de febrero de 2024.
Netanyahu	They committed the most horrific crimes imaginable, and they're part of the axis of evil that Iran has formed.	Netanyahu addresses calls for cease-fire. 30 de octubre del 2023.
George W. Bush	Freedom and fear are at war . 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.	<i>Address To the Joint Session of the 107th Congress.</i>
George W. Bush	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.	<i>Address To the Joint Session of the 107th Congress.</i>

George W. Bush	The hijackers were instruments of evil who died in vain. Behind them is a cult of evil which seeks to harm the innocent and thrives on human suffering.	<i>Department Of Defense Service of Remembrance at The Pentagon</i>
George W. Bush	Theirs is the worst kind of violence, pure malice, while daring to claim the authority of God. We cannot fully understand the designs and power of evil . It is enough to know that evil, like goodness, exists. And in the terrorists, evil has found a willing servant .	<i>Department Of Defense Service of Remembrance at The Pentagon</i>
George W. Bush	War has been waged against us by stealth and deceit and murder. This nation is peaceful , but fierce when stirred to anger.	<i>National Day of Prayer and Remembrance Servic</i>
George W. Bush	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.	<i>Address To The 107th Congress.</i>

Estos son solo algunos ejemplos, ya que podemos encontrar este recurso en prácticamente todos los discursos a analizar. La estructura es clara: una antítesis entre dos grupos opuestos, ellos y nosotros. Por un lado, se habla de valores como «el bien», «la libertad», «el mundo civilizado» o «la justicia» y se presentan como valores propios. Mientras que, por otro lado, para definir al otro bando se usan sus antónimos: «el mal», «el miedo», «la crueldad» o «la barbarie».

Además, para reforzar esta idea de superioridad moral se hace hincapié en las buenas acciones de su propio país, como Estados Unidos que «ofrece comida y medicamentos en las zonas donde lleva a cabo operaciones militares» e Israel que «ofrece pasos seguros para que los civiles escapen de las zonas en guerra». Esto hace que el público les perciba como compasivos y heroicos, ya que, según esta narrativa, a

pesar de haber sido atacados brutalmente, en lugar de venganza buscan justicia y se preocupan por el bienestar de la población civil.

A su vez, ambos líderes hablan de la guerra como un mal necesario e incluso una responsabilidad moral para evitar el terrorismo. Netanyahu afirma que «Israel no quería entrar en guerra» y Bush habla de su deseo de paz y justicia. Esto refuerza aún más su posición de víctimas y de héroes, ya que no solo han sufrido ataques terroristas, sino que se han visto obligados a emprender acciones bélicas contra su voluntad.

Asimismo, esta superioridad moral se ve respaldada en ambos casos usando la religión. Según la RAE, el concepto de la moral no está vinculado directamente a la religión, sino más bien a lo que se considera socialmente bueno o malo. Sin embargo, aunque Bush lo hace de una manera mucho más obvia, ambos oradores relacionan moral y religión. Bush menciona directamente a Dios cuando habla de los juicios morales y de la diferencia entre el bien y el mal, y aunque Netanyahu no lo hace de forma tan evidente, sus discursos también tienen una carga religiosa importante.

Estas referencias a la religión se pueden entrever con el uso contante de la palabra «evil». Tanto Bush como Netanyahu utilizan constantemente esa palabra para definir a sus enemigos. De hecho, Netanyahu rescata de los discursos de Bush el concepto «axis of evil» para hablar de Irán y sus aliados. La palabra «evil» no tiene por definición una connotación religiosa, pero ha sido utilizada tan a menudo en contextos religiosos y en la propia Biblia que evoca automáticamente una connotación «diabólica» y tiene más valor simbólico que otros sinónimos como «wrongful» o «bad» (Stam B., J., 2020). Además, esta connotación religiosa se hace evidente cuando Bush dice que “el mal ha encontrado en los terroristas un siervo complaciente”. La terminología empleada es claramente religiosa y no solo condena las acciones de los terroristas, los demoniza.

5.1.2 Referencias religiosas

Ambos líderes hacen referencias directas a la Biblia o a Dios en sus discursos, pero en el caso de Bush estas referencias son más persistentes y están presentes con más frecuencia. Esto puede deberse a que ambos países tienen un porcentaje muy alto

de población religiosa. Según Datosmacro, Estados Unidos tenía alrededor de un 79% de población cristiana, mientras que en la actualidad Israel cuenta con un 95,5% de población que se declara religiosa, siendo el judaísmo la religión principal.

Estados Unidos siempre ha sido un país con un porcentaje alto de población cristiana, por lo que no sorprende que en los discursos políticos se hagan menciones religiosas. Sin embargo, el caso de Bush llama especialmente la atención y ha sido ampliamente estudiado por expertos de análisis del discurso. A pesar de que Michael Gerson, quien escribía los discursos de Bush, haya negado que pretendiera identificar los valores nacionales con aquellos de la religión cristiana, desde un punto de vista cuantitativo, Bush tiene el récord de más alusiones a Dios por cada 1000 palabras, superando incluso a Ronald Reagan. Desde un punto de cualitativo, los investigadores han apuntado que sus discursos presidenciales contenían expresiones religiosas como «posturas “petitorias” o “proféticas”»: “petitorias” en el sentido de solicitar o dar gracias por la ayuda divina, y “proféticas” implica “un conocimiento de los deseos, anhelos o intenciones de Dios”» (Smith, R. M., 2008).

Resulta más complicado encontrar estudios publicados sobre los discursos de Netanyahu que vamos a analizar ya que son mucho más recientes, pero sí existen artículos académicos sobre otros discursos que siguen una línea similar. En ellos se destaca el uso de elementos religiosos y la mezcla de patriotismo y religión. A través de sus discursos, el líder de Likud refleja un patriotismo excluyente a los ciudadanos israelíes que no son judíos, ya que insiste contantemente en que Israel es un estado judío y deben recatarse los valores judíos que se han ido perdiendo debido a la ideología liberal. Por ello, desde que Netanyahu lidera Likud, el partido se ha ido alejando del liberalismo hacia el conservadurismo y el populismo de derechas (Ben Porat, G., & Filc, D., 2022).

A continuación, se expondrán algunos ejemplos de referencias religiosas en los discursos de ambos líderes.

Orador	Cita	Discurso
Netanyahu	Ladies and gentlemen, the Bible says that there is a time for peace and a time for war.	Netanyahu addresses calls for cease-fire. 30 de octubre del 2023.
Netanyahu	May God bless Israel and May God bless all those who stand with Israel.	Netanyahu addresses calls for cease-fire. 30 de octubre del 2023.
George W. Bush	God's signs are not always the ones we look for. We learn in tragedy that his purposes are not always our own.	<i>National Day of Prayer and Remembrance Servic</i>
George W. Bush	This world He created is of moral design. Grief and tragedy and hatred are only for a time. Goodness, remembrance, and love have no end. And the Lord of life holds all who die, and all who mourn.	<i>National Day of Prayer and Remembrance Servic</i>
George W. Bush	We have no other choice , because there is no other peace. We did not ask for this mission , yet there is honor in history's call. We have a chance to write the story of our times, a story of courage defeating cruelty and light overcoming darkness.	<i>Address To the United Nations General Assembly</i>
George W. Bush	On this National Day of Prayer and remembrance, we ask almighty God to watch over our nation , and grant us patience and resolve in all that is to come.	<i>National Day of Prayer and Remembrance Servic</i>
George W. Bush	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	<i>Address To the Joint Session of the 107th Congress</i>

	grant us wisdom, and may He watch over the United States of America.	
--	---	--

Las referencias religiosas en los discursos de Netanyahu no son tan complejas como en aquellos de Bush. El líder israelí menciona la Biblia para darle validez a sus acciones bélicas, la usa como argumento de autoridad: incluso en la Biblia se contempla que hay tiempos en los que la guerra es necesaria. Además, cuando finaliza el discurso pidiendo que Dios bendiga a Israel, puede tratarse de un guiño al clásico eslogan «may God bless America», que ha sido utilizado por varios presidentes estadounidenses desde la época de Reagan, incluido Bush, que cierra la gran mayoría de sus discursos con esa frase.

Sin embargo, las referencias religiosas de Bush son más habituales, ya que están presentes en todos sus discursos, y más complejas. Por un lado, habla de las señales de Dios y de su voluntad, además de afirmar que en el mundo creado por Él el dolor es pasajero, mientras que el amor prevalece. Además, menciona que «no les ha quedado otra opción, que es su deber cumplir su misión para con la historia», haciendo referencia a la existencia de un supuesto destino que deben cumplir, como si todo estuviera escrito y ese fuera su deber moral. Esto se corresponde exactamente con el aspecto profético ya mencionado anteriormente, ya que hace referencia a la supuesta existencia de un plan divino. Bush hace afirmaciones sobre el futuro de Estados Unidos basándose en lo que él considera que Dios ha planeado para el país.

Por otro lado, también podemos ver el aspecto petitorio de los discursos del ex presidente de Estados Unidos, ya que pide contantemente a Dios que proteja el país y le dé la sabiduría para afrontar los conflictos a los que debe hacer frente Estados Unidos.

Tras comparar las referencias religiosas de ambos oradores podemos constatar que mientras Netanyahu hace alusiones religiosas de forma más superficial, simplemente para darle legitimidad a sus planes, Bush construye gran parte de su discurso basándose en la religión y el «plan de Dios». Esto puede resultar bastante surrealista para la mentalidad europea, ya que el presidente está asegurando la victoria de su país basándose en que Dios siempre hace el que bien triunfe sobre el mal, en lugar de en hechos objetivos como la superioridad militar.

5.1.3. Miedo a peligros futuros

El miedo es un recurso muy empleado en los discursos ya que genera en el público un sentimiento de urgencia que les empuja a tomar acción. Cuando se nos asegura que existe una amenaza inminente tendemos a actuar para protegernos, y en política, eso puede generar una movilización de votos o de apoyo al líder que promete proteger la nación de esos peligros. Esto tiene un efecto incluso mayor cuando el país ha sido atacado recientemente, como es el caso de Estados Unidos tras el 11-s o de Israel tras el 7 de octubre, ya que los ciudadanos han podido constatar la existencia de esos peligros, no se trata de una amenaza abstracta, sino de algo real, por lo que, si el líder afirma que puede volver a pasar, que el peligro aún no ha terminado, resulta mucho más creíble.

Para ilustrar esto, se presentarán algunos fragmentos en los que Bush y Netanyahu han utilizado el miedo en sus discursos para movilizar a la comunidad nacional e internacional.

Orador	Cita	Discurso
Netanyahu	In fighting Hamas and the Iranian axis of terror, Israel is fighting the enemies of civilization itself.	Netanyahu addresses calls for cease-fire. 30 de octubre del 2023.
Netanyahu	I hope and pray that civilized nations everywhere will back this fight, because Israel's fight is your fight, because if Hamas and Irans axis of evil win, you will be their next target.	Netanyahu addresses calls for cease-fire. 30 de octubre del 2023.
George W. Bush	The danger, he warned, has long ceased to be a mere possibility. The danger is here now.	<i>Department Of Defense Service of Remembrance at The Pentagon</i>
George W. Bush	That evil has returned , and that cause is renewed.	<i>Address To the United Nations General Assembly</i>
George W. Bush	They kill because they aspire to dominate. They seek to overthrow governments and destabilize entire regions.	<i>Address To the United Nations General Assembly</i>

George W. Bush	Few countries meet their exacting standards of brutality and oppression. Every other country is a potential target. And all the world faces the most horrifying prospect of all: These same terrorists are searching for weapons of mass destruction, the tools to turn their hatred into Holocaust. They can be expected to use chemical, biological and nuclear weapons the moment they are capable of doing so.	<i>Address To the United Nations General Assembly</i>
George W. Bush	Civilization, itself, the civilization we share, is threatened.	<i>Address To the United Nations General Assembly</i>

Una vez más, Bush lleva esta estrategia a un nivel más que Netanyahu. El líder israelí lleva a cabo una estrategia que Paul Chilton ya contempló en su análisis del discurso *Rivers of Blood* y denominó *fear of unesticified dangers* (Chilton, P., 2004). Este recurso consiste en hacer alusión a posibles amenazas futuras, pero sin dejar claro qué son exactamente esas amenazas. Netanyahu habla de Hamas como los «enemigos de la civilización» y dice que otros países occidentales podrían ser los siguientes, pero no desarrolla más esa idea ni ofrece argumentos claros de por qué lo que denomina como «axis of evil», un concepto también bastante ambiguo, representa un peligro real para occidente. Es decir, Netanyahu busca generar un sentimiento de amenaza a nivel internacional, pero de forma equívoca.

El caso de Bush es totalmente diferente, ya que alerta de peligros concretos y hace acusaciones específicas. En los discursos más recientes tras el 11-s a penas se ven este tipo de recursos, ya que no se busca generar un sentimiento miedo, sino de seguridad. Tras un atentado terrorista es imprescindible que una figura de autoridad tranquilice a los ciudadanos para evitar el pánico colectivo. En un contexto así, cuando aún no se sabe a ciencia cierta si habrá un cuarto ataque, atemorizar a la población podría tener consecuencias nefastas. Sin embargo, según se va acercando la intervención militar en Afganistán, Bush comienza a alertar de la amenaza que supone el régimen talibán a nivel mundial para justificar dicha invasión.

De hecho, la mayoría de las referencias a estos peligros se concentran en el mismo discurso, *Address To The United Nations General Assembly*, del 10 de noviembre del 2001, en la Organización de las Naciones Unidas, ya que poco más de un mes antes Estados Unidos había comenzado a enviar tropas a Afganistán y fue justo en ese discurso en el que Bush habló por primera vez de la posibilidad de que los terroristas tuvieran armas nucleares de destrucción masiva, que sería el mismo argumento que se utilizó años más tarde para justificar la invasión de Iraq.

Bush también utiliza dos estrategias mencionadas en el análisis de Paul Chilton: *fear of domination* (miedo a la dominación) y *fear of destruction* (miedo a la destrucción) (Chilton, P., 2004). El expresidente afirma que los terroristas buscan dominar el mundo y que cualquier país es una víctima potencial de sus atentados. Además, cuando menciona la posibilidad de que eventualmente obtengan armas de destrucción masiva dice que llevarán a cabo su «Holocausto».

Teniendo en cuenta los discursos que se han analizado, podemos concluir que Bush utiliza el miedo de forma más radical que Netanyahu. El líder israelí afirma desde un primer momento que Israel va a ganar la guerra, con o sin apoyo, ya que es consciente de su superioridad militar, y cuando utiliza la herramienta del miedo lo hace de cara a la comunidad internacional, probablemente para que otros países se pongan de su lado. No obstante, Bush busca crear un sentimiento de alarma a nivel mundial, ya que habla de peligros concretos y de ataques a gran escala.

5.1.4. Referencias históricas

Durante el análisis de los discursos se han encontrado algunas referencias a otros eventos históricos, en general a modo de comparación o de metáfora. Además, en el caso de Netanyahu, también se han mencionado experiencias personales. A continuación, se expondrán algunos ejemplos de estas referencias históricas para luego analizarlas en mayor profundidad.

Orador	Cita	Discurso
Netanyahu	Hamas launches this war by perpetrating the worst savagery our people of seen since the Holocaust .	Netanyahu addresses calls for cease-fire. 30 de octubre del 2023.

Netanyahu	just as the United States would not agree to a ceasefire after the bombing of Pearl Harbor or after the terrorist attacks of 9-11 , Israel will not agree to a cation of hostilities with Hamas after the horrific attacks of October 7.	Netanyahu addresses calls for cease-fire. 30 de octubre del 2023.
Netanyahu	It's incomparable, he says there is one comparison: in World War II, the battle for Manila.	US Jewish Leaders Conference, 18 de febrero de 2024.
Netanyahu	President Silva has disgraced the memory of six million Jews murdered by the Nazis and he's demonized the Jewish State like the most virent anti-semite he should be ashamed of himself.	US Jewish Leaders Conference, 18 de febrero de 2024.
Netanyahu	No one would do that in the case of fighting Isis . You wouldn't leave a quarter of Isis intact in a defined territory. You wouldn't even think about that, and you didn't. America finished the job with its allies.	US Jewish Leaders Conference, 18 de febrero de 2024.
Netanyahu	I've had my own personal experience . This has accompanied me in my life. I was wounded in the rescue of hostages from a hijacked Sabina airplane. My older brother Yoni died while leading the INB Rescue of 103 Jewish hostages .	US Jewish Leaders Conference, 18 de febrero de 2024.
George W. Bush	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 .	<i>Address To the Joint Session of the 107th Congress</i>

George W. Bush	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.	<i>Address To the Joint Session of the 107th Congress</i>
George W. Bush	These same terrorists are searching for weapons of mass destruction, the tools to turn their hatred into Holocaust .	<i>Address To the United Nations General Assembly</i>

Una de las referencias históricas más usadas por ambos es el Nazismo y el Holocausto. En el caso de Netanyahu es bastante evidente que es una referencia que tiene un poder simbólico enorme debido a que Israel es un estado judío y el régimen Nazi afectó a su comunidad de forma directa. Además, el líder israelí se escuda en el antisemitismo para defenderse de las críticas de otros jefes de estado que no están de acuerdo con sus acciones militares. Este método resulta eficaz porque es cierto que el pueblo judío ha sufrido una opresión sistemática desde hace siglos, por lo que Netanyahu califica cada crítica como un ataque antisemita, aunque no se trate de un ataque racista por ser judío, sino por sus acciones bélicas contra Palestina.

Además, Netanyahu habla de su experiencia personal ya que el presidente formó parte las fuerzas especiales de élite Sayeret Matkal, la unidad antiterrorista de Israel, y llevó a cabo operaciones militares en la guerra contra Egipto (BBC News Mundo, 2023). Al relatar su experiencia personal rescatando rehenes y cómo su hermano falleció durante una misión de rescate refuerza esa idea de héroe y de líder fuerte.

Bush también utiliza referencias al Nazismo, el fascismo y el totalitarismo porque generan sentimientos muy fuertes en la audiencia. Nadie es ajeno a los horrores que se cometieron durante esos regímenes y mencionarlos genera una reacción en el público. Finalmente, también menciona la intervención militar de la década anterior en Iraq y la de dos años antes en Kosovo a modo de comparación con la guerra en la que

acaban de embarcarse, dejando claro la guerra contra el Terrorismo no será tan fácil de ganar.

5.1.5. Unidad de la ciudadanía

Otro recurso que emplean ambos líderes es la apelación a la unión ciudadana, tanto a nivel nacional como internacional. Esto suele suceder cuando se dan crisis de este tipo. Cada vez que tienen lugar atentados, ataques o accidentes en los que fallecen personas, la comunidad se une y se apoya mutuamente. Además, este sentimiento de unión se ve exaltada por los discursos «ellos versus nosotros» que se comentaron con anterioridad. Este tipo de discursos resalta las diferencias entre comunidades y exagera las similitudes, por lo que las personas del endogrupo se sienten más unidas.

Orador	Cita	Discurso
Netanyahu	This year that solidarity is particularly important because it's an expression of unity between the Jewish people and the Jewish state , between so many of our friends around the world and the great trial that we are faced with today.	US Jewish Leaders Conference, 18 de febrero de 2024.
Netanyahu	This will send a message of unity, unity inside Israel, unity outside Israe, unity between us.	US Jewish Leaders Conference, 18 de febrero de 2024.
Netanyahu	The Army is united as never before , the public is united as never before and we are united with you for one thing: total Victory.	US Jewish Leaders Conference, 18 de febrero de 2024.
George W. Bush	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	<i>Address To The Nation On The September 11 Attacks</i>

George W. Bush	This is a day when all Americans from every walk of life unite in our resolve for justice and peace.	<i>Address To The Nation On The September 11 Attacks</i>
George W. Bush	In these acts, and in many others, Americans showed a deep commitment to one another , and an abiding love for our country. Today, we feel what Franklin Roosevelt called the warm courage of national unity . This is a unity of every faith, and every background. It has joined together political parties in both houses of Congress.	<i>National Day of Prayer and Remembrance Servic</i>
George W. Bush	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.	<i>Address To the Joint Session of the 107th Congress</i>

Netanyahu pide la solidaridad y el apoyo de la comunidad internacional, especialmente de la comunidad judía. Expresa que el pueblo está más unido que nunca con el objetivo de la «victoria total», ya que tener un enemigo común hace que el público se sienta más unido entre sí. Bush describe que todo el pueblo estadounidense, independientemente de su contexto, ha colaborado para buscar la paz y la justicia. Además, hace una referencia al primer discurso inaugural de Franklin D. Roosevelt cuando habla de *the warm courage of national unity*, la unión de la ciudadanía independientemente de sus diferencias culturales. Bush menciona incluso que dentro del congreso el partido republicano y el demócrata están más unidos que nunca y pide el apoyo de otros países para luchar juntos contra el terrorismo.

5.1.6. Apelación a las víctimas

Ambos líderes hablan de las víctimas y cuentan sus historias ya que genera un sentimiento de empatía en la audiencia. Sin embargo, lo hacen de manera totalmente diferente. Mientras Netanyahu ofrece una descripción de los ataques, del sufrimiento de las víctimas y de la crueldad de aquellos que los perpetraron, Bush habla de su coraje y de su valentía e incluso cuenta historias concretas que enfatizan esa heroicidad. Ahora se expondrá algunos ejemplos para ilustrar estas diferencias.

Orador	Cita	Discurso
Netanyahu	Hamas murdered children in front of their parents, murdered parents in front of their children, they burned people alive, they rape women, they beheaded men, they tortured Holocaust survivors, they kidnapped babies. They committed the most horrific crimes imaginable	Netanyahu addresses calls for cease-fire. 30 de octubre del 2023.
Netanyahu	We've seen children murdered in front of their parents, parents murdered in front of their children, women raped and beheaded after being raped. We've seen youngsters burned alive in death bits, we've seen mothers and babies kidnapped by these monsters.	US Jewish Leaders Conference, 18 de febrero de 2024.
George W. Bush	They are the names of men and women who began their day at a desk or in an airport, busy with life. They are the names of people who faced death, and in their last moments called home to say, be brave, and I love you. They are the names of passengers who defeated their murderers and prevented the murder of others on the ground. They are the names of rescuers, the ones whom death found	<i>National Day of Prayer and Remembrance Servic</i>

	running up the stairs and into the fires to help others.	
George W. Bush	Inside the World Trade Center, one man who could have saved himself stayed until the end at the side of his quadriplegic friend. A beloved priest died giving the last rites to a firefighter. Two office workers, finding a disabled stranger, carried her down sixty-eight floors to safety. A group of men drove through the night from Dallas to Washington to bring skin grafts for burn victims.	<i>National Day of Prayer and Remembrance Service</i>

El presidente de Israel da una descripción muy sanguinaria y cruenta de los ataques del 7 de octubre. Su objetivo no es honrar a las víctimas ni hablar de ellas, sino demonizar a los terroristas mostrando las cosas que hicieron. Da detalles macabros de cómo fueron los ataques para que la comunidad internacional se haga una idea de la crueldad a la que puede llegar Hamas.

George W. Bush sigue una estrategia completamente diferente, ya que su objetivo es otro. El líder estadounidense pone el foco en las víctimas en lugar de en los atacantes, busca contar sus historias ya que muchos de ellos perdieron la vida de forma heroica, ayudando a otros. Este tipo de historias emocionan mucho al público y generan un sentimiento de empatía muy fuerte para con las víctimas y también un sentimiento de patriotismo que se retroalimenta con las estrategias de generar unión entre la ciudadanía. Todo el discurso de Bush tiene un aspecto patriótico muy fuerte, habla constantemente de la superioridad de Estados Unidos y argumenta que fueron atacados por ser un símbolo de prosperidad y libertad. Estas historias de heroísmo que describen cómo unos ciudadanos dieron la vida por otros ayudan a reforzar ese discurso de que el pueblo estadounidense está unido y es fuerte.

Según lo que hemos visto en estos discursos, Netanyahu busca usar el miedo y la crueldad para generar un sentimiento de odio y demonizar a todo aquel que tenga algo que ver con Hamas. Sin embargo, Bush busca ganarse a su audiencia utilizando historias sentimentales y conmovedoras que emocionan al público.

5.2. Contexto

Puesto a que ya se ha explicado el contexto histórico y político de ambos países, hablaremos del contexto de cada discurso para tratar de identificar qué recursos se han usado a la hora de elaborar el discurso dependiendo del público al que va dirigido. Empezaremos con los discursos de Netanyahu, ya que contamos con un corpus más limitado, y terminaremos con los de Bush. El orden de los discursos a analizar será por orden cronológico.

5.2.1. Discursos de Netanyahu

El primer discurso de Netanyahu, que se ha titulado *Netanyahu addresses calls for cease-fire*, tuvo lugar el 30 de octubre. Se trata de un comunicado de prensa ante los medios internacionales en el que el líder israelí declina las peticiones de un alto al fuego. Este discurso es relativamente breve y llama la atención por el uso de una sintaxis muy simple, ya que las frases son breves y directas. Un ejemplo de esto sería el comienzo del discurso, cuando dice: «Israel did not start this war. Israel did not want this war, but Israel will win this war», en español: «Israel no empezó esta guerra. Israel no quería esta guerra, pero Israel va a ganar esta guerra». Se trata de un lenguaje muy sencillo, con frases cortas y directas y un vocabulario muy básico. En este caso, el uso de estas estructuras gramaticales tan sencillas transmite claridad y seguridad: no se dan rodeos, el presidente lo tiene claro y lo transmite de forma inequívoca.

Después, describe los ataques de forma muy cruda y visual para generar una reacción en el público internacional, que no está familiarizado con ese tipo de violencia. Además, también utiliza referencias culturales como el 11-s o el ataque de Pearl Harbor, ambos son parte de la historia estadounidense pero conocidos mundialmente. Esto puede deberse a que Estados Unidos es uno de los mayores apoyos de Israel y con dichas referencias busca encontrar el apoyo de los ciudadanos estadounidenses y hacer que se sientan identificados con los israelíes.

En este discurso, Netanyahu también hace referencia a la Biblia, lo que puede resultar muy útil para generar empatía y conexión con el público occidental. La religión judía y la cristiana comparten algunas escrituras, por lo que hacer referencia a la Biblia o a esas escrituras sagradas compartidas genera un sentimiento de conexión y empatía entre judíos y cristianos. Además, el hecho de utilizar el término «Bible» en lugar de «Torah» dice mucho de la intención del presidente, que claramente busca la simpatía de la comunidad cristiana a nivel internacional.

El segundo discurso de Netanyahu, titulado *Netanyahu addresses US Jewish Leaders Conference in Jerusalem*, está más enfocado a la comunidad judía, ya que se trata de un discurso que el presidente dio el pasado 18 de febrero en La Conferencia de Presidentes de las Mayores Organizaciones Judías de los Estados Unidos. Este evento es una reunión que se celebra para defender los intereses de la comunidad judía en Estados Unidos y brindar apoyo a Israel (About the Conference – COP, n.d.). Al tratarse de una audiencia complemente judía y comprometida con el sionismo Netanyahu ya parte con ventaja, ya que sabe que se trata de personas que están de acuerdo con la causa israelí. De hecho, en varias ocasiones el discurso es interrumpido por aplausos.

En este discurso se pueden ver más referencias al nazismo y al Holocausto que en el discurso del 30 de octubre, ya que al tratarse de personas que pertenecen a la comunidad judía esta historia compartida tiene un efecto incluso más potente. Además, se trata de un discurso más largo, más descriptivo y con más referencias históricas. En general podría decirse que es un discurso más elaborado, no tan simple como el discurso del 30 de octubre. Esto puede deberse a que la intención de cada uno es diferente. En el primero, busca responder a la petición del alto el fuego y dar una negativa clara y concisa. Ofrece argumentos sencillos y claros para que no quede ninguna duda de que el ejército israelí seguirá adelante. En el segundo, por el contrario, busca reforzar la simpatía y el apoyo de la audiencia. Explica con detenimiento las estrategias del ejército israelí, lo compara con otras batallas históricas, se detiene a ofrecer detalles sobre la crueldad de Hamas y sobre el esfuerzo del ejército por evitar la muerte de civiles... En resumen, es un discurso más descriptivo y menos tajante que el primero.

5.2.2. Discursos de George W. Bush

El primer discurso de Bush que se analizará tuvo lugar el 11 de septiembre del 2001, el mismo día de los atentados, y recibió el nombre de *Address To The Nation On The September 11 Attacks*. Se trata de un comunicado emitido en televisión y grabado en la Oficina Oval de la Casa Blanca en el que el presidente se dirige a la ciudadanía en general. Se trata de un discurso muy patriótico con un lenguaje muy emotivo. En él Bush busca transmitir un sentimiento de calma y unión, ya que Estados Unidos acaba de sufrir un ataque sin precedentes y se debe reforzar la confianza en el ejército y en la seguridad del país. Además, este discurso, como la mayoría de los discursos de Bush, tiene una carga religiosa elevada y se cita un salmo de la Biblia. Finalmente, en este discurso no se hace referencia a posibles peligros futuros, solo se habla del dolor y el luto que sufre Estados Unidos.

El segundo discurso, *National Day Of Prayer And Remembrance Servic*, tuvo lugar el 14 de septiembre en la Catedral Nacional de Washington, en un evento en el que presidente Bush, varios expresidentes y otros dignatarios se reunieron en reconocimiento de un Día Nacional de Oración y Recuerdo por las víctimas, familiares y trabajadores de rescate de los ataques terroristas. No sorprende que este discurso esté repleto de referencias religiosas, ya que el propio carácter del evento es cristiano. Además, también habla de la necesidad de que el pueblo estadounidense y la comunidad internacional se unan para librar una guerra contra aquellos que perpetraron los ataques. Al tratarse de un día dedicado a velar a las víctimas de los atentados, el presidente también hace referencia al valor de las personas que fallecieron en los atentados o en las misiones de rescate. De hecho, en el evento se leyeron todos los nombres de los fallecidos.

El tercer discurso, llamado *Address To The Joint Session Of The 107th Congress*, tuvo lugar en el Capitolio de los Estados Unidos el 20 de septiembre del 2001 y fue el discurso en el que Bush anunció al mundo que los ataques terroristas habían sido perpetrados por al Qaeda, una organización terrorista de extremismo islámico. Este discurso es bastante extenso y se puede ver una evolución en el contenido: comienza hablando de la unión y la solidaridad que ha mostrado el mundo con Estados Unidos tras los ataques, de la unión de los ciudadanos estadounidenses y del patriotismo, temas muy parecidos a los que llevábamos viendo hasta ahora. Sin embargo, según avanza el discurso y se menciona a los autores de los crímenes el

discurso de vuelve más exaltado y Bush comienza a hacer referencia a los posibles peligros y ataques que podrían tener lugar a nivel mundial. Habla de destrucción, fascismo, guerra... y advierte a otros países que ellos serán los siguientes. Es entonces cuando empieza la narrativa «ellos versus nosotros», y Bush comienza a hablar del régimen talibán de Afganistán y del sufrimiento de los afganos. Además, lanza un mensaje claro al mundo entero «o estáis con nosotros o contra nosotros».

Hasta este discurso las intervenciones de Bush no tenían un carácter tan persuasivo, se trataba más bien de discursos muy emotivos y patrióticos que buscan exaltar la unidad nacional, consolar a todos aquellos que estaban de luto y estrechar lazos con otros países para buscar su apoyo. Sin embargo, a partir de este discurso las intenciones del presidente dan un giro y se convierten en intervenciones mucho más persuasivas. Bush sabe que tarde o temprano, cuando Afganistán se niegue a cumplir con las condiciones puestas por Estados Unidos, tendrá que mandar tropas y comenzar una guerra. De hecho, en esta intervención, poco más de una semana después de los ataques, Bush ya advierte que habrá guerra y que no será una batalla sencilla ni rápida. Por ello, a partir de este momento su objetivo para los próximos discursos será persuadir a los ciudadanos estadounidenses y a la comunidad internacional de la necesidad de entrar en guerra, y lo hará utilizando la estrategia del miedo.

El siguiente discurso tiene lugar en el pentágono el 11 de octubre y recibe el nombre de *Department Of Defense Service Of Remembrance At The Pentagon*. El contexto de este discurso es diferente a los anteriores ya que Bush ya ha enviado tropas a Afganistán, es decir, la guerra ya se considera empezada. Según el departamento de defensa de Estados Unidos (U.S. Department of Defense, n.d.) este fue un evento celebrado para conmemorar a las víctimas del ataque al pentágono. Sin embargo, debido al contexto bélico, el discurso tiene un carácter más persuasivo que los primeros dos discursos que se dieron antes de anunciar la autoría de al Qaeda y de entrar en guerra. El discurso comienza recordando los ataques y a las víctimas, como se esperaría de una intervención dedicada a las víctimas de un atentado terrorista, pero según va avanzando, el tema central cambia, y pasa de las víctimas a los atacantes. Bush comienza a hablar de los terroristas, de sus planes de llevar a cabo un Holocausto, del peligro que acecha al mundo y anuncia que el ejército estadounidense ya ha sido enviado a Afganistán a destruir las células terroristas. A partir de entonces, el resto del discurso se centra en la estrategia militar que se seguirá durante la guerra.

En este caso, vemos como el contexto político de Estados Unidos y el tipo de audiencia ha afectado en gran medida al discurso. Por una parte, en lo que respecta a la audiencia podemos ver que, en los primeros discursos, más centrados a la ciudadanía en general, no se habla de cuestiones militares ni de guerra. Sin embargo, en el Pentágono el público tiene formación militar y el discurso está completamente adaptado a ese tipo de audiencia, ya que hace referencia a mandos y áreas del ejército. Además, en lo que se refiere al contexto político, el discurso también está más centrado en cuestiones militares porque la guerra ya ha comenzado y ya ha pasado un mes de los ataques, por lo que hablar de los posibles peligros que supone al Qaeda ya no genera el sentimiento de histeria que hubiera generado si se habla de ello justo después de los atentados.

El siguiente discurso es el que Bush pronuncia en las Naciones Unidas, llamado *Address To The United Nations General Assembly*, el 10 de noviembre del 2001. Se trata de un discurso mucho más sobrio que los anteriores, ya que el público son los mandatarios de países extranjeros, no la ciudadanía. Una de las curiosidades que más destacan de este discurso es la falta de referencias religiosas, que suelen ser una marca personal de Bush. De hecho, ni siquiera pronuncia del típico «God bless America» para cerrar el discurso. Esto puede explicarse por el contexto del discurso, ya que no es un discurso exaltado y sentimental dirigido a la ciudadanía, es un discurso argumentativo de gran seriedad que se ofrece a los líderes internacionales para persuadirles de la necesidad de entrar en Afganistán, describir cómo se llevará a cabo la intervención y solicitar su apoyo.

Lo más destacable de este discurso es el uso del miedo. Bush busca asustar a los líderes mundiales para que se unan en su Guerra contra el Terrorismo y lo hace advirtiéndoles de que su objetivo es destruir la civilización y dominar el mundo. Además, este es el primer discurso en el que se hace referencia al armamento nuclear y las armas de destrucción masiva. En ese momento, Bush solo especula con la idea de que podrían conseguirlas, pero con el paso del tiempo cada vez habla más a menudo de esas armas y con más certeza de que las poseen. Y finalmente, ese sería el argumento que utilizaría para invadir Iraq en 2003.

El último discurso de Bush que se ha analizado para el trabajo es *State Of The Union Address To The 107th Congress*, del 29 de enero del 2002. El contexto político

de este discurso difiere más de los anteriores ya que han pasado cerca de dos meses desde la anterior intervención del presidente y la guerra de Afganistán ya está más avanzada. De hecho, Bush habla de Afganistán como un país aliado en la Guerra Contra el Terrorismo, ya que las células terroristas han sido destruidas y el gobierno talibán se ha sustituido por un gobierno afín a Estados Unidos. El discurso comienza con un tono patriótico, recordando todo lo que ha avanzado el país norteamericano desde los atentados del 11-s y describiendo todo lo que se ha conseguido en Afganistán. Sin embargo, según avanza el discurso el foco se pone en Irán e Iraq, el siguiente enemigo de Estados Unidos en la Guerra contra el Terrorismo. Lo que al principio parecía un discurso de victoria se convierte en lo que sentaría las bases para las próximas intervenciones militares.

Este discurso ha sido seleccionado porque reúne muchas de las estrategias retóricas utilizadas en discursos anteriores y se puede ver una diferencia clara entre el tono que Bush usa para hablar de las victorias militares en contraposición al que usa para referirse a futuras campañas bélicas. Al comienzo, utiliza el patriotismo y hace muchas referencias a la unidad ciudadana y la superioridad de Estados Unidos, mientras que cuando habla de Irán o Iraq vuelve a utilizar el miedo para alarmar a la población, justo lo que hacía apenas dos meses hacía con Afganistán. Es evidente que Bush usa una estrategia clara para justificar la guerra: el miedo.

6. Conclusión

Para acabar, se realizará un resumen de las conclusiones que se han obtenido en el análisis y de cómo ha sido el proceso de búsqueda de información y de redacción del trabajo. En el análisis se han detectado seis recursos principales utilizados tanto por Netanyahu como por Bush para persuadir a la audiencia de la necesidad y la legitimidad de sus acciones bélicas: el ellos versus nosotros, las referencias religiosas, el miedo, las referencias históricas, las apelaciones a la unión de la ciudadanía y a las víctimas. Sin embargo, cada uno utiliza estos recursos de manera diferente.

El primer recurso, ellos versus nosotros, es usado por ambos oradores de manera muy similar. Ambos utilizan estructuras de antítesis para hablar del endogrupo en contraposición al exogrupo. Además, ambos hacen apelación a las supuestas acciones humanitarias que han tenido con los países rivales y exaltan su posición heroica y

solidaria. Usan un vocabulario similar, con términos como «barbarie», «maldad», «el bien frente al mal», etc. y ambos usan terminología que recuerda a la religión, con palabras como «evil», que demonizan a sus rivales.

En el uso del segundo recurso, las referencias religiosas, los líderes difieren más, ya que Bush lo lleva a un nivel más que Netanyahu. Si bien es cierto que el presidente israelí menciona la Biblia y a Dios, el discurso de Bush presenta rasgos petitorios y proféticos, es decir pide directamente a Dios su apoyo y su ayuda y hace referencia a la existencia de un plan divino y la necesidad de cumplir con su destino. Por ello, podemos inferir que Bush hace más uso de la religión para legitimar sus acciones que Netanyahu y que sus referencias son mucho más complejas que las del israelí.

En lo que respecta al uso del miedo, Bush y Netanyahu también hacen un uso diferente de este recurso. Si bien es cierto que Netanyahu realiza descripciones mucho más crudas y sangrientas de los ataques de Hamas que Bush de los del 11-s, cuando Netanyahu hace referencia a los peligros que podría suponer el terrorismo a nivel mundial, lo hace de forma mucho más imprecisa, lo que no tiene un efecto tan punzante como ofrecer información precisa de cuáles son esos peligros. Por el contrario, Bush hace lo completamente opuesto, no es tan cruento en la descripción de los ataques, pero habla de peligros concretos y hace acusaciones precisas y directas, como la posibilidad de que los terroristas obtengan armamento nuclear.

Otro recurso empleado por ambos oradores es el uso de referencias históricas para hacer comparaciones con el presente, entre las que destacan las referencias al Nazismo y al Holocausto. En el caso de Netanyahu resulta evidente porque estas referencias tienen un gran impacto en la audiencia, especialmente aquellas personas que son judías, ya que les toca de manera personal. Además, el líder israelí también hace referencias a batallas del ejército y a experiencias personales que vivió durante su servicio militar. Por su parte, Bush no hace tantas referencias históricas, solo menciona el nazismo y algunas batallas libradas por Estados Unidos, pero únicamente las menciona brevemente para compararlas con la situación actual del país.

Otro recurso retórico que se ha detectado en los discursos de ambos presidentes es la apelación a la unidad de la ciudadanía, que se retroalimenta con el primer recurso analizado, el ellos versus nosotros. Ambos líderes piden el apoyo internacional tanto

para ofrecer respaldo a las víctimas como para recibir aprobación en sus campañas militares. Además, hacen hincapié en que las tragedias que han tenido lugar en sus países han reforzado el sentimiento de comunidad y la empatía de los ciudadanos. Sin embargo, Netanyahu utiliza esa unión de forma amenazante, ya que deja claro que la unión del pueblo en lo que respecta a la decisión de acabar con Hamas es tan fuerte y unánime que seguirá adelante con la guerra independientemente de lo que la comunidad internacional pueda opinar al respecto.

Finalmente, el último recurso sería la apelación a las víctimas de los ataques, una referencia que Netanyahu y Bush emplean de forma muy diferente. Netanyahu habla de las víctimas para describir lo terribles y crueles que fueron sus muertes, lo hace para generar en el público un sentimiento de odio hacia el enemigo. Sin embargo, Bush relata las historias de los que fallecieron de forma heroica y busca con ello emocionar a la audiencia y transmitir un mensaje de unión y patriotismo en Estados Unidos.

Por último, explicaré el proceso de creación de este trabajo y las conclusiones personales a las que he llegado. El primer reto ha sido seleccionar qué discursos usar para el trabajo. En el caso de Bush ha sido más sencillo porque muchas de sus intervenciones más relevantes estaban recopiladas en un archivo de la Casa Blanca, por lo que acceder a sus discursos y seleccionarlos no ha sido complicado. Por el contrario, hacer la selección de discursos de Netanyahu ha sido más difícil, porque muchos de ellos estaban en hebreo y para aquellos en inglés no encontré ninguna fuente fiable donde aparecieran por escrito, por lo que hubo un trabajo de transcripción.

Otra decisión importante fue elegir qué estrategia de análisis seguiría para el trabajo, ya que cada teórico propone una forma distinta. Tenía claro que quería centrarme en los recursos retóricos, pero no sabía cómo hacerlo hasta que encontré el análisis de Chilton del discurso *Rivers of Blood*, del que ya se ha hablado con anterioridad. Ese análisis sirvió de base para el formato del apartado 5.1 y para identificar los seis recursos retóricos que se analizan y comparan en el análisis. Una vez tuve identificadas las estrategias retóricas fui avanzando más rápido, ya que solo quedaba comprarlas y sacar conclusiones de aquellos fragmentos que había seleccionado.

Una vez terminado el análisis, con una visión de conjunto de todos los discursos del corpus se ha podido confirmar que en estas intervenciones prima el sentimentalismo frente a los hechos objetivos. Todos estos recursos retóricos buscan convencer a la audiencia desde el sentimentalismo y las emociones, no ofreciendo datos reales ni argumentos sólidos.

También se ha constatado que los discursos están muy adaptados al contexto y a la audiencia de cada momento. Aunque ambos líderes tienen un estilo personal, sus intervenciones están muy condicionadas por el tipo de audiencia, y tienden más al sentimentalismo y las referencias a la moral y la religión cuando dan discursos orientados a la ciudadanía nacional, mientras que adoptan un tono más serio cuando se dirigen a un público internacional o a otros líderes extranjeros. Por lo que podemos inferir que esta apelación a las emociones es totalmente intencionada y se usa como una herramienta para persuadir a aquellas personas que pueden caer más fácilmente en discursos populistas.

Por último, tanto Netanyahu como Bush instrumentalizan más los sentimientos negativos que los positivos. Aunque ambos hacen alusión a la unión de la ciudadanía, la empatía y la solidaridad, en sus discursos tiene mucho más peso el odio y el miedo, que con el paso del tiempo han ido imperado en todas sus intervenciones. La conclusión final de este trabajo es que el miedo es la herramienta clave usada en política para persuadir de la necesidad de una intervención militar, ya sea a través de las referencias religiosas, las comparaciones históricas o la demonización del enemigo. Como sociedad deberíamos ser más conscientes del uso estas tácticas de persuasión por parte de los políticos porque podrían llevarnos a actuar movidos por los sentimientos en lugar de por la razón.

7. Bibliografía

Beshara, R. K. (2018). A critical discourse analysis of George W. Bush's 'War on Terror' speech. *Journal of Language and Discrimination*, 2(1), 85–112.

<https://doi.org/10.1558/jld.34307>

Carlini, Matthew Francis, "The "Ruins of the Future": Counter-Narratives to Terrorism in the 9/11 Literature of Don DeLillo, Jonathan Safran Foer, and Ian McEwan. "Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 2009. https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes/28

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249-283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse*. Londres: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Critical discourse analysis: the study of language*. Londres y Nueva York: Longman.

Oktar, L. (2001). The Ideological Organization of Representational Processes in the Presentation of us and them. *Discourse & Society*, 12(3), 313-346. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926501012003003>

Stam B., J. (2020) *El lenguaje religioso de George W. Bush: Análisis semántico y teológico*.

Ben Porat, G., & Filc, D. (2022). Remember to be Jewish: Religious Populism in Israel. *Politics and Religion*, 15(1), 61–84. doi:10.1017/S1755048320000681

BBC News Mundo (2023). Benjamin Netanyahu, la vida y la carrera del hombre que por más tiempo ha gobernado Israel y ahora lidera la ofensiva contra Hamás. *BBC News Mundo*. <https://www.bbc.com/mundo/articles/c03280689n7o>

Smith, R. M. (2008). Religious Rhetoric and the Ethics of Public Discourse: The Case of George W. Bush. *Political Theory*, 36(2), 272-300.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591707312447>

National Geographic (2024) Israel y Palestina: ¿Cómo y cuándo comenzó el conflicto? *National Geographic*. https://historia.nationalgeographic.com.es/a/israel-palestina-como-cuando-comenzo-conflicto_20332

Amnistía Internacional (2024) Crisis en Gaza e Israel. *Amnistía Internacional*. <https://www.es.amnesty.org/en-que-estamos/campanas/crisis-en-gaza-e-israel/>

About the conference – COP. (n.d.). <https://conferenceofpresidents.org/about/>

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE. (n.d.). *President Bush addresses the audience during the Pentagon memorial service*. <https://dod.defense.gov/OIR/gallery/igphoto/2001240308/>

8. Anexos

Discursos de Netanyahu analizados en este trabajo

Netanyahu addresses calls for cease-fire. 30 de octubre del 2024

Israel will fight. Since October 7 Israel has been in war. Israel did not start this war. Israel did not want this war, but Israel will win this war. Hamas launches this war by perpetrating the worst savagery our people of seen since the Holocaust. Hamas murdered children in front of their parents, murdered parents in front of their children, they burned people alive, they rape women, they beheaded men, they tortured Holocaust survivors, they kidnapped babies.

They committed the most horrific crimes imaginable, and they're part of the axis of evil that Iran has formed. An axis of terror that works by arming training and financing Hamas and Gaza, Hisbah in Lebanon, the Hutis in Yemen and other terror proxies throughout the Middle East and beyond the Middle East. In fighting Hamas and the Iranian axis of terror, Israel is fighting the enemies of civilization itself.

Victory over these enemies begins with moral clarity. It begins with knowing the difference between good and evil, between right and wrong. It means making a moral distinction between the deliberate murder of the innocent and the unintentional casualties that accompany every legitimate war, even the most just war. It means holding Hamas responsible for the double war crime it commits every day by deliberately targeting Israeli civilians while deliberately using Palestinian civilians as human Shields. It means making clear that the use of human Shields is not only an immoral tactic of terror but also an ineffective one, because as long as Hamas' use of Palestinian human Shields results in the international community blaming Israel, Hamas will continue to use it as a tool of terror and so will others. Hamas will continue to use the basements in Gaza's hospitals as the command post of its vast territorial network and will continue to use mosques as fortified military positions and weapon depots, it would continue to steal fuel and humanitarian assistance from UN facilities while Israel is doing everything to get Palestinians civilians out of harm's way Hamas is doing everything to keep Palestinian civilians in harm's way.

Israel urges Palestinian civilians to leave the areas of armed conflict, while Hamas prevents those civilians from leaving those areas and gunpoint. Hamas is also preventing foreign nationals from leaving Gaza altogether and most despicably, Hamas

is holding over 200 Israeli hostages, including 33 children, holding them, terrorizing them and keeping them as hostages. Every civilized nation should stand with Israel and demand that these hostages be freed immediately and freed unconditionally. I want to make clear Israel's position regarding the ceasefire: just as the United States would not agree to a ceasefire after the bombing of Pearl Harbor or after the terrorist attacks of 9-11, Israel will not agree to a cation of hostilities with Hamas after the horrific attacks of October 7.

Calls for a ceasefire are calls for Israel to surrender to Hamas, to surrender to terrorism, to surrender to barbarism. That will not happen. Ladies and gentlemen, the Bible says that there is a time for peace and a time for war. This is a time for war. A war for common future. Today we draw a line between the forces of civilization and the forces of barbarism. It is a time for everyone to decide where they stand. Israel will stand against the forces of barbarism until victory.

I hope and pray that civilized nations everywhere will back this fight, because Israel's fight is your fight, because if Hamas and Irans axis of evil win, you will be their next target. That's why Israel's victory will be your victory, but make no mistake, regardless of who stands with Israel, Israel will fight until this battle is won and Israel will prevail. May God bless Israel and May God bless all news stand with Israel.

Israel-Hamas war: Netanyahu addresses US Jewish Leaders Conference in Jerusalem. 18 de febrero del 2024.

You know I've been seeing you here year after year, but this year it's different. Each year you come here to express your solidarity with the state of Israel, the solidarity of the diaspora with the Jewish state, but this year that solidarity is particularly important because it's an expression of unity between the Jewish people and the Jewish state, between so many of our friends around the world and the great trial that we are faced with today. We have faced an attack of savagery that is unparallel since the Holocaust we haven't seen such cruelty directed against the Jewish people since the Nazi Genocide.

We've seen children murdered in front of their parents, parents murdered in front of their children, women raped and beheaded after being raped. We've seen

youngsters burned alive in death bits, we've seen mothers and babies kidnapped by these monsters. We've seen them rejoice over this savagery something that even the Nazis refused to publicize, but they came in, these killers, with GoPro cameras to proclaim to the world, to their people, what kind of cruelty and what kind of inhumanity they were capable of. With fish Glee they showed this murderous, horrible action that puts us in front of a huge challenge and our challenge, and our goal can be summarized in two words: total Victory.

Total Victory against these Savages. It's not just our battle, it's not just our battle, it's the Battle of civilization against barbarism because if Hamas gets away with this, if the axis of Evil and Terror that Iran dominates in this world or seeks to dominate the Middle East it will expand everywhere, and so this is a battle that is important for Israel's future and our survival, but it's also critical for the future of civilization. So, we set a goal total Victory, and that goal has three missions one to destroy Hamas, second to free our hostages, all of our hostages, and third to ensure that Gaza no longer poses a threat to Israel. Now when we set out to do this even our best friends said to us: "can't be done", they said: "could be done". They said: "well, you know if you go into a ground operation you run into horrible risks. If you go into Gaza City you're going to go into horrible risks. If you go into Shifa Hospital you're going to have to kill all the patients, you might kill all the patients and all the doctors and so many civilians". None of that happened. They said: "if you go into the tunnels...", and these are experienced people who were thinking about the best thing that they could offer, the best advice they could offer us, they said: "if you go into the tunnels, these are death traps that are impossible". Our soldiers are in the tunnels, our brave soldiers are in the tunnels, demolishing the infrastructure of these killers. They're doing things that were unbelievable and they're doing so in exemplary action.

We're doing that in things in standards that no Army has applied, it's not only me who say this, you should read the words of Colonel John Spencer, he's the head of urban Warfare at West Point, he toured several times in Iraq he says: "the Israeli Army is going to lens to prevent civilian casualties as no Army no military has done in comparable situations" and he said: "there is no comparable situation". In Gaza we're facing 30,000 armed terrorists with an underground tunnel territ tunnel network of hundreds of kilometres maybe 500 kilometres. There's nothing comparable like that.

He Compares this to the Battle of Mosul. Mosul is smaller than Gaza. Mosul had uh 3 to 5,000 fighters terrorists. It took America and its allies about 9 months. They achieved the conquest of Mosul and the defeat of the terrorists and the ratio of those of civilians to not to combatants killed was about 3 to 1 some say 4 to 1. 10,000 people were killed. We are now down to a ratio of 1 to one. Look, every civilian casualty is a tragedy, but we are doing things to prevent this that simply cannot be compared to any other Arena.

John Spencer says: what other Army gives advanced notice about where it's going to attack? We have thousands and thousands and thousands of phone calls. We call the Gazans on their cell phones, and we say, "get out of Harm's Way". We drop leaflets we offer safe corridors, safe havens for people to leave.

It's incomparable, he says there is one comparison: in World War II, the battle for Manila. I wasn't familiar with it. I heard it from him he says: in the battle for Manila there were 177,000 Japanese soldiers and the American Army went in, and they found something that they haven't encountered before: systemic tunnels. They weren't called tunnels; they were called sewage tunnels, and the Japanese soldiers used the sewage tunnels which made the fighting a lot more difficult. Manila had a population of 1 million. 100,000 civilians were killed in that Battle.

The Israeli Army is going to lens that no other Army has done to prevent civilian casualties. No other Army. *applauses* Of course this this doesn't prevent the vilification of Israel this doesn't prevent the horrible slurs and Slanders and lies that are held against the Jewish State and the Jewish Army. I mean this is incredible they took us to this farce in the Hague. South Africa accuses us of genocide, can you imagine? South Africa accuses us of genocide when we're doing everything but genocide against a genocidal Foe and this is repeated sometimes by world leaders. Today the president of Brazil by comparing Israel's war in Gaza against Hamas a genocidal terrorist organization to the Holocaust. President Silva has disgraced the memory of six million Jews murdered by the Nazis and he's demonized the Jewish State like the most virent antisemite he should be ashamed of himself. *applauses* You know we often speak about the history of anti-Semitism, and we say how could those lies that were levelled against the Jewish people, these extraordinary falsifications, these un unbelievable diet tribes that had no basis in fact, how could they have been believed by so many? but

that's exactly what's happening today in the case of Israel. The vilifications and lies levelled against Israel are believed by many, but I have to say also there are many who don't believe them and stand by us beginning with the United States of America in the broad segments of the American public. Yes, there are some who join the demonstrations. The most absurd thing is Gays for Gaza, have you seen this? I mean, you don't want to be gay in Gaza. You don't want to. You can't talk about human rights and talk about the Hamas regime.

These monstrous entity that executes anybody who disagrees with them, they are now as we are making every effort to get civilian out of Harm's Way, Hamas is doing every effort to keep them In Harm's Way and when we provide safe corridors and the Gazans begin to move there they try to stop them at gunpoint and when they can't stop them at gunpoint they stop them with gunfire. To identify with Hamas and to hurl these lies at Israel is to side with the barbarians.

But I want to tell you none of this will stop us. None of this will stop us, none of it. We're committed to Total Victory and total victory means the release of the hostages. This is not something that is simple. It's very hard, I'm not sure that any government has to face quite such a predicament it has horrible dilemmas. The release of hostages is an imperative in in the Jewish tradition, but it faces it puts decision makers in very difficult situations. you know, when you're young and you're a soldier in a special unit you don't quite understand that, because I've had my own personal experience, this has accompanied me in my life. I was wounded in the rescue of hostages from a hijacked Sabina airplane. My older brother Yoni died while leading the INB Rescue of 103 Jewish hostages. Recently we achieved the release of 110 hostages. That's a very important number, but it's not enough. We still have a way to go, but we released the majority of hostages, which is of living hostages, which is very very crucial and most recently a few days ago, we achieve a wonderful Rescue of two hostages, two additional hostages by our brave Soldiers. Our formula is very simple: the release of hostages can be achieved through strong military action and tough negotiations, very tough negotiations. That tough position has to involve the exertion of pressure and the exertion of pressure is not merely on Hamas itself, but on those who can exert pressure on Hamas, beginning with Qatar. Qatar can press Hamas as no one else can. They host Hamas leaders, Hamas is dependent on them financially and I urge

you to press Qatar to press Hamas, because we want our hostages released. I hope that we can achieve a deal soon to release more of our hostages but Deal or No Deal we have to finish the job to get total Victory.

I had recently a very good conversation with President Biden. I very much appreciate the support that he and the US government have been given us since the beginning of the war. Sometimes we have differences of opinion, but we've been able to overcome them, and I want to tell you that I agree with President Biden that we need to do everything in our power to get civilians out of Harm's Way as we complete the job. We've destroyed 3/4 of Hamas's fighting battalions. It's very important to understand they have organized battalions where people, where commanders give orders to companies or to organize fighting formations and you can say you can have a 100 people attack the Israeli Army from this direction or 50 people attack them from that direction. Once you destroy the battalions there is no organized command and control structure. You're left with individual terrorist which we mop up with ground action which is much less intense. We cannot leave a quarter of Hamas's terrorist battalions intact. No one would do that in the case of fighting Isis. You wouldn't leave a quarter of Isis intact in a defined territory. You wouldn't even think about that, and you didn't. America finished the job with its allies. We will finish the job here with our brave soldiers. And we will make sure that the civilian population has a way to get out of Harm's Way to safe corridors and to safe zones.

I hope we can also reach an understanding on the day after Hamas, but here's the critical thing: the day after Hamas is the day after Hamas is destroyed. The emphasis is on after! After Hamas is removed from the scene. And I can tell you one thing, that I think we can agree on many things, but one thing Israel cannot agree to is in international dictates that would seek to unilaterally recognize a Palestinian State, basically force a Palestinian State on Israel after the horror of October 7th. And you should know that the people of Israel are really united in this.

I brought today a resolution before the government I want to read it to you: "Israel utterly rejects international dictates regarding a permanent settlement with the Palestinians. A settlement, if it is to be reached, will come about solely through direct negotiations between the parties without preconditions. Israel will continue to oppose

unilateral recognition of a Palestinian State such a recognition in the wake of the October 7th Massacre would be a massive and unprecedented reward to terrorism and would prevent any future peace agreement.” This passed unanimously in the government today, it will pass tomorrow in the Knesset I think with an overwhelming majority, and I hope that the conference can consider adopting this statement as well. This will send a message of unity, unity inside Israel, unity outside Israe, unity between us. And I have to tell you again, you can see this when you go outside: you can see that in the taxi cabs, you can see it if you walk into a restaurant or in the lobby of a hotel where you're staying at. Israel is United as never before. The Army is united as never before, the public is united as never before and we are united with you for one thing: total Victory. Total Victory will give us security. Total Victory will give us peace and an expansion of the peace with our Arab neighbours and total Victory will ensure our future thank you friends. Thank you, the conference of presidents.

ADDRESS TO THE NATION ON THE SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACKS

THE OVAL OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.
SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

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.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER AND REMEMBRANCE SERVICE

THE NATIONAL CATHEDRAL

WASHINGTON, D.C.

SEPTEMBER 14, 2001

We are here in the middle hour of our grief. So many have suffered so great a loss, and today we express our nation's sorrow. We come before God to pray for the missing and the dead, and for those who love them.

On Tuesday, our country was attacked with deliberate and massive cruelty. We have seen the images of fire and ashes, and bent steel.

Now come the names, the list of casualties we are only beginning to read. They are the names of men and women who began their day at a desk or in an airport, busy with life. They are the names of people who faced death, and in their last moments called home to say, be brave, and I love you.

They are the names of passengers who defied their murderers, and prevented the murder of others on the ground. They are the names of men and women who wore the uniform of the United States, and died at their posts.

They are the names of rescuers, the ones whom death found running up the stairs and into the fires to help others. We will read all these names. We will linger over them, and learn their stories, and many Americans will weep.

To the children and parents and spouses and families and friends of the lost, we offer the deepest sympathy of the nation. And I assure you, you are not alone.

Just three days removed from these events, Americans do not yet have the distance of history. But our responsibility to history is already clear: to answer these attacks and rid the world of evil.

War has been waged against us by stealth and deceit and murder. This nation is peaceful, but fierce when stirred to anger. This conflict was begun on the timing and terms of others. It will end in

a way, and at an hour, of our choosing.

Our purpose as a nation is firm. Yet our wounds as a people are recent and unhealed, and lead us to pray. In many of our prayers this week, there is a searching, and an honesty. At St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York on Tuesday, a woman said, "I prayed to God to give us a sign that He is still here." Others have prayed for the same, searching hospital to hospital, carrying pictures of those still missing.

God's signs are not always the ones we look for. We learn in tragedy that his purposes are not always our own. Yet the prayers of private suffering, whether in our homes or in this great cathedral, are known and heard, and understood.

There are prayers that help us last through the day, or endure the night. There are prayers of friends and strangers, that give us strength for the journey. And there are prayers that yield our will to a will greater than our own.

This world He created is of moral design. Grief and tragedy and hatred are only for a time. Goodness, remembrance, and love have no end. And the Lord of life holds all who die, and all who mourn.

It is said that adversity introduces us to ourselves. This is true of a nation as well. In this trial, we have been reminded, and the world has seen, that our fellow Americans are generous and kind, resourceful and brave. We see our national character in rescuers working past exhaustion; in long lines of blood donors; in thousands of citizens who have asked to work and serve in any way possible.

And we have seen our national character in eloquent acts of sacrifice. Inside the World Trade Center, one man who could have saved himself stayed until the end at the side of his quadriplegic friend. A beloved priest died giving the last rites to a firefighter. Two office workers, finding a disabled stranger, carried her down sixty-eight floors to safety. A group of men drove through the night from Dallas to Washington to bring skin grafts for burn victims.

In these acts, and in many others, Americans showed a deep commitment to one another, and an abiding love for our country. Today, we feel what Franklin Roosevelt called the warm courage of

national unity. This is a unity of every faith, and every background.

It has joined together political parties in both houses of Congress. It is evident in services of prayer and candlelight vigils, and American flags, which are displayed in pride, and wave in defiance.

Our unity is a kinship of grief, and a steadfast resolve to prevail against our enemies. And this unity against terror is now extending across the world.

America is a nation full of good fortune, with so much to be grateful for. But we are not spared from suffering. In every generation, the world has produced enemies of human freedom. They have attacked America, because we are freedom's home and defender. And the commitment of our fathers is now the calling of our time.

On this national day of prayer and remembrance, we ask almighty God to watch over our nation, and grant us patience and resolve in all that is to come. We pray that He will comfort and console those who now walk in sorrow. We thank Him for each life we now must mourn, and the promise of a life to come.

As we have been assured, neither death nor life, nor angels nor principalities nor powers, nor things present nor things to come, nor height nor depth, can separate us from God's love. May He bless the souls of the departed. May He comfort our own. And may He always guide our country.

God bless America.

ADDRESS TO THE JOINT SESSION OF THE 107TH CONGRESS

UNITED STATES CAPITOL
WASHINGTON, D.C.
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. 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. 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.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SERVICE OF REMEMBRANCE
AT THE PENTAGON

THE PENTAGON
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA
OCTOBER 11, 2001

Please be seated. President and Senator Clinton, thank you all for being here. We have come here to pay our respects to 125 men and women who died in the service of America. We also remember 64 passengers on a hijacked plane; those men and women, boys and girls who fell into the hands of evildoers, and also died here exactly one month ago.

On September 11th, great sorrow came to our country. And from that sorrow has come great resolve. Today, we are a nation awakened to the evil of terrorism, and determined to destroy it. That work began the moment we were attacked; and it will continue until justice is delivered.

Americans are returning, as we must, to the normal pursuits of life. Americans are returning, as we must, to the normal pursuits of life. But we know that if you lost a son or daughter here, or a husband, or a wife, or a mom or dad, life will never again be as it was. The loss was sudden, and hard, and permanent. So difficult to explain. So difficult to accept.

Three schoolchildren traveling with their teacher. An Army general. A budget analyst who reported to work here for 30 years. A lieutenant commander in the Naval Reserve who left behind a wife, a four-year-old son, and another child on the way.

One life touches so many others. One death can leave sorrow that seems almost unbearable. But to all of you who lost someone here, I want to say: You are not alone. The American people will never forget the cruelty that was done here and in New York, and in the sky over Pennsylvania.

We will never forget all the innocent people killed by the hatred of a few. We know the loneliness you feel in your loss. The entire

nation, entire nation shares in your sadness. And we pray for you and your loved ones. And we will always honor their memory.

The hijackers were instruments of evil who died in vain. Behind them is a cult of evil which seeks to harm the innocent and thrives on human suffering. Theirs is the worst kind of cruelty, the cruelty that is fed, not weakened, by tears. Theirs is the worst kind of violence, pure malice, while daring to claim the authority of God. We cannot fully understand the designs and power of evil. It is enough to know that evil, like goodness, exists. And in the terrorists, evil has found a willing servant.

In New York, the terrorists chose as their target a symbol of America's freedom and confidence. Here, they struck a symbol of our strength in the world. And the attack on the Pentagon, on that day, was more symbolic than they knew. It was on another September 11th — September 11th, 1941 — that construction on this building first began. America was just then awakening to another menace: The Nazi terror in Europe.

And on that very night, President Franklin Roosevelt spoke to the nation. The danger, he warned, has long ceased to be a mere possibility. The danger is here now. Not only from a military enemy, but from an enemy of all law, all liberty, all morality, all religion.

For us too, in the year 2001, an enemy has emerged that rejects every limit of law, morality, and religion. The terrorists have no true home in any country, or culture, or faith. They dwell in dark corners of earth. And there, we will find them.

This week, I have called the Armed Forces into action. One by one, we are eliminating power centers of a regime that harbors al Qaeda terrorists. We gave that regime a choice: Turn over the terrorists, or face your ruin. They chose unwisely.

The Taliban regime has brought nothing but fear and misery to the people of Afghanistan. These rulers call themselves holy men, even with their record of drawing money from heroin trafficking. They consider themselves pious and devout, while subjecting women to fierce brutality.

The Taliban has allied itself with murderers and gave them shelter. But today, for al Qaeda and the Taliban, there is no shelter. As Americans did 60 years ago, we have entered a struggle of uncertain duration. But now, as then, we can be certain of the outcome, because we have a number of decisive assets.

We have a unified country. We have the patience to fight and win on many fronts: Blocking terrorist plans, seizing their funds, arresting their networks, disrupting their communications, opposing their sponsors. And we have one more great asset in this cause: The brave men and women of the United States military.

From my first days in this office, I have felt and seen the strong spirit of the Armed Forces. I saw it at Fort Stewart, Georgia, when I first reviewed our troops as Commander-in-Chief, and looked into the faces of proud and determined soldiers. I saw it in Annapolis on a graduation day, at Camp Pendleton in California, Camp Bondsteel in Kosovo. And I have seen this spirit at the Pentagon, before and after the attack on this building.

You've responded to a great emergency with calm and courage. And for that, your country honors you. A Commander-in-Chief must know, must know that he can count on the skill and readiness of servicemen and women at every point in the chain of command. You have given me that confidence.

And I give you these commitments. The wound to this building will not be forgotten, but it will be repaired. Brick by brick, we will quickly rebuild the Pentagon. In the missions ahead for the military, you will have everything you need, every resource, every weapon, every means to assure full victory for the United States and the cause of freedom.

And I pledge to you that America will never relent on this war against terror. There will be times of swift, dramatic action. There will be times of steady, quiet progress. Over time, with patience, and precision, the terrorists will be pursued. They will be isolated, surrounded, cornered, until there is no place to run, or hide, or rest.

As military and civilian personnel in the Pentagon, you are an important part of the struggle we have entered. You know the risks

of your calling, and you have willingly accepted them. You believe in our country, and our country believes in you.

Within sight of this building is Arlington Cemetery, the final resting place of many thousands who died for our country over the generations. Enemies of America have now added to these graves, and they wish to add more. Unlike our enemies, we value every life, and we mourn every loss.

Yet we're not afraid. Our cause is just, and worthy of sacrifice. Our nation is strong of heart, firm of purpose. Inspired by all the courage that has come before, we will meet our moment and we will prevail.

May God bless you all, and may God bless America.

ADDRESS TO THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS

NEW YORK, NEW YORK

NOVEMBER 10, 2001

Thank you. Mr. Secretary General, Mr. President, distinguished delegates, and ladies and gentlemen. We meet in a hall devoted to peace, in a city scarred by violence, in a nation awakened to danger, in a world uniting for a long struggle. Every civilized nation here today is resolved to keep the most basic commitment of civilization: We will defend ourselves and our future against terror and lawless violence.

The United Nations was founded in this cause. In a second world war, we learned there is no isolation from evil. We affirmed that some crimes are so terrible they offend humanity, itself. And we resolved that the aggressions and ambitions of the wicked must be opposed early, decisively, and collectively, before they threaten us all. That evil has returned, and that cause is renewed.

A few miles from here, many thousands still lie in a tomb of rubble. Tomorrow, the Secretary General, the President of the General Assembly, and I will visit that site, where the names of every nation and region that lost citizens will be read aloud. If we were to read the names of every person who died, it would take more than three hours.

Those names include a citizen of Gambia, whose wife spent their fourth wedding anniversary, September the 12th, searching in vain for her husband. Those names include a man who supported his wife in Mexico, sending home money every week. Those names include a young Pakistani who prayed toward Mecca five times a day, and died that day trying to save others.

The suffering of September the 11th was inflicted on people of many faiths and many nations. All of the victims, including Muslims, were killed with equal indifference and equal satisfaction by the terrorist leaders. The terrorists are violating the tenets of

every religion, including the one they invoke.

Last week, the Sheikh of Al-Azhar University, the world's oldest Islamic institution of higher learning, declared that terrorism is a disease, and that Islam prohibits killing innocent civilians. The terrorists call their cause holy, yet, they fund it with drug dealing; they encourage murder and suicide in the name of a great faith that forbids both. They dare to ask God's blessing as they set out to kill innocent men, women and children. But the God of Isaac and Ishmael would never answer such a prayer. And a murderer is not a martyr; he is just a murderer.

Time is passing. Yet, for the United States of America, there will be no forgetting September the 11th. We will remember every rescuer who died in honor. We will remember every family that lives in grief. We will remember the fire and ash, the last phone calls, the funerals of the children.

And the people of my country will remember those who have plotted against us. We are learning their names. We are coming to know their faces. There is no corner of the Earth distant or dark enough to protect them. However long it takes, their hour of justice will come.

Every nation has a stake in this cause. As we meet, the terrorists are planning more murder — perhaps in my country, or perhaps in yours. They kill because they aspire to dominate. They seek to overthrow governments and destabilize entire regions.

Last week, anticipating this meeting of the General Assembly, they denounced the United Nations. They called our Secretary General a criminal and condemned all Arab nations here as traitors to Islam.

Few countries meet their exacting standards of brutality and oppression. Every other country is a potential target. And all the world faces the most horrifying prospect of all: These same terrorists are searching for weapons of mass destruction, the tools to turn their hatred into holocaust. They can be expected to use chemical, biological and nuclear weapons the moment they are capable of doing so. No hint of conscience would prevent it.

This threat cannot be ignored. This threat cannot be appeased. Civilization, itself, the civilization we share, is threatened. History will record our response, and judge or justify every nation in this hall.

The civilized world is now responding. We act to defend ourselves and deliver our children from a future of fear. We choose the dignity of life over a culture of death. We choose lawful change and civil disagreement over coercion, subversion, and chaos. These commitments — hope and order, law and life — unite people across cultures and continents. Upon these commitments depend all peace and progress. For these commitments, we are determined to fight.

The United Nations has risen to this responsibility. On the 12th of September, these buildings opened for emergency meetings of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Before the sun had set, these attacks on the world stood condemned by the world. And I want to thank you for this strong and principled stand.

I also thank the Arab Islamic countries that have condemned terrorist murder. Many of you have seen the destruction of terror in your own lands. The terrorists are increasingly isolated by their own hatred and extremism. They cannot hide behind Islam. The authors of mass murder and their allies have no place in any culture, and no home in any faith.

The conspiracies of terror are being answered by an expanding global coalition. Not every nation will be a part of every action against the enemy. But every nation in our coalition has duties. These duties can be demanding, as we in America are learning. We have already made adjustments in our laws and in our daily lives. We're taking new measures to investigate terror and to protect against threats.

The leaders of all nations must now carefully consider their responsibilities and their future. Terrorist groups like al Qaeda depend upon the aid or indifference of governments. They need the support of a financial infrastructure, and safe havens to train and plan and hide.

Some nations want to play their part in the fight against terror,

but tell us they lack the means to enforce their laws and control their borders. We stand ready to help. Some governments still turn a blind eye to the terrorists, hoping the threat will pass them by. They are mistaken. And some governments, while pledging to uphold the principles of the U.N., have cast their lot with the terrorists. They support them and harbor them, and they will find that their welcome guests are parasites that will weaken them, and eventually consume them.

For every regime that sponsors terror, there is a price to be paid. And it will be paid. The allies of terror are equally guilty of murder and equally accountable to justice.

The Taliban are now learning this lesson — that regime and the terrorists who support it are now virtually indistinguishable. Together they promote terror abroad and impose a reign of terror on the Afghan people. Women are executed in Kabal's soccer stadium. They can be beaten for wearing socks that are too thin. Men are jailed for missing prayer meetings.

The United States, supported by many nations, is bringing justice to the terrorists in Afghanistan. We're making progress against military targets, and that is our objective. Unlike the enemy, we seek to minimize, not maximize, the loss of innocent life. I'm proud of the honorable conduct of the American military. And my country grieves for all the suffering the Taliban have brought upon Afghanistan, including the terrible burden of war. The Afghan people do not deserve their present rulers. Years of Taliban misrule have brought nothing but misery and starvation. Even before this current crisis, 4 million Afghans depended on food from the United States and other nations, and millions of Afghans were refugees from Taliban oppression.

I make this promise to all the victims of that regime: The Taliban's days of harboring terrorists and dealing in heroin and brutalizing women are drawing to a close. And when that regime is gone, the people of Afghanistan will say with the rest of the world: good riddance.

I can promise, too, that America will join the world in helping

the people of Afghanistan rebuild their country. Many nations, including mine, are sending food and medicine to help Afghans through the winter. America has air-dropped over 1.3 million packages of rations into Afghanistan. Just this week, we air-lifted 20,000 blankets and over 200 tons of provisions into the region. We continue to provide humanitarian aid, even while the Taliban tried to steal the food we send.

More help eventually will be needed. The United States will work closely with the United Nations and development banks to reconstruct Afghanistan after hostilities there have ceased and the Taliban are no longer in control. And the United States will work with the U.N. to support a post-Taliban government that represents all of the Afghan people.

In this war on terror, each of us must answer for what we have done or what we have left undone. After tragedy, there is a time for sympathy and condolence. And my country has been very grateful for both. The memorials and vigils around the world will not be forgotten. But the time for sympathy has now passed; the time for action has now arrived.

The most basic obligations in this new conflict have already been defined by the United Nations. On September the 28th, the Security Council adopted Resolution 1373. Its requirements are clear: Every United Nations member has a responsibility to crack down on terrorist financing. We must pass all necessary laws in our own countries to allow the confiscation of terrorist assets. We must apply those laws to every financial institution in every nation.

We have a responsibility to share intelligence and coordinate the efforts of law enforcement. If you know something, tell us. If we know something, we'll tell you. And when we find the terrorists, we must work together to bring them to justice. We have a responsibility to deny any sanctuary, safe haven or transit to terrorists. Every known terrorist camp must be shut down, its operators apprehended, and evidence of their arrest presented to the United Nations. We have a responsibility to deny weapons to terrorists and to actively prevent private citizens from providing

them.

These obligations are urgent and they are binding on every nation with a place in this chamber. Many governments are taking these obligations seriously, and my country appreciates it. Yet, even beyond Resolution 1373, more is required, and more is expected of our coalition against terror.

We're asking for a comprehensive commitment to this fight. We must unite in opposing all terrorists, not just some of them. In this world there are good causes and bad causes, and we may disagree on where the line is drawn. Yet, there is no such thing as a good terrorist. No national aspiration, no remembered wrong can ever justify the deliberate murder of the innocent. Any government that rejects this principle, trying to pick and choose its terrorist friends, will know the consequences.

We must speak the truth about terror. Let us never tolerate outrageous conspiracy theories concerning the attacks of September the 11th; malicious lies that attempt to shift the blame away from the terrorists, themselves, away from the guilty. To inflame ethnic hatred is to advance the cause of terror.

The war against terror must not serve as an excuse to persecute ethnic and religious minorities in any country. Innocent people must be allowed to live their own lives, by their own customs, under their own religion. And every nation must have avenues for the peaceful expression of opinion and dissent. When these avenues are closed, the temptation to speak through violence grows.

We must press on with our agenda for peace and prosperity in every land. My country is pledged to encouraging development and expanding trade. My country is pledged to investing in education and combating AIDS and other infectious diseases around the world. Following September 11th, these pledges are even more important. In our struggle against hateful groups that exploit poverty and despair, we must offer an alternative of opportunity and hope.

The American government also stands by its commitment to a just peace in the Middle East. We are working toward a day when

two states, Israel and Palestine, live peacefully together within secure and recognize borders as called for by the Security Council resolutions. We will do all in our power to bring both parties back into negotiations. But peace will only come when all have sworn off, forever, incitement, violence and terror.

And, finally, this struggle is a defining moment for the United Nations, itself. And the world needs its principled leadership. It undermines the credibility of this great institution, for example, when the Commission on Human Rights offers seats to the world's most persistent violators of human rights. The United Nations depends, above all, on its moral authority — and that authority must be preserved.

The steps I described will not be easy. For all nations, they will require effort. For some nations, they will require great courage. Yet, the cost of inaction is far greater. The only alternative to victory is a nightmare world where every city is a potential killing field.

As I've told the American people, freedom and fear are at war. We face enemies that hate not our policies, but our existence; the tolerance of openness and creative culture that defines us. But the outcome of this conflict is certain: There is a current in history and it runs toward freedom. Our enemies resent it and dismiss it, but the dreams of mankind are defined by liberty — the natural right to create and build and worship and live in dignity. When men and women are released from oppression and isolation, they find fulfillment and hope, and they leave poverty by the millions.

These aspirations are lifting up the peoples of Europe, Asia, Africa and the Americas, and they can lift up all of the Islamic world.

We stand for the permanent hopes of humanity, and those hopes will not be denied. We're confident, too, that history has an author who fills time and eternity with his purpose. We know that evil is real, but good will prevail against it. This is the teaching of many faiths, and in that assurance we gain strength for a long journey.

It is our task — the task of this generation — to provide the

response to aggression and terror. We have no other choice, because there is no other peace.

We did not ask for this mission, yet there is honor in history's call. We have a chance to write the story of our times, a story of courage defeating cruelty and light overcoming darkness. This calling is worthy of any life, and worthy of every nation. So let us go forward, confident, determined, and unafraid.

Thank you very much.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS TO THE 107TH CONGRESS

THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL
WASHINGTON, D.C.
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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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. 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. 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.

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.

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. 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.

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.

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.

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

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. 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.

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.

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. 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.

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.

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.

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.

My budget nearly doubles funding for a sustained strategy

of homeland security, focused on four key areas: bioterrorism, emergency response, airport and border security, and improved intelligence. We will develop vaccines to fight anthrax and other deadly diseases. We'll increase funding to help states and communities train and equip our heroic police and firefighters. We will improve intelligence collection and sharing, expand patrols at our borders, strengthen the security of air travel, and use technology to track the arrivals and departures of visitors to the United States.

Homeland security will make America not only stronger, but, in many ways, better. Knowledge gained from bioterrorism research will improve public health. Stronger police and fire departments will mean safer neighborhoods. Stricter border enforcement will help combat illegal drugs. And as government works to better secure our homeland, America will continue to depend on the eyes and ears of alert citizens.

A few days before Christmas, an airline flight attendant spotted a passenger lighting a match. The crew and passengers quickly subdued the man, who had been trained by al Qaeda and was armed with explosives. The people on that plane were alert and, as a result, likely saved nearly 200 lives. And tonight we welcome and thank flight attendants Hermis Moutardier and Christina Jones.

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. 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. 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.

Americans who have lost their jobs need our help and I support extending unemployment benefits and direct assistance for health care coverage. Yet, American workers want more than unemployment checks — they want a steady paycheck. When America works, America prospers, so my economic security plan

can be summed up in one word: jobs.

Good jobs begin with good schools, and here we've made a fine start. Republicans and Democrats worked together to achieve historic education reform so that no child is left behind. I was proud to work with members of both parties: Chairman John Boehner and Congressman George Miller. Senator Judd Gregg. And I was so proud of our work, I even had nice things to say about my friend, Ted Kennedy. I know the folks at the Crawford coffee shop couldn't believe I'd say such a thing, but our work on this bill shows what is possible if we set aside posturing and focus on results.

There is more to do. We need to prepare our children to read and succeed in school with improved Head Start and early childhood development programs. We must upgrade our teacher colleges and teacher training and launch a major recruiting drive with a great goal for America: a quality teacher in every classroom.

Good jobs also depend on reliable and affordable energy. This Congress must act to encourage conservation, promote technology, build infrastructure, and it must act to increase energy production at home so America is less dependent on foreign oil.

Good jobs depend on expanded trade. Selling into new markets creates new jobs, so I ask Congress to finally approve trade promotion authority. On these two key issues, trade and energy, the House of Representatives has acted to create jobs, and I urge the Senate to pass this legislation.

Good jobs depend on sound tax policy. Last year, some in this hall thought my tax relief plan was too small; some thought it was too big. But when the checks arrived in the mail, most Americans thought tax relief was just about right. Congress listened to the people and responded by reducing tax rates, doubling the child credit, and ending the death tax. For the sake of long-term growth and to help Americans plan for the future, let's make these tax cuts permanent.

The way out of this recession, the way to create jobs, is to grow the economy by encouraging investment in factories and equipment,

and by speeding up tax relief so people have more money to spend. For the sake of American workers, let's pass a stimulus package.

Good jobs must be the aim of welfare reform. As we reauthorize these important reforms, we must always remember the goal is to reduce dependency on government and offer every American the dignity of a job.

Americans know economic security can vanish in an instant without health security. I ask Congress to join me this year to enact a patients' bill of rights to give uninsured workers credits to help buy health coverage, to approve an historic increase in the spending for veterans' health, and to give seniors a sound and modern Medicare system that includes coverage for prescription drugs.

A good job should lead to security in retirement. I ask Congress to enact new safeguards for 401K and pension plans. Employees who have worked hard and saved all their lives should not have to risk losing everything if their company fails. Through stricter accounting standards and tougher disclosure requirements, corporate America must be made more accountable to employees and shareholders and held to the highest standards of conduct.

Retirement security also depends upon keeping the commitments of Social Security, and we will. We must make Social Security financially stable and allow personal retirement accounts for younger workers who choose them.

Members, you and I will work together in the months ahead on other issues: productive farm policy, a cleaner environment, broader home ownership, especially among minorities, and ways to encourage the good work of charities and faith-based groups. 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.

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.

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.

And I hope you will join me — I hope you will join me in expressing thanks to one American for the strength and calm and comfort she brings to our nation in crisis, our First Lady, Laura Bush.

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.” 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.

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. 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, and ask it to join a new effort to encourage development and education and opportunity in the Islamic world.

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. 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.

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.

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.

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. 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.

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.

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.